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ABSTRACT

Marketing Marginalized Neighborhoods.
Tourism and Leisure in the 21st Century City
Johannes Novy

This thesis deals, as its subtitle indicates, with tourism on the neighborhood level. In it, I provide a comparative account of the recent history of tourism development in Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, New York. Grounded in a discussion of the forces reconfiguring urban development as well as tourism in the advanced capitalist world, it examines how, by whom, and with what effects the two neighborhoods are re-imagined, re-constructed, and re-experienced as places to visit and explore; unburies the frequently omitted historicity of “slumming” and other niche tourism practices impacting so-called marginalized neighborhoods; elaborates upon the potential of tourism for socially equitable forms of neighborhood development and explores how the old face of tourism is being challenged by the increasingly complex and diverse realities of contemporary travel and leisure. Understanding tourism as a complex, dynamic system rather than simply an industry or process, the thesis pays particular emphasis to the need to rethink the way the demand side of tourism in cities is conceived and made sense of. Whereas tourism consumption in urban research has traditionally been framed as an altogether distinct activity, my research posits that distinctions between tourism and other forms of migration on the one hand as well as tourism and other forms of leisure and place consumption on the other hand have become increasingly blurred. This, I argue, not only brings about significant changes with regard to cities’ tourism and leisure landscapes. Rather, I also find evidence that the increasing pervasiveness of mobility and tourism as well as its increased dedifferentiation, i.e. the blurred boundaries between tourism and non-tourism activities, also transforms meanings of place and space and raises important questions concerning several critical concepts in urban studies such as the notions of ‘citizenship’, ‘community’, and ‘belonging’ in the 21st century.
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INTRODUCTION

For a long time common wisdom had it that urban tourism, as a social activity as well as an industry, is apart from a few exceptions confined to cities’ central districts where most tourist attractions as well as other places travelers frequent (hotels etc.) typically tend to concentrate. Not anymore, for urban tourism has not only grown disproportionately in recent decades in terms of visitor numbers, revenues and jobs but has also become increasingly complex and affects a seemingly ever-growing share of cities’ terrains. We are at the beginning of the 21st century, in other words, long past the point where tourism almost exclusively affected cities’ central areas, economically and otherwise. When living in New York I was reminded of this nearly every day when I saw Grayline’s coach buses drive through my neighborhood’s quaint streets. Park Slope, the neighborhood I lived in, is located in Brooklyn, and it was only in 2005 that Grayline, one of New York City’s largest tour operators, expanded its service beyond Manhattan’s core tourist zones and began covering areas in the city’s “Outer Boroughs”.

Similarly, “my” neighborhood has witnessed a proliferation of hotels in recent years. When I began researching for this thesis, four hotels were being built or planned in my zip code area in addition to three existing ones of which not one was older than two years. Before this “hotel craze” (McLaughlin 2008: 3) there had been not a single hotel in the vicinity. Moreover, the number of tourists as well as place-consumers, as I will call city residents who explore parts of their hometowns where they do not reside, seemed to have increased substantially in my neighborhood. “Seemed” because – and this is a problem we will encounter again and again throughout this
study – solid data about visitor activities on the neighborhood level does not exist. Instead, as will be discussed later, available data even at the city level leaves a lot to be desired, which makes researching urban tourism both a challenging and occasionally frustrating endeavor. What existed however were the observations of my grocer, of the bartender at my local pub, the city council member that represents my district and the hotelier next door, and they all overwhelmingly confirmed my own impression: the neighborhood I lived in, as well as many of the neighborhoods surrounding it, have become increasingly popular “destinations” for both New Yorkers behaving “as if tourists” (Lloyd and Clark 2001: 357) as well as visitors from out-of-town.

None of this is entirely new of course. I will in fact argue in the following that much of what happens today with respect to tourism “beyond the beaten path”, as the phenomenon is sometimes referred to colloquially, has been with us since the early days of commercialized urban tourism and that place consumption as a leisure activity for city residents has similarly long roots. One thing that is new, however, is the extent and breadth to which areas previously not visited, or less frequented by tourists and place consumers, are today integrated into cities’ tourism and leisure trade. Tourism and leisure development beyond cities’ centers in the “new”, post-Fordist, post-industrial urban political economy (Harvey 1989; Zukin 1995) in other words has become more evident and more pervasive. And it has emerged in many places as a powerful force, bringing about significant changes with respect to cities’ “landscapes of consumption” (Zukin 1991) and prompting new opportunities as well as challenges for the areas in which it occurs.
This is also the case with regard to marginalized, inner-city neighborhoods, by which I mean centrally located areas where people on the margins of urban society – ethnic or racial minorities, immigrants, poor people etc. – live and work and whose very names to this day evoke images of poverty and deprivation (Judd 2003: 30). Belleville in Paris, London’s East End, or the two cases this thesis is concerned with - Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, New York - are only several examples of this phenomenon. Not too long ago widely considered obsolete and places to be avoided rather than enjoyed, such areas are today (for reasons to be discussed later) colorfully described in visitor guides and on web sites. They are seen to possess “cosmopolitan flair” (Rath 2005), “creative energy” (Lloyd 2002) as well as “distinctive heritage and culture” (Maitland and Newman 2004) and consequently have in many cities become part of the itinerary of a growing share of consumers.

A review of the literature suggests that the observable rise of tourism and leisure development in marginalized neighborhoods is the result of a complex set of interrelated trends and developments of which many are intimately connected to broader processes of urban restructuring and social change. These trends and developments include but are not limited to: post-industrial shifts of contemporary cities’ economies; changing patterns of business and leisure; new geographies of capital accumulation; changing governance logics and urban policy paradigms; evolving lifestyles and consumption practices; the conversion of socially marginal and working-class areas of the central city to middle-class residential use; increasingly sophisticated forms of cultural commodification; as well as “new” tourist demands and tourism strategy formations.
At the same time, the current rise of socially marginal neighborhoods as tourism and leisure destinations also raises numerous questions about where contemporary processes of urban and social change more generally are taking us: questions about the implications of the emergent global consumer culture for local communities; urban inequality and intensified class stratification, cities’ political economies and development trajectories, authenticity and ownership, identity and heritage, commodification, and, maybe most importantly, questions about the future prospects of marginalized communities and population groups in contemporary cities in the advanced capitalist world.

For some commentators, the rising attractiveness of deprived inner-city neighborhoods as destinations represents a welcome development. In their perspective it constitutes yet another sign of a reversal of trends toward suburbanization and urban decline that dominated discourses surrounding urban development - particularly in the United States - for most of the 20th century. Increases in tourism and leisure activity, they argue, not only make cities and neighborhoods more attractive, secure and vibrant places but also offer possibilities of inclusion, participation, identity and soul. For many planners, therefore, marketing local culture and heritage as well as places’ distinct ambience appears to be the “silver bullet” to alleviate, if not eliminate, urban deprivation and economic distress (Osborne and Kovacs 2008).

Unsurprisingly, not all scholars share this position. Instead, a large body of literature emphasizes the inequitable effects of rent increases and displacement, for example, of contemporary urban transformations and the role growth dynamics associated with tourism, leisure, and consumption play in encouraging them (Zukin 1995; Smith
Tourism and leisure according to these authors does not contribute to the social, economic, and political inclusion or empowerment of low-income residents but rather furthers their disenfranchisement. It may do little to improve employment mobility and the prospect of better-paid work but instead fuels real-estate prices, distorts communities’ culture and heritage, and transforms their infrastructure according to the needs of consumers who earn decisively more than the average residents living in them.

This dissertation will explore both perspectives. It will show that both of them have merit, as tourism and leisure development on the neighborhood level, like many other aspects of contemporary urban change, typically involve different and contradictory effects. While tourism usually is said to operate in a context of an urban political economy that places local communities’ – and particularly those most in need – at a disadvantage, it also brings about (potential) benefits to a variety of people and involves opportunities for community groups and other actors that try to advance the well-being of their neighborhoods. This and the fact that the tourism and leisure industries typically represent one of the few urban economic growth sectors within reach for many marginalized neighborhoods underscores the need to better understand under what circumstances and how visitor and leisure economies can benefit to local economies.

Although there is now a substantial literature on marginal city spaces’ revalorization in North America, Europe, and elsewhere most research thus far has focused on their more general reconfigurations as sites of capital accumulation and consumption in post-industrial cities, and, even more, on gentrification processes (see Hyra 2006,
Lloyd 2002; Boyd 2000; Mele 2000; Levine 2004). Relatively little research has been done on the particular role of tourism in driving neighborhood change and particularly our understanding of the processes that combine to transform urban neighborhoods into desirable places is not well developed. Further, scholarship to this day struggles to come to terms with the manifold changes with respect to tourism and leisure that pattern post-Fordist societies, their implications for cities and neighborhoods, or the question whether and - if so - how these changes could be employed for the benefit of both marginalized communities as well as cities at large. A final limitation of existing scholarship is that there is a lack of international comparative research that could reveal how developments are mediated by processes and forces embedded in local culture, history and economic and political systems.

Building on these premises, this thesis seeks to break new ground. Drawing on empirical research in Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, it, first, makes a contribution to the scholarly field by exploring the implications of changing tourism and leisure patterns for processes of neighborhood change, as well as urban revitalization and economic development policy. More specifically, this study introduces consumption-oriented research on what is sometimes referred to as “post-tourism” or “new tourism” (see i.a. Feifer 1985; Ritzer and Liska 1997; Poon 1993, 1994; Maitland 2006; Maitland 2008; Maitland and Newman 2009) and others have termed “post-Fordist tourism (see i.a. Urry 1990). Drawing on a diverse set of scholarly perspectives it conceptualizes ways that tourism, jointly with wider practices of leisure and mobility reconfigures cities’ geographies, social structures, and economies.
Secondly, the thesis attends to the relationship between governance and the current revaluation of socially marginal urban spaces as destinations. That is, it will shed light on the ways public, private, and civil society actors on the neighborhood and city level deal with and – in interaction with other forces – shape the character, trajectory, and outcomes of tourism and leisure development. This includes efforts to “market” marginalized neighborhoods - by which I mean more than marketing in the narrow sense of undertaking promotion but rather all measures through which public and private actors, often working collaboratively, strive to attract tourists and place consumers (Kearns and Philo 1993). And, equally important, it entails other activities that, while often not directly or explicitly concerned with tourism and leisure development as such, promote, constrain, and temper the development of marginalized neighborhoods as destinations. Located within the extant debates concerning the relationship of macro- and micro-level conditions in shaping the trajectory of cities, the study in other words seeks to advance existing scholarship by examining how policy and politics, private-sector interests as well as community-based activism mediate the processes through which previously marginalized districts are currently re-imagined, re-constructed, and re-experienced as places to visit and explore. Finally, the research also considers implications for future policy and planning, particularly by shedding light on “bottom-up” tourism development strategies committed to people-centered development, their potential to achieve more socially equitable and “sustainable” forms of development and regeneration, as well as possible ways to expand them. In sum, the research’s primary goals can be summarized as follows:

- To analyze urban tourism, conceived as an integral part of processes of neighborhood and urban change and as a strategy for revitalization, and
make some tentative steps towards a better understanding of the principal characteristics of tourism on the neighborhood level.

- To characterize, compare, and explain the different approaches to tourism development in Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, New York, as well as the different trajectories of tourism in the two communities.
- To investigate the potential of “bottom-up” and other tourism development approaches in the context of cities’ current political economy for “sustainable” development and socially equitable forms of revitalization.

To further establish the research’s focus and scope, the remainder of this chapter has three purposes. The first of these is to elaborate more in depth on the thesis’ main concerns, to position them in the context of previous scholarly contributions, and to introduce the research questions guiding the analysis. The second is to provide an overview of the thesis’ methodological and theoretical framework, to introduce the cases analyzed and to describe the rationales for selecting them. Finally, the chapter concludes by outlining the organization of the thesis.

**PLANNING AND POLICY - SEA CHANGE OR NO CHANGE?**

A number of scholarly contributions suggest that the transformation towards post-industrial and post-Fordist societies since the 1970s, the culturalization of economic development under late capitalism as well as the rise of neoliberal urban governance, involving a heightened attention to place marketing and image politics since then, led to a “sea change” with regard to the way deprived but colorful precincts are understood, represented, and dealt with by the local state, business interests, and
other relevant actors in contemporary cities. Following this argument, government, 
private sector, as well as civic society actors increasingly recognize the symbolic and 
material assets of these areas and treat them accordingly.

Developments in Berlin and New York City – both bourgeoning urban tourism desti-
nations – at first glance seem to be in line with this observation. Consistent with what 
has been described in the scholarly literature about the (re-)valorization of marginal-
ized city spaces (Hoffman 2003; Shaw, Bagwell et al. 2004; Rath 2007), several pre-
viously neglected areas in these cities are currently attracting growing attention by 
consumers and are also more and more subject to activities by the local state, the 
tourism industry, and other relevant actors that seek to harness their potential as 
destinations. The inner-city neighborhoods Kreuzberg and Harlem are cases in point. 
Historically associated by mainstream society with poverty, high crime rates, poor 
schools, and sub-standard housing and forming part of the most impoverished parts 
of their cities, these communities have in recent years (again) become destinations 
for growing numbers of visitors and place consumers and also witnessed a plethora 
of attempts by a variety of actors to further – or capitalize on - their attractiveness as 
places to consume in and explore.

At the same time, however, the thesis also finds evidence that points in rather differ-
ent directions and emphasizes the need not to overstate changes in the ways de-
prived neighborhoods are understood, represented, and treated in light of the new 
urban growth dynamics associated with tourism and leisure. Unburying the historicity 
of the phenomenon under investigation, the thesis will for one describe develop-
ments both in Berlin and New York in the late 19th and early 20th century that chal-
lenge the conventionally held view that the marketing of marginalized neighborhoods, as I call it, is an essentially novel phenomenon.

And it will describe the many limitations that characterize today’s efforts to present areas like Harlem or Kreuzberg as destinations: The most influential actors of the tourism/entertainment sector in both cities and its associated public/private institutions, for example, to this day focus overwhelmingly on promoting and developing tourism and leisure where most of their members are based, i.e. in the established tourist zones and commercial areas. Comprehensive public sector planning or policy concerned with encouraging tourism and leisure meanwhile, for better or for worse, does not exist in either of the two cases, while many actors on the neighborhood level lack the resources and clout to adequately market their communities, have no interest in promoting them, or even fight the “touristification” of their communities. It is for this reason that the dissertation focuses on both: the strategies through which communities like Kreuzberg and Harlem are marketed, as well as the limitations on such efforts. The main research questions to be addressed are:

- What is the role of public policy and planning as well as private sector and civic society efforts in promoting, constraining and influencing tourism development in Kreuzberg and Harlem and how has it changed over time?
- What are the reasons for - and what are the effects of - their (non-)actions?
- What differences exist and what accounts for them?

These and related questions will be dealt with and answered by means of case-oriented, cross-national comparison which allows researchers to account for both
contextual specificity as well as the forces stemming from other scales than the local. Lastly, by comparing developments in Berlin and New York, we are also able to explore aspects relating to some of the key theoretical issues pertaining to contemporary urban studies, namely the debate about differences and similarities between urban development politics within North America and Western Europe in the face of a globalizing and neo-liberalizing urban world.

WHAT’S NEW ABOUT NEW URBAN TOURISM?

Changes on the demand side can also be assumed to play an important role in the observable spatial expansion and dispersion of tourism as well as the revaluation of previously neglected urban spaces as loci of leisure and consumption. These changes and how they link to processes of urban and neighborhood change until recently attracted relatively little scholarly attention. This neglect can at least in part be attributed to the lack of engagement of scholars of the urban with the growing body of literature – in tourism sociology and elsewhere – that is concerned with the demands and experiences of tourists and the ways they change over time. In fact most work in urban studies, as Selby (2004: 2) explains, to this day considers tourism primarily as a set of economic activities and is largely “devoid of people”. As a result studies, however persuasive they are in terms of supply side developments as well as the institutional and regulatory setting in which tourism occurs, all too often build upon standardized assumptions about who tourists are, how they behave and where they are to be found: assumptions that fail to grasp the variations that characterize tourists’ experiences, the activities undertaken in the city, or their physical manifestations in the forms of tourism precincts and so on (see i.a. Selby 2004; Mait-
land and Newman 2009). Making things worse, much of what was written has relied on overwhelmingly negative portrayals of tourists stemming from the era of traditional package holidays or “mass tourism”. Tourists have been ridiculed as Hawaiian shirt wearing, camera-toting “second class citizens” who represented a destructive, irresponsible force degrading cultures and places, and getting pleasure from the stultifying and generic experiences officially sanctioned tourist sites offered them (McCabe 2005: 85; Maitland and Newman 2009; Selby 2004). Conceptualizations of tourists as “conscious, thinking and experiencing beings” meanwhile were, at least until recently, few and far between (Selby 2004: 62).

Elsewhere, for instance in cultural studies, sociology or multidisciplinary tourism studies, a shift from generalizing to pluralizing conceptualizations of tourism and the tourist experience can be observed that offer a more nuanced understanding of the “visitor class” (Eisinger 2000). This scholarship noted the increased segmentation of contemporary travel as well as particularly the increased importance of more flexible, independent, experienced travelers. These investigations stressed the ways in which visitors’ backgrounds, interests, and behavior have changed along with evolving growing mobility and enhanced capacities for consumption in affluent societies. Frequently characterized in terms of a shift from Fordist to post-Fordist tourism consumption and production, descriptions emerged of a “new tourism” (Poon 1993, 1994) and the rise of “post-tourists” (Feifer 1985; Ritzer and Liska 1997; Lash and Urry 1994). Although a few recent works have adopted this more complex view of tourism (see esp. Hoffman, Fainstein et al. 2003; Maitland and Newman 2009), most urban scholarship has not explored issues raised by contemporary tourism. The long history of “slumming” and other forms of niche tourism practices to be discussed
make it debatable whether it is accurate to talk about the emergence of a new stage of tourism altogether in today’s post-Fordist times, as neologisms such as “post tourism”, or “new tourism” tend to imply. What is clear, however, is that the old face of tourism is being challenged by the actual realities of contemporary travel and that this is especially evident in cities where the segmentation differentiation that characterizes contemporary tourist and travel activity is particularly pronounced.

Alongside of this, recent tourism research in other disciplines or disciplinary subfields also pays testimony to the need to move beyond conceptualizations that conceive of tourism as a force external to, or disjointed from, contemporary societies and to recognize that, to paraphrase John Urry (1995), we are all tourists, all the time. To be a tourist and to engage in touristic activity in other words has increasingly become part of the ordinary, the everyday; it is part of contemporary culture, shapes our way of seeing and experiencing the world that surrounds us, and turns us into tourists in our own (urban) locations (see also Selby 2004; Shaw and Williams 2004; Franklin and Crang 2001). Increasing numbers of people go gallery hopping and clubbing in up-and-coming neighborhoods; venture into ethnic enclaves to explore specialty shops, festivals and exotic restaurants; take guided walking tours through neighborhoods with which we are not acquainted to learn about their history, culture, and heritage or simply enjoy discovering areas by chance or serendipity.

Such practices, which are considered particularly widespread among well-educated, culturally competent workers in cities’ post-Fordist economies, as well as transient city users such as students or business visitors on short term assignments, also have to be considered in order to account for the economic, physical, social, and
symbolic reconfiguration of city space and hence will be addressed in this dissertation.¹

- What is new about “new” urban tourism and how do developments in Kreuzberg and Harlem correspond to theories and propositions of tourism scholars about the growth of “new” or post-Fordist tourism patterns?

A main goal of this thesis is to address these research questions – both empirically and, in particular, by establishing and exploring the links between the largely discrete yet interconnected disciplines of urban studies and tourism studies. The findings reinforce the argument of Maitland and Newman (2004, 2008), who pioneered research on the spontaneous emergence of “new tourism” precincts, as they call them, and have emphasized the need to pay attention to the conviviality among different groups of city users - white collar professionals and workers in industries and occupations primarily requiring symbolic manipulation, transient city users (temporary migrants, business visitors on short term assignment and so on) as well as tourists – and the way they jointly shape the transformation of urban space in contemporary cities.

¹ In fact, for the purpose of this study, tourism refers to both day trippers and staying visitors, including those visiting for both leisure and business, as well as residents, whether temporary or permanent, who consume the city “as if tourists.”
TOURISM, NEIGHBORHOOD REGENERATION AND THE ROLE OF “BOTTOM-UP” APPROACHES

There is widespread agreement in the scholarly realm that the restructuring processes of recent decades in which activities previously deemed peripheral to the “productive city” such as tourism and leisure moved center stage in cities’ political economy coincided with, and to some extent also contributed to, an intensification of inequalities of various kinds. The contemporary city in other words is not only one increasingly “consumed by consumption” (Miles and Miles 2004: 172), scholars agree, but also one that is increasingly fragmented or divided (see i.a. Musterd and Ostendorf 1998; Marcuse and Kempen 2000; Andersen and van Kempen 2001). There is a widening gap between the employed, educated, and well-paid upper and middle classes on the one hand and disadvantaged groups on the other hand (among them particularly the long-term unemployed as well as migrant and racial minority groups). The problem is further exacerbated by the destruction of diverse, mixed-income communities as new users and uses locate in the inner-city and longtime residents, businesses and their support networks are displaced by gentrification and entrepreneurial strategies appropriating “under-utilized” city spaces for profit making (Zukin 1995; Smith 2002; Gotham 2005).

Though rarely examined in depth, the role of tourism and leisure in such processes led many scholars to be critical if not outright dismissive of marginalized neighborhoods’ emergence as sites of tourism and leisure consumption (Smith 2002; Dâvila 2004; Gotham 2005). According to this perspective, experiences of exclusion or marginalization are more likely exacerbated than eased when poor neighborhoods
are confronted with an influx of consumers who are considerably more affluent than the local population living in them. There is, as discussed above, another perspective however, which emphasizes that the phenomenon should not be framed in too narrow, agency-revoking ways. It posits that to simply dismiss tourism and leisure trends is flawed as it implies ignorance of the realities of postindustrial cities’ political economies, excludes disadvantaged neighborhoods from the opportunity to participate in one the most important urban economic sectors of the present day and disregards the potentials that changing tourism and leisure patterns in cities in the advanced capitalist world entail for people-centered, progressive forms of development (Hoffman 2003; Smith 2007; Shaw, Bagwell et al. 2004; Rath 2007). From this perspective, local communities are not just passive recipients of “development” but agents in the urban process that despite constraining political-economic structures can make exogenous change work in their interest. In the best-case scenario, it is argued, development strategies that attract tourists can benefit local citizens by providing quality-of-life improvements, cultural amenities, revenues and jobs, improving neighborhoods’ physical and commercial landscapes, giving voice to the usually voiceless and building political clout for formerly marginalized groups and the places with which they are identified.

Regardless of these potentials, most of these scholars admit that the there is frequently an unfair distribution of benefits derived from tourism and that the long-term sustainability of using tourism as a means of development remains questionable. Such concerns are frequently built upon the notion that too much tourism development may lead to a situation where the costs of additional growth begin to outweigh the benefits as well as the recognition that tourism contains the seeds of its own de-
struction - that is, that unregulated tourism growth under certain circumstances can diminish the prospects of tourism in the long run. A full-fledged evaluation of tourism’s impacts on the two communities examined is well beyond the scope of this thesis. What is offered, however, is a reflection upon the broader questions regarding the impact of tourism on neighborhoods, the sustainability of tourism development as well as some of the policy and planning issues they raise (see i.a. Scheyvens (2002; Hinch 1996; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). Particular attention is moreover paid to bottom-up approaches to attaining sustainable tourism and socially equitable forms of development as well as other initiatives billed under “sustainable tourism” or “community tourism” that claim to utilize local development means. Particularly, the following research questions guide this exploration:

- What are the impacts caused by various forms of tourism and what are the potentials and pitfalls of tourism as a means of local development in the context of cities’ current political economy?
- What is “sustainable“ tourism, how do the selected communities engage with it?
- What lessons can be drawn from the literature for achieving for “sustainable“ development and socially equitable forms of revitalization?

CASE SELECTION

The two cities and two neighborhoods within them selected as foci for research were chosen both for their individual interest as sites for studying tourism and leisure trends and for the possibility of comparison. Although at first glance a comparison
between developments in New York and Berlin might seem like a dubious exercise given their different urban structure and developmental dynamics, they share important features that allow for comparison but at the same time differ sufficiently to provoke insight into the reasons for dissimilar outcomes.

New York, a city of over 8 million inhabitants, is widely considered to be the epitome of a global city, performing a vital function of command and control within the contemporary world system (Friedmann and Wolff 1982; Mollenkopf 1988; Fainstein 2001; Sassen 1991 [2001]). Home to roughly 3.4 million residents, Berlin on the other hand is, according to virtually every analysis of the global urban system, not a global city, particularly not if one follows Saskia Sassen’s influential understanding of the term based on economic control functions (Cochrane and Jonas 1999; Latham 2006a, 2006b; Strom 2001; Krätke 2004). Instead, Berlin is among Germany’s poorest cities. It has suffered for the most part of the past twenty years since its reunification from a declining or stagnating urban economy, and – despite its regained status as the nation’s capital and recent signs of economic improvement – languishes nowhere near the top-tier of the national, let alone European or global urban hierarchy (Krätke 2004; Ward 2004).

Another related, distinguishing feature with powerful repercussions for all kinds of local development dynamics concerns immigrant flows, and the ethno-racial make-up of the two cities’ population. New York represents a receiving city, in many ways like no other in the world. It is characterized by an extraordinary ethnic and racial diversity and continues to be dramatically affected by ongoing immigration (Foner 2006, 2007). Berlin, by comparison, seems less of a “gateway” city. While immigra-
tion has historically always played a big role in the city’s history and population trends indicate that Berlin is becoming more ethnically diverse every day, the city still is much less in its ethnic composition than “traditional” receiving cities such as London, Toronto or New York (Bloomfield 2003, 2006; Silver 2006): in 2005 persons with immigrant background (i.e. residents without German nationality, naturalized Germans with migration background, as well as repatriates and their descents) took up only a relatively modest 23.4 percent of Berlin’s population (Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin 2008: 12).

The list of differences could be easily expanded. However, for the purpose of this inquiry Berlin and New York represent nevertheless fascinating cases for comparison with respect to the subject of study at hand. At the risk of over-simplification, it is possible to summarize the commonalities shared by both cities that are relevant to this study as follows:

- they qualify as both world cities and “world tourism cities” that attract large flows of visitors from both domestic and international locations for a variety of reasons (Maitland and Newman 2009), making them important sites for revealing patterns of tourism, leisure and consumption in contemporary urban environments, as well as their evolution and implications.

- urban policy in both cities is increasingly shaped by growth- and market-oriented governmental logics founded on services and tourism expansion in which place-marketing and city branding, flagship projects, the mobilization of urban space as an arena for market-oriented economic growth and elite consumption practices and associated activities play a critical role; and
both cities are places of sharp social and spatial divisions, underscoring the need to explore how cities’ restructured economies - and particularly the increased importance of consumption-based sectors they entail - can be employed for development processes to the advantage of communities suffering from economic disadvantage as well as cities at large.

With regard to areas of difference between the two cities, my focus is on urban politics and policy. Whereas Berlin and New York both exemplify many of the key trends that are currently reshaping advanced capitalist cities’ urban political economies, governance arrangements, policy approaches, and regulatory environments at the same time remain distinctive in all sort of ways, allowing for an examination of how dynamics common to present-day urban development in Europe and North-America play out in different places in different ways.

Whereas New York has been described as epitomizing the “market-centered” American model of urban development politics in which officials, working in close collaboration with the private sector, lean heavily toward the marketplace (Savitch and Kantor 2002), urban development politics in Berlin have been described as shaped but not defined by the surge of neoliberal policy adaptations and emerging entrepreneurial bargaining, amongst other things due to the ongoing influence of a by comparison still relatively generous and structuring nation-state, a greater regulative capacity of the local state and other legacies of inherited institutional frameworks, regulatory practices, and political struggles (see i.a. Cochrane 2006).
### Table 1: Tourism by the Numbers

Data from New York and Berlin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New York Tourism</th>
<th>Berlin Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Visitors (millions)</td>
<td>Arrivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>2,985.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>3,074.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>3,186.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>3,225.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>3,448.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>3,602.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4,170.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5,006.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>4,929.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4,750.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4,952.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5,923.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>6,484.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>7,077.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7,585.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>7,906.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>8,253.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Berlin Visitor Numbers 1993-2009. (Source: Amt für Statistik Berlin/Brandenburg; Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologien und Frauen)
Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem in New York meanwhile were, as suggested above, obvious choices for the analysis of developments on the neighborhood level. They in many ways represent exemplary cases for studying the transformation of deprived inner-city communities in light of recent decades of urban and economic restructuring involving, not least, an increasing importance of tourism and leisure as forces of change. Significant differences notwithstanding, both neighborhoods share a long history of socio-economic and racial/ethnic marginalization, and both neighborhoods have been profoundly impacted by the shift from industrial to postindustrial cities and the proliferation of economies that emphasize symbols, creativity and cultural consumption, involving, among other things, substantial increases in tourism and leisure activity (see Novy and Huning 2009).

RESEARCH BACKGROUND: HARLEM AND BERLIN-KREUZBERG

Few other neighborhoods I can think of are as widely known — and, at the same time, as misunderstood — as Harlem and Kreuzberg. “America’s best-known ghetto” (Grunwald 1999), Harlem is known throughout the world as the most significant African-American community in the United States — the country’s “Black Mecca” (Maurrasse 2006: 19) — and looks back at a long history as an epitome of urban decay and blight. Kreuzberg’s name recognition meanwhile also travels a long way due to the neighborhood’s image as Berlin’s legendary center of subcultural and alternative scenes as well as the city’s epitomal Turkish Diaspora (Lang 1998; Sundermeier, Diehl et al. 2002). Such representations hold some truth, but are at the same time inherently problematic. Neighborhood portrayals in popular discourse generally tend to simplify the realities to be found within them. This is even more so in the case
of Kreuzberg and Harlem, not least because of the two communities’ complexity and size, as both encompass vast and diverse areas.

Figure 1 “Welcome to Harlem, USA”, “Willkommen in Kreuzberg” - Both neighborhoods have welcomed tourists for decades

Constructed initially as a mixed middle- and working class area in the last decades of the nineteenth century and centrally located just north of Central Park, Harlem is home to almost 500,000 residents and takes up a solid chunk of Manhattan north of 110th Street, while Kreuzberg – located south of Berlin’s central city district Mitte – counts roughly 150,000 inhabitants. Unsurprisingly, not all of Harlem’s residents are of African-American descent and not all of Kreuzberg’s inhabitants are Turkish or part of the countercultural or alternative milieus that for the past decades have shaped the neighborhood’s image. Harlem and Kreuzberg, in other words are more diverse than popular opinion suggests and moreover consist of several distinct parts or Kieze (a widely used synonym in Berlin for “neighborhoods”), often marked by decisive differences, a strong sense of community and various development-relevant collective and individual actors. Both Harlem and Kreuzberg are, in other words, “neighborhoods of neighborhoods”.

Harlem is commonly divided into three parts; the predominantly African-American Central Harlem, East – or Spanish – Harlem, as well as, until recently also majority African American, Morningside Heights, also known as West Harlem. In Kreuzberg it is popular to distinguish between the former Postal Code areas “(SW) 61” and “(SO) 36”, of which the former is more middle-class and German and the latter poorer and more ethnically diverse.
For practical purpose in terms of data collection, the emphasis in this study is placed on Central Harlem which is roughly bounded by Central Park at 110th Street to the south, 155th Street to the north, 5th Avenues on the east and Morningside and St. Nicholas Park on the west. In Berlin “SO36” which is bounded by the municipal district Mitte to the north, the River Spree to the east, as well as the Luisenstädtische Kanal and the Landwehrkanal in the west and south is the subject of inquiry. Since the boundaries between the different parts of Kreuzberg and Harlem are anything but rigid and have little administrative or legal significance, references will also be made throughout the text to other parts of Kreuzberg and Harlem. Acknowledging the two neighborhoods’ complex and diverse character also implies the need to be cautious about many of the attributes Harlem and Kreuzberg are commonly associated with, their status as “marginalized” or - to use a term that is more common in Europe – “excluded” communities being one of them. Both neighborhoods, as will be discussed later, remain among the most socio-economically challenged areas of
their cities and many of their residents can be described as marginalized or excluded from mainstream societies’ economic and social relations.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Harlem</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Kreuzberg</th>
<th>Berlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>363 ha</td>
<td>78900 ha</td>
<td>1038 ha</td>
<td>89175 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>124,073</td>
<td>8,008,278</td>
<td>145 645</td>
<td>3.391.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Unemployed</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26,2</td>
<td>16,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Living in Poverty</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household income</td>
<td>19,920 (in Dollars)</td>
<td>38,293 (in Dollars)</td>
<td>14.604 (in Euros)</td>
<td>17.568 (in Euros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population w. Income Support</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Central Harlem and Kreuzberg at a Glance (Source Census 2000, Statistisches Landesamt Berlin)

At same time it is important to keep in mind that by no means all residents that live within them share the plight of most of their neighbors. Instead, Kreuzberg has always been inhabited by a sizable middle-class (Krautschick 1991; Lang 1998) while Harlem, despite the well-documented impact of middle class urban outmigration in the course of the second half of the twentieth century, even in its worst times also remained home to a significant percentage of Black middle-class New Yorkers (Prince 2005; Hyra 2006; Maurrasse 2006). Further, it is important to keep in mind that concepts such as marginalization or exclusion carry a different meaning in different contexts.

² Both slippery concepts that are frequently played mischief with, the terms “marginalization” and “exclusion” are used in this study in neutral terms to signify the combined impact of material deprivation, widening inequalities, lack of opportunity, and multidimensional disadvantages, for instance in terms of work, education and training etc. – poor and otherwise disadvantaged population groups and communities are confronted with (Geddes 2000; Atkinson 2000).
Particularly the distinct urban experience of African-Americans, as for example discussed by Massey and Denton (1993), with their special position of disadvantage rooted in two hundred years of African slavery and a hundred years of state-sponsored discrimination does not allow for easy comparisons over time and space. With that said, Harlem and Kreuzberg nonetheless are comparable units for the purpose of this inquiry which is not so much concerned with the two neighborhoods’ parallels and differences as sites of marginalization or exclusion, but with their role as places of leisure and consumption in today’s post-industrial society and the way tourism and leisure development within their midst affects their trajectory.

METHODOLOGY AND FIELDWORK

This study can be seen as a combination of exploratory and explanatory research (Andranovich and Riposa 1993). It is exploratory in that its aim is to provide greater insight and understanding with regard to the implications of changing tourism and leisure patterns and practices for marginalized communities as well as urban and neighborhood development more generally. And it is explanatory because it seeks to understand how a comprehensive set of factors, both internal and external to the neighborhoods, influenced the particular developments taking place on the local level.

To this end, a qualitative research methodology based on what is known as the case-oriented, comparative approach (Ragin 1987; Ragin and Becker 1992; Yin 1994) was selected as the best-suited research design. This approach’s focus on in-depth analyses of a limited number of cases allows for an understanding of the
changes and continuities with regard to tourism and leisure in contemporary cities in general and neighborhoods in particular; while its – more implicit than explicit - comparative angle provides opportunity for insightful evidence and conclusions with respect to the thesis’ explanatory dimension.

Case-oriented research typically refers to the primarily qualitative analysis of a small set of cases as opposed to the standard quantitative approach with its emphasis on variables (Ragin 1987; Ragin and Becker 1992; Yin 1994). Contrary to the hypothetico-deductive model with its emphasis on the generation and testing of detailed, pre-defined hypotheses, case study research typically contains a substantial element of narrative – or story telling - and “develops descriptions and interpretations of the phenomenon from the perspective of participants, researchers and others” (Flyvbjerg 2006: 240).

Cases are thereby viewed as configurations of inseparable characteristics that cannot be studied separate from their respective context, but must rather be examined within it. Yin (1994) asserts that although case studies can be used to respond to aspects of the “who”, “what”, “when” and “where” categories, they are particularly important for the examination of “how” and “why” questions since they are able to deal with complex operational links that cannot be adequately examined through survey designs or experiments. Beeton (2005: 41), along these lines, emphasizes that a particular strength of the case study approach lies in its holistic-inductive nature and grounding with an emic, insider’s perspective, which is particularly relevant to disciplines with an applied, practice-oriented focus (e.g. urban planning), as Campbell (2003: 4) has pointed out.
Related to this, the approach is praised for its flexibility which allows researchers to tolerate the complex, unruly elements that typically characterize urban development processes and produces a comprehensive and contextualized understanding of real world problems and phenomena (Patton 2001: 39).³ The strength of the approach hence is its depth; its arguable weakness is the problematic nature of generalizing from individual cases (see Ragin 1987). Knowledge induced from a limited number of case studies, it is recognized, however, helps to develop a nuanced view of reality, which contributes to advance science. As succinctly put by Flyvbjerg (2001: 87): “a discipline without a large number of thoroughly executed case studies is a discipline without systematic production of exemplars, and a discipline without exemplars is an ineffective one.”

A common critique of case studies is that they suffer from an intrinsic bias by being overly entrenched in the community and as a result neglect extra-local forces affecting locales and their development. To address this concern, this study departs from conventional inductive case study designs and their focus on the local by adopting insights of Burawoy’s extended case perspective, which connects the analysis of micro-level developments to developments outside of a locale (Burawoy 1991) and building upon an open-ended, continuing process of interaction between theory and data. Referred to variously as “retroductive” or “abductive” (see i.a. Coffey and Atkinson 1996, Blaikie 2000), this approach to social scientific research rejects a rigid adherence to deduction and “theory first” or induction and “case studies first” strategies.

³ At the same time, this “flexibility” also involves problems for case study research has in the past been criticized for being soft and subjective or, in other words, for lacking the tenets of “hard sciences” (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995). Today, many scholars emphasize however that qualitative research can very well be “scientific”, that “good science is problem driven and not methodology driven” (Flyvbjerg 2006: 242), and that case study research – while not allowing for statistical generalizations - does permit analytical generalization relevant to theoretical propositions (see i.a. Flyvbjerg 2006; Yin 2003).
as “unnecessarily stultifying” (Langley 1999: 694) and instead proposes to engage in a dynamic interplay between data and theory throughout the research process to accommodate and benefit from existing theory but also better account for unanticipated empirical findings or theoretical insights gained in the course of the inquiry.

In terms of fieldwork, case-study research typically involves knowledge generation through the collection, analysis, and interweaving of a wide range of primary and secondary data which are necessary for establishing comprehensiveness - and credibility - in almost any qualitative project (Creswell 1998). The study at hand used a triangulation of techniques, namely semi-structured interviews with key informants and actors focused on extracting rich detail from a few interviewees rather than large numbers of interviews (see Appendix), text analysis of a variety of primary and secondary sources along with an interweaving of data derived through observational, ethnographic techniques as further discussed below.

Triangulation refers to an approach to data collection and analysis in which evidence is deliberately sought from a wide range of different, independent sources and often by different means (for instance, comparing oral testimony with written records). It opens the way for richer and potentially more valid interpretations. Generalizations were only made when findings from different sources were in agreement with each other and interviewees were frequently asked to verify or refute understandings gained from other sources – particularly when they were obtained in “don't quote me” conversations, as was often the case.
Additionally, peer reviews and member checking were also employed, though less systematically, to further enhance the research's validity and rigor (see i.a. Creswell and Miller 2000; Creswell 1998; Coffey and Atkinson 1996). Interviews with key actors and informants arguably constituted the single most important data source.\footnote{Key informants are people who have a special expertise or privileged “insider knowledge” of the subject under investigation. Key actors are understood as people who play a prominent role in the policy and development arenas in the selected cities and neighborhoods. Of course, these two categories overlap as key actors frequently are also the informants to turn to in order to gain access to “insider knowledge”.} Frequently difficult to get hold of and reluctant to be interviewed about what many considered an either irrelevant or deeply contentious subject matter, city officials, community activists, local entrepreneurs and private sector representatives as well as other individuals with expertise or special insider knowledge regarding the study’s concerns provided me with indispensable information without which this thesis would have never come to fruition.\footnote{The majority of interviewees were selected early on during the research on the basis of their knowledge of, or involvement in, the issues being studied. In addition, I used a combination of “reputational” and “snowball” sampling and asked all interviewees whether they could think of other potential interview partners relevant to the research who would maybe be willing to talk to me. Of those who would, many did so only under the condition of anonymity, which is why I often don’t quote them directly or by name. A full list of the key informants interviewed in this research is provided in the appendix.} Particularly since the written record relating to the relationships between tourism and leisure, policies and regulation, as well as urban and neighborhood development is, as other urban tourism researchers will readily confirm, rather sparse (see Pearce 1998).

Unlike the questionnaire framework, where detailed questions are formulated ahead of time, semi-structured interviews are conducted with a relatively open framework which allows for focused, conversational, two-way communication. The approach thus is based on the premise that each interview will be unique and that the quality of the approach lies precisely in its “conversational” character, i.e. in the constructive dialogue between individuals conversing about a common theme (Kvale 1996: 44).
At the same time, the methods literature provides several strategies that allow researchers to steer between the free spontaneity of a no-method approach and the rigid structures of standardized interviewing. The design of an “interview guide”, i.e. of written notes that identify the issues to be discussed and questions to be asked, is one of them and permitted me to give structure to the interviews I conducted without precluding the exploration of unanticipated topics (Kvale 1996: 129).

A wide array of archival, academic, and popular data in written form also played a critical role in the research process. Apart from secondary academic sources, at least eight types of written source material were collected and analyzed throughout the study. They include planning and policy documents, websites and blogs, policy reports, census data, tourism statistics, articles in magazines, journals, and newspaper, literary publications as well as tourist guides and other travel media.

Finally apart from expert and informant interviews and the working with texts, observation methods and particularly participant observation also represented important data collection techniques as the research over time became more and more ethnographic in nature. I attended dozens of community meetings and public events, participated in numerous walking tours and, while spending time in the neighborhood had countless informal interactions with people on the streets and in homes, restaurants, bars, coffee shops, shops and cultural institutions. This was in part a necessity for the completion of the interviewing element of my research, as being present in the two communities soon occurred to me as the only way to gain the trust and interest of several key actors and informants who were initially reluctant to talk to me. And it was owed to the realization that I had underestimated the importance of micro-
ethnographic research for a sufficient understanding of the neighborhoods under investigation and the manifold changes they are experiencing.

Overall, fieldwork was carried out on the neighborhood level over a period of roughly three years from 2005 until 2008 during a number of visits in the selected neighborhoods and while attending events, meetings, as well as bus and walking tours relevant to my research. It combined both simple and participant observation. Simple observation is where a researcher is non-participant, like a “fly on the wall” (Jackson 2003: 149), without a relationship with the people being observed as they remain unaware of his/her activities. Participant observation, on the other hand, is when a researcher takes part, to some degree, in the activities of the people being observed. It combines, according to Corbetta (2003), observation as a tool for collecting social data and immersion of the researcher in the social reality studied. It implies watching and listening and also entails contact between the subject who studies and the subjects being studied. The aim of combining the two types of observation was to draw on the strengths of both approaches while at the same time minimizing their weaknesses.

Just like qualitative research more generally, ethnographic approaches are frequently criticized for their alleged subjectivity as they typically involve a grounding in the communities that are examined, which makes it difficult for the researcher to remain “distant” to his or her research objects and be “objective”. I experienced these difficulties more than once in the course of my research, yet these difficulties do not change the fact that it is particularly the grounding in communities, which is seen by some to endanger the credibility of findings, that also opens researchers to richer,
fuller interpretations and findings. As one element in a multiple-methods approach, ethnography in this study without a doubt allowed for new realities to surface that otherwise would have been missed (Creswell and Miller 2000; Creswell 1998; Coffey and Atkinson 1996).

Lastly, as regards the collected data’s analysis, the research refrained from computer-assisted formal coding or content analysis techniques and instead relied on qualitative, or ethnographic, content analysis, in which the emphasis is on allowing categories to emerge out of data and on the role of the investigator in the search for underlying themes and the construction of meaning. What Rydin (2003: 183) has called “close reading” (or “listening” for that matter) hence guided the analysis.

THEORY IN COMPARATIVE URBAN (TOURISM) RESEARCH

To begin with one must distinguish between the conception of theories as generalizations or predictive devices and theories for the purpose of making sense of something that is going on at a given place and time. This thesis uses "theory" in the latter sense and rests on the premise that any analysis of urban tourism development needs to broadly engage with literature that is non-tourism related, especially within the wider sociology and urban studies domain in order to recognize how global patterns and processes of urban change are affecting the nature and development of tourism and explain patterns of policy. Hence, an integrated approach drawing on a

---

6 The basic strategies available for the pursuit of rigor and validity in qualitative research – apart from systematic and self conscious research design, data collection, interpretation, and communication – that were adopted for this research included verification checks, and, as discussed earlier, triangulation.
broad-ranging interdisciplinary literature that interconnects the growing body of urban tourism research that has emerged since the 1990s with debates and insights from the domain of the social sciences more generally as well as especially those of urban studies was adopted.

Albeit sometimes in an indirect manner and without encumbering itself with its particular terminology, the thesis particularly relies on insights of regulation theory, which has become central to the new tourism literature and provides a rich framework for a historical and contemporary comparative analysis of global urban tourism and development. A regulation theory approach, as Fainstein et al. (2003: 240) explain, “places tourism within a complex matrix of economic, political, cultural and spatial interactions and illustrates the interplay of sectors and scales—local, regional, national and international”. And it accounts for the wider context of the transformations of late capitalism as well as differences in terms of production, consumption and their regulations across time and space (Amin 1994; Lauria 1997; Jessop 2002) “without sacrificing the possibility of agency or overlooking the complex role of culture” (Fainstein et al. 2003: 240). Conceptualizing urban tourism, as Fainstein and Judd (1999: 5) suggested, as a dynamic “ecological system” that consists of three, constantly interacting components: the tourist (e.g. the demand side), the tourism industry (e.g. the supply side) and the city, understood as a regulatory-institutional as well as a physical and social entity, the thesis in addition engages with a broad range of other theoretical and empirical contributions to approach its concerns. This includes a range of “meso-level” theoretical approaches to urban politics such as regime and growth machine theory (Stone 1989, 1993; Stoker and Mossberger 1994; Logan and Molotch 1987) comparative approaches to the study of contemporary ur-
ban development such as Hank Savitch and Paul Kantor’s “bargaining theory” (see Savitch and Kantor 2002) as well as, albeit more implicitly, new institutionalist approaches (Pierre 1999; DiGaetano and Strom 2003) to make sense of the politics of urban tourism and development, citywide and on the neighborhood level, and account for differences across space and time; critical urban theory that provides a theoretical background for understanding processes of urban and regional restructuring; neoliberalization as well as the transformation of culture and consumption - including tourism consumption - from residual categories in urban studies into key concerns; as well as various contributions stemming from the multidisciplinary area of (urban) tourism research to illuminate some of the processes and patterns of urban tourism and wider practices of leisure and mobility in contemporary society that nowadays shape the landscape of cities.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CHAPTERS

The remainder of this dissertation is divided into six chapters. Incorporating the growing body of social science research on tourism with the substantial literature on urban and neighborhood development, Chapter One provides a more in-depth discussion of the context in which the rise of tourism and leisure development in marginalized neighborhoods needs to be seen in, clarifies definitional issues, and introduces the key theoretical debates this dissertation builds upon and to which it seeks to contribute.

Moving the discussion to the empirical, chapters two, three, and four address the thesis’ three central concerns introduced above. Consistent with the thesis’ overall
approach, the presentation of the study’s findings relies heavily on the technique of narrative. The chapters hence are structured alongside historical/chronological and thematic lines and typically shift from city to city and neighborhood to neighborhood on any given subject, employing a comparative perspective whenever possible and useful. This choice reflects Sandercock’s emphasis on the importance of the “story telling” dimension of academic urban research to “(bring) the findings of social research to life” (2003: 311) and is expected to generate a readable and meaningful – even if at times inevitably partial – account of the issues at stake. In addition, compared to the more common approach to present individual chapters devoted to individual cases that are subsequently contrasted in a concluding section, this structure reduces repetitions and helps to highlight similarities and differences among the cases studied.

Drawing upon a range of primary and secondary data sources, Chapter Two focuses on tourism in marginalized neighborhoods from a demand-side perspective. Integrating political-economic concerns with more qualitative and interpretive dimensions of touristic experience, it discusses the multi-layered – and in contemporary studies frequently omitted - historicity of the phenomenon, reflects upon changes in the touristic consumption and experience of city space, and elaborates on the increased and intersecting mobilities that characterize contemporary urban life as well as the way tourists and other place consumers may share in the creation of new tourism areas.

Chapter Three turns to the supply side. Paying particular attention to the role of the local state in dealing with tourism beyond the city’s core, this chapter explores both: past and present strategies through which public and private sector actors strive(d)
to market marginalized neighborhoods as desirable places to visit, play, and consume in, as well as the limitations and constraints on such efforts. By means of comparison, the chapter thereby sheds light on the way the reimagination and repositioning of districts as destinations for leisure and tourism consumption is mediated by specific local conditions and at the same time challenges narratives that overstate the totalizing tendencies of neoliberal, entrepreneurial policy agendas, emphasizing place-marketing, place branding and associated activities as well as their implications.

Concerned with tourism’s potential to foster socially equitable forms of local development and provide tangible benefits for ordinary citizens (including low-income groups) and, Chapter Four discusses grassroots strategies of “tourism from below” (Gotham 2005) that rival tourism strategies generated by elite growth coalitions and uses the cases of Kreuzberg and Harlem to examine how policy content and context shape tourism patterns and practices as well as the consequences they bring about.

Chapter Five evaluates the implications for conceptualization and research of recent trends in leisure and tourism on the neighborhood level. It brings the different themes and subjects raised during the previous chapters together, and synthesizes its key findings to propose a new way of looking at what to date represents a relatively neglected type of urban tourism. Lastly, the final chapter of this thesis, Chapter Six, summarizes the study’s results, discusses them in terms of their policy implications and elaborates upon the limits of the present study and avenues for further research.
I. SETTING THE CONTEXT

The introduction already gave a brief overview of the thesis’ key concerns and the wider context in which they need to be considered, offering a few introductory remarks on the different theoretical debates in the urban studies and related disciplines this thesis builds upon and seeks to contribute to. This chapter will take a more analytical approach to the broader context in which the current revaluation of marginalized neighborhoods as loci of leisure and consumption needs to be seen.

Paying particular attention to the growing significance of leisure and consumption in urban environments as well as the increasing social and spatial divisions that characterize today’s urban realities, Part One focuses on the key characteristics of economic and urban restructuring cities in Western Europe and North America experienced in the course of the last decades and the way urban theory has made sense of them. Part Two examines the relationship between tourism and urban environments. It offers a critical review of the tourism literature and its key theoretical insights, covering such issues as how tourism has been defined and understood in the social sciences, why tourists visit cities and cities want tourists, how recent transformations of the global capitalist order affected tourism production and consumption and how tourism needs to be understood in relation to wider practices of leisure and mobility in contemporary society.
1. CONTEMPORARY URBAN CHANGE AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF URBAN THEORY

Tourism and leisure development in marginalized neighborhoods as such is, as subsequent chapters will describe in greater detail, anything but new. Already in the mid-nineteenth century, during the early days of commercialized leisure and urban tourism, it had become fashionable in cities in Western Europe and North America to visit segregated urban areas where the poor, ethnic and foreign-born concentrated, i.e. to go slumming, or as it was called, “rubbernecking” (Gates 1997; Cocks 2001; Heap 2009; Gilbert and Hancock 2006). At the same time, current developments also differ markedly from those of the past. It is widely agreed upon in the scholarly realm that today’s revaluation of deprived communities as loci of leisure and consumption represents a phenomenon that is in myriad ways intrinsically tied to global restructuring of economic, political, social and cultural processes in the course of the second half of the twentieth century, bound up with a movement to late or advanced capitalism and from a modern to a postmodern epoch.

Related to this profound change has been a new global division of labor, hallmarked by a decline of the heavy and manufacturing industries that dominated the modern city in the West. Accompanying this has been a parallel increase in the importance of post-industrial service industries as well as a gradual reorientation away from the logics and organization of the production of goods and services towards a position where consumption became a critical organizational feature (see esp. Jayne 2006). In fact, some scholars even argued that cities towards the end of the twentieth century should no longer be seen as landscapes of production but as landscapes of
consumption (Zukin 1998: 825). This has been coupled with a changing occupational structure characterized by a proliferation of high-wage and low-paying jobs, the emergence of new “postmodern” urban cultures, and “new urban politics” (Cox 1993, 1995; DeFilippis 1999), as well as new urban socio-spatial configurations characterized, among other things, by reversing trends of suburbanization and inner-city decline, parallel processes of ghettoization as well as a deepening and hardening of social and spatial inequalities.

These and related changes led theorists to proclaim the emergence of a new era of urbanism, referred to variously as informational, postindustrial, post-Fordist, postmodern, global, or, more derogatorily, neoliberal (see i.a. Castells 1996, Scott and Soja 1996, Dear 2000, Sassen 1991 [2001], Smith 2002, Brenner and Theodore 2002). In, and sparked heated debates in the academic realm about the best way to make sense of the causes, characteristics, and consequences of contemporary urban change. The goal of the following pages is not to account for – let alone resolve – these theoretical debates conclusively. Rather, the discussion is primarily intended to serve as an introduction to the key aspects of contemporary urban change that provide the context of the phenomenon with which this dissertation is chiefly concerned and offer insight into the different epistemological and methodological approaches that have sought to describe and explain them.

Particular attention will be paid to the causes and consequences of the growing spatial and social divisions that characterize contemporary cities; the relationship between the changing role of culture and consumption in cities and broader processes of urban change, as well as the impact of consumption on the character of today’s
cities, their economy, social structure, geography, and everyday life. We begin our
discussion with a brief overview of scholarly accounts of the economic and political
processes by which cities like New York or Berlin have been transformed into post-
industrial centers of consumption and into neighborhoods often sharply divided by
race and class, including Marxist geography (Harvey 1989), world and global city
research (Friedmann and Wolff 1982; Sassen 1991 [2001]), theories of the informa-
tion revolution and globalization (Castells 1989, 1996), what became known as the
“new urban sociology” (Gottdiener 1985; Feagin 1998; Gottdiener and Hutchison
2006), as well as various studies of post-industrial economics (Lash and Urry 1994;
Florida 2002).

Although differing substantially among themselves in focus as well as theoretical and
methodological grounding, a major contribution of such approaches has been their
insistence on the critical role of processes of restructuring referred to variously as
post-industrial, post-Fordist, or postmodern, capital accumulation, including real es-
tate speculation, investment, and disinvestment, as well as on the importance of
state intervention, power relations, and conflicts in processes of urban development
and socio-spatial change.

1.1. STRUCTURAL URBAN TRANSFORMATIONS AND CHANGING URBAN
POLITICS

Many commentators discuss processes of urban change in recent decades with ref-
ence to the alleged onset of a “post-Fordist”, “post-industrial” or “postmodern” re-
ality, posited around 1975-1979, alongside processes of “globalization” (variously
conceived). Placing cities’ development in the advanced capitalist world within the context of *The Condition of postmodernity*, David Harvey, in a seminal contribution, relates changes with regard to cities’ economies, social structures, geographies, and cultures to shifts in the organization of capitalism and new forms of time-space experience since the early 1970s:

There has been a sea-change in cultural as well as economic practices since around 1972. This sea-change is bound up with the emergence of new dominant ways in which we experience space and time. While simultaneity in the shifting dimensions of time and space is no proof of necessary or causal connection, strong a-priori grounds can be adduced for the proposition that there is some kind of necessary relation between the rise of postmodernist cultural forms, the emergence of more flexible modes of capital accumulation, and a new round of “time-space compression” in the organization of capitalism. (Harvey 1989: vii).

Working from Marxist premises, his argument emphasizes structural parameters defined primarily by economic considerations, namely the shift in the dominant regime of accumulation from Fordism, with its typical focus on general standardization and mass production towards a “more flexible mode of accumulation” (he deliberately avoids the term “post-Fordism” to avoid suggesting that there are fundamental dis-
continuities in the two modes of capitalist organization). As Harvey sees it, this “sea-change” resulted in a far more complex and supple economic structure with respect to such things as the labor process, the labor market, products, and consumption patterns. It was also responsible for the emergence of new urbanities, new cityscapes, as well as the reinterpretation and alternative exploitation of urban forms and landscapes, ultimately leading to the emergence of the postmodern city or what Edward Soja (1999) called *Postmetropolis*.

Harvey’s authoritative and still widely read text represents one of the earliest and most comprehensive attempts to account for the changing urban condition in the late twentieth century and is arguably only matched in scope and ambition by Castells’ elaborations on urbanization and urban processes in the emerging global information age in his trilogy “The Information Age - Economy, Society and Culture” (Castells 1989, 1996, 1997, 2000). In it, Castells supports Harvey’s argument that recent decades have given rise to urban forms and processes that differ markedly from their predecessors and suggests that new technologies, internationalization, global markets as well as other economic, political and social transformations of the second half of the 20th century have resulted in a profound redefinition of the urban from a site of production and collective consumption to a node within global flows of capital and people. Cities according to him are developing into extensive webs of interaction through the accelerated movement of people, commodities, and images across na-

---

7 Flexible accumulation (according to Harvey the predominant form of capitalism for the last three decades) implies a rapid increase in the pace of communication and transfers of money and people. Dramatic improvements in technology such as telecommunication, information technology and transport have had the effect of compressing time and space in the developed world. Whereas Fordism relied on mass production and mass consumption, flexible accumulation “is marked by a direct confrontation with the rigidities of Fordism. It rests on flexibility with respect to labour processes, new markets, products and patterns of consumption…greatly intensified rates of commercial, technological, and organizational innovation” (Harvey 1989: 147).
tional borders, of the space of flows, resulting in a trend toward “the historical emergence of the space of flows, superseding the meaning of the space of places” (348).

Taking not only economic globalization but also transforming occupational structures, cultural assumptions, and social relationships into account, one of the central tenets Castells’ markedly post-Marxist analysis shares with Harvey’s conceptualization of global urban change is the emphasis on the growing importance of regional and national urban hierarchies, inter-urban networks as well as territorial competition as a result of globalization, an argument which is further elaborated upon in the burgeoning field of global and world city research (Friedmann and Wolff 1982; Sassen 1991 [2001]).

Global and world city research sheds light on the complex interplay of de- and re-territorialization that characterized recent decades as well as the emergence of new “geographies of centrality” (Sassen 1991 [2001]: 85) as advanced capitalist countries shed large parts of their older industrial capacity and became societies dominated by high-tech, knowledge production and the tertiary sector. One of the major contributions of global and world cities research has been to relate the dominant socioeconomic trends within major advanced capitalist cities in the late twentieth century – e.g. deindustrialization, contradictions of reinvestment and disinvestment, the expansion and spatial concentration of financial and producer services industries, labor-market segmentation, class and ethnic conflict, socio-spatial polarization etc. – to the emergent world urban hierarchy and the global economic forces that underlie it. At the same time, however, it is argued that global and world city research has also deflected attention away from the crucial role of the state in the transformation of world capitalism on the one hand, and the restructuring of cities on the other hand.
As stated by Brenner (1998: 3): “The ways in which the contemporary ‘global-local interplay’ … [are] embedded within, mediated through and actively promoted by re-configurations of state territorial organization on multiple spatial scales [are not] systematically investigated.”

Sassen in particular has been accused of attributing too much power to market mechanisms and too much uniformity to urbanization processes while ascribing too little relevance to the role of the state or political variables more generally (White 1998). For instance, she has paid relatively little attention to variables that have led some scholars to proclaim the ascension of neoliberalism and argue that current processes of global economic restructuring are the result of a conscious “political project aimed to re-establish conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of the economic elites” (Harvey 2005: 19). Commonly described as being characterized by the dismantling of Welfarist-Keynesian and social collectivist institutions and parallel construction and consolidation of policies promoting free markets and state deregulation, neoliberalism or neoliberalization - implying a process or direction rather than a condition - has become widely recognized as a critical element of recent governance change on a broad range of geographical scales in the advanced capitalist world.\(^8\) Significantly, in many accounts, the city thereby has special importance for neoliberalization, and vice versa. This idea was first explored - though not quite in those terms - in Harvey’s (1989) discussions of the ways urban govern-

\(^8\) At the same time, several scholars have also emphasized not to confound neoliberalism as a totalizing political force (Brenner and Theodore 2002: 349), as neoliberalism, as Hackworth (2006: 11) explains, is a highly contingent, uneven and incomplete process that manifests itself, and is experienced, differently across space however (see also Brenner and Theodore 2002: 351). In other words, inherited institutional frameworks, politics and policy regimes, regulatory practices, and political struggles all influence how neoliberalism is adopted or pursued.
ance from the mid-1970s onwards became increasingly preoccupied with new ways to foster and encourage development and economic growth.

This trend towards “entrepreneurialism”, as Harvey terms it, is in stark contrast to the “managerialism” of the era of the welfare state of the earlier decades in which urban governments focused on the local provision of services and facilities to urban populations. This shift was characterized by a move away from welfare provision and focus on public goods towards enhancing efficiency and competitiveness as well as a greater ideological commitment to the minimalist state. As a result, already scarce municipal funds have been redirected to place marketing and image politics for urban spaces and urban residents as well as projects fostering high-end consumption activities like tourism while at the same time lowering the quality of life for the urban poor by leaving less money for housing, education and social services.

Positing a shift from a predominately Fordist model of capitalist development to the emergence of post-Fordist and neo-Fordist modes of production and consumption, the regulation school subsequently elevated the urban dimension (or “moment”) to a key feature (for a discussion see Amin 1994). Jessop (2002: 470), whose work was particularly influential in disseminating Regulationist ideas, asserts that it is “at the urban level …that… neoliberalism has its most significant economic, social and political impacts on everyday life” (470). According to several authors this is particularly the case with regard to New York City whose fiscal crisis of the mid-1970s and subsequent shifts in governance and policy orientation are often described as signature events for the ascendancy of the United States’ new urban right, if not for the transnational project of neoliberalism more generally (Sites 2003; Harvey 2005; Hack-
Following the lead of New York, cities around the world in the late 1970s became, as Brenner and Theodore (2002: 21) point out, “increasingly important geographical targets and institutional laboratories for a variety of policy experiments, from place marketing, enterprise and empowerment zones, local tax abatements, urban development corporations, public private partnerships, and new forms of local boosterism to workfare policies, property-redevelopment schemes, business-incubator projects, new strategies of social control, policing, and surveillance, and a host of other institutional modifications within the local and regional state apparatus.”

In programmatic terms, as Brenner (2002: 368) puts it, one particularly important “goal of such neoliberal urban policy experiments is to mobilize city space as an arena for market-oriented economic growth and elite consumption practices”, an idea most forcefully elaborated upon by Smith (2002) who argues that gentrification, often concealed as “regeneration”, and with it the transformation of urban space according to the tastes and needs of well-to-do, highly educated residents and a greatly enlarged of equally privileged transients using the city for business or leisure has become a key “urban dimension” of neoliberalism.

Proponents of critical urban theory like Smith consider such policies expressions of a “new revanchist urbanism” to re-establish favorable conditions for capital accumulation and reconfigure class relations (Smith 2002). In contrast, proponents of the “public choice theory” of urban development, like political scientist Paul Peterson,
consider them all but inevitable. In his book *City Limits* Paul Peterson (1981) argued that cities have no choice but to face the local consequences of the structural transformations on a national and global scale and engage in what he calls “developmental politics”. In other words, they must try to capture and retain potentially mobile businesses and residents if they are to survive in an age of globalization, nation-state devolution and ever-increasing inter-urban competition.

In the terminology of urban regime theory, a widely employed framework for the analysis of political and developmental dynamics in cities in the advanced capitalist world, this is frequently identified as a new version of urban “growth machine politics” (see esp. Stone 1989, 1993; Stoker and Mossberger 1994; Stoker 1995; Logan and Molotch 1987, Savitch and Kantor 2002). Initially developed in the United States but in recent years also adopted for the analysis of urban development and politics in other parts of the world, urban regime theory approaches have been credited for putting “the politics back into urban political economy” (Harding 1999: 676): the shed light on – and provide guidance to the analysis of – the actors and decision-making processes shaping the production and reproduction of cities and urban development.

Urban regime theory and the growth machine thesis distinguish themselves from structural Neo-Marxist or public choice approaches in two ways: The first is a rejection of the assumption that local politics hardly matters and that the environment in which city administrations operate determines all their significant choices. The second is in the dismissing of the implication that cities have a single set of “interests” which can be understood without reference to the desires of city residents and users
as expressed through the political system or other channels.\(^\text{10}\) Significantly, however, regime theorists still arrive at a similar conclusion with regard to the evolution of urban development politics in the course of the second half of the twentieth century; that is, they like the determinists, emphasize that broader processes of urban and economic restructuring - along with a wide-ranging re-scaling of urban governance and statehood - have shifted local development politics towards growth- and private sector oriented behavior or – as they are sometimes referred to - neoliberal governance logics (Fainstein and Fainstein 1986; Elkin 1987; Stone 1989, Stoker 1995, Logan and Molotch 1987, Savitch and Kantor 2002). Historically fragmented, New York City politics has been no exception.

While no single person or group, as in other cities like Chicago controls the political process due to the city’s pluralist political landscape, many scholars nonetheless have interpreted the city’s recent history in elite terms. Their argument is that the city’s liberal political regime, which had originated during the New Deal period of the 1930s and 1940s and had developed even further until Mayor John Lindsay’s two terms (1966–1972) was significantly weakened by the fiscal crisis in the 1970s, resulting in a reassertion of a “conservative pattern of accommodation” (Shefter 1985, cited in Mollenkopf 1989: 132) or “mercantile regime” (Savitch and Kantor 2002) within which business interests, including particularly the so-called FIRE sectors,

\(^{10}\) For them, as Harding (1999: 676) puts it, “cities and urban life are produced and reproduced, not by the playing out of some externally imposed logic, but by struggles and bargains between different groups and interests within cities. The outcomes of these struggles and bargains, they argue, far from serving the general ‘good of the city’, reward some groups whilst disadvantaging others".
finance, insurance, and real estate, as well as entertainment and tourism assumed a privileged role (see also Smith 1996; Sites 2003; Moody 2007).\textsuperscript{11}

This rise of the “new urban politics” (Cox 1993, 1995; DeFilippis 1999), as it is sometimes called, with its emphasis on local economic growth and development has in recent decades also been more and more documented empirically across Western Europe where local leaders, in response to changing political and economic circumstances, both nationally and internationally, have also increasingly reduced their commitment to the public provision of social services, housing and other goods of collective consumption in favor of entrepreneurial forms of urban governance emphasizing growth and competitiveness. Transcending the legacies of division created by past global political arrangements and reinserted into “normal” capitalist urbanization, post-reunification Berlin has been no exception. Rather, scholars have argued that the city after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and its sudden exposure to post-industrial economic restructuring and global inter-urban competition experienced what could be called a process of “normalization” or “convergence”, empirically visible through an increasing orientation towards market-oriented, entrepreneurial forms of local governance and urban economic development (see i.a. Cochrane and Jonas 1999; Cochrane and Passmore 2001; for a rebuttal of the “normalization” argument see Latham 2006a, 2006b).

\textsuperscript{11} At the same time, several scholars have pointed out that other factors continue to affect New York City politics, including context-specific intergovernmental power relations, amplified by Democratic and Republican party politics, played out on state, and local levels, as well as the ongoing influence of multiple interest groups other than business – including unions, civic groups, and voluntary organizations – in the city’s governance arena. It is because of them, that policy patterns, e.g. with regard to the level of public sector intervention, despite recent regime changes and the ascendancy of neoliberalism remain in all sort of ways distinctive and that many elements of the extensive set of social services and public provisions that had been introduced in previous eras continue to exist (see i.a. Savitch and Kantor 2002: 2000-207; Mollenkopf 1989).
Applying the urban regime approach to post-1989 development politics in Berlin, Strom for example finds that “The Building of the New Berlin” (Strom 1996; 2001) after the city’s reunification has been characterized by a shift in urban policies towards growth-oriented development and private sector involvement in local governance. This has occurred despite inherited institutional frameworks and regulatory practices such as patterns of federal support and the nature of the state bureaucracy, that make Berlin’s governance arrangements and developmental dynamics in all sorts of ways distinctive and have hindered the emergence of a stable “growth coalition” or “entrepreneurial” urban regime.

Cities’ “entrepreneurial turn” is, even among scholars who accept that cities within the present political economy depend on successful capital accumulation, controversially discussed. According to many skeptics, far from solving the challenges cities find themselves confronted with in the current era of global competition and economic “flexibility”, pro-growth urban politics offers little more than a temporary fix even if local leaders manage to successfully attract capital, jobs and consumption dollars. Moreover scholars have pointed out that the rise of urban entrepreneurialism is responsible for a variety of conflicts in which contemporary cities find themselves as municipalities seek to survive in regulatory “race to the bottom” and struggle with fiscal problems resulting from giant direct and indirect business subsidies and consequent lack of tax revenues (Peck and Tickell 1994; see also Harvey 1989). Due to diminishing levels of government support for public education, housing, and other social services as well as exclusionist policies of various kinds, cities thus face intensified social and social-spatial problems, especially in their marginalized neighborhoods.
At the same time, shifting political priorities and practices represent only one among several interrelated factors and developments contributing to the manifold social problems that characterize today’s urban realities. These, as we discuss in the next section, include particularly sharp increases in poverty and inequalities as well as parallel processes of marginalization and neighborhood decline. Other frequently cited causes for these and related trends and developments include, but are not limited to, economic restructuring, i.e. particularly the bifurcated character of post-industrial labor markets as working class industrial jobs were replaced by higher-level white collar positions and low-level menial work; the dismantling of welfarist-Keynesian regulatory arrangements and subsequent rise of “workfarist” social policies by higher level of governments; the moves of middle and working class families away from the inner city to the suburbs as well as persistent - and in many instances increasing - racial and ethnic disparities.

To be sure social and spatial inequalities, neighborhood decline as well as processes of social marginalization or exclusion have dominated scholarly discourses – as well as urban realities – for decades, even if they were not always discussed in precisely these terms. Further, the relative severity and exact causes of cities’ social and spatial conflicts and challenges obviously differ from city to city and from country to country depending on local conditions. At the same time, there is broad-based agreement that today’s situation differs markedly from the past. Placing particular emphasis on the specific situation in the two cities selected as case studies, the purpose of the following section is to shed further light on the way scholars have made sense of the causes, characteristics, and consequences of cities’ growing social and spatial divisions. Given that the literature on the subject is vast, the section’s focus
will be on developments of the last thirty years as well as those scholarly works that are of particularly importance to an understanding of processes and dynamics on the neighborhood level, including debates concerning polarization (Fainstein, Gordon et al. 1992; Sassen 1991 [2001]), the rise of the so-called underclass (Wilson 1989; Wilson 1996), as well as what Wacquant (1999) calls the emergence of “advanced marginality”.

1.2. CITIES’ INCREASING SOCIAL AND SPATIAL DIVISIONS

Attempts to specify the factors responsible for uneven urban development, recognize its contemporary manifestations, and imagine ways to challenge it have in recent decades emerged as key concerns of urban social science in both theoretically and empirically based settings (see i.a. Wilson 1987, Sassen 1991 [2001], Fainstein et al. 1992, Massey and Denton 1993, Marcuse 1999). This trend reflects a broad-based recognition that cities, which had long been sites of stark social and spatial contrasts between wealth and poverty, exhibited rising levels of inequality in recent decades – in both social as well as spatial terms. Wacquant (1999: 1640-41), for instance, posits:

Where poverty in the Western metropolis used to be largely residual or cyclical, embedded in working-class communities, geographically diffuse and considered remediable by means of further market expansion, it now appears to be increasingly long-term if not permanent, disconnected from macroeconomic trends and fixated upon disreputable neighborhoods of relegation in
which social isolation and alienation feed upon each other as the chasm between those consigned there and the rest of society deepens.

Similarly, Marcuse and van Kempen (2000: 250) argue that:

Cities have always shown functional, cultural and status divisions, but the differentiation between areas has grown and lines between the areas have hardened, sometimes literally in the form of walls that function to protect the rich from the poor.

New York City plays in this context a particular role, as the city's fragmented socio-economic and socio-spatial structure as well as its uneven development dynamics are documented and analyzed like no other and widely considered particularly pronounced – especially in contrast to European cities which are traditionally considered more integrated, homogeneous, and inclusive than their US-American counterparts. Throughout history a city of particularly sharp and bitter contrast; New York transformed following the United States' urban crisis of the 1960s and the fiscal crises of the 1970s into what is frequently described as an exemplary "dual" or "divided" city (Mollenkopf and Castells 1991; Fainstein et al. 1992; Marcuse and van Kempen 2002). This characterization highlights schisms between Whites and non-Whites; between an "organized core of professionals and managers and a disorganized periphery" of diverse social groups (Mollenkopf and Castells 1991: 17); between the spaces of "metropolitan heaven and inner city hell" (407) and so on. Data from the 1990s and 2000s confirms that dualities in the socio-economic and socio-spatial
structure of New York City have further intensified, despite – or arguably because of – several periods of extensive economic prosperity and growth.

European cities at the same time according to a broad consensus in the scholarly realm also face pervasive problems, including growing poverty and inequalities, a case in point being Berlin which is said to have evolved from a divided into a “fragmented city” since the city’s reunification as it has become increasingly socially, economically, and spatially polarized (Krätke 2004; Häußermann and Kapphan 2004; Mayer 2006; Krätke and Borst 2000; Gornig and Häußermann 2002; Kapphan 2002.). While the city thus far has failed to close the ranks on other large European cities like London or Paris in terms of its economic importance, Berlin twenty years after the city’s reintegration into world capitalism increasingly takes on the features of a “normal” big city, i.e. a city of many-sided – and in fact intensifying - economic and socio-spatial divisions and accompanying social problems (Mayer 2006).

What, then, accounts for the increase in social inequality, polarization, poverty, and misery in urban areas on both sides of the Atlantic in recent decades? Local circumstances in any given city, of course, warrant attention. Berlin’s recent trajectory, for instance, is only properly understood when the city’s distinct 20th century history, the profound transformations beginning with Die Wende (“the turning point”) in 1989 and particularly the break-down of the city’s industrial base after the loss of special Cold War-era state subsidies in the city’s western part and the end of manufacturing in the east are accounted for. Yet while “globalization does not explain everything” (van Kempen 2007: 22; see also Hamnett 1994) and local distinctiveness has to be considered, most scholars agree that growing social and spatial divisions represent a
phenomenon that is intrinsically related to global economic restructuring, i.e. the profound changes of advanced capitalist economies in the course of the past 40 years. Proponents of dualization and fragmentation like “Global City” theory proponent Saskia Sassen (1991 [2001]; see also Mollenkopf and Castells 1991; Fainstein et al. 1992) for instance use employment and earnings data to illustrate empirically how globalization or, more specifically, the decline and geographical dispersal of cities’ long-standing manufacturing, shipping, wholesaling, and other blue-collar functions and corresponding concentration of white-collar office work, has produced increased income and occupational polarization in (core) cities as (blue-collar) middle-income jobs were increasingly replaced by service jobs at the high- and low-income extremes of the labor market.

The growth of high and low income employment sectors and slower growth or decline of middle income jobs in cities in the post-industrial world, according to Sassen (1991 [2001]), also heightens inequitable spatial patterns of investments and public expenditure: Within the housing market, the growth in numbers of highly-paid urban professionals “has raised the profitability of the market for expensive housing, while growing unemployment among low-income workers has further depressed the lower end of the housing market”, Sassen (1991 [2001]: 479) for instance notes. As a result, gentrification takes place next to rent increases, conversion of low to high income housing, and homelessness (Sassen: 1991 [2001]: 480). In this conception cities’ socio-spatial fabric is increasingly differentiated into two different, physically separated entities: “citadels” characterized by upscale neighborhoods, downtown office towers, and festival marketplaces for cities’ political and economic control capacities and elites, as well as “ghettos”, i.e. marginalized residential quarters and
production spaces for cities’ increasingly internationalized proletariat (Marcuse 1997).

Particularly Sassen’s work, which stems largely from her attempts to generalize from developments in archetypal “global cities” like New York, have been criticized for transferring findings from one socio-economic context to another, for downplaying the role of the state, as well as for her emphasis on occupational polarization as the driving force of cities’ heightened social and spatial divisions. Hamnett (1994, 1996, 2004), for example, argues that – at least in the case of London - professionalization rather than polarization has been the dominant feature of urban socio-economic change in globalizing cities in the advanced capitalist world. Rather than low-skilled and high-skilled service jobs both expanding in an hour-glass fashion, as Sassen suggests, according to him only the latter professional and managerial occupations have grown, resulting in an overall upgrading of the workforce as well as a parallel growth of an economically inactive population which is too poorly educated to meet the heightened demands required by cities’ changing industrial economies. Hence, the problem may not be “that there are too many low-skilled jobs but that there are not enough to provide work for those with few educational qualifications” (Hamnett 2004: 61).

Primarily concerned with the predicament of African Americans in American me-tropolises, William Julius Wilson’s “mismatch theory” (1987, 1996) is also built on the assumption that urban labor markets’ professionalization is at the core of rises of socio-economic and socio-spatial inequality but adds a socio-spatial component to the argument. According to him, cities’ growing social and spatial divisions are at
least partially owing to a distinct and growing phenomenon: the emergence of a new “underclass” made up of poor, black inner city residents who were confronted with a double mismatch: they were too poorly educated to meet the requirements demanded by the changing structures of cities’ economies and they live too far away from places where there are still remnants of the industrial era which could provide jobs - unskilled manual work – for which they qualify. And they lacked, according to Wilson, role models as inner cities also suffered from the flight of middle- and working-class blacks who took advantage of affirmative action and fair housing laws to relocate to higher-income urban neighborhoods and the suburbs, and in doing so fueled the isolation and deprivation of inner-city ghettos.

In the United States, the behavioral aspects of Wilson’s work have met critique as many scholars discarded his claim that ghetto families are without positive social relations or devoid of aspirations to move out of the conditions in which they are confined. Further Wilson was criticized for neglecting the role of race as a critical factor in understanding disparities in virtual all areas of life in the United States in favor of class-based and cultural explanations. And he accused of spatial determinism as scholars pointed out that concentrations of poverty are not always related to areas without opportunities and poor neighborhoods do not always follow the trajectories he described. Nevertheless, his work has been extremely influential and spurred a wave of research that focused on the effects of living in extremely poor neighborhoods, i.e. the role of what became known as “neighborhood effects”.

---

Further, and despite its emphasis on the particularities of the situation of African-Americans, Wilson’s work also attracted a great deal of attention in Europe, if nothing else because its occurrence paralleled a growing scholarly concern about the ways disadvantaged groups in European cities too were increasingly isolated – both socially and physically – from mainstream society. Contrary to the US discourse, which discussed these issues with reference to Wilson’s notion of an underclass, European scholars instead popularized the notion of social exclusion, as “a way of addressing what appeared to be, or was defined to be, a new set of problems caused by fundamental changes in the nature of society” (Atkinson 2000: 1038; see also Geddes 2000). By that time, growing social and spatial divisions as well as spatial concentrations of disadvantaged social groups had become commonplace in cities across Western Europe too and raised fears about fragmentation and ghettoization processes typical of American metropolises - even if most scholars were quick to point out that the US experience, despite some convergence, remained distinct in all sorts of ways.

Wacquant (1996), for instance, dismissed the idea that conditions in European cities are as bleak as in urban America. Yet despite significant differences in the production and reproduction of urban inequalities Wacquant argues that it is possible to

---

13 For a critical discussion of the notion of “social exclusion” see Atkinson (2000) or Geddes (2000)

14 Wacquant (1999), Mustard and Ostendorf (1998) and Marcuse and van Kempen (2002), among others note that although many Europeans are concerned about cities’ “Americanization”, the actual situation is still far from that reality. No European city, as yet, has experienced the level of social and spatial inequality typical of American metropolises or possesses areas of concentrated poverty that are as physically isolated and deteriorated as American inner-city ghettos. Differences between American cities and their European counterparts are usually discussed with reference to the legacy and remaining force of European welfare arrangements and redistributive mechanisms, adopted at national, regional or municipal level, that provided – and to some extent continue to provide - social housing, social security, minimum income levels, health provisions and many other services; the still felt impact of European cities’ historically more integrated, compact and inclusive social and spatial fabric; as well as differing patterns of racial and ethnic relations.
identify a number of shared characteristics that have led to the development of what he terms “advanced marginality” in larger cities on both sides of the Atlantic. According to him, its onset is characterized by a combination of four structural dynamics or logics:

- the resurgence of social inequality in the context of overall prosperity and the elimination of jobs for unskilled workers;
- an “absolute surplus population” that will never work again, as well as a form of poverty that is becoming more persistent for those who do have jobs, as a result of low rates of pay and the exploitation of temporary workers;
- the retrenchment of the welfare state and reorientation of public policy towards market competitiveness; and
- manifold negative effects of concentrated poverty and deprivation which add to the disadvantages experienced by marginalized neighborhoods’ poor inhabitants.

These features stand according to Wacquant “in stark contrast with the commanding traits of poverty in the era of Fordist expansion from the close of World War II to the mid-1970s”. The result is a “modernization of misery” (Wacquant 1999: 1640) that is characterized, among other things, by the proliferation of what Wacquant calls “neighborhoods of relegation”, i.e. marginalized neighborhoods, where those population groups at the very bottom of the emerging urban order concentrate. Ironically, however, many of the political, demographic, and economic trends behind processes of deprivation and isolation are also responsible for another phenomenon common in cities throughout the advanced capitalist world that ostensibly seems to be at odds
with the above discussed concentration of dereliction and poverty: gentrification.
First identified in a few major Western cities such as London and New York,\textsuperscript{15} gentrification today is ubiquitous in the central and inner cities of the advanced capitalist world” (Smith 1996: 38) and widely recognized as a “major component of the urban imaginary” (Ley 2003: 2527). Further, the process of gentrification has also expanded horizontally within cities since it was first identified in the 1960’s: as initially suitable neighborhoods “filled up” gentrification in many cities spread toward the downtown’s periphery, into, as Hackworth (2002: 825) puts it, areas hitherto thought of as “ungentrifiable” (see also Smith 2002; Atkinson and Bridge 2005).

Numerous scholars describe, for instance, how New York, where the phenomenon is considered particularly pervasive, has been transformed in recent decades as gentrification expanded beyond the neighborhoods with appealing housing stock and excellent transportation access into those with considerably less desirable housing, challenging transportation connections and few amenities, including many parts of Upper Manhattan (Smith 1996; Hackworth 2002; Smith 2002; Lees 2003; Newman and Wyly 2006; for an alternative perspective, questioning the extent of gentrification and particularly displacement in Upper Manhattan see Freeman and Braconi 2004 and Freeman 2005). Similarly, gentrification in Berlin also spread significantly in recent years, including into parts of Kreuzberg, even though many scholars still consider its extent less pronounced than in most other capitals and world cities (see i.a. Bernt and Holm 2005; Krätke 2004; Mayer 2006; Bader and Bialluch 2008).

\footnote{\textsuperscript{15} Indeed, the origination of the term “gentrification” has often been credited to Ruth Glass’ seminal study of urban change in London (Glass 1964: xix) in which she described how poor and working-class neighborhoods in the inner city were transformed via an influx of middle-class homebuyers and renters “until all or most of the original working class occupiers are displaced, and the whole social character of the district is changed.”}
One of the most controversial topics in urban studies today, the movement of affluent residents back to the inner-city in recent decades has been enthusiastically endorsed by many observers for helping to spur renewal and revitalization and bringing new economic and social activities to long neglected urban areas. Irrespective of the very real, though by no means universal benefits imparted by it, this sunny notion of gentrification as a solution to, or a reversal of, many of the urban problems described above ignores the high social costs that usually come along with gentrification, including the harsh realities of displacement and the disenfranchisement of long-term residents and businesses from the neighborhoods they call(ed) home.

Thus, many members of low-income communities are highly critical of gentrification processes and wary about any development that could trigger them, including particularly tourism whose connections to gentrification have been described as particularly pervasive (Mele 2000; Gotham 2001; Gotham 2005; Greenberg 2008). Subsequent chapters will elaborate on the complex dynamics of gentrification, as well as its manifold connections to tourism on the neighborhood level, in greater detail. Let us turn first to a discussion of some of the underlying changes with regard to the role of culture and consumption in contemporary cities that relate to the rise of both gentrification and tourism in inner-city neighborhoods.

---

16 For an overview of many of the issues surrounding gentrification see the special issues on gentrification of Environment and Planning A (2007, vol. 39, issue 1) and the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research (2008, vol. 32, issue 1)
1.3. CULTURE, CONSUMPTION AND THE CONTEMPORARY CITY

Another aspect of the “new urban order” of particular importance to this thesis is the increased economic and social significance of consumption and culture that came to define cities and their development in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. As Featherstone (1991: 101) observes “Postmodern cities have become centres of consumption, play and entertainment, saturated with signs and images to the extent that anything can be represented, thematized and made an object of interest.”

To this end, researchers have noted the rise of the “Fantasy City” (Hannigan 1998) or the “Consumer City” (Glaeser, Kolko et al. 2000). In this section of the chapter I review scholarly contributions that provide a theoretical background for understanding the transformation of culture and consumption - including tourism consumption - from residual categories in urban studies into key concerns (Zukin 1991, 1995; Miles and Paddison 1998; Miles and Miles 2004; Jayne 2006). I will first outline how critical urban theory has tried to make sense of culture and consumption’s growing importance, building primarily upon the seminal contributions of David Harvey (1989) and Sharon Zukin (1991, 1995). Subsequently other political-economic analyses will be discussed before the section concludes with an exploration of the impact of occupational change and the rise of the so-called “creative class” (Florida 2002, 2005) on the role of culture and consumption in contemporary cities and their development.

---

17 Culture and consumption of course always played an important role in shaping cities’ social and economic life and were moreover already in past periods of urbanization employed to advance economic or urban development agendas. Despite the intellectual legacy of such key figures as Walter Benjamin or Georg Simmel, whose writings on consumption and the city are extensive and influential, such concerns were for most of the twentieth century not central to urban scholarship however (Miles and Paddison 1998; Miles and Miles 2004; Jayne 2006).
For Harvey (1989), who goes a long way in *The Condition of Postmodernity* towards coming to terms with the complexities inherent in an understanding of the changing significance of culture and consumption, it all comes down to economics. Reflecting on the notion of the “postmodern”, to which the reassessment of culture and consumption in the late twentieth century is intrinsically tied, Harvey entertains the idea that culture and consumption are more than reflections of a formed social and economic structure. Nevertheless, he locates their development within the nature and logic of capitalism without crediting them with autonomy. Instead they are located within a superstructure, which is largely determined by economic developments associated with the shift towards a flexible regime of accumulation.

In this latest phase of capitalism, Harvey posits, cities’ economic and social life became consumption-oriented, cultural and aestheticized for a number of interrelated reasons: capital increasingly turned to culture and consumption, as well as signs, symbols, and spectacles in its search for profit; cultural and symbolic industries gained significance as productive forces in their own right; and a growing emphasis on individualized consumption, among other things as a form of investment, self-fulfillment, and means of self-expression for cities’ new middle class, also brought about significant changes in all areas of life. Significantly, Harvey elaborates that this not only involves what we would characterize as “high” culture but also street-level culture, non-mainstream groups and lifestyles, artistic innovation, funky neighborhoods, multi-cultural spaces, etc. as traditional divisions between high and low culture eroded and “consumer identities” became more differentiated and individualized.
Alongside of this, Harvey notes that city politics has come to reflect the image and expectations of a postmodern public. The heightening competition among cities that emerged in the course of the second half of the twentieth century not only concerns the attraction of jobs and mobile corporations, but also the repositioning of cities within the spatial division of consumption: “Gentrification, cultural innovation, and physical upgrading of the urban environment (including the turn to postmodernist styles of architecture and design), consumer attractions (sports stadia, convention and shopping centers, marinas, exotic eating places) and entertainment (the organization of urban spectacles on a temporary or permanent basis) have all become much more prominent facets of strategies for urban regeneration [as cities] above all have to appear as “innovative, exciting, creative and safe place[s] to live or visit, to play and consume in” (Harvey 1989:9).

Essentially, Harvey contends that entrepreneurial cities’ turn to “the idea of culture” (be it in the arts, theatre, music, or more broadly in localized ways of life, heritage, collective memories etc.) and other “soft” locational factors in search of new sources of what he elsewhere (Harvey 2000) called “monopoly rents”. By this term he means the amount of rent that can be earned based on claims to the uniqueness of a location, as other locational differences – for example traditional geographical variables – became less significant. This dynamic according to Harvey also explains the appropriation of places’ culture through private sector actors in pursuit of profit, for example in the practice of real estate development or tourism, who also build on a seemingly ever expanding array of aesthetics and cultural forms as marks of distinction to establish or maintain a monopolistic edge over competitors. In doing so, Harvey contends, they further the “shameless commodification” and “all-pervasive loss of dis-
tinctiveness” of urban culture and urban life (Harvey 2000: 409) that for Harvey constitute defining elements of cities in the age of late capitalism.

Another seminal materialist investigation with regard to the implications of the changing role of culture and consumption for urban and social theory on the one, and cities and their development on the other, constitutes urban sociologist Sharon Zukin’s work on *The Cultures of Cities* (1995). Sometimes drawing on and sometimes departing from Harvey’s analysis, she examines a variety of issues related to the relationship of culture and consumption to the contemporary city. This includes the ways changing notions of culture and consumption are reshaping urban places and conflicts over revitalization, the rising power - and implications - of cities’ growing “symbolic economies”, i.e. the production and consumption of art, gourmet food, fashion, music, entertainment and tourism (and the spaces required for each) in light of post-industrial transformation processes, as well as the appropriation and commodification of local arts, history, and culture by local elites for economic interests: “With the disappearance of local manufacturing industries and periodic crises in government and finance, culture is more and more the business of cities - the basis of their tourist attractions and their unique, competitive edge” (Zukin 1995: 1-2).

Zukin’s analysis thereby relates to several different ways of defining culture. Culture in the sense of refined art, literature, theater, dance, and cuisine; in the sense of a “way of life”, or a marker of difference and source of distinction has always been a fundamental part of the urban experience, Zukin argues. But this is just one sense in which culture plays a role in understanding contemporary urban development and life. In today’s world, she remarks, cultural consumption (of art, food, fashion, music,
tourism), as well as the marketing and advertising strategies attached to each, has also become a new means of accumulating capital as well as a powerful instrument of urban governance.

Essentially Zukin inverts the Marxist base-superstructure approach and argues that culture and the arts, as part of the new “symbolic economy” and against the backdrop of declining urban industrial bases, fiscal crises, and the rise of the consumer society, have come to hold real economic power.\(^{18}\) They have become critical productive forces in contemporary urban environments by producing goods, services and, importantly, space, and moreover establish competitive advantages over other cities for attracting business, affluent residents, and visitors. The material reproduction of society depends on the material reproduction of space - land, labor, and capital are prime factors in this process of reproduction. Yet, the production of space depends on symbolic considerations and on an interplay between aesthetics and function. As cities have developed service economies, they have “both propagated and been taken hostage by an aesthetic urge” (Zukin 1996: 44).

Building upon Baudrillard’s idea of capitalist image production, the “new” urban economy according to her should be conceived as symbolic, consisting of two parallel production systems: the production of space, with its synergy of capital investment and cultural meanings, and the production of symbols, which construct both a currency of commercial exchange and a language of social identity (1995: 23-24, emphasis hers). Lastly, culture in Zukin’s analysis is conceptualized as a powerful

\(^{18}\) One of the axioms of (orthodox) Marxist thought is that economic surpluses generate cultural and artistic activities but not the other way around.
means of framing space and social control as well as a “terrain of struggle” that reflects inequalities of power defining “whose city” it is.

While there remains debate over the extent to which today’s urban economy is really more cultural or symbolic than before, Zukin’s analyses are widely praised for providing the theoretical armature and empirical foundation for the now-accepted claim of cultural signification as intrinsic to the economic structure of contemporary cities and for having placed the analysis of symbols and imagery to the fore of studies of urban development (Eade and Mele 2002). Her work is complemented by a broad swath of critical thinking in urban studies and related disciplines about the relationship of culture and consumption to the contemporary city and its development. Scott (1997, 2004) for instance sheds further light on the economic underpinnings of the changing relationships between production and consumption, commerce and culture laid out by Zukin and their implications for modern cities. “As a result of the growth of disposable consumer income and the expansion of discretionary time in modern society, the consumption of cultural products of all kinds is evidently expanding at an accelerating pace, and the sectors engaged in making them constitute some of the most dynamic economic frontiers of capitalism today”, Scott (1997: 323-324) notes, and adds that this development has particular relevance for cities which “have exhibited a conspicuous capacity both to generate culture in the form of art, ideas, styles and attitudes, and to induce high levels of economic innovation and growth.”

While Scott (1997, 2004) advanced scholarship’s understanding particularly with respect to what could be called the production of (cultural) consumption, other scholars
have focused on issues of planning, policy making, and politics. This literature contains two principal approaches:

(1) a more optimistic, pragmatic strand directed at using culture as a (re-)development tool (see esp. Bianchini 1993; Landry 2000; Evans 2001, 2005); and

(2) a more critical stance strand that is concerned with the political-economic underpinnings and social implications associated with what is frequently described as the “festivalization of urban politics” and its focus on culture- and consumption-driven development, place marketing and image politics (Eisinger 2000; Häußermann and Colomb 2003; Judd and Simpson 2003).

Primarily oriented toward enhancing practice, the first effectively embraces the development dynamics associated with “capitalism’s cultural turn” (Thrift 1999) and views consumption- and culture-led developments “as one of the few remaining strategies for urban revitalization which can embrace the effects of globalization and capture the twin goals of competitive advantage and quality of life” (Evans 2005: 960). Rooted in critical urban theory, the latter meanwhile is concerned with more traditional political economic concerns, including the role of power relations and conflicts in processes of urban development, as well as issues related to social justice. Such studies typically shed light on the strategies that are employed in order to advance cities’ transition from a space of production to one of consumption, the actors and interests behind them, as well as the impacts they entail (Kearns and Philo 1993; Gottdiener 1997; Eisinger 2000; Judd and Simpson 2003).
In line with the first approach, Clark (2003; Clark et al. 2002) sets his study against the backdrop of economic globalization, transforming occupational and demographic structures as well as changing consumption preferences and social relationships. He ascribes the heightened role of culture and consumption in inner-city areas in his work on *The City as an Entertainment Machine* to the changing social and cultural profiles of inner city residents and workers employed in cities’ post-industrial economies. From here, it is but a short hop to the creative city discourse invigorated by Richard Florida (2002, 2005) with its boosterish message about the power of the so-called “creative class” to act as an engine of economic growth and transform city areas. Described by Marcuse (2003: 41) as “an engaging account of the lifestyle preferences of yuppies”, much of Florida’s writings emphasize the work, play and consumption habits of “creative class” members and their active role in the construction of “neo-bohemian” enclaves (Lloyd 2002) and other urban environments that meet their consumption-oriented, cultural and aestheticized needs.

Recent themes developed within the more critical tradition address the construction of themed fantasy spaces geared toward pleasure and consumption (Sorkin 1992; Hannigan 1998; Sassen and Roost 1999; Miles 2005), the emerging importance of the “fun sectors” of the new urban economy such as the arts, tourism, leisure, and entertainment as elements of urban regimes or growth machines (Whitt 1987; Eisinger 2000; Judd and Simpson 2003), the commodification of ethnicity, culture, and historic preservation in urban redevelopment schemes, the remaking of cities as brands and resultant transformation of urban politics, urban space and public life (Kearns and Philo 1993; Gottdiener 1997; Häußermann and Colomb 2003; Green-
As this literature focuses disproportionately on what Lloyd (2002: 519) called “administered consumption” - such as the development of big hallmark infrastructures like New York’s Times Square (see i.a. Zukin 1995, Reichl 1999) or Berlin’s Potsdamer Platz (Sassen and Roost 1999; Allen 2006a), the staging of events (see i.a. Burbank 2002; Gold and Gold 2008) or the branding of city space and cultural forms (see i.a. Zukin 1995; Hannigan 1998) - some scholars have argued that such accounts “obscure more evolutionary processes of cultural development” (see i.a. Lloyd 2002: 519). They emphasize the need to devote greater attention to more organic process of leisure and (place) consumption as well as the way changing demographics, lifestyles, and consumption habits are involved in the production of culture and consumption opportunities in contemporary cities. While such more supply-side oriented perspectives are criticized – among other things - for their lack of engagement with critical urban and social theory (Marcuse 2003; Peck 2005; Allen 2006b; Markusen 2006), their work is important for the purpose of this study for a variety of reasons. Maybe most significantly, they point to the rise of a new urban culture devoted to aesthetic pursuits whereby residents and city workers – be it in search for leisure activities, a connection to the past, or learning or inspiration - engage in activities that are indistinguishable from what tourists do:

Consumers no longer travel vast distances to experience a magnificent diversity of consumption opportunities. For their convenience, flourishing districts of urban entertainment concentrate objects, or at least their facsimiles, [gath-
In many cases, particularly in large cities, this may be a straightforward case of internal tourism: residents visit parts of the city that are new to them or which have particular attractions, especially the central areas. But more broadly, there is a de-differentiation between touristic practices and other spheres of cultural experience and between tourism and everyday life (Urry 1995, 2002; Franklin and Crang 2001; Shaw and Williams 2004). While, as discussed, many people enjoy touristic behaviors even though they do not count as tourists under official definitions, some of those who do fit official definitions do not think of themselves as tourists at all.

For example, those visiting friends and relations, frequent business travelers, second homers or students going on exchange may simply not see themselves as tourists, although they do have touristic behaviors (Maitland 2008). Such practices are indicative of the increasingly blurred demarcations between leisure and work places, entertainment and work activities, and leisure and work time that have come to characterize contemporary society and, while not altogether new, considerably contribute to the growing role of spatial and temporal mobility on the one hand and leisure and consumption on the other hand in (urban) economic and social transformation processes. Related to this increased role of leisure activities, is, to turn to this thesis’ key concern, the growing importance of urban tourism itself, as a social activity, an industry and as a policy concern (Judd and Fainstein 1999; Law 2002; Hoffman, Fainstein et al. 2003; Selby 2004).
1.4. TOURISM AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT – THE RELATIONSHIPS

Urban environments worldwide have throughout history been among the most significant of all tourist destinations. As Karski (1990: 15) states:

Urban tourism has, in one form or other, been with us since Mesopotamia and Sumeria were spawning the phenomenon of urbanisation. People with the means and inclination to do so have been drawn to towns and cities just to visit and experience a multiplicity of things to see and do. Pilgrims in the 14th century were urban tourists visiting cities like Canterbury. The historic Grand Tour of Europe, in the 18th and 19th centuries, was essentially an urban experience for the rich, taking in more spectacular towns and cities, usually regional and national capitals. These were the melting pots of national culture, art, music, literature and of course magnificent architecture and urban design. It was the concentration, variety, and quality of these activities and attributes... that created their attraction and put certain towns and cities on the tourism map of the day.

Yet despite this, until the 1980s urban tourism as a research topic attracted relatively little attention. Arguing that tourism scholarship was overwhelmingly conceived of as a temporary urban to rural migration, Stansfield (1964) was one of the first scholars to draw attention to this almost exclusively rural focus in tourism studies: “It is frequently inferred by recreational studies that there exists some inherent opposition of the two environments, urban and non-urban, resulting in a strong and presumably widespread desire for residents within one to seek recreation in the other” (Stansfield
This idea is exemplified by one of the first spatial models of recreation behavior by Christaller (1964: in Hinch 1996: 96-97), one of the founding fathers of urban spatial modeling, who assumed a center-periphery relationship between cities that provided visitors and peripheral or rural areas that attracted them. Such conceptualizations set the course for a generation’s work in the emerging multidisciplinary field of tourism studies in which recreation and leisure were overwhelmingly considered a function of the countryside (Ashworth 2003: 144). Since scholars in urban studies and related disciplines until recently did not devote much attention to tourism in cities either, urban tourism hence suffered from what Ashworth (1989) called a “double neglect”: He wrote that “those interested in the study of tourism have tended to neglect the urban context in which much of it is set, while those interested in urban studies ... have been equally neglectful of the importance of the tourist function of cities” (33). Urban tourism, in short, was until well into the 1980s not recognized as a notable and distinct field of research by either scholars of recreation or of the urban.

This has changed. Reflecting fundamental transformations with regard to the role and function of cities as well as the characteristics of modern day tourism, urban tourism today attracts considerable attention in the scholarly community, as a proliferation of published works in recent years exemplifies (see i.a. Law 1993; Berg, Borg et al. 1995; Page 1995; Judd and Fainstein 1999; Law 2002; Hoffman, Fainstein et al. 2003; Judd 2003; Selby 2004). The increase in urban tourism research particularly since the late 1980s is typically explained with reference to two, strongly related,

---

19 Indeed, a current review of Leisuretourism.com using the generic term Urban Tourism generates over 800 pieces of literature and Scopus over 1300 references as a sign of its intellectual health (see Ashworth and Page 2011: 1).
real-world phenomena: an escalating growth of tourism activity as well as a heightened political, social, and economic significance of tourism for cities and their development (Pearce 2001: 927; Judd and Fainstein 1999; Selby 2004).

Reliable statistics are hard to come by, yet there is wide agreement that urban tourism has in fact increased rapidly in recent decades, with average annual growth rates exceeding the average increases in the world’s general tourism market. This rapid increase is a result of rising living standards and increased leisure time, technological improvements, cheaper and rapidly expanded means of transportation, increases in business travel, improvements in urban amenities and infrastructures, a drift worldwide towards short (city) breaks, and so on. As a consequence, there is strong evidence that tourism has evolved into a major economic force in many cities around the world.

New York, the United States’ most visited city, welcomed an estimated 45.6 million domestic and international visitors spending $28.2 billion in 2009, which in turn generated 7.5 billion in taxes and supported 303,649 tourism-related jobs with $16.6 billion in wages (NYC & Company 2010). Statistics for Berlin, which established itself after the fall of the Berlin Wall as Europe’s third most visited destination and counted a record-breaking 20 million overnight stays in 2010 alone, meanwhile indicate that tourism contributed in 2007 (the last year that numbers were available) roughly 7.5 percent to the city’s aggregate income, generated more than € 1 billion in local taxes

---

20 This is, as Wöber (2000; see also Maitland and Newman 2009) points out, primarily owed to the fact that individual cities collect their own data on tourism and that there is a lack of consistency in research focus and data gathering affecting the quality of even apparently basic data. Consistency problems in other words not only exist with respect to data on more specific matters such as the purpose or length of tourists’ stay, but also regarding the type of visitors that are counted or the areas that are included, which is why attempts to aggregate tourism data from different sources or compare tourism related data are confronted with formidable difficulties.
(2003: € 703 Million), and sustained over 255,000 of the city’s roughly 1.5 million (fulltime) jobs (2003: 170,000) (BTM 2007). Largely omitting information on day trippers, as well as people visiting friends and relatives and the like, such numbers by no means present a statistically complete picture of tourism activity in the two cities but at the very least show that tourism has become a substantial contributor to both cities’ economies.

Such numbers help us to understand why tourism has evolved into a key concern of local policymakers. Large cities in the United States and Western Europe, as previously discussed, always attracted visitors from outside their immediate regions, whether staying overnight or as day trippers, because of business activity, retail, cultural and sport facilities, the desire to see friends and relatives and various other reasons. Although income from tourism was frequently not insignificant in absolute terms, relative to the whole economy it was usually of only small importance, and local politicians and planners – a few exceptions notwithstanding – typically devoted only little attention to what was widely considered a “marginal social activity” (Beauregard 1998: 220).

Tourism, as Beauregard (1998: 220) put it with reference to the United States, was until well into the 1970s, “simply not a factor in government-led urban economic development.” Today, only a couple of decades later, the situation differs dramatically as tourism – along with leisure and consumption more generally – is widely considered a key driver of contemporary urban change, and virtually every city in the advanced capitalist world attaches elevated attention to attracting visitors to their cities. On the one hand because urban tourism is seen as an important urban economic
sector that generates jobs and (tax) revenues. On the other hand, because of its “symbolic weight”, tourism is viewed as a critical means to reposition cities in a rapidly changing economic environment and/or reaffirm their standing in an evolving metropolitan hierarchy (Fainstein, Hoffman et al. 2003: 2).

In New York, most policymakers up until the 1970s considered tourism as a byproduct of geographical and cultural-historical advantage, local economic and infrastructure investment, national policy and global economic shifts, i.e. as a “indirect result of other forces and policies and not as a policy area in its own right, per se” (Gross 2009: 25; see also Greenberg 2008). New York City’s tourism policies until then as Gross (2009: 25) stresses, “tended to be expressed indirectly through taxation and finance programmes supporting economic development and entrepreneurship.” By the late 1970s and early 1980s, however, attitudes among policymakers, business persons, and the city’s civic elites had shifted, resulting in deliberate strategies and programs aimed at the expansion of the increasingly lucrative tourism trade (Greenberg 2008: 181-182). At their most basic level, such policies, of which many originated first in American cities and were subsequently embraced by local elites elsewhere in the world, include - but are not limited to

- the building and/or expansion of elaborate infrastructures to support local recreation and tourist economies as well as
- intensified marketing and branding efforts to attract visitors and appeal to the institutions that compose the tourist industry (see i.a. Law 1993; Judd 1995; Page 1995; Law 2002).
In New York, the increasing emphasis on tourism and leisure in economic development from the late 1970s onwards caused marketing of the city to transform from an essentially amateurish and marginal activity into a vast and professionalized component of local governance. Mayor Abraham David (“Abe”) Beame established the city’s first “comprehensive marketing program” and subsequently several public-private entities were created for tourism promotion (Greenberg 2008: pp.161). It is physically manifested by the parallel proliferation of purposefully constructed tourism locations – what Judd and Fainstein (1999) refer to as “tourism bubbles” like South Street Seaport or Times Square’s redevelopment which despite their relative isolation from the areas surrounding them nonetheless had a profound impact upon the city’s urban fabric.

In Berlin tourism development meanwhile also became an essential component of local politics as soon as the city’s reunification allowed it. Embedded in broader efforts to turn Berlin into a post-industrial metropolis and bring the former Cold War outpost into the top tier of contemporary global cities, local policymakers after Berlin lost its status as a city relatively isolated from global economic changes and inter-city competition in other words also began to engage in extensive planning and coalition building with the goal to promote the city as a destination and reorganize its urban landscape according to the needs of visitors and the tourist industry. Such efforts, which are in Berlin maybe best exemplified by the construction and marketing of spectacular urban landscapes like Potsdamer Platz (see especially Häußermann and Colomb 2003), are today discussed extensively in the academic literature and both reflect and reinforce what some scholars have described as a “touristification” of
urban space or, alternatively, as a “recreational turn” in processes of urbanization (Gotham 2005; Stock 2007).

Scholars agree that urban tourism has evolved into an extremely important political, economic and cultural phenomenon in recent decades that figures prominently within processes of urbanization. Practices and economic activities, land use patterns, as well as the “gaze” (Urry 1990, 2002) of consumers, (place) entrepreneurs, and local leaders are all informed by it. Accordingly, urban tourism research has, as mentioned above, made significant strides in recent decades as scholars from a range of social science disciplines discovered urban tourism as a viable field of inquiry, looked at it from a broad range of concerns and perspectives, and, in doing so, contributed to a better understanding of various aspects of the phenomenon. At the same time, several scholars also concede that there are severe limitations of the existing literature on urban tourism. A convincing theoretical or conceptual framework, for instance, has proven difficult to attain, not least since scholars’ understanding of tourism itself to this day has not approached a comprehensive, cohesive state. Meethan (2001: 2), for instance, characterizes tourism as “under-theorized, eclectic, and disparate”, a view that he is not alone in proposing. Before further elaborating on tourism in cities, a discussion of the problems and challenges involved in theorizing and conceptualizing tourism thus is in order.
2. (URBAN) TOURISM RESEARCH AND THE CONTEMPORARY CITY – AN OVERVIEW

A major difficulty in coming to terms with processes and patterns of urban tourism arises from the concept of tourism, which in itself is anything but clearly defined. Consequently, this chapter commences with an attempt to demarcate and delineate the identity and contested meaning of tourism, addressing issues such as how tourism has been defined and understood in the social sciences, and how recent transformations of the global capitalist order affect tourism production and consumption before turning to a discussion of tourism activity in cities and the ways scholars have made sense of it. After having considered definitional issues and research directions, it concludes with a short discussion of tourism in “world tourism cities” and makes a case for a stronger synthesis of tourism research and urban studies.

2.1. TOURISM - DEFINITIONS, DELINEATIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS

The word tourism has been part of the English lexicon for nearly two centuries. Initially it was primarily used with reference to the Grand Tours of Europe’s upper classes to the continent’s culturally significant places. It was cited for the first time in the Oxford English Dictionary in 1811, seven years after the invention of the steam engine laid the foundation for railway transportation and helped to make travel more accessible to the population in general (Smith 2004: 26; see also Netto 2009). What emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a fashionable social activity for the privileged few evolved in the course of the twentieth century into a critical
element of contemporary societies and cultures. According to the World Travel &
Tourism Council (2009) the business of travel (comprising everything from airlines to
hotels to tour operators) currently accounts for more than 9 percent of the world’s
economic output and is responsible for 9.2 percent of employment worldwide. A $ 7
trillion dollar industry, it is today frequently said to be one of the largest economic
sectors in the world, indeed at least according to organizations in the business of
tourism, it might soon eclipse oil as the world’s largest, and moreover is considered a
primary force for physical, economic, social, and cultural change. As Franklin and
Crang (2001: 19) state:

The tourist and styles of tourist consumption are not only emblematic of many
features of contemporary life, such as mobility, restlessness, the search for
authenticity and escape, but they are increasingly central to economic restruc-
turing, globalization, the consumption of place and the aestheticization of eve-
ryday life.

In fact, according to some observers, tourism has become so pervasive that it has
taken over much of today’s everyday life world and for this reason lost its “specificity”
(Urry 1990: 82). Positing that tourism ceased to differ from other forms of production
and consumption and occupies more and more time in people’s daily, weekly, and
annual calendar, Munt (1994: 104), for example, argues that in contemporary socie-
ties “tourism is everything and everything is tourism.” And Lash and Urry (1994: 270)
even go so far as to speculate about an “end of tourism”. After all, as Urry (1990: 82)
put it, “people are much of the time ‘tourists’, whether they like it or not.” Unsurprisingly, given tourism’s central position in twentieth century societies, many disciplines have developed an interest in it, including economics (Bull 1991; Eadington and Redman 1991), socio-psychology (e.g. Pearce 1982), geography (Shaw and Williams 2002; Hall and Page 2006), sociology (e.g. Urry 1990; Lash and Urry, 1994), anthropology (e.g. Smith 1989), marketing and management (e.g. Pender and Sharples 2005; Kolb 2006), political science (e.g. Hall 1994, 2003), and environmental studies and ecology (e.g. Gössling and Hall 2006).

For example, as an economic phenomenon, tourism responds to the forces of supply and demand, and business terms such as “tourism marketing” and “tourism management” are frequently used. Tourism is also a social phenomenon, as tourists interact with people of host countries, fellow travelers, and travel agents. Furthermore, tourism is a psychological phenomenon as it is related to an individual’s particular personality traits, skills, and abilities to make decisions about travel and activities (Pearce 1982). And it is a cultural phenomenon as it entails the transmission of norms and values between visitors and host communities and involves manifold implications for different cultures and subcultures (Smith 1989). Each discipline provides a partial rather than a holistic approach to tourism. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of tourism requires an integrative approach to the tourism system (Przeclawski 1993).

21 While this might be considered a rather convoluted approach to the debate over contemporary tourism, their observations relating to the role of tourism in the world of postmodern culture and what they coin “disorganized capitalism” are useful in setting the emergence of alternative forms of tourism development in a broader conceptual context.
Yet what is actually meant by the term tourism? And what does it mean to be a tourist? In fact, despite tourism’s relevance to people almost everywhere, one of the most prevalent problems that recurs throughout much of the literature on tourism is the question of actually defining the subject. Gilbert (1990 in Williams 2004: 2) encapsulates the views of many authors in noting that tourism is “a single term that designates a variety of concepts”. Similarly, the OECD (1991: 16) observes that “tourism is a concept that can be interpreted differently depending on the context. “Tourism” may cover the tourists, or what the tourists do, or the agents who cater to them, and so on. There is, in other words, neither a conceptual nor a technical frame of reference that could serve as a universally acknowledged guide to tourism research, and it is precisely its absence that is frequently cited as a one of the main weaknesses of this emerging area of study in the social sciences (Williams 2004).

McIntosh et al. (1995, cited in Richie et al. 2003: 3), for instance, defined tourism as “the sum of phenomena and relationships arising from the interaction of tourists, business suppliers, host governments, and host communities in the process of attracting and hosting these tourists and other visitors.” The World Tourism Organization (WTO) offered a narrower - and technical - approach in what seems to be the officially accepted definition: “Tourism comprises the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year, for purposes other than taking up permanent residence or employment” (in Beaver 2005: 312). Przeclawski (1993: 10), however, suggested another definition, which relates people’s movement to another place to their desires to establish contact with new natural, social and cultural environments: “Tourism (...) is the sum of the phenomena pertaining to spatial mobility, connected with a voluntary,
temporary change of place, the rhythm of life and its environment and involving personal contact with the visited environment (natural, cultural or social).”

As these different definitions indicate, tourism, in its broadest sense, is a process of a change of place by groups or individuals to fulfill desires through exploring and experiencing different cultures, environments and various other activities. Destinations stimulate and motivate visits; they are the places where tourism products are produced to be experienced by visitors. And they are also the places where local residents experience the impacts of tourism. Gunn (1994: 27) defined destination as “a geographic area containing a critical mass of development that satisfies traveler objectives”. Thus, the boundaries of a destination could be classified geographically, for example the whole country (national scale), a region within the country (regional scale); a city or town (local scale), or, as in this study, particular areas within a municipality such as neighborhoods. Whether the complex array of phenomena and processes tourism entails possess enough commonalities for a universal conceptualization to be useful is meanwhile contested, and there are few texts that do not point to the troubles involved in capturing tourism’s multifaceted nature with a unified, all-encompassing concept or definition (Williams 2004). Further, attempts to establish a frame-of-reference that serves as a guide to tourism research are also made difficult by the inherently eclectic character of tourism as a field of study, as understandings about the essential nature of tourism vary dependent on as the epistemological and ontological assumptions of the viewer as well as scholars’ scientific focus and interests. Disagreements exist with regard to both conceptual definitions -

22 Rojek and Urry (1997) even go so far as to question the usefulness of thinking of tourism as a distinct concept or category altogether. For them tourism “is hardly useful as a term of social science” but rather a “chaotic conception” that includes a “too wide range of disparate phenomena” to be usefully employed in social sciences inquiries (Rojek and Urry 1997: 1).
which attempt to elucidate the essential nature of tourism - as well as technical definitions serving statistical purposes. There is, in other words, neither a conceptual nor a technical frame of reference and it is precisely their absence that is frequently cited as a one of the main weaknesses of tourism research as an emerging area of study in the social sciences (Williams 2004). Recently, scholars have advocated a flexible approach to account for the increasingly permeable, fluctuating, and blurred boundaries that separate tourism from other forms of consumption and production. Most scholars do not go so far as to subscribe to Lash and Urry’s or Munt’s arguments, introduced earlier, which essentially call the usefulness of thinking of tourism as a distinct concept or category into question altogether. Yet there is a growing awareness that there are a number of points at which tourism and other (presumably non-touristic) consumption and production patterns are interrelated, and that neither can be adequately understood without reference to the other (see Table 3).

Table 3 Relationships between Tourism, Leisure, Recreation and Work (Hall et al. 2004: 4)
Along these lines, conceptions that divide tourism from other forms of mobility have also increasingly made way in recent years for approaches that interpret tourism as one dimension of temporary mobility, “being both shaped by and shaping it within contemporary practices of consumption, production and lifestyle” and view tourism as well as other forms of mobility as intrinsically connected (see Table 4) (Bell and Ward 2000; Hall and Page 2006: 5). Bell and Ward (2000), for instance, view tourism as a component of a continuum of mobilities ranging from local leisure pursuits and home based activities to those of travel away from home or work, as well as experiences of migration and Diaspora.

Table 4 Situating tourism in relation to other forms of mobility: temporal and spatial dimensions (Shaw and Williams 2001: 8)
Between these poles, they argue, different forms of temporary mobility involve territorial movement for consumption or production reasons, or a combination of both, and typically tend to be blurred in terms of scale and time so that temporary mobility is best viewed as “a sequence of intersecting and overlapping layers, of varying intensity and spatial extent, each representing a different form of mobility behaviour” (Bell and Ward 2000: 93). Though hardly providing a working definition for all purposes, such representations of tourism are of particular relevance to discussions of tourism in cities. Here, the connections between tourism and other consumption and mobility practices are known to be particularly pronounced, especially when compared to the resort-based forms of tourism that preoccupied much research during the 1960s and 1970s when tourism studies emerged as a sub-discipline in its own right in the social sciences:

In some cases, it remains possible to make clear, or at least workable, distinctions between hosts and visitors, places of work and residence, and places of play to which people travel as tourists, and between touristic and non-touristic behavior. Torremolinos in Spain is still primarily a holiday resort; visitors to The Gambia or Bhutan are unlikely to be confused with locals. However, in many destinations distinctions have become hazy and tourism cannot be seen as a separate activity confined to particular areas or particular times. It is more pervasive and divisions between tourism and everyday life in the city have blurred (Maitland and Newman 2009: 3)

As hinted at earlier, definitional problems also exist in relation to the supply side of tourism. It is - similarly to the demand side of tourism - also notoriously hard to pin
down and define. Early attempts at defining the tourist industry have included a number of different industries producing any aspect of the tourism product, e.g. the travel industry; hotels and catering; retailing and entertainment and so on, yet such approaches are problematic as tourists, as Ashworth and Page (2011: 12) point out, "make some use of almost everything and exclusive use of almost nothing." Addressing this issue, Smith (1988) has proposed to conceive the tourism industry as an industry with two tiers of which one consists of businesses that would not be able to survive without tourism and the second one comprises businesses that cater to tourists and residents and hence would be able to survive without tourism. Leiper (2008) has meanwhile argued that the term “the tourism industry” as a generic expression is too simplistic and misleading and should be replaced by the plural term, “tourism industries”. This definitional quagmire returns us to the more general struggle about how tourism should be conceived that continues to shape debates in the tourism literature. Neither tourists nor the “tourist industry” can easily be identified or defined and the fact that tourism in the current era, as will be discussed below, seems to become ever more differentiated and at the same time indistinct, if anything complicates the search for clear definitions.

2.2. TOURISM AS A FIELD OF STUDY - TOWARDS A SYSTEMS APPROACH

Whilst many authors argue that a lack of sophistication in tourism research is still apparent, it is also true that the research field has evolved considerably over the last decades. Jafari’s “four stages” of tourism writings (2001, 2003) provide a good basis for placing this evolution in context. Taking the motives of the proponents as a key rationale, he views the development of theory in tourism research as having passed
through four evolutionary phases or platforms of knowledge. Of course, as in all attempts to classify developments over time, the identification of stages is somewhat artificial and in many ways more properly should be seen as building on each other. However, they do serve as a way of capturing what has been happening, which in this case is the emergence of a subject of study out of a rapidly growing field of practice.

| Advocacy platform (up to 1960) | Context after the 2nd World War, economic development as the main factor. The governments assume a role of “facilitators” of the tourist activity. Perspective “anti-management” characterized by a positive attitude with no critics in relation to the sector (recognition of the respective economic benefits). |
| Cautionary platform (1960 to 1980) | Emergency in the end of the sixties, the Tourism begins to be understood as a destructive force of the local cultures, which should be controlled and avoided. Increase of the number of articles published in magazines of areas not directly connected to the tourism. In the eighties a development of efforts for the identification of ways potentially more positive for the reception communities (introduction of concepts as alternative tourism and ecotourism). |
| Adaptancy platform (1980 to late 1980s) | In the eighties a development of efforts for the identification of ways potentially more positive for the reception communities (introduction of concepts as alternative tourism and ecotourism). |
| Knowledge-based platform | Change from an emotional and ideological speech to an objective speech. Adopts a holistic approach to the tourism while an integrated and interdependent system, in which the process of decision making depends on the application of scientific methods. |

Table 5 Jafari’s four tourism platforms of tourism writings (2001, 2003)

The first phase reflected an uncritical and championing position. A largely affirmative, policy-enhancing stance dominated the “advocacy” platform in the 1960s, emphasizing a strong economic rationale for tourism. The second, “cautionary” platform, high-
lighted the significant negative economic, cultural, and environmental aspects of
tourism, as the periphery of mass international tourism was extended to less deve-
loped countries during the 1970s. More evenhanded, the “adaptancy” platform em-
phasized alternative or remedial forms of tourism, which were more environmentally
and culturally responsive to the needs of host communities that mass tourism, a
theme which became popular during the 1980s. Lastly, the “knowledge” platform was
a reflection of the growing maturation of tourism research and an increased ac-
knowledge of the previous three platforms’ shortcomings. In this last stage or
phase the “scientification of tourism as a field of study” according to Jafari (2001)
progressed considerably. Scholars began to connect tourism studies with the major
debates in social science, developed a more balanced view of tourism’s benefits and
costs and shifted from largely inductive positivist or empiricist frameworks to more
critical approaches (grounded in political economy or cultural interpretation). And
they adopted more holistic analytical frameworks in which tourism development was
studied as part of a wider ecology (Judd and Fainstein 1999) or “system” (Leiper
1995).

Conceiving systems as sets of elements or parts that are connected to each other by
at least one distinguishing principle or theme, Leiper (1989, 1995) was one of the
first scholars to suggest that viewing tourism as a system represents the most effec-
tive way to capture the complexity and dynamism tourism involves, including the
structure of demand, the organization of supply, the way tourism shapes and is
shaped by the context by which it is surrounded, the impacts that tourism creates,
and not least, the manner in which each of these changes over time (Leiper 1989,
The advantage of a systems approach is that tourism is not automatically seen in isolation from its political, natural, economic or social environments (...). It emphasizes the interconnectedness between one part of a system and another. This encourages multidisciplinary thinking which, given tourism’s complexities, is essential to deepen our understanding of it (Burns 1999: 29).

Related to this, Page (1995) posits that a systems approach has the advantage that it is open to the dynamic, constantly changing nature of tourism. It allows the complexity of the real life situation to be accounted for in a relatively simple model that demonstrates the inter-linkages of all the different elements involved in tourism’s production and consumption and enables interpretations of the way tourism patterns and practices relate to the environment in which they occur (see suggested model in Table 5). Different disciplines (as well as areas of study within a single discipline), as Williams (2004:5) points out, focus attention on different concepts and definitions and not every type of inquiry is best approached by employing understandings of tourism as a system.

Further, attempts to reflect the interdisciplinary character of tourism, the complex interrelationships involved and their dynamic nature have met with varying success. System approaches have the danger of reductionism, yet as guiding conceptual

---

23 Maybe most significantly, system approaches allow scholars to account for the role of contextual factors - culture, politics, history etc. - specific to the place in which tourism occurs as well as for the ways tourism is subjected to a range of influences exerted by broader changes in society such as the rise of post-Fordism and associated shift towards more specialized, individual and niche markets.
frameworks have proven to be useful to investigate the way tourism both affects and/or is affected by physical and human geography characteristics of places. This is also the case in the emerging subfield of urban tourism research as scholars like Page (1995) and Fainstein and Judd (1999) have emphasized.

The latter have proposed to examine urban tourism as well as its relationships and interactions with broader processes extending from the highly localized to the global in areas such as the economic, the cultural, the social, the political/governmental, and the environmental by conceiving urban tourism as a dynamic “ecological system”. This system consists of three, constantly interacting components: the demand side, i.e. tourists; the supply side, i.e. the firms, organizations, and facilities catering to tourists (the tourism industry or industries); and the city, understood as a regulatory-institutional as well as a physical and social entity. In doing so, Fainstein and Judd provided a political economy framework, cognizant of the importance of cultural
interpretations and studies of individual behavior that is particularly useful for analyses that seek to examine how and why tourism’s development and outcomes vary at different places.

2.3. TOWARDS POST-FORDIST, “NEW” TOURISM

A fundamental issue that has been of longstanding interest to tourism researchers and moreover explains at least some of the difficulties involved in coming to terms with the notion of tourism itself relates to the changes tourism experienced in recent decades. Occasionally described as a shift from an “old” tourism in line with Fordist principles to a “new” tourism (Poon 1993), these changes are said to be characterized by an increased flexibility in both production and consumption processes in line with the more general shifts in the capitalist productive system towards “flexible accumulation” following the oil and economic global crisis of the mid-1970s (Harvey 1989; Ioannides and Debbage 1998; Milne and Ateljevic 2001; Torres 2002). In line with changes in production more generally, standardized products produced for a mass clientele, generally identified as mass tourism, are described as being gradually complemented or replaced by a more diversified, specialized, individualized, post-Fordist (or neo-Fordist) tourism landscape. More individualized and customized products, changing tourist wants and needs, as well as the increased integration of different forms of mobility and blurring lines between tourism, leisure, business and work discussed above characterize this new landscape.

Poon (1993: 85) for instance posits that new tourism is “a phenomenon of large-scale packaging of non-standardized leisure services at competitive prices to suit the
demands of tourists as well as economic and socio-environmental needs of destinations. New tourists, she claims, are “more experienced travelers, more educated, more destination-oriented, more independent, more flexible and more ‘green’. Consumers look at the environment and culture of the destinations they visit as a key part of the holiday experience” (85). They appear to be more independent and self-directed and moreover seem to be driven by a desire to differentiate themselves from the crowds: amongst other things by moving away from already established tourism attractions and areas, i.e. by pursuing itineraries off-the-beaten track.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fordist tourism</th>
<th>Post-Fordist tourism</th>
<th>Neo-Fordist tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Tourism</td>
<td>Specialized/Individualized/</td>
<td>Niche Market Mass Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible/Rigidity</td>
<td>Customized Niche Market</td>
<td>Flexible Specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatially Concentrated</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Product Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated Products</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Continuity of Fordist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Number of Producers</td>
<td>Shorter Product Life Cycle</td>
<td>Structures/Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted Product</td>
<td>Product Differentiation</td>
<td>Mass Customization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economies of Scale</td>
<td>Small Scale or “Small Batch”</td>
<td>Consumer Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large # of Consumers</td>
<td>Consumer Controlled</td>
<td>Desire Reality While</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Consumption</td>
<td>Individualized Consumption</td>
<td>Reveling in Kitsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated Consumers</td>
<td>“Better Tourists”</td>
<td>Flexible/Specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonally Polarized</td>
<td>Rapidly Changing Consumer Tastes</td>
<td>“McDonaldized” Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Western Amenities</td>
<td>Desire Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staged Authenticity</td>
<td>“Green Tourism”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Pressures</td>
<td>“De-McDonaldization”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘McDonaldization’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Fordist, Post-Fordist and Neo Fordist tourism characteristics (Torres 2002)
Post- or neo Fordist\textsuperscript{24} tourism differentiation has also been an important prerequisite for the rise of tourism in cities in recent decades as well as particularly the development of new geographies of tourism and place consumption within them to which our attention now turns. Post-Fordist tourism for one fostered a movement from the classic, mass tourism “sun-and-sand” or “ski resort” products to more diversified tourism commodities of which many tend to have an urban focus. And it created the conditions for more organic and eclectic processes of urban tourism development composed of a kaleidoscope of experiences and spaces (Judd 2003: 31), the continuous development of new niches and forms of urban tourism and leisure activity not yet anticipated or conceptualized as well as the enhanced attractiveness of previously non-marketable places.

\textbf{2.4. URBAN TOURISM (RESEARCH)}

Urban tourism emerged as a significant and distinctive field of study during the late 1980s and 1990s. Previously research on urban tourism was, as Pearce (2001: 926) points out, sporadic and limited in scope. References to urban tourism as a distinct phenomenon and area of research began to proliferate in the literature in the late 1980s but the scholarly contribution which seems to have set off an upsurge of scholarly attention was Ashworth’s (1989) \textit{Urban tourism: an imbalance in attention?} in which he stated:

\textsuperscript{24} Ioannides and Debbage (1998), among others, suggest that tourism is characterized by both Fordist and post-Fordist elements and posit that “neo-Fordism” is a better term than post-Fordism as it more accurately describes the continuity between Fordism and contemporary productive forms marked by flexibility (see also Torres 2002).
There has been quite simply a rural bias noticeable in both the quantity of the literary output and the quality of the theorizing about tourism. This is in itself remarkable because most tourists originate from cities, many seek out cities as holiday destinations and the social and economic impacts of tourism are substantial in urban areas. Thus the failure to consider tourism as a specifically urban activity imposes a serious constraint that cannot fail to impede the development of tourism as a subject of serious study (33).

More than a decade later, there has been an increase in the number of books, mostly edited collections, by both tourism researchers and urban studies specialists including Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990, 2000); Page (1995); Law (1993, 1996); van den Burg, van der Borg and van der Meer (1995); Judd and Fainstein (1999); Hoffman et al. (2003); Selby (2004), Maitland and Newman (2008), and Hayllar, Griffin and Edwards (2008). Taken together, the research literature today covers an extensive number of issues, some of which are unique to urban tourism or are primarily urban phenomena and some of which are common to a number of forms of tourism but may take on particular characteristics in urban contexts (Edwards et al. 2008b: 1034). Yet despite all this, urban tourism research still lacks development and particularly definitions that could accommodate the many distinctive characteristics of urban tourism as a particular kind of tourism to this day remain few and in between.

2.5. URBAN TOURISM – DEFINITIONS, CONCEPTS, AND CONFUSIONS

What is urban tourism and what makes it distinguishable from tourism in general? Researchers have pondered this question for decades and a review of the relevant
literature illustrates that there is still little agreement as to how urban tourism precisely should be defined. This is in part owed to the fact that the development of urban tourism as an academic subfield can be described as largely “practice-driven” in the sense that theory, the search for definitions, generalizations, conceptualizations and explanations, has to a large extent followed a research agenda driven by policy and private sector needs (Ashworth 1989).

Bearing this in mind, most scholars at the very least agree, however, that an answer to this question lies in considering the particularities of the spatial context within which tourism occurs, i.e. the density and diversity, whether of functions, facilities, cultures or peoples, which distinguish the urban from the rural. In discussing how urban tourism should be conceived, Pearce (1995, 2001), for instance, stresses that it is the complex nature of cities - characterized by high densities of structures, people and functions as well as distinctive mixes of different social, economic and cultural conditions - that makes urban tourism a distinct and inextricably complicated phenomenon. This complexity, Pearce (2001: 927) explains,”…is inextricably melded into the structure and nature of urban tourism, giving it characteristics which set it apart from other, particularly resort-based, forms in coastal or alpine environments.” Sometimes characterized as an overlap area between a number of adjectival tourisms such as heritage tourism, cultural tourism and so on (Ashworth 2009: 208; Ashworth and Page 2011), urban tourism hence is typically made sense of with reference to its antonym - tourism in non-urban environments - and the attributes that are believed to set it apart from it.
Of particular importance is in this context the notion of variety as it is the variety of different markets, products and experiences as well as consumers and suppliers that distinguishes tourism in cities from rural, mountain, seaside or other geographically demarcated tourisms. Defying any attempt at comprehensive listing, the motives and backgrounds of tourists who visit cities are typically extremely variegated, particularly as significant numbers of tourists in urban areas are visiting for a primary purpose other than leisure or a combination of purposes, for example, choosing to attend a professional meeting in a city where friends or relatives live. Given the various motivations for visiting an urban destination, which led Pearce (2001: 928) to describe urban tourism demand as “multidimensional and frequently multipurpose in nature”, it comes at no surprise that urban tourists take advantage of a great variety of attractions and resources offered to them - a variety that according to Karski (1990: 16) in itself is a distinguishing feature of urban tourism: He claims that the attractiveness of cities lies in their “… rich variety of things to see and do in a reasonably compact, interesting, and attractive environment, rather than in any one component. It is usually the totality and the quality of the overall tourism and town center product that is important.”

Similarly, Judd (1995: 179) linked urban tourism supply and demand in his reference to the urban tourism product as an “agglomeration” of components; different resources, primary and secondary, as also Jansen-Verbeke (1988) has suggested in her attempt to categorize the elements of the “urban tourism product”, make a city a destination (see Table 8).25 Another distinguishing characteristic of tourism in an ur-

---

25 Primary resources are according to Jansen-Verbeke the elements that attract visitors to an urban area, including historic buildings, urban landscapes, museums and art galleries, concerts, spectator sports, conferences, exhibitions, and special events. Secondary resources are the activities that support or enhance the visitor experience and include: shopping, catering, accommodation, transport, and tourism agencies.
ban context is that the range of facilities and suppliers catering to tourists is typically much broader than in other environments, and that only a few of them - whether shops, catering establishments, cultural attractions and even transport facilities – were created exclusively for tourist use. Urban tourism instead is typically one function among many others, with visitors sharing services, spaces, and amenities with residents and other city users – sometimes harmoniously and sometimes not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY ELEMENTS</th>
<th>SECONDARY ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Place</td>
<td>Leisure Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>Physical characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concert Halls</td>
<td>- Ancient monuments and statues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cinemas</td>
<td>- Ecclesiastical buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exhibitions</td>
<td>- Harbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Museums and art galleries</td>
<td>- Historic Street Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theatres</td>
<td>- Interesting buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water, canals and river fronts</td>
<td>- Parks and green areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Facilities</td>
<td>- Socio-cultural features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indoor and outdoor</td>
<td>- Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Facilities</td>
<td>- Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bingo Halls</td>
<td>- Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Casinos</td>
<td>- Liveliness and ambience of the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Festivities</td>
<td>- Local customs and costumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Night Clubs</td>
<td>- Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organized Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8 Categorization of tourism products by Jansen-Verbeke (in Page 1995: 62)**

One consequence of this is that both tourists as well as the businesses catering to them are in cities even more difficult to identify than in other spatial settings. Ashworth and Page (2011) identify this attribute as one reason why many scholars - reflecting the fashion for quantification which asserted that “if you can't measure it, it isn’t worth the effort” – either ignored urban tourism or limited their attention to its
most palpable expressions (e.g. spaces built specifically for tourism consumption, events. etc.).

Further, the near impossibility to demarcate and measure tourism in cities – particularly in today’s “network society” (Castells 1996) – also explains at least in part why urban tourism has proven to be inherently difficult to study and why the question how urban tourism should be defined and delineated to this day has not been resolved satisfactorily. Instead, studies on urban tourism continue to use the term individualistically and there are several scholars that have publicly questioned whether overarching, all-encompassing conceptualizations or definitions that go beyond locating tourism in a specific spatial setting are needed in the first place, given that tourism in cities entails a widely disparate set of activities and phenomena (see Ashworth 2003). According to Edwards et al. (2008b: 1038) urban tourism is for instance best understood as

(...) one among many social and economic forces in the urban environment. It encompasses an industry that manages and markets a variety of products and experiences to people who have a wide range of motivations, preferences and cultural perspectives and are involved in a dialectic engagement with the host community. The outcome of this engagement is a set of consequences for the tourist, the host community and the industry.

Related to this, scholars have emphasized that cities are not alike and that their differing characteristics affect the kind of urban tourism occurring in them. This suggests that tourism in cities does not only differ from tourism in other environments
but that there are different “urban tourisms” (Ashworth and Page 2011), implying that different definitions might be appropriate for different places under investigation.

2.6. ANALYZING URBAN TOURISM – STATE OF KNOWLEDGE

Despite the mentioned difficulties in defining urban tourism, research on tourism in cities, as discussed earlier, has also become increasingly sophisticated. Ashworth (1989), writing in the formative days of urban tourism research, identified four principal approaches to analyzing urban tourism. He delineated these approaches as follows:

(1) “facility approaches” that are concerned with inventorying and quantifying those urban facilities exclusively or dominantly used in tourism, or deliberately promoted as part of tourism products;

(2) “urban ecological approaches” which focus on studying the structure or morphology of urban areas and seek to analyze tourism within the wider forms and functions of the city (a feature of this approach is the identification of functional zones or districts - e.g. CBD, historic core, markets area, industrial area);

(3) “user approaches” that examine the qualities, behavior, motivations, and perceptions of tourists - particularly related to tourism marketing;

(4) “policy approaches” that analyze issues arising from the concerns of city governments as well as private sector actors to accommodate and/or promote tourism by focusing on a range of policy issues, including tourism management policies, marketing efforts, and infrastructure provision.
Subsequently, the field has expanded significantly, and began to cover a number of topics and approaches to analyzing urban tourism not included in Ashworth’s initial, much-cited list of reference, including (but not limited to):

(1) research into the culture and experience of place consumption; the lived realities and everyday readings of urban tourism landscapes and representation (see i.a. Urry 1990; Selby 2004) as well as the ways tourism is both shaped by and shapes places; as well as

(2) political-economy informed studies that provide a more critical perspective on issues related to tourism development, including analyses of the commodification of culture and of place, branding, marketing and place-making efforts, the use of tourism as a means of urban (economic) development as well as the politics of urban tourism (see i.a. Eisinger 2000; Law 2002; Hoffman et al. 2003).

Yet despite the recent proliferation of scholarly works scholars continue to stress the weaknesses of urban tourism research, a particular concern being the fragmented character of the field (Pearce 2001: 928; Selby 2004). Ashworth and Page (2011) emphasize that particularly scholars in the domain of tourism research, despite repeated calls throughout the 1990s for a more integrative approach (Pearce 2001), remain negligent of debates within urban studies that could help them to make sense of the ways that global patterns and processes of (urban) change are affecting the nature and development of tourism in cities. Maitland and Newman (2009) meanwhile suggest that the opposite is also the case, i.e. that many scholars of the urban - despite lip services suggesting otherwise – fail to attend to newer insights provided
by tourism researchers (e.g. about tourism’s supply side).\textsuperscript{26} At the same time, however, there are also exceptions to this all too familiar observation, one of them being the emerging research field on the evolution and development of urban tourism in world (tourism) cities to which our attention now turns.

2.7. WORLD (TOURISM) CITIES AND THE MICRO GEOGRAPHIES OF VISITOR ACTIVITY & PLACE CONSUMPTION

Indicating an increased maturation of the field, urban tourism research has experienced a growing differentiation in recent years. Whereas research in the past rarely distinguished between different city types (and moreover tended to extrapolate mainly from a few well-known, over-publicized cases), there has now been an increasing engagement with the specificities of urban tourism in different types of cities. One such engagement is the growing body of research concerning urban tourism in established world cities located in the global circuits of tourism - “world tourism cities” (Maitland and Newman 2009), as they are sometimes referred to, such as London, Paris, or New York and Berlin.

Described as typically polycentric, multifunctional, and well integrated in global flows of money and people, these cities are increasingly recognized as shaping different forms of tourism – and, in turn, as being shaped differently by tourism – than smaller,

\textsuperscript{26} Examples include for instance the ongoing reliance of some tourism scholars on “destination lifecycle models” to explain the evolution of tourism - models that were developed based upon research on mountain and seaside resorts (see Butler 1980), where the cycle has actually been observed and widely studied, and that urban scholars discard as being unable to capture the complex internal geographies and trajectories of city space. Scholars of the urban meanwhile can been criticized for frequently relying on stereotypical, occasionally derogatory characterizations of tourists and for treating tourists all too often as “a unitary type confined to a tourist bubble” when engaging in debates on urban tourism (Wicken 2002, cited in Maitland and Newman 2009: 15).
less diverse, less prominent and less polycentric cities or cities dependent upon tourism for their global profiling, such as Venice, Florence, or Las Vegas.

Exploring urban tourism from two different perspectives, namely the role of tourism in the city and the city in tourism, and relating their examination of tourism trends to wider debates in urban studies, Maitland and Newman identified some of the principal characteristics of these cities, including several that have implications for this study’s key concerns. They argue that large, multi-functional cities playing an important role in the world system always attracted and absorbed large and diverse flows of visitors and that the emergence of post-Fordist and neo-Fordist modes of production and consumption along with globalization as a process which is uneven in its effects in time and space, if anything extended their particular role as visitor destinations.

One important indicator of this is a typically larger concentration of business and conference travel arising from cities’ role in (global) business networks, better transportation infrastructures as well as the multiple physical, cultural and other assets they call their own. Particularly the latter meanwhile are also a key reason for cities’ elevated position as leisure tourism destinations as they appeal to a variety of different visitor segments and contrary to other types of destinations are less prone to seasonal fluctuations of visitor numbers. In addition to typically attracting substantial numbers of visitors almost all year round, they tend to draw substantially more repeat visitors, frequently hailing from other large cities themselves, than urban destinations with less manifold assets to offer. Lastly, day trippers and visitors coming for other purposes than business or leisure in the narrow sense – tourists visiting friends
and relatives as well transient city users such as second-homers, exchange students or workers on short term assignments – unsurprisingly also tend to be present in disproportionately large numbers.

Another defining characteristic within these cities is according to Maitland and Newman that the production and consumption of the place experiences that tourists (and other interested groups) consume is constantly evolving, i.e. in a constant state of flux, due to dynamic interactions between global and local forces affecting both demand and supply. Highlighting the link between tourism, the rise of urban based knowledge economies, locally differing consumption and lifestyle cultures as well as middle-class consumerism and gentrification, world tourism cities thus function according to Maitland and Newman (2008) as hotbeds of emerging tourism trends. This includes new forms of “cultural” or “creative” tourism, involving more participatory forms of consumption, interaction, learning and doing (see also Richards and Wilson 2006); the development of new tourism and leisure products built upon ethnicity made possible through cities’ typically existent and continuously evolving ethnic mix as well as large enough bases of potential customers that allow ethnic niches to flourish (see also Rath 2007); as well as a growing desire of world tourism city visitors – of whom many can be described as more sophisticated, individual and well-informed types - to escape planned tourism zones and to get to know experiences and places that have not been constructed for and do not provide for tourists.

Spatially, these dynamics entail the emergence of new micro-geographies of place consumption. These micro-geographies interconnect with other processes at work such as demographic and occupational changes, gentrification, and urban regenera-
tion policy. They are facilitated by the existence of a typically well-developed “infra-
structure” of cultural intermediaries stimulating off-beat forms of place consumption
such as alternative lifestyle and listing magazines as well as modern information ex-
change technologies such as the Internet and the various social networks that reside
in it. The result are new urban internal geographies that challenge earlier scholarly
accounts, which considered tourism to be overwhelmingly limited to cities’ cores and
a few, mostly centrally located districts and zones (e.g. the entertainment zone, the
“tourist bubble etc.).

As is the case with any attempt to separate out different city types and classify or
define the roles that cities play on a global stage, there is some debate as to whether
designations such as “world tourism cities” are useful and, if so, what specific criteria
should be employed for their identification (Ashworth and Page 2011: 4; Ashworth
2010). That caveat aside, Maitland and Newman’s attempt to delineate the
specificities of tourism development in major tourism cities and tourism occurring in
neighborhoods within them clearly has its merits. They illustrate that tourism devel-
opment paths in cities of a certain size, diversity, and relevance in the global system
(economically and otherwise) frequently take on distinct patterns and dynamics and
that these demand scholarly attention. And they provide insights concerning the par-
ticularities of the micro-geographies of tourism, occurring, spontaneously or as part
of official policy, away from the already established tourism attractions and areas in
major cities.
3. CHAPTER SUMMARY

The aim of this chapter was to discuss the broader context in which the current revaluation of marginalized neighborhoods as loci of leisure and consumption needs to be seen and to introduce some of the key concepts and debates of relevance to this study’s concern. In Part One we began with a discussion of some of the key features of contemporary urban change in North America and Western Europe in the face of a globalizing and neo-liberalizing urban world. It showed that today’s revaluation of deprived communities as loci of leisure and consumption represents a phenomenon that is in myriad ways intrinsically tied to global urban and economic restructuring bound up with a movement to post-Fordism or late capitalism and from a modern to a postmodern epoch. The changing dynamics of urban economic growth, “postmodern” urban cultures, and “new urban politics” (Cox 1993, 1995; DeFilippis 1999) were reflected upon; cities’ persistent (and all too often increasing) social and spatial divisions discussed; and the heightened relevance of culture, consumption as well as symbolic economies and amenity-driven growth consumption examined.

Subsequently, in Part Two, the growing importance of tourism - as a social activity, an industry and as a policy concern - was explored and the scholarly response to its growing presence in, and significance for cities discussed. The development of knowledge in tourism research, Post- or neo Fordist tourism differentiation, as well as the increased integration of different forms of mobility and blurring lines between tourism, leisure, business and work were explored and several assumptions, concepts and models concerned with tourism in cities elaborated upon. The chapter concluded with a short review of the emerging literature on “world tourism cities”
which seeks to examine tourism development paths in major cities as well as particularly the opening up of new tourism areas within them.
II. HARLEM AND KREUZBERG FROM A DEMAND-SIDE PERSPECTIVE

Chapter One discussed the broader context in which the current revaluation of marginalized neighborhoods as loci of leisure and consumption needs to be seen in and introduced some of the key concepts and debates of relevance to this study’s concern. In doing so, it set the ground for the following chapter which will move the analysis to the neighborhood level. Introducing Kreuzberg and Harlem and integrating political-economic concerns with more qualitative and interpretive dimensions of touristic experience, this chapter focuses primarily on the demand side. It discusses the multi-layered – and in urban studies frequently omitted - historicity of the phenomenon, reflects upon changes in the touristic consumption and experience of city space, and elaborates on the intersecting mobilities that characterize contemporary urban life as well as the way tourists and other place consumers may share in the creation of new tourism areas.

1. URBAN TOURISM: LONGING FOR AUTHENTICITY, ESCAPING INTO FANTASY, OR EXPERIENCING REALITY?

Being a tourist, as McCabe (2005: 85) once succinctly pointed out, must be a pretty miserable existence – at least if one were to follow the overwhelmingly negative portrayals that until recently dominated much that was written on tourists in sociology and the emerging tourism studies. As Harrison (2001: pp.160) argued, the tourists were “the enemy” and tourist behavior all too often denigrated as a hunt for “caricature”, debauchery and pseudo-events, which had been Daniel Boorstin’s – today fre-
quently attacked - polemic against modern societies’ consumer culture of which tourism is clearly a part (see Boorstin 1961; for an early critique of Boorstin see MacCannell 1999: 103-106). Similarly, scholars of the urban – at least until recently - also frequently tended to portray tourists in an overwhelmingly critical light and few scholars bothered to actually research tourists’ attitudes and behavior before commenting on them. Instead, much of the literature on urban tourism relied on standardized, and in their absoluteness questionable and sometimes outright misleading assumptions - or “truths”. A case in point is scholars’ over-reliance on, and misreading of MacCannell’s argument (1999) that the origins of modern tourism are to be sought in the pursuit of authentic cultural origins, cultural milestones, and cultural difference and that “touristic consciousness is motivated by the desire for authentic experiences” (101). Confused through the plethora of meanings ascribed to the notion of authenticity, discussions surrounding tourists’ assumed search for the authentic typically insinuate an interest of visitors in the premodern and in “heritage” as well as a desire to move beyond the usual tourist experience and have “real” experiences not engineered for tourist consumption – a line of thought that is critical to this thesis’ concern as the search for the authentic is often cited as key to the attention devoted to “ghettos as [tourist] attractions” (e.g. Conforti 1996).

Neighborhoods like Kreuzberg and Harlem, it is frequently suggested, are of appeal to tourists as they offer something different, more genuine than those parts of the city that are staged for touristic visitation. They are described as non- or less “touristic” and precisely for this reason worth discovering – even if it is implicit in MacCannell’s analysis that tourists’ quest for genuinely authentic experiences is ultimately futile as they are systematically barred from having them and typically fooled by a covert
“staged authenticity” (MacCannell 1999: pp.98). Dissatisfied with the realities of modern societies and their artificiality and meaninglessness, the modern tourist according to MacCannell is nevertheless damned to inauthenticity, progressing “from stage to stage, always in the public eye, and greeted everywhere by their obliging hosts” (MacCannell 1999: 106). Gilbert and Hancock (2006) second MacCannell’s argument when they note how early 20th century visitors sought experiences “off the beaten track” in neighborhoods like Harlem or Chinatown but quickly complained that what they encountered in fact also had oftentimes become “staged” and decorated so as to look authentic. MacCannell’s theory of the alienated modern tourist has been one of the most influential studies at the beginning of academic research into tourism and its sociology. At the same time subsequent writings of tourism sociology have also emphasized the need to move beyond MacCannell’s assumptions, arguing that empirical studies often tended to disprove, rather than support, his argument and that the psychological, behavioral and social patterns of tourism consumption had become increasingly complex (Cohen 2004: 3); that many tourists are aware of their outsider position and can equally appreciate an authentic and a staged event or experience (Feifer 1985); and that authenticity moreover should not be conceived as an external objectively determined category but rather represents something that is negotiated by each tourist individually (see i.a. Cohen 1988).

In a similar vein, tourism in marginalized neighborhoods is also frequently made sense of with reference to tourists’ assumed interest in lower classes and the exotic “other”. That is, the quest of certain segments of the upper and middle classes in Western countries to patronize areas or establishments which are populated by, or intended for, people below their own socio-economic status and/or ethnic or racial
minorities. Referred to as “slumming” (or “poorism”) when involving interactions with the less fortunate as well as “urban ethnic tourism” when primarily driven by an interest in places that ethnic or racial minorities call home (the two are in reality of course more often than not intertwined), tourism motivated by voyeuristic curiosity is often associated with condescension, exploitation, and bourgeois insensitivity and consequently negatively connoted. Many local inhabitants interpret their exposure as a kind of cultural imperialism or colonization, and critics posit that stereotypes about the toured “other” are reinforced. That all tourism involves voyeurism of some sort and that tourism in marginalized neighborhoods particularly has to be seen as at least in part voyeuristically driven is undeniable. At the same time, one can also argue that all our interests in the lives of strangers – as well as difference more generally - could be dismissed as voyeurism. In this light insinuations that all tourists are driven by a condescending or disrespectful kind of voyeurism are in themselves rather stereotypical statements.

Uriely (2005: 200), in a discussion of the conceptual development of tourist experience research showed how this kind of stereotyping has diminished. She identified four developments: a reconsideration of the distinctiveness of tourism from everyday life experiences; a shift from homogenizing portrayals of the tourist as a general type to pluralizing depictions that capture the multiplicity of the experience; a shift of focus from the displayed objects provided by the industry to the subjective negotiation of meanings as a determinant of the experience; and a movement from contradictory and decisive academic discourse, which conceptualizes the experience in terms of absolute truths, toward relative and complementary accounts that recognize differences in types and forms of tourism. Particularly as regards tourism on the neigh-
borhood level, however, discussions on tourism still “tend to be rooted not in the visi-
tors’ perspective but the view of those who produce places” (Maitland and Newman
2009: 14) and we know little about the characteristics and experiences of visitors to
particular areas in cities.

Harlem and Kreuzberg are no exceptions to this. Instead even consistent data on
apparently simple topics such as visitor numbers is hard to come by while reliable
data on more detailed matters such as visitors’ attitudes and perceptions are all but
non-existent. Obtaining accurate answers to simple questions like “who are these
tourists?”, “what are their motivations?”, and “what do they think of what they’ve ex-
perienced?” is surprisingly difficult, concedes Julia Lu of Harlem’s Upper Manhattan
Empowerment Zone (UMEZ), a publicly-funded non-profit organization that seeks to
promote economic development in Harlem (Julia Lu, personal Interview).

In 2000, her employer commissioned an audience survey to learn more about the
tourists visiting Harlem (Audience Research & Analysis 2000), but even UMEZ rec-
ognizes that their survey provides by no means a complete picture of tourism activ-
ity. Instead, as is often the case with data collected by local tourism organizations, its
focus rested primarily on selective, readily identifiable tourist segments such as bus
tourists whose background, perceptions, and motivations are not representative and,
even more problematically, also tend to reinforce many stereotypes about tourists.
Other visitors, particularly those that do not fit the simplistic but pervasive conven-
tional notions about tourists as primarily passive and reactive consumers of experi-
ences produced by others, meanwhile are largely invisible from the perspective of
organizations like UMEZ. Their presence becomes clear, however, by means of
qualitative methods (e.g. participant observation as well as interviews with locals and tourists) but before turning to the various forms and types of tourism that characterize Harlem and Kreuzberg today, we will first turn to a discussion of the historicity of the phenomenon under investigation.

2. SLUMMING, FLANERIE AND THE ORIGINS OF TOURISM AND LEISURE CONSUMPTION IN MARGINALIZED NEIGHBORHOODS

Tourism in marginalized neighborhoods is sometimes conceived as a phenomenon of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century city; a consequence of new patterns of leisure and consumption as well as cities’ changing demographic, cultural and spatial make-up. In reality, however, it is by no means a completely new phenomenon, for it was already by the mid-nineteenth century during the early days of commercialized urban tourism that it had become fashionable among the well-to-do in London as well as several American cities – most prominently New York and Chicago - to visit segregated, impoverished as well as ethnic urban areas, i.e. to go slumming, or as it was called, “rubbernecking” (see Heap 2009; Gates 1997; Cocks 2001; Gilbert and Hancock 2006). Tourism in poor neighborhoods hence dates back at least a century and a half in New York and is closely linked to other concurrent transformations in cities and in American culture as a whole: urbanization and industrialization, massive immigration, the growing influence of a new “mass media”, the concentration of the poor, ethnic, and foreign-born in less desirable areas of the city, and the development of a turn-of the century urban commercial culture centered
around pleasure, leisure, and consumption, as well as in increased curiosity and anxiety about ethnic difference, poverty and urban danger (Gates 1997: 76).

***

In New York Chinatown became the object of a considerable slumming craze in the course of the second half of the nineteenth century (Lin 1998). Neighborhoods such as the Jewish Lower East Side, Little Italy or the Black Tenderloin District followed in quick succession while tourism in Harlem became a mass phenomenon a few decades later when the neighborhood acquired its “world-wide reputation” (Johnson 1991: XIV) as the United States’ “capital of the African Diaspora” (Maurrasse 2006: 17).27 “Housing 50,000 Blacks in 1914, and nearly 165,000 by 1930”, Harlem, which had initially been built as an exclusive suburb for the white middle and upper middle classes in what was then a rural setting, became within a few years a “neighborhood transformed” (Sacks 2006: 3). As Harlem developed, artistic and intellectual activity began to flourish in the soon legendary neighborhood, fostering not only a sense of pride among people of African descent, but also catching the attention of tourists from near and far (Maurrasse 2006: 21): By the mid-1920s, white (upper) middle class New Yorkers as well as tourists visited what James Weldon Johnson (1991: 2) called the “greatest Negro city in the world” in droves. They came to patronize cabarets such as the Cotton Club, which presented all-black entertainment to all-white...

---

27 Like most other New York neighborhoods settled by successive waves of immigrants, Harlem became a black neighborhood in the early 1900s after the real estate market of the once exclusive, predominately white district collapsed. Speculators had built a surplus of housing in anticipation of the Uptown extension of the subway lines and landlords eventually agreed to rent their empty apartments to blacks—at higher rents then they had been asking of whites. Many more African Americans arrived during and after the First World War when the Great Migration brought hundreds of thousands of African Americans to cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and New York City (Osofski 1963; Maurrasse 2006).
audiences; experience the creative spirit and excitement of what became known as the “Harlem Renaissance”; and confirm (or, occasionally, test) their stereotypes about blacks’ putative inferiority, rawness, and primitiveness. Furthermore, undeniably also a motive, they could take advantage of the rather negligible enforcement of Prohibition laws which had cut off the free flow of alcohol in other parts of the city. And they engaged in sexual activities they would not dare to engage in anywhere else.28

Figure 4 A Night Club Map of Harlem (by Elmer Simms Campbell, ca. 1932)

---

28 The commodification, eroticization and sexual exploitation of the ethnic “other” and the poor clearly constituted not only in Harlem a driving force of slumming. Similarly, the desire to discover and express desires typically suppressed in 19th and early 20th century middle-class milieus (e.g. homosexuality) also was a factor and many visiting came not necessarily to take callous advantage of Harlemites as “others” but rather also considered Harlem a place of refuge for which they were grateful where they could just be themselves (see Heap 2009; for another valuable discussion of sexual tourism in Harlem see Edwards 2001).
Bustling with music and dance clubs - there were reputed to be more than 125 night-clubs in Harlem by the mid-1920s - art exhibits, and theaters, Harlem during this time period, in the words of Gilbert and Hancock (2006: 99) became “a manylayered fantasy world of black life and culture”. Its allure, while effectively obscuring the hardship of most residents as well as the neighborhood’s poverty and substandard living conditions (see Taylor 2002: 16), demonstrated along with the popularity of neighborhoods like Chinatown that racial and ethnic diversity as well as places the “lower classes” called home represented key elements of New York’s appeal as the city joined Rome, London, and Paris as one of the world’s iconic urban tourist landscapes: As New York developed as a tourist city, poor districts and the spectacle of ethnicity and race became “an important 'sight' in the city, as significant in its own way as the Statue of Liberty or the Empire State Building” (Gilbert and Hancock 2006:4).

Typically explained with reference to the white middle classes’ lust for adventure, exotica, freedom and authenticity and described as a response to the alienating effects of modernization, the practice of slumming in late 19th and early 20th century American cities unsurprisingly is a controversial topic. The idea of slumming carries with it according to many past and present commentators a stereotypical and exploitive notion that there is something freer, more authentic, or less repressed in the allegedly primitive lives of the lower classes, and also that their qualities may be gleaned at one’s discretion and with minimal commitment and social cost. Yet as valid as these criticisms are, they fall short of painting the whole picture as scholars like Heap (2009) and Dowling (2007) have also pointed out that the “slummer” was

---

29 Attracting according to an article of the New York Times (1927: W21) about 130,000 daily visitors, New York by the late 1920 had been the single largest urban tourist destination in America for many decades.
not only a destructive but also a progressive force. As an activity, slumming in other words also reflected a growing degree of tolerance amongst certain segments of the (white) middle-classes, eroded Victorian morals and helped to usher in a modernity that could accommodate a polyglot, flexible, and inclusive vision of American society. Slumming thus involved both racial and classist paternalism, stereotyping as well as the exploitation of the depraved “other” but also a middle-class, reformist concern for the poor and a questioning of “traditional” American values. Artists, bohemians, and radicals of all stripes were deliberately promoting social and racial mixing and expressing disdain for the dominant moral order of their times. It constituted a practice, as Heap (2009: 238) pointed out, which helped to create a more cosmopolitan American public while dispersing tourist spending-power to sites across the city.

***

In Berlin, a decisively less diverse – and also, to a certain degree, less segregated - city at the time, slumming, the word and the activities associated with it, was by most accounts less common, let alone organized. At the same time, however, contemporary (eye)witness reports confirm that the nether regions of Germany’s capital city and its disparate artistic, sexual, and nocturnal subcultures played particularly during the inter-war period a substantial role for Berlin’s attractiveness as a tourist destination. Home to impoverished workers, the unemployed, small shopkeepers, Jews

---

30 Cocks in *Doing the Town: The Rise of Urban Tourism in the United States, 1850-1915* makes a similar argument, claiming that urban tourism heralded and speeded “the erosion of a Victorian, ‘refined’ understanding of class, gender, and ethnicity and the gradual emergence of a cosmopolitan, commercial conceptualization of these social relations in the early twentieth century” (2001: 1-2).

31 Berlin attracted as many as two million tourists annually during the best economic times of the Weimar Republic (Spode and Gutbier 1987: 38, cited in Stanley). The city was, as Koshar (2000: 72) put it, the most popular urban tourist attraction in Germany and a magnet for foreign travelers as well.
from Eastern Europe as well as other migrants and immortalized in numerous literary works such as Alfred Döblin’s *Alexanderplatz* (1929), particularly the old parts of today’s Mitte district such as the Scheunenviertel attracted visitors for precisely these reasons before the Nazi regime’s takeover of power in 1933 (Ladd 1997: 114; Koshar 2000). Contrary to the situation in New York, where sightseeing tours of poor or ethnic neighborhoods had become a veritable industry already by the beginning of the 20th century, slumming in Berlin was with few exceptions less organized and more individualistic. Yet travel media of the time still devoted significant attention to what Netley Lucas, in her 1927 biography, referred to as "the most lurid underworld of all cities" (in Gordon 2000: 1) and the perceived pleasures and horrors associated with it. In fact, entire guidebooks were written about them. Positing that Berlin was “a city of oppositions” and that it was “a pleasure to discover them” (Moreck 1931: 7-8 in Koshar 2000: 85), The *Führer durch das lasterhafte Berlin* (“The Guide through Naughty Berlin”) is a case in point. Primarily concerned with the frenetic debauchery, uninhibited free-spiritness and carnal excesses that Weimar Berlin as the “Babylon-on-the-Spree” was known for, it argued that each city had
both an “official side and an unofficial and it goes without saying that the latter is the most interesting and the most illuminating for understanding the urban world”, adding that those “who seek experiences, who demand adventure, who want sensations, they must go into the shadows”. Monuments and architectural landmarks were “milestones of boredom”, places where humanity “mixes like a piquant ragout, where the wide world is at home” were Berlin’s real attraction (Moreck 1931: 7-8 in Koshar 2000: 85). Significantly, much of this interest in Berlin’s everyday life as well as particularly the seedy and disreputable corresponds, as Koshar (2000: 84) points out, with the nineteenth and early twentieth century practice of flânerie, i.e. the “enlivened literate interest in […] the art of walking, observing, and representing the daily life of the modern city.” Both products of modern life and the industrial revolution, and appearing in growing numbers on the streets of Europe’s rapidly changing and growing mid- to late-nineteenth century cities, tourists and flâneurs jointly epitomized a new spectatorial, consumerist perspective on urban space and life. Flâneurs, just like many travelers and other place consumers today, usually took pains to distinguish themselves from “ordinary” tourists whom they criticized for simply consuming sights for the purpose of personal leisure, not knowledge and perspective, as well as for their ignorance concerning the appeal of the everyday and “real”.32

Deliberately seeking a panoramic, comprehensive experience of the modern city, flâneurs, it could be argued, in fact mirror new types of tourism consumption (see Urry 1990) and in doing so illustrate the somewhat problematic nature of neologisms

32 A case in point is the editor and writer Franz Hessel whose famed Berlin account Sightseeing Trip not only celebrates small scenes of everyday life as essential to the experience of the city but also stresses the importance to resist the pre-planned agendas of travel bureaus and omnibus tours in order to explore urban space and discover its soul – “to saunter properly”, he wrote, “one must not plan too definitively” (Hessel 1984 [1927]: 145, cited in Koshar 2000: 85).
such as “new tourism” that are used to describe them. Conversely, as regards the cases this thesis explores, the discussion above hopefully clarified, that tourism, i.e. place consumption, beyond New York and Berlin’s conventional sights and sites was by no means uncommon in previous eras and that tourism in Harlem has particularly long roots.

Relatively little meanwhile is known about tourism in Kreuzberg in the 19th and early 20th century. With the exception of its northernmost edge, the 17th century city expansion Friedrichstadt, a rather rural place until well into the 19th century, the area today known as Kreuzberg developed into a densely built urban neighborhood primarily in the second half of the 19th century when industrialization caused Berlin to grow rapidly. Düspohl (2009: 27) reports that the elevation it bears its name from - Kreuzberg literally means “cross hill” - ever since the 1820s constituted a “popular sight that drew many visitors on a daily basis” after a memorial by famed architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel was built on top of it in commemoration of the Napoleonic Wars. Likewise it is known that several dance halls, beer gardens and other entertainment venues catering to the middle and upper classes as well as working class people developed on previously not built-up areas in what would later became Kreuzberg (see Uebel 1985).

Moreover, the southern parts of the Friedrichstadt, which with the Groß-Berlin-Gesetz (“Greater Berlin Act”) of 1920 became part of the newly established city district Kreuzberg, also possessed a vibrant commercial and visitor economy. Compared to many other areas of Berlin, however, there is relatively little mention of the area as a destination until the second half of the twentieth century.
After World War II the lure of many marginalized communities that had previously attracted tourists and other consumers faded away, industrialized and rationalized forms of mass consumption became more and more prevalent. Activities such as flânerie and slumming lost their relevance, and various urban neighborhoods, both in Berlin and New York, once famed for their appeal as destinations fell into oblivion.

In the United States, the diminution of slumming, as Heap (2009: 277-278) described it, “like its advent in the late nineteenth century, was a byproduct of several significant developments, including the spatial and demographic reorganization of U.S. cities, the continuing reconfiguration of popular conceptions of race and sexuality, and the emergence of new forms of commercialized leisure. Each of these developments took shape in reciprocal relation to the others, but perhaps none played a more pivotal role in suppressing the popularity of slumming than the rampant suburbanization of the immediate postwar period (as) it not only removed most white amusement seekers from the … public amusements around which slumming was usually organized but also contributed to whites increasing perception of urban America as racialized ‘inner cities’ filled with potentially dangerous, darker-skinned people.”

***

Harlem’s demise as a destination as well as its more general decline is a case in point. For many decades, Harlem’s thriving and internationally renowned nightlife
and culture had concealed the hardship of most Harlem residents, the rampant discrimination they experienced as well as the neighborhood’s substandard living conditions as one of the poorest and most crowded sections of the city. For many observers, the Harlem Riot of 1935 marked the beginning of the end of the Harlem Renaissance (Gill 2011: 303). A day after the outburst, "thousands of curious white visitors thronged Harlem's sidewalks", the New York Times (1935: 1) reported. Yet, as Blair (2007: 5) states, their "racial tourism was no longer predicated on the kinds of engagement, however problematic, associated with the heyday of the Renaissance. Now visitors were mainly on hand to view the shocking evidence of seething unrest, communist agitation, and racial retribution."

By the 1960s and 1970s the area’s allure as a joyful place of “laughing, singing and dancing” (Johnson 1991: XIV) had almost all but faded away. A political nexus during the civil-rights era, when leaders like the Reverend Adam Clayton Powell Jr. and Malcolm X rose to prominence, Harlem got caught in the grip of increasing deterioration and social disorder as manufacturing jobs, which had been a major source of economic stability Uptown, disappeared, middle-class African-Americans fled and disinvestment intensified (Gill 2011; Maurasse 2006). Its once proud commercial corridors of 125th Street, 135th Street, 116th Street, and 145th Street, as well as magnificent churches, historical housing and beautiful parks fell into disrepair; crime and drug problems increased; and in 1964, when an off-duty police officer shot an African-American teenager, riots and rising racial conflicts further contributed to the neighborhood’s isolation. Short-changed of important city resources and services, Harlem transformed into what Marcuse (1998a) called an “outcast ghetto” and be-
came a metaphor - not only in the United States but internationally - for the country’s race problems and seemingly intractable urban ills (see Stehle 2006).

Other neighborhoods that had previously been popular destinations meanwhile experienced a similar fate or vanished altogether as a result of slum clearance projects, assimilation, and slowing immigration streams, while those that remained saw their share of visitors decline due to the growing resentments on part of citywide leaders and the general public against the city’s “old” neighborhoods, more general changes in consumption and leisure habits, as well as intensifying social problems and anti-urban sentiments in American popular culture. The result of all of this was, as Gilbert and Hancock (2006) explain, that slumming more and more became a thing of the past and tourist practices and geographies in New York became increasingly separated from the “living city”, concentrating mostly in renewed, modern parts of Down- and Midtown Manhattan (see also Gross 2009). Propelled by a growing middle-class, shorter work weeks, longer paid vacations, and significant advances in transportation and communications technology, tourism particularly in the 1950s and 1960s boomed in New York. Yet while more visitors than ever were coming to New York, most, as London (2010: 24) emphasized, “also seemed to be seeing less of the city than ever before.”

The press took notice of this trend, as London (2010) in his analysis of tourist practices and geographies in New York during the age of urban renewal points out. In an article on visitor practices in New York, the New York Times reported as early as 1934 that the “general tendency at the present time is toward modern developments” (Bernstein 1935, cited in London 2010: 12). Five years later, during the World’s Fair,
it informed its readers that the “typical tourist doesn’t expect to see tong wars in Chinatown or murder on the Bowery” but instead is “more concerned with the new bridges and big buildings” (Copland 1939, cited in London 2010: 14). Visitor surveys of the time meanwhile also suggested a shift towards monuments as well as the sanitized, commercialized “renewed city” at the expense of New York’s older districts. Whereas a study of tourists’ interests by the New York Merchant Association in 1927 had identified Chinatown and Harlem as belonging to the city’s top visitor draws (New York Times 1927, cited in London 2010), later surveys either, as in the case of a study conducted by the New York Convention and Visitor’s Bureau in the 1930s, lumped them together as the city’s “foreign sections” (New York Convention and Visitor’s Bureau 1934, cited in London 2010), or, as was the case in a later survey by the tourism bureau, did not even bother to mention them (New York Convention and Visitor’s Bureau 1955, cited in Simon 1964: 39).

This is not meant to suggest that the actual spatial character of tourism in New York during the heydays of Fordism could be accurately described by focusing only on Downtown and Midtown Manhattan and a few enclavic tourist spaces in between. Domestic working-class and ethnic visitors did continue to frequent other venues, including many on the periphery of Manhattan, while a certain share of middle and upper class visitors also saw value in visiting areas outside of modern Mid- and Downtown and pro-actively sought to explore alternatives to the predominant, mainstream and middle-class-based tourism and leisure paradigms of the time. Evoking both an older tradition of urban visitation and rejecting at least to a certain extent the racial and class fears that drastically constrained mainstream visitors’ geographies, many of these place consumers had in common that they shared an interest in find-
ing unique, vernacular aspects of city life, aspects that were thought to be lacking in the sterile confines of commercial and central business districts.

A case in point is Greenwich Village with its blend of historic architecture, street life, bohemianism and neighborliness; from the 1950s onwards it developed into one of the first and most popular of these “alternative” destinations (see London 2010). While Greenwich Village in the past had been described by guidebooks simply as a neighborhood of migrants, artists and bohemians, it would represent something much more significant to both visitors and residents in the early 1960s – a counter-space to the depthless commercialism of corporate America (London 2010). In relation to the larger tourist industry, these practices, which were described by some as a sort of “anti-tourism” (Fussell 1980), were initially deemed invisible and inconsequential, and it was only in later decades that such assessments would change.

***

In (West) Berlin, developments after World War II were somewhat similar. Here Kreuzberg was one of the first areas that attracted bohemians and others in search of neighborhoods with character from the late 1950s onwards. While parts of the neighborhood had been severely damaged by air raids, other areas survived World War II relatively intact. Due to their dense mix of apartments and industrial lofts and substandard living conditions official policy classified many of them as slums. Kreuzberg’s isolated location surrounded by water and – after 1961 – the Berlin Wall made

---

33 According to estimates of the time, less than 60 percent of Kreuzberg’s tenement buildings were inhabitable after World War II (Sundermeier, Diehl et al. 2002: 2; Düspohl 2009: 108)
it even less desirable. Kreuzberg turned into a peninsula, surrounded by the wall and by water. Many streets became dead-ended, Kreuzberg’s economy stagnated and many residents who had the material means to relocate moved to other districts in search of more modern set-ups, leaving the underprivileged - poor people, old people, and migrant workers - behind (Bader and Bialluch 2008; Bader and Scharenberg 2009; Scharenberg and Bader 2010). Rent regulation as well as extensive - but ultimately only partially realized - urban renewal plans, which sought to impose a modernist built environment - large-scale, functional and rational - on the city, further discouraged existing property owners from investing. As a result, housing was of low quality but cheap, which made it an attractive option for newly arriving immigrant workers and their families who found they did not have to compete with Germans for affordable housing or fear discrimination by landlords (Düspohl 2009; Lang 1998).34

Particularly Turkish labor migrants (known in German as Gastarbeiter, “guest workers”) – who began to migrate to West Berlin in the thousands in the 1960s as a consequence of German recruitment agreements with Ankara - moved into Kreuzberg’s Wilhelmine-era tenements in large numbers. By the early 1970s dense and conspicuous enclaves began to characterize wide swaths of Kreuzberg, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the Wall. The district became, in the words of Kil and Silver (2006: 96), an “island of the foreign, the ‘Other’, and the poor” and – due to the strong presence of Turks – was soon referred to as Berlin’s “Little Istanbul.” At the same time a new population of “alternatives” moved in: students, artists, anarchists, draft-dodgers, punks and others who liked the multicultural and anti-authoritarian

34 Reversely, landlords saw socially, economically, and above all legally disadvantaged migrant families as desirable tenants to turn in a tidy profit before the razing of the Wilhelmine era tenements was to begin as they allowed them to temporary rent out their properties without investing in them.
atmosphere that increasingly characterized the neighborhood. These groups mingled with migrants as well as remaining longtime (and mostly working class) residents, resulting in the so-called “Kreuzberg mix” (Rada 1997:140). The southeastern and most isolated part of Kreuzberg, called SO 36, especially developed into an alternative “ghetto”, where residents’ movements, squatting movements, the gay scene and student milieus founded networks of counter-cultural organizations (Bader 2005).

Significantly, tourism, broadly conceived, was anything but absent during this period during which Kreuzberg gained international fame as former West Berlin’s radical and multicultural center. Forays of Berlin visitors as well as Berliners from other city areas into Kreuzberg were already in the late 1950s and early 1960s not unheard of when Kreuzberg, due to an early influx of galleries and bars, became known as “Berlin’s Montmartre” (Düspohl 2009: 125; Lang 1998: 119). By the late 1970s particularly guidebooks oriented towards readers with a more “alternative” background devoted attention to the district and informed readers about its role as a headquarter of minorities and non-conformist groups, its inherent social problems and dilapidated housing conditions, as well as particular destinations such as clubs, restaurants, galleries, and theatres (Lang 1998: pp.139). Coach busses touring Kreuzberg’s squats, bazaar-lined streets and other alleged manifestations of the area’s “otherness” followed, and by the 1980s complaints about tourists “destroying” the neighborhood had become almost as common as tourists themselves (see Lang 1998: 184). Indeed, even popular culture took up Kreuzberg’s rise to fame as a destination. In the popular musical *Linie 1*, which first premiered in Berlin in 1986, an English-speaking tour guide makes an appearance, advertising the neighborhood as a tourist spot: “And now ladies and gentlemen, the exciting high point of every Berlin visit; the jour-
ney to Kreuzberg! SO 36! Their (sic) burns the air, there you are from the socks, a mixture of Rive Gauche and the Bronx and then still singular on the world!” (in Suhr 1990: 238)

In light of the mass of sightseeing buses that had started venturing into the neighborhood, this satire was not too far-fetched. More prevalent and arguably also more consequential than these most obvious manifestations of tourism, however, was the – largely unaccounted for – influx of visitors from other parts of Berlin, Germany and – to a lesser extent – other countries that did not match conventional assumptions about tourists in everyday discourse and also, until recently, in the literature of tourism research: they travelled individually and had a lot in common with the new urban milieus that had made the district their home, both in terms of their demographic characteristics as well as their lifestyle and consumption preferences, and consequently were only at times recognized as “not from here”. These visitors predated recent debates on the increasing “conviviality” (Maitland 2008) amongst different groups of city users as well as research on the ways through which place consumers, searching for neighborhoods with character, contribute to processes of neighborhood change and ultimately gentrification (see Zukin 1991, 1995; Mele 2000; Lloyd 2002). Many of these visitors patronized shops, bars, cafes and cultural attractions and in doing so contributed to the proliferation of amenities that came to underpin the neighborhood’s appeal. Whereas the presence of tourists conforming to customary views on who tourists are as well as particularly of the above-mentioned coach bus tourists soon was considered a nuisance by many and controversially discussed (Lang 1998), other visitors barely attracted attention – after all, many of the
new residents now shaping the neighborhood had first encountered the area as visitors themselves.

At a recent public forum on tourism development in Kreuzberg, a long-time resident, speaking from the audience, addressed this issue and went on a lengthy rant about what she described as a “double standard” characterizing the way tourism was discussed in the neighborhood: “This level of intolerance is disturbing, has it crossed your mind that most of us sitting here strictly speaking were tourists one time. Imagine if we were welcomed with such hostility?” Tourism, these remarks illustrate, is not as easily defined as it is attacked or denounced. The widespread concern among
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35 “Touris in Kreuzberg”, September 2, 2010, Markthalle Kreuzberg
locals from at least the late 1970s onwards that Kreuzberg could lose its edge as new residents and businesses threatened the neighborhood’s identity was only in part confirmed as gentrification for years did not take place to the extent anticipated (Lang 1998). While some places experienced signs of gentrification, others did not. Kreuzberg as whole retained its image as a place of cultural pluralism and alternative lifestyles on the one hand and utmost marginalization on the other hand until well after Germany’s reunification, when the fall of the Wall put the district back in Berlin’s geographic center (Lang 1998; Bader and Bialluch 2008).

***

Almost brought to its knees by a host of factors, Harlem meanwhile by most accounts was until well into the 1980s considered a “no-go area” by most New Yorkers and visitors alike. The economic changes wrought by the transition to a postindustrial global economy had brought about troubling social and demographic changes in Harlem, at the same time visibly affecting its built environment. Blight spread as public investment in housing collapsed, city-owned buildings and parks were abandoned, and fires, often attributable to private landlords, broke out. Unemployment and crime rates reached notorious proportions; population numbers fell and widespread damage to the housing stock and neglect meant that those who stayed lived under ever more crowded and deteriorating conditions.

Perhaps unsurprisingly then, most tourist maps did not even bother including it, cutting off at 110th Street where Harlem begins, and media coverage barely encouraged tourists to visit. The Chicago Tribune, to illustrate this, for instance portrayed
the neighborhood at the end of the 1970s as “distinguishable by dilapidated buildings, burned-out tenements, and other unlovely sights, toured only by social workers … and by politicians at election time” (Oppenheim 1978: 48). Evidence suggests that Harlem never ceased to attract tourists altogether as particularly African-Americans continued to visit even during the neighborhood’s worst of times and what MacCannell called “negative sightseeing”, where the attraction was poverty and devastation, also occurred (MacCannell 1999: 40; see also Welz 1993).

Particularly the latter were on the margins of tourist behavior, however, and the neighborhood was considered off-limits to most tourists and leisure consumers until well into the 1980s, when observers began to note increases of tourism and leisure activity: In 1984 the New York Times reported that tourism to Harlem, “largely ignored by many New Yorkers, including many residents of Harlem itself” [had] been steadily growing for many years” (Severo 1984: B3). Five years later New York’s premier newspaper proclaimed that the “epitome of all that is dangerous and hopeless about urban America” (Chira 1989: A1) was on the verge of becoming “a must-see stop for tourists curious about black music, food, and culture.” This growth of tourism activity in what used to be considered the archetype of an African-American ghetto during the heyday of Fordism preceded, as Hoffman (2003: 288) points out, “the development of a tourism infrastructure and the decline in the crime rate” and is to her significant enough to claim the arrival of an urban tourism incorporating a new, post-Fordist mode of regulation within which niches are becoming increasingly mainstream.
4. THE NICHES BECOME MAINSTREAM; MARGINAL SPACE MOVES CENTER STAGE

By the late 1990s it was hard to miss that both Harlem and Kreuzberg were experiencing substantial increases in tourism activity. These increases of course had to do with the more general tourism booms Berlin and New York respectively were enjoying at the time but cannot be explained by reference to them alone. Rather, as discussed above, tourism’s rise has many origins, including particularly broader forces of economic restructuring, a new fit between the larger political economy and inner city neighborhoods, as well as what authors such as Urry (1990: 14-15) describes as a shift towards post-Fordist forms of tourist practices and economies.

Significantly, despite significant capital investment in residential and commercial projects and encroaching gentrification, poverty, unemployment and other aspects of deprivation have neither in Harlem nor Kreuzberg disappeared. Instead, while the two neighborhoods are rewoven into the urban fabric and economy, a large share of their residents remain cut off from mainstream society, and many other problems that have contributed to Kreuzberg’s and Harlem’s perception as “marginalized” also remain unchanged. Bearing certain resemblances to tourism and leisure consumption patterns in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, it seems, however, that the two neighborhoods’ continuing economic and social woes are not necessarily to the detriment of the two neighborhoods’ identification as destinations. Rather, evidence suggests that the neighborhoods’ problems are almost part of their appeal. In the widely available tour guide “Berlin for young people” (Herden Studienreisen Berlin 2006: 129), for example, Kreuzberg’s continuous economic ills are portrayed
as an asset: Referring to Mayor Klaus Wowereit’s widely noted bon mot that Berlin is “poor but sexy”, the travel guide proclaims “Kreuzberg is [Berlin’s] poorest district – so it’s gotta be super sexy!” Similarly, in the case of Harlem, we find evidence that the recent growth of tourism in the area is at least in part owed to the persistence - and spectacularization of – negative discourses and stereotypes. The thrill of the ghetto in other words, as Löbbermann (2003: 114) comments, also continues to “inform tourism in Harlem”. Visitors thus do not only venture into the neighborhood in growing numbers to attend Gospel and Jazz concerts, search for traces of the “Harlem Renaissance”, experience the vibrancy on the neighborhood’s streets, or explore the areas’ numerous historic sites alone.

On a bus tour on a cold spring day in 2007, one could see the thrill in many passengers’ faces as the bus headed Uptown and the tour guide began sketching a history of the neighborhood. His repeated mentioning of issues relating to safety in Harlem (“Harlem ain’t what it used to be folks ... Taking the normal precautions, you’ll be fine“) and dramatized discussion of the low points of Harlem’s history (“No one would come, except to buy drugs“) were met with plenty of smart cracks about the area.
(“...and to get killed!”) and at times it seemed that the sight of dilapidated buildings, homeless loitering near a soup kitchen and other testimonies of the neighborhood’s past and present problems elicited more cameras clicking and beeping than architectural treasures like Hamilton Grange and Sugar Hill.

This leaves locals puzzled. Writes Lola Adesioye, a Harlem resident, in an article on the British Guardian’s “Comment Is Free” website: “I’m still struggling to get to grips with tourists’ fascination with coming into a poor area, one still considered by many to be a “ghetto”, just to watch black people eat, worship and generally go about their daily lives – as if deprivation is somehow interesting and the way in which black people socialize really is so different from other Americans.” There can be no denial that some tourists, as Adesioye suggests, until today engage in what could be called a “postmodern version of slumming.” Be it to satisfy their voyeuristic curiosity and gaze at the neighborhood’s alleged “ghetto culture” or in search of what they imagine to be islands of authenticity as well as, equally important, locality in a sea of supposedly de-territorialized, commoditized and homogenized urban environments and culture. An article in The Guardian in 2010 for example described Harlem as follows: “Harlem is still a place where strangers greet each other on the street, where families share stoops on summer evenings, where B&Bs outnumber hotels” (Gill 2010). Likened by some to “third world tourism” and frequently conceived as part of wider postmodern nostalgic yearnings in times of widespread dislocation and fragmentation (Jameson 1984), this desire for the authentic and old-fashioned territoriality undeniably constitutes an important component of tourism in areas like Harlem. As is the equation of poor or ethnic neighborhoods with criminality, vice and violence and the sense of thrill tourists associate with them.
At the same time, however, one should also not exaggerate its role and relevance, as doing so would mask important other processes at play in destinations such as the ones under investigation here. Tourism in Harlem and Kreuzberg today flourishes by no means only because they offer the quaint, genuine and pristine, imagined or otherwise, that other urban environments are frequently said to have lost, let alone their poverty and disenfranchisement. Neither is it, as is frequently assumed in discussions surrounding authenticity as the basis for tourism, visitors’ desire to experience and consume “difference” that on its own could explain their appeal. The two neighborhoods’ powerful sense of otherness – ethnic, social and cultural – constitutes a main draw to be sure but tourists’ identities and behavior as well as contemporary Harlem’s and Kreuzberg’s identity as destinations are much more variegated and complex to allow for such generalizations.

***

In today’s Harlem tourism takes on different forms. Double-decker sightseeing buses cross - and crowd - 125th Street every few minutes. Groups queue up at Sylvia’s, the well-known soul food restaurant, the Apollo Theater, a famous theater for live performances on 125th Street, or, on Sundays, in front of Harlem’s churches to attend a service. Local entrepreneurs give tours to popular streets, churches, clubs, restaurants, Harlem Renaissance sites and other places where African-American cultural and political history was forged. Less visible, i.e. immediately recognizable, are those tourists who come individually, particularly when they are African-

---

36 In fact, the Associated Press reported in 2007 that each year, about 40 percent of the 3 million people using Gray Line’s hop-on, hop-off buses around New York take the “Uptown Loop,” which includes Harlem and stops on 125th Street across from the Apollo Theater (Harpaz 2007).
American, for example to visit cultural institutions like the Studio Museum of Harlem, catch a show at one of the neighborhood’s music clubs, buy African or African-American artifacts, books, or DVDs at one the street vendors along 125th Street or at the Malcolm Shabazz Market on 116th Street, or partake in festivals or events like Harlem Week or the African-American Day Parade.\(^{37}\) Significantly, tourism is thereby by no means, as is implied in much that is written about the topic, solely based on Harlem’s past, i.e. nostalgic longing and the neighborhood’s long history as the heart of black America. Cultural innovation also draws tourists, the global appeal of Hip Hop and its related cultural practices of b-boying, deejaying, rap, and graffiti art which attracts uncounted visitors to Harlem, along with other parts of Upper Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx, being a particularly striking example (Rosen 2006; Xie et al. 2007). In addition, the neighborhood’s recent revalorization and gentrification – not least an effect of its appeal as a tourist site - has also played its part by making the area safer and bringing in trendy bars, restaurants and other amenities that today attract tourists in their own

\(^{37}\) Unfortunately research on African-American tourism is only slowly emerging (Butler et al. 2002), none of which concerns Harlem, and there is little data concerning the ethnicity of present day visitors to Harlem. The already mentioned survey research by the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone (2000: 9) meanwhile suggests that only 16 percent of the first-time visitors to Harlem in the year 2000 defined themselves as black but this study was, as discussed, primarily concerned with organized mass tourism (e.g. bus tourism) and hence possesses relatively little explanatory power with regard to tourism activity in more general terms.
right. Ranging from its history and heritage to its present-day amenities (cafés, galleries, shops, bars, and clubs), aesthetics, atmospheres and (off-)scenes, numerous qualities provide different reasons for different types of tourists to visit the area and “lashed up” (Maitland and Newman 2004: 340) are responsible for a situation strikingly different than a few decades ago: “Twenty-five years ago, people were wondering, 'Why a tour of Harlem?'“ said Muriel Samama (cited in Harpaz 2007), who founded the tour company Harlem Spirituals in the early 1980s. Today, nobody asks 'Why Harlem?' any more.”

***

Tourism in Kreuzberg meanwhile also can be described as increasingly variegated – and, arguably, mainstream, as both the neighborhood itself as well as its visitors have changed over the years. Much of this change can be ascribed to a diversification of urban tourism practices and audiences (in Berlin and elsewhere) as well as the fact that Kreuzberg after 1989 found itself - not only in the figurative sense but literally - back in the center of things due to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and subsequent reunification of Berlin.

New cultural institutions of national and, in part, international significance such as the Jewish Museum (Jüdische Museum Berlin) and the Berlinische Gallerie, which opened in 2001 and 2005 respectively, nowadays attract hundreds of thousands visitors every year who for the most part differ substantially from the “alternative” crowd which dominated visitor streams in Cold War times.
In addition, high profile, large-scale local events like the annual *Karneval der Kulturen* (“Carnival of Cultures”) have done their part in raising the district’s profile as a destination (Soysal 2006: 43; see discussion below). Moreover, despite ongoing negative discourses and negative images fashioned or reinforced by the media and the bleak everyday reality of many of its inhabitants (Mayer 2006; Stehle 2006),
there is evidence that Kreuzberg as a whole is perceived different today than only a few years ago and, as a destination, has moved out of the niche and into the mainstream. The neighborhoods retains a chronically high unemployment rate (between 2005 and 2009 it hovered between 20% and 25%, being higher in SO36), and they continue to suffer from many problems of social exclusion, yet a recent study by the city’s economic development department about “Tourism in Berlin’s Districts” (Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologien und Frauen 2007) found that Kreuzberg today constitutes the city’s third-most popular neighborhood among Berlin visitors.

Regarded as a ghetto for decades, Kreuzberg according to the study today is cherished by a large share of visitors for its ethnic diversity, creative, subcultural atmospheres as well as its social and political liberality. Such findings lend support to Levent Soysal’s claim that the neighborhood since the city’s reunification shifted its position from being a desolate margin next to the Wall to a “ceremonial ghetto for the metropolis” (2004: 67), i.e. is increasingly cast not as a zone of alleged lawlessness and utmost poverty but as one of cultural pluralism, alternative lifestyles, creativity and excitement. Unsurprisingly then, Kreuzberg experienced sharp increases in overnight visitors and overnight stays that went far beyond the growth rates of any other of the city’s western districts.

---

38 As of 2009, Kreuzberg still had the lowest average income and highest poverty rates of all of Berlin’s neighborhoods. Problems related to the high concentration of migrant residents – who account for total of about 34 percent of Kreuzberg’s inhabitants (not counting naturalized immigrants) and were affected disproportionately from the disappearance of industrial work after the city’s reunification – as well as particularly the rising resignation of and tensions among youths with a migrant background meanwhile aggravate its status as a district that finds itself increasingly marginalized or - to use a catch phrase of the European scholarly discourse – excluded from mainstream society’s social and economic relations.
The number of hotels and hostels more than quadrupled, rising from 9 in 1993, the earliest year that data is available, to 41 in 2010 (as of July 31st) and by 2009 Kreuzberg counted 562,390 overnight guests and 1,336,378 overnight stays compared to 56,560 overnight guests and 148,099 overnight stays in 1993 (Statistisches Landesamt Berlin-Brandenburg 2010). Hostels and other budget accommodation saw the largest increases, which lends support to the commonly held view that the district is especially popular among young travelers and particularly among what is aptly described as the “EasyJet-Set” (Rapp 2009). This term refers to the recent massive influx of young tourists coming for all-night, non-stop partying from the moment they arrive from their low-cost carrier flight. Unaccounted for are meanwhile those visitors who sublet apartments or rooms, stay with relatives or friends or make a day trip to the district, who are believed to exceed the number of regular overnight guests by a wide margin.

5. CHALLENGING THE VISITOR-HOST DICHOTOMY. “NEW” URBAN MIDDLE CLASSES, “NEW” FORMS OF CONSUMING CITIES

Another factor contributing to Harlem’s and Kreuzberg increased touristic appropriation in recent years has to do with the tendency of residents to enjoy the same activities as visitors, i.e. consume their own neighborhood in touristic form. In both neighborhoods we find evidence confirming the earlier discussed claim that tourism and touristic behavior are less and less separated from daily life by time and space, and

---

39 Berlin’s overall number of tourist lodging, to allow for a better comparison, increased in the same time period (i.e. between 1993 and 2006) from 435 to 721, overnight guests from 3,040,466 to 8,263,000 and overnight stays from 7,455,151 to 18,872,000 (Statistisches Landesamt Berlin-Brandenburg 2010).
indeed tourism has become “a significant modality through which transnational modern life is organized” (Franklin and Crang 2001: 3). This “as if tourism” (Lloyd and Clark 2001: 357) manifests itself in a variety of different, sometimes less and sometimes more obvious forms.

Several new neighborhood-focused online and print guides to shopping, dining, entertainment and culture, for instance, target at – and attract the attention of - residents and visitors in the two neighborhoods, while several walking tours and other sightseeing programs, as I encountered again and again during my research, are also enjoyed by visitors and locals alike. Similarly locals partake in discounted trips to museums and restaurants offered in order to stimulate local markets and, judged by the large number of locals you see in both Harlem and Kreuzberg wearing T-shirts, caps and other apparel referring in one way or another to the two neighborhoods, even souvenirs do not always help to distinguish between tourists and locals. Clearly a matter of further research, gear bearing bold neighborhood logos in today’s world are apparently popular not only as reminders of where we were as tourists but also of who where are and where we (want to) belong.

At the same time, there is evidence thats points towards the transforming of relations between tourism and other forms of consumption and cultural practices alluded to before. At the same time as many visitors venturing into Kreuzberg or Harlem are not separated but rather integrated into the life of the city, new, upwardly mobile or solidly middle-class residents in both neighborhoods display a lifestyle that makes them engage with - and consume - their own urban locations in ways more akin to tourists than those residents who struggle to meet their everyday needs. This is exemplified
amongst other things by a significant expansion in upscale recreational and cultural facilities (restaurants, bars, art galleries, as well as mixed-use urban spectacle projects from beach bars in Kreuzberg to urban entertainment centers and the like in Harlem), which cater to locals as well as tourists alike. Related to this, the multitude of local festivals and other events in both Harlem and Kreuzberg meanwhile illustrates that notions of local culture, ethnicity and identity are also experienced by many locals in a rather touristic manner. Harlem Week and Kreuzberg’s Carnival of Cultures – the two neighborhoods’ largest and most renowned annual events - are cases in point. They serve consumptive and spectating demands that in the past have been more readily associated with tourists but in reality quite often give the impression that locals are the leading consumers of their neighborhoods’ qualities and flavor.

In fact, during my research I was frequently perplexed how many of the “tourists” I met when spending time in Harlem or Kreuzberg defied the common clichés and stereotypes. These “visitors” were, in many ways, just like me. They participated in walking tours and similar programs in their home cities to learn about certain areas or histories they didn’t know before or wanted to learn more about and made me understand that engaging in tourist activities in a given place does indeed not necessarily imply not to be connected to it. During one of my visits in Harlem in 2008, when participating in a free walking tour as part of “Open House New York”, a city-wide architecture and design event which invites people to buildings, old and new, normally off-limits to the general public, an elderly woman I had met when waiting for our guide summed up her motivation to join the tour in one sentence: “This is where I live” she said, adding later that she had passed by many of the buildings the tour
covered “all [her] life” and that the tour had taught her a new perspective and appreciation about “sites that are part of history.”

Moreover, Harlem and, arguably to an even larger extent, Kreuzberg also illustrate that it is increasingly difficult to distinguish between tourism and other mobility patterns. Harlem, for instance, due to its proximity to Columbia University and other academic institutions, is a popular location for researchers and students staying anywhere from a few weeks to a few years in New York. Similarly, Kreuzberg, though historically a magnet for young internationals for several decades, today epitomizes numerous of the “new” forms of mobility alluded to in earlier chapters. The neighborhood is a favorite destination among exchange students, young expat hipsters searching for low-cost living and cultural experimentation and other “migratory elites.” Their numbers have mushroomed in Berlin as a result of the European Union’s efforts to facilitate (and promote) border-crossing mobility of students and highly skilled labor, the emergence of discount airlines, the Internet and e-mail, and, not least, because of the city’s glamour and still relatively moderate rents and living expenses.

Particularly those working in the media, entertainment, fashion or art worlds are drawn to the city. Jack, a freelance play writer and musician, is one of them. He contacted me after I had been interviewed about tourism in Berlin by the ExBerliner, a monthly English-language magazine for international visitors and residents that was founded in 2002 and whose steadily expanding print and online activities since then can be seen as testimony of the later’s growing presence in the city. Sipping a café latte at Lucia’s, a favorite hang-out for expats on Kreuzberg’s Oranienstraße he, just
as uncounted others I talked to, likened Berlin to New York when being asked about the city’s appeal (“Berlin is really like New York in the ’70s”). Moreover, he explained that his repeat stays in Berlin (he had spent three summers in Berlin in as many years) were also economically motivated: “I pay half as much, have double the space, and when I rent out my place in Bedford-Stuyvesant, I even make money!” Kreuzberg had become the location of choice because he had spent the first nights in Berlin on the sofa of “friends of friends of friends” and soon after his arrival realized that almost everyone he knew was also living in or near the neighborhood. “There is a vast network of expats down here, particularly from New York”, he told me, adding that the fact that “there are hundreds of others like me” had certainly helped him to find his way around.

As we looked around us, watching other customers work on their laptops or surfing the Internet, our conversation shifted to the profound impact new communication and information technologies have on today’s patterns of tourism consumption and mobility. Not only do they allow people to “work away from work” and stay connected to family and friends: they also, just as new technologies and (travel) media (e.g. guidebooks, alternative weeklies etc.) have been implicated in changing patterns of tourism consumption in previous eras, have a powerful impact on the ways tourists and other temporary city users are moving around in - and experience - the cities they are staying in. Connected to various social media networks and regularly surfing popular blogs and websites covering various aspects of city life in Berlin, Jack, for one, put me to shame with his familiarity with new hotspots and hidden gems around town - a familiarity that demonstrates that “outsiders“ can very well possess extensive insider knowledge, i.e. that the popular distinction between locals as “insiders“
and non-locals as “outsiders” is often a murky one. Populating Internet cafes, dominating
the nightlife, and adding additional flavor to the area’s already diverse character, Kreuzberg’s variegated “temporary residents” clearly have become a tangible life force of the neighborhood, as is also exemplified by reports on significant increases in second-home numbers and vacation apartments for rent.  

As their backgrounds and activities can be assumed to overlap those of more conventional tourists as well as many of the neighborhood’s more privileged permanent

---

40 Apart from a recent report by the Hotel- und Gaststättenverband Berlin (Berlin’s Hotel and Restaurant Association) which estimated the number of vacation apartments to amount to more than 10,000 citywide (Linde 2010), there is unfortunately no data available concerning the number of second homes or vacation apartments citywide, let alone neighborhood level. Both activists as well as policymakers recognize, however, that their numbers have increased significantly and that inner-city districts like Kreuzberg are particularly affected.

Figure 10 Vacation rentals have become ubiquitous in many parts of Kreuzberg, as is illustrated by the hundreds of apartments advertised on websites like “Craigslist” on any given day.
residents (Maitland and Newman 2009), such developments must also be seen as contributing to the increasingly blurred boundaries between tourism and non-tourism activities alluded to earlier. Authors like Martinotti (1999; see also Costa and Martinotti 2003) refer to this blurring when they challenge the utility of conventional distinctions between in- and outsiders or hosts and visitors when exploring the interaction between cities and those who use them. Their work does not deny that tourists’ and residents’ perceptions, behaviors and needs can at times be sharply at odds but also emphasizes the relevance of class and cultural capital in shaping how places are experienced, consumed, and interpreted. And it raises important questions concerning the meaning of citizenship, community, and belonging in the 21st century.

***

In the past, repeatedly compared to Harlem as the embodiment of a chaotic criminal territory (see Stehle 2006), Kreuzberg today evokes different comparisons among visitors. “Kreuzberg is a young and funky area that reminds me of Camden Town,” says one British tourist, referring to one of London’s most sought after neighborhood destinations, adding: “There is huge potential here for the future” (cited in Hawker 2010). In Harlem meanwhile, some tourists come to similar conclusions. Says one British tourist: “Great food, jazz clubs, fabulous architecture (some of the most interesting in NYC), lots of gentrification, some slummy bits … - it reminded me of Islington” (Adesioye 2008).

Such comparisons, as profane or far-fetched as they may seem, would have been unimaginable only a few years ago and point to an indeed profound transformation
that this account of Harlem’s and Kreuzberg’s development as destinations from a demand side hopefully was able to shed light on. Significantly, it is a transformation that, as will be explored in the next chapter, most likely would not have occurred without profound policy efforts on the local level as well as considerable changes with regard to the way the neighborhoods were understood, represented, and treated by the local state, the tourism industry, and other relevant actors in New York’s and Berlin’s governance and urban development arenas.

The rise of tourism activity in neighborhoods like Harlem or Kreuzberg can in other words not be explained by reference to places’ inherent qualities as well as the combined effects of growing mobility, enhanced capacities for consumption and communication, as well as changing tourists’ demands alone. Rather, larger forces – the two cities’ restructuring economies and accompanying institutional change – are also at work, while the neighborhoods’ burgeoning tourist industries, place marketing experts and other urban boosters as well as external development interests do their part in promoting them and both neighborhoods – though to a varying extent - benefit from a “critical infrastructure” (Zukin 1991) that influences public taste in their favor.41

41 Zukin (1991, 1995) argues that there is a “critical infrastructure” of individuals, entailing connoisseurs, cultural mediators, media outlets, marketing bureaus, business associations, tourist boards and parts of the (national and local) government, that influences what is considered visit-worthy and what’s not and by doing so affects neighborhoods’ tourist appeal (see also Rath 2005).
Here, the thesis’ focus turns to the supply side of tourism. Tourism’s supply side, as we have already argued, is variously defined. To some it involves companies which deliver tourism products and services, including tour operators, accommodation, and travel agents and companies for which tourism is not the main focus of business, but a component, such as restaurants and cafes. Others include tourism-relevant planning and policy-making – or the lack thereof – not only on the local level, but also on regional and (inter-)national levels as well as those commonly said to comprise localities’ “growth machines”, i.e. business interests, landowners, the local newspaper, and the governing body while still others have argued that destinations’ amenities, attractions and infrastructure more generally, in short everything that makes a place a destination, also forms part of the supply side of tourism. The focus of this chapter rests on an examination of activities aimed at facilitating tourism and marketing marginalized neighborhoods as desirable places to visit, play, and consume in.

The activities of local place entrepreneurs seeking to promote – and capitalize on - the neighborhoods’ character and distinctive identities will be discussed and the role of the public sector as well as extra-local players examined. Identifying the key agents of change but also challenging narratives that overstate the totalizing tendencies of neoliberal policy agendas that emphasize place-marketing and associated activities as well as their implications, the chapter moreover sheds light on the way the reimagination and repositioning of districts as destinations for leisure and tourism
consumption is mediated by specific local conditions and elaborates upon the limitations and constraints of efforts to promote tourism development in neighborhoods like Harlem and Kreuzberg.

1. **ON CONTINUITIES AND DISCONTINUITIES**

A prevalent theme that resonates in much that is written about tourism in cities and tourism in “marginalized” neighborhoods in particular is that recent decades have been characterized by fundamental shifts with regard to the way such neighborhoods are understood, represented, and treated by the local state, the tourism industry, and other relevant actors shaping tourism and leisure development. Such arguments are not without merit to be sure as the aestheticization and promotion of areas and aspects of urban environments previously deemed unmarketable or undesirable represents a critical component of today’s urban realities throughout the advanced capitalist world. At the same time there is also an inherent danger in such portrayals.

For one it is easily lost sight of the fact that much that happened with regard to tourism and leisure in such spaces during the late 19th and early twentieth century also gave rise to – and indeed was at least in part made possible by - the existence of a veritable industry as well as, just as today, their promotion in urban guidebooks, newspapers, magazines and related resources. As regards New York, commercial guides offering tours for “slumming parties” (New York Times 1884), “rubberneck automobiles” taking spectators on journeys into the city’s nether parts (Tracey 1905: SM 4) as well as travel media of various sorts informed readers about the “frightening”, “foreign” or simply enjoyable aspects of neighborhoods like Chinatown, Little
Italy, or the Lower East Side. In addition and made up mostly of members of the city’s elites, civic associations that sought to awaken interest in the history of the city, such as the City History Club of New York to name just one example, emerged. Rather serious in purpose they, too, contributed to a heightened attention paid to the city’s “old” neighborhoods by offering various programs, including city history classes and walking tours (see i.a. Hood 2002). Advise on how to experience them hence was widespread and arguably foreshadowed much of what is today intensely discussed as distinctly postmodern or contemporary. Highlighting the significance of guidebooks and related travel media, Blake (2006: 130), for instance, vividly described how these “frequently encouraged tourists to explore ethnic neighborhoods on their own, suggesting self-guided walking tours with the aid of a guidebook. Freed from fears of exploring these neighborhoods and the tyranny of the sightseeing bus with its set itinerary and pat megaphone narratives, tourists could create for themselves a more personal experience of the city”. Similarly, Gilbert and Hancock (2006) in their work on tourism discourses in New York between the late 19th and mid 20th centuries also emphasize the initial neighborhood-orientation of much of the existent travel media of the time.

As a consequence tourism became more and more organized, directed, and routinized and, offering yet another striking parallel to today, according to many commentators also increasingly commoditized, staged, and ultimately spoiled. Chinatown’s development is a case in point for it was already by the beginning of the twentieth century that tourists began to complain that the area was about to lose its appeal as a destination, while residents were increasingly unnerved by the negative stereotyping the industry employed Gilbert and Hancock 2006). Complaining about the “bark-
ers” on sightseeing buses, one local businessman declared: “They relate stories of crime that never took place. They characterize the homes of respectable Chinese … as opium joints. They point to any building at random and inform visitors that … murderer … hid there. We have had enough” (New York Times 1923: 16).

Many Harlem residents complained of exploitation and commodification as tourism development progressed within their midst in the course of the 1920s and 1930s. Commenting on the burgeoning tourism industry that had developed in Harlem, Langston Hughes, one of the best-known writers to emerge from the Harlem Renaissance, was a very vocal critic. In his autobiography The Big Sea, which also provides a compelling account of Harlem’s conditions of the time, he not only criticized the industry’s inherently exploitive nature - “much of the ownership of the Harlem institutions of the time rested in white hands” (Maurrasse 2006: 22) - but also expressed his dismay about the effects it brought about for Harlem’s night life: “The '20's are gone and lots of fine things in Harlem night life have disappeared like snow in the sun - since it became utterly commercial, planned for the downtown tourist trade, and therefore dull” (Hughes 1940: 227).

Of course such complaints were not necessarily shared by everyone. Instead it is reasonable to assume that many Harlemites - particularly those who relied economically on tourism and leisure in the neighborhood - were less worried about the tourism industry’s presence than about its decline. After the Great Depression set in, conservative discourses about race and immigration gained ascendancy. The old “slumming” itinerary increasingly gave way to a more selective geography based upon consumption and commercial entertainment concentrated in Midtown, which by
the 1930s had replaced Lower Manhattan as the visual center of the city’s skyline and assumed its role as the city's public face or "brand" (Blake 206: 169).

Be that as it may, what is important here is that comments like Hughes’ serve as reminders that today’s interest of the tourism and leisure industry as well as other relevant players in places like Harlem is not unprecedented: Rather it has a long history, a history that fell into oblivion with the demise of established tourism patterns and practices and others taking their place.

The shifting of tourist expectations and geographies during the late 1930s was referenced and reinforced in the text and imagery of travel media and promotional material of the time, as London’s study (2010) on travel guides’ portrayal of New York during the age of urban renewal illustrates. Now the material amenities New York held for the visitor, i.e. its wealth of singular landmarks, high and mid-brow cultural/entertainment options, as well as shopping offerings, and not the historic characteristics of its space or those who inhabited it, dominated the guidebooks. Businessmen and city officials were eager to advertise and promote New York as an “elegant all-American metropolis” and divert attention away from other aspects of city life that would detract from the desired image of New York as an accomplished, modern, harmonious and safe American city (Blake 2006: 78). Any mention of the city’s ethnic or poor neighborhoods that had previously been covered extensively – Harlem being a point in case – was, at most, marginal. Published in 1964, Hart’s Guide to New York City, for instance, told travelers in no uncertain terms, “There is little or nothing for tourists to see here [in Harlem] other than the degradation of the city,” while Wolfe's New York: A Guide to the Metropolis, published in 1975, omitted Harlem al-
together (Sandford 1987). Similarly, tourist maps which had previously designated “all parts of the city as equally part of the tourist itinerary” became more selective, both geographically and thematically (London 2010). The city of towers and landmarks of Midtown Manhattan as well as a disembodied landscape of sights and sites Downtown were now presented as making up the totality of “New York” to visitors, while areas like Harlem or the city’s other four boroughs were either omitted or left blank (Blake 2006: 137). Maps omitting any mentioning of places like Harlem not to speak of the outer boroughs are to this day frequently cited as emblematic of the “Manhattan-centric” character of tourism marketing and policy in New York, which indeed shaped the contours of tourism promotion in New York for decades and to a certain extent for reasons discussed later continue to do so today (see Fainstein and Powers 2006; Gross 2008; Greenberg 2008). It is a “Manhattan centrisim” - although it should perhaps more correctly be called “Midtown centrisim” - however that only emerged as a result of a combination of transformation processes between the 1930s and the early 1950s and hence by no means always dominated the geography of the tourist destination New York.

Significantly, it was also during this time period that New York’s tourism/entertainment sector became more organized and began to wield more influence in municipal politics (Greenberg 2008: 23-24). Unlike some other US cities like Las Vegas or New Orleans which had long been dependent on tourism and put effective marketing and promotional efforts in place, tourism remained until the second half of the twentieth century of relatively little significance for New York’s elites as well as the city’s overall strategy of economic development. Created in 1934 as a branch of the New York Merchant Association and initially mostly composed of those who
benefited most directly from tourism such as hotel and restaurant owners, the city’s Convention and Visitors Bureau tended in the first years of its existence to be sidelined in the city’s governance arena. It was only after World War II when a number of factors – from the expanding middle-class to the globalization of the economy, to the rising popularity of jet and automobile travel - catapulted the tourism industry into an era of massive expansion that City Hall and New York’s broader business community began to express interest and partake in its activities.

The Bureau’s budget was raised, prominent commercial and civic figures joined its board and coordinated (but by today’s standards modest) marketing campaigns to better capitalize on what was now seen as a multi-billion industry were launched (London 2010; Greenberg 2008). Significantly, whereas at least some public and private urban boosters in previous decades – largely acting independently of each other and outside formal institutional arrangements – had recognized “old” New York’s commercial value and sought to capitalize on it, most promotional activities now avoided reference to it. Instead, New York’s Convention and Visitors Bureau (NYCVB) focused almost exclusively on a highly sanitized vision of the city as a site of modern consumption and entertainment above all else, one that was almost entirely white and decidedly middle-class.

With few exceptions, such as local leaders’ decision to consciously preserve New York’s Little Italy as a “ghetto for tourists” (Conforti 1996), the almost complete omission of the city’s poorer and ethnic neighborhoods from the city’s marketing was emblematic of a more general attitude towards them that prevailed for most of the 20th century: they were not considered tourist attractors but rather deemed chaotic, un-
healthy places in need of replacement and - particularly from the late 1960s onwards when the United States’ urban crisis deepened and a racially charged culture of fear began to take hold of the city – frequently considered areas to be avoided and feared. Issues of historic preservation had certainly become a concern by the late 1960s and intellectuals like Jane Jacobs as well as artists and everyday people had long begun to propagate - and appreciate - a radically different understanding of urban life centered around lived and worked-in neighborhoods as well as notions of spontaneity, diversity, and historicity. Yet these and other developments notwithstanding – the emergence of vanguard media outlets such as the Village Voice, which was founded in 1955, or New York Magazine (founded in 1967) promoting alternative forms of urban consumption being one of them - New York’s official marketing remained in other words overwhelmingly ignorant of Gotham’s famously diverse and polyglot neighborhood-based assets, except to extol selected shopping and entertainment opportunities they at times provided (see Greenberg 2008).42

Owing to this as well as the more general lack of political support (and business interest), many hotels and other tourism-dependent (and tourism attracting!) businesses outside of Manhattan’s core closed during this time period. Among the losses were several Harlem institutions like the historic Hotel Theresa,43 the Apollo Theater, and nightspots like the Renaissance Ballroom and Rockland Palace, reinforcing the dominant position of Manhattan south of 96th Street in the tourism market and the

42 This, in fact, also holds true for the marketing activities of other relevant actors such as the New York State Division of Tourism, as Hoffman (2003) points out, whose first advertising venture — the well known “I love NY” campaign in 1977 — was decidedly anti-urban and featured primarily commercials depicting parks and other natural amenities Upstate.

43 Nicknamed “Harlem’s Waldorf Astoria”, the hotel on 125th Street was a vibrant center of black life from its opening days in 1913 until it closed its doors in 1967.
neglect other areas experienced. Every now and then attempts were made to counter this trend – in 1974 the NYCVB, for instance, published a “starter’s list of top attractions in the ’other boroughs’” to remind tourists that “The Big Apple” is “more than Manhattan” (Hartford Courant 1974). Ultimately, however, such attempts remained sporadic and had little impact. The overall marketing of the city remained, in the words of Miles and Miles (2004: 52), “as reductive as the skyline of a postcard view from a distant vantage point.”

Increasingly taking a position that would soon be referred to as “entrepreneurial” (Harvey 1989), city and state officials from the mid-1970s onwards more and more considered marketing a key priority to combat the city’s bad economy and improve its image as a business destination (see Greenberg 2008: 131-225). Deindustrialization, middle-class flight to the suburbs as well as the economic woes following the oil shock heightened the importance of utilizing tourism as an economic development strategy and coalition formations among local financial and real estate elites, media and cultural industries, and the city’s political elites further contributed to the elevation of tourism marketing and related activities in urban policy (see Greenberg 2008: pp.14). Notably, most attention and resources were spent on providing a positive, populist, consumer- and investor-oriented vision of New York that could distract attention from the city’s daunting problems of the time, however.

Thus, almost all marketing activities – from the city’s first, quasi-official marketing campaign, known as “Big Apple”, sponsored by the real estate-led Association for a Better New York in 1971 to the “I [heart] NY” campaign which was launched by the New York State Department of Commerce in 1977 – by and large avoided refer-
ences to the city’s poorer, crisis-torn neighborhoods. It was left to other players - alternative media like the Village Voice, New York Magazine, or later Time Out catering as “urban consumer manuals” to young, social-climbing urbanites (Greenberg 2008); real estate and other “place-sensitive” industries with a stake in previously ignored neighborhoods, civic and economic actors on the local level etc. – to respond to – or anticipate – changes in travel and leisure consumption and make the first steps, for better or for worse, towards a renewed emphasis on what I call the “marketing of marginalized neighborhoods”.

***

The treatment and representation of poor neighborhoods in Berlin on the part of the local state, the tourism industry, and other relevant actors shaping tourism and leisure development meanwhile has been – just as pretty much everything else in Berlin’s complex history over the past hundred years – characterized by repeated changes and contradictions. In the late 19th and early 20th century, numerous urban boosters and local entrepreneurs sought, just as in other industrializing cities, to capitalize upon upper and middle-classes’ ambivalence towards the modern city, their nostalgia for how the city used to be and fascination with the city’s poorer, historic quarters. Arguably the most impressive testament of the wave of nostalgia that swept through the rapidly modernizing city was the recreation of “Alt Berlin,” the city’s chaotic and messy historic center, as part of the Berlin Industrial Exhibition of 1896 (Zelljadt, 2005, 2008). Later, with Berlin transforming at rapid pace, guidebooks and other publications on the city’s historic core came to constitute a minor genre and even “official” Weimar-era marketing efforts at times involved references to
slumming aesthetics, vice and debauchery – despite their overall mission to define Germany’s capital as Europe’s most modern city after the model of New York and Chicago (Kiecol 2008: 161; see also Schütz and Siebenhaar 1996). Hitler’s rise to power and the subsequent destructions of World War II brought many of these activities to a halt, however, and in the immediate postwar era from 1946 to 1970, a period in which tourism rebounded, the attention of both public and private actors rested on other priorities.

Instrumentalized in the wider ideological conflict between the two German states, practices of tourism promotion and place marketing during this time period primarily served ideological needs. They were dominated by attempts on both sides of the border to, on the one hand, change historical associations, i.e. counter Berlin’s image as Hitler’s former seat of power and destitute victim of the Allied bombing campaign, and, on other hand, present East and West Berlin respectively as show cases for their respective national states and social systems.

Authorities in West Berlin, particularly after the beginning of the construction of the Wall in August 1961, in addition were eager to demonstrate that the city, despite the uncertainties about its future and its ambiguous geopolitical situation as a physically isolated island in the middle of the GDR’s territory, was a safe and viable place to work, live and visit. The emphasis of their marketing and promotion activities hence rested on images and symbols that deflected attention from the city’s past and pre-

---

44 Conscious, organized marketing and “place selling” efforts in Berlin have been traced by historians as dating back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Warnke 2005; Biskup and Schalenberg 2008) - practices which can be labeled as precursors to more contemporary forms of place marketing. They received a boost when the city’s tourist office – the Ausstellungs-, Messe- und Fremdenverkehrsamt, or Ameframt - was created in 1927 which contributed to a significant professionalization of city advertising (Stadtwerbung) and place promotion efforts (Kiecol 2008: 164).
sent problems, positioned the city as a “bulwark of freedom” against the communist bloc (Spode and Gutbier 1987, cited in Stanley 2009) and signaled the city’s belonging and ties to the Western world. In line with the more general ideological competition between the East and the West at the time, they sought to demonstrate the superiority of Western-style capitalism. New landmarks helped convey the message that West Berlin was a future-oriented, modern city and distanced it both from the Nazi era and from the neighboring GDR; those realized in the course of the international building exhibition “Interbau” in 1957 in this context took on a particular role. As did images of the West Berlin’s bustling commercial centre around Kurfürstendamm such as the shopping mall Europa-Center (1963-65) with its huge rotating Mercedes Star on top which – against all odds - helped promote West Berlin as an “ordinary” metropolis. Moreover, it was also in the center of West Berlin, the area around the Wittenbergplatz, Zoo Station, and Kurfürstendamm, that most tourism-relevant facilities and services concentrated, while other parts of the West Berlin - except for the traditional recreation areas in Berlin’s southwest like the lido at Wannsee – saw relatively little development.

Areas like Kreuzberg meanwhile were after World War II, as has already been discussed, initially considered redundant altogether and consequently left derelict or slated for clearance. Even once the brutal imposition of Modernist urban renewal came to an end, few local leaders considered them as tourist attractions. True, Berlin’s *Fremdenverkehrsamt* (“Travel Bureau”), since 1949 responsible for the city’s tourism promotion, had already by the early 1970s begun to hint at the experimental, informal, frontier atmosphere of Berlin in some of its campaigns after the city, following the student and counter movements of 1968, had increasingly become re-
nowned, both nationally and internationally, for its lively sub- and alternative cultures (Stanley 2009). Those spaces that arguably embodied this climate most, such as Kreuzberg’s SO36 area, remained nonetheless primarily seen as objects of social programs and were - particularly when inhabiting migrant populations – by many stigmatized as ghettos (see Stehle 2006; Lang 1998).

To local leaders appreciating the combination of multiculturalism, ethnic, and alternative lifestyles that gradually came to characterize much of Kreuzberg, promoting tourism meanwhile was not an issue either: whereas those that stigmatized the neighborhood as a chaotic and criminal territory or Turkish ghetto believed that tourists needed to be protected from Kreuzberg, those fascinated by the area increasingly adopted the attitude that “Freakland” Kreuzberg (Lang 1998) needed to be protected from intrusion in order to preserve its uniqueness. This sentiment if anything grew in strength as Kreuzberg in the course of the late 1970s and 1980s more and more attracted the attention of tourists and tourism boosters. In 1987 the New York Times called Kreuzberg “Berlin’s version of the Lower East Side” (Weedman 1987) - and first signs of gentrification started to appear (see also Lang 1998). Similar to New York, where international and national media and particularly “urban consumer manuals” (Greenberg 2008: 85) played a decisive role in “opening up” ethnic and

---

45 Even references to Harlem as the putative epitome of a ghetto, were not uncommon as Stehle (2006) points out as many parts of Kreuzberg came more and more to be seen as spaces that “ordinary” people avoided and where integration had clearly failed. A case in point is the news coverage of the centrist news magazine Der Spiegel which, without exploring the historical and political dimensions of this comparison, repeatedly likened the situation in Kreuzberg to Harlem (see Stehle 2006). Taking on a decidedly racial tone, a 1973 cover story entitled “Ghettos in Germany: One Million Turks” (Der Spiegel, 31/1973, cited in Stehle 2006) opened for instance with the alarmist slogan: “The Turks are coming – save yourself, if you can” (24). It used Kreuzberg as an example to describe the “flood” of migrants “overpowering” West German cities and predicted a rise in crime and social decay “similar to that of Harlem.” Along these lines the New York Times also likened conditions in Kreuzberg to those in American inner-city neighborhoods. One article from 1977 for instance opened with the sentence “Block by block, the crumbling Kreuzberg neighborhood is becoming a ghetto of Turkish migrant workers and their families, a slum spreading along the concrete wall that slashes through Berlin like a scar” (Whitney 1977: 3; see also Gupte 1984: 88)
working class neighborhoods for alternative kinds of consumption, this gradual domestication of Berlin’s long frowned-upon counter culture was initially less, it seems, influenced by activities of city officials than by the extensive media attention Kreuzberg received. Particularly Berlin’s two alternative bi-weekly magazines Tipp and Zitty as well as alternative travel media like the (Zitty-produced) travel guide Anders Reisen (“Travel Differently”) that first appeared in 1980 included significant room for a discussion of Kreuzberg as a “Kudamm contrast program”, i.e. an alternative to the city’s main sights and sites located along and around its premier boulevard Kurfürstendamm - or Kudamm, as it is known locally (Lang 1998: 138; see also Schütz and Siebenhaar 1996: 37).

By the mid-1980s, this “contrast program” was more and more recognized by local officials as an important component of Berlin’s tourism appeal and consequently integrated into the discourse and imagery produced by city officials (Colomb 2008). Various developments including the emergence of the Green Party as an important political player had contributed to an increasing recognition of - and official support for - Berlin’s Alternativkultur (“alternative culture”). Even those leaders who did not appreciate the city’s vibrant alternative scenes recognized their strategic relevance for marketing purposes as well as the city’s image (Suhr 1990: 227). “A new Berlin image gradually crystallized itself. Kreuzberg became one of its advertising signposts and the offbeat Berlin in all its facets one of the fundamental components of the new scenario. Punks, foreign cultures and subcultural lifestyles now belonged to the ex-
pected inventory of an orderly big city. This Berlin image made its way in the official tourism advertising somewhat late in the 1980s, which didn’t prevent it from having a long-lasting effect up until today” (Schütz and Siebenhaar 1996: 37).

![Figure 11 Marketing the “alternative” Berlin (1975)](image)

Strongly influenced by the pressures of various leftist movements and neighborhood groups as well as the growing force of the local Green Party, local development politics in Kreuzberg itself largely refrained from instrumentalizing endogenous re-
sources through marketing or similar activities. Instead, issues of collective consumption, community culture and political self-determination as well as the protection of the area’s cultural and social identity as well as built environment from developments deemed exploitive or inappropriate dominated the agenda (Huning and Novy 2006; Novy and Huning 2009).

Here we can detect a crucial difference from the situation in New York, where local leaders in disadvantaged neighborhoods already in the 1970s and 1980s began to eye tourism as a source of income and job generation and complained about the lack of support from the city as well as public-private entities. “Harlem has everything… [We have] a product that has not been recognized – in fact it has been neglected,” Lloyd Williams, then Vice President of the influential Uptown Chamber of Commerce (UCC) told a reporter in 1981 and in doing so probably expressed what many other neighborhood leaders felt across the city (cited in: Vaughan 1981: F1). Taking matters in its own hands, his organization, which was chartered in 1896 as the Harlem Board of Commerce and in 1993 changed its name to Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce, in subsequent years worked diligently to promote tourism in Harlem itself through various programs and projects. Met with varying degrees of success and failure, the Chamber’s efforts - as well as those of other key players in

---

47 Berlin is one of Germany’s three city-states, i.e. both a state and a municipality, and has, similarly to London or Paris, a two-tiered government system divided between the main administration (Hauptverwaltung), i.e. the Senat, and semi-autonomous districts - or boroughs – the Bezirke. Kreuzberg used to be an independent district until 2001 when the number of city districts was reduced to 12 as part of an administrative reform and Kreuzberg and neighboring Friedrichshain were merged into a single administrative district. Governed by the so-called Bezirksamt (BA) which is is elected by the district-parliament, the so called Bezirksverordnetenversammlung (BVV), Berlin’s districts do not raise their own taxes (their financing is instead derived fully from the city’s first tier authorities), but nonetheless have important powers and duties, for instance in the realms of planning and urban development, and in many areas enjoy significant formal and informal leverage.

48 London (2010) for instance cites a Brooklyn-based businessman claiming that the “work of the NY Visitors and Convention Bureau has accomplished the same as blacklisting might for Brooklyn”.

Harlem’s local governance arena – will be discussed in the following sections which will examine more recent supply-side developments in both Harlem and Kreuzberg in greater detail and depth. This section meanwhile has shown that today’s reinter-pretation of neighborhoods like Harlem or Kreuzberg as destinations on the part of city officials, business interests and other actors represents not only a break with the more recent past but also harkens back to practices that emerged more than a century ago.


From the mid-1970s onwards, a period during which the “standpoint of the out-of-towner”, as Greenberg (2008: 14) put it, more and more held “sway in urban affairs”, revitalization plans for Harlem proliferated and attempts to revive Harlem’s tourist industry in many of them played an integral part. Particularly local institutions such as the above-mentioned Uptown Chamber of Commerce (UCC) considered tourism a viable means to offset the area’s decline and counter the negative image that had all too long been associated with Harlem. Arguing that tourism was key to Harlem’s future, Lloyd Williams told a reporter in 1983: “We know that Harlem has a great attraction to tourists, and since tourism is now the second largest industry in New York City, it’s crucial that we get our share of those tourist dollars” (cited in Bailey 1983:
It was in this spirit that Harlem Week, which today constitutes one of New York’s largest annual community celebrations, was born.

Founded as a one-day celebration in 1974 “to give tribute and recognition to the great history and legacy of Harlem with a pronounced expression of great hope for its future” (Lloyd Williams, cited in: Ebony 2004: 164), Harlem Week represents one of the earliest – and arguably most successful – attempts of local elites to change Harlem’s image for the better. At a time when not only Harlem but the whole city, hit by a seemingly unmanageable fiscal crisis, seemed to hit rock bottom, the event soon draw hundreds of thousands visitors and, equally important, showed local stakeholders that tourism in Harlem despite the neighborhood’s bleak realities and the image that was often projected was, against all odds, possible (Sandford 1987; Hightet and Johnson 1984).

As a consequence, numerous activities towards developing tourism – in many cases under the leadership of the UCC – ensued. Important milestones included the publication of a new Harlem tourist and information map in 1979, described by the New York Times as “the first such map of the upper Manhattan area to be produced in 52 years”, and a tourism campaign with the slogan “Do it Up in Harlem” linked to New York State’s successful “I love New York” tourism marketing also in 1979 (Rule 1979: B3). Five years later and following numerous community meetings, forums, and conferences under the auspices of the UCC concerning the tourism develop-

---

49 Unsurprisingly not all leaders in Harlem shared this perspective and Bailey’s article makes no secret of the controversies surrounding William’s and other leaders’ emphasis on attracting tourist dollars – along with outside investments - to revitalize Harlem. Speaking up for Black capitalism and Black power, Elombe Brath, director of the African-Jazz Arts Society and Studios, is cited in the same article as saying “Harlem can be saved as a Black community if it follows a course of buying black, supporting black, encouraging Black and demanding that Black people be accountable to the community.”
ment in Harlem, Citibank announced during Harlem Week of 1984 that it intended to sponsor the formation of a local “Harlem Visitors and Convention Association” (HVCA). In subsequent years it would become instrumental in promoting Harlem to tourists as well as, equally important, the international tourism infrastructure. It published promotional materials like the “I Love New York Harlem Travel Guide” which was put together in conjunction with the New York State’s division of tourism in 1985 and also spearheaded a variety of other initiatives designed to draw tourists.

Changing press coverage also contributed to Harlem’s greater prominence. The rise to fame of Sylvia’s Restaurant, today one of Harlem’s Soul food landmarks, which essentially occurred without any marketing or paid advertisement, is exemplary of this. Family-owned and operated, Sylvia’s had been a popular eatery ever since it was founded in 1962 in the heart of Central Harlem by local businesswoman Sylvia Woods. Significantly until well into the 1970s it attracted primarily locals before a highly favorable review from New York Magazine’s premier restaurant critic Gail Greene in 1979 exposed “Harlem’s best-kept soul-food secret” (Harris 2001: 10) to the entire city and beyond. In the review the author describes at great length her initial doubts about venturing into Harlem, positing that she “wasn't sure … I would be all that welcome ribbing and chicken hopping in Harlem” (Greene 1979: 63). The attention it caused led to vastly increased customer business, arrangements with national and international tour groups to visit the restaurant, and eventually the expansion of the restaurant into a burgeoning soul food empire that now takes up almost an entire city block and sells its own line of bottled specialty soul food products (Harris 2001: pp.10).
Along with these developments, urban revitalization plans with a touristic component also proliferated. These included plans for a $96 million hotel and international trade and convention center on West 125th street, a major enclosed shopping mall and a center for the arts, as well as various attempts to revive the former glory of Harlem’s historic Victoria and Apollo Theaters. Despite notable exceptions, such as the Apollo’s reopening or the Studio Museum’s opening on 125th Street in the early and mid 1980s, many of these high-flying commercial and cultural projects of the early 1980s floundered due to conflicts among community organizations as well as a lack of financing (redlining was still an issue at the time) and/or government support.

In fact, with federal moneys for urban and neighborhood development diminished after the election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency of the United States in 1984, many long-planned projects that depended on financing from the federal government were scratched. At the same time, however, New York State was anything but inactive, however. Arguably at least in part owing to the growing political clout of Harlem-based politicians in city and state governments as well as the city’s dominant Democratic Party, state and city politicians after decades of benign (and not so benign) neglect instead stepped up their efforts to fuel private and public investment in blighted areas of Harlem. A subsidiary of the New York State Urban Development Corporation, a highly controversial presence within the community that was often charged with mismanagement and cronyism, the Harlem Urban Development Corporation (HUDC) was set up in 1971 to encourage development and commercial activity in the neighborhood. It played a crucial role in the planning and execution of nu-

50 This is maybe best exemplified by the rise to prominence of the so-called “Gang of Four”, i.e. the political careers of David Dinkins, Basil Paterson, Charles Rangel and Percy Sutton who all ascended to top political posts in the course of the 1960s and 1970s (see Maurrasse 2006: 35).
merous projects in the course of the 1970s and 1980s (Gates 1997: 291), while the city emerged as a pro-active force particularly in the 1980s when it, through tax foreclosure, reluctantly took ownership of some 60 – 70 percent of Harlem's real estate (Maurrasse 2006: 23; Prince 2005: 396).

In 1982 Mayor Edward Koch, who had already at the end of the 1970s pledged his support to make Harlem “once again the cultural capital of the city” (cited in Rule 1979: B3), commissioned a “Harlem Task Force” to draw up a redevelopment plan. Building upon the premise that “with drastic reductions in federal housing and economic aid” resulting from the cuts of the Reagan administration, the “private sector ... would have to play a pivotal role”, it called for facilitating private and public-private investments in a selective number of “stronger” anchor areas such as Striver’s Row, the area around Mt. Morris Park, and 125th Street which was identified as a critical “commercial corridor for economic development” (see Schaffer and Smith 1986: 360).

Dennis Coghill, the president of HUDC which was commissioned to develop housing on city-owned property and attract commercial development, was clear about his strategy for these developments: “Starting from 110th Street, we will make a first beachhead on 112th Street. You know, some anchor condominium conversions. Then a second beachhead up on 116th Street ... Essentially the plan is to circle the wagons and move into Central Harlem from the outskirts” (cited in Smith 1997: 164).

---

51 In 1978, a new city law allowed properties that were one year behind on payment of city taxes to be foreclosed for tax arrears (“in rem”), a measure to curb deterioration of abandoned buildings. Suddenly the city was in possession of a massive number of empty as well as inhabited buildings in neighborhoods across the city.
Emphasis was placed on keeping middle-income residents from leaving and encouraging private residential capital investment and homeownership through auctioning off city-owned buildings and by stimulating mixed-income and market-rate housing development in the area. Substantial construction activity, particularly after the announcement of New York City's Ten-Year Plan in 1985, followed and the neighborhood little by little entered an era of new residential and commercial desirability. Real estate prices rose, a modest shift in demographics set in, new businesses began to dot the neighborhood’s streets, and reports about a “second renaissance” – as well as the beginning of Harlem’s gentrification – surfaced in increasing numbers.

This economic and residential resurgence was not the consequence of state action alone but also resulted from various other citywide trends. The period saw enormous job increases in the city’s post-industrial, service sectors; a tightening of the real estate and housing market and shifting movements of capital and the emergence of a new, affluent black middle class. These factors interacted synergistically with the expansion of the area’s tourism infrastructure: City-wide tour operators began to include Harlem in their itineraries, a growing number of local companies also offered tours through the neighborhood, local religious institutions, such as the Abyssinian Baptist Church began to arrange church visits and Gospel concerts, and even a few accommodation facilities such as the Sugar Hill International House, a hostel on St. Nicholas Avenue, which opened in 1985, were established (Sandford 1987; Hoffman 2003).

---

52 In 1985 NYC Mayor Edward I. Koch announced a 10-year capital plan, the largest municipal housing program in the United States, which directed an estimated $5 billion, most of it City capital, into neighborhood and housing redevelopment. While the program has been lauded for contributing significantly to the rebirth of neighborhoods and new hope and opportunity for communities across the city, it has also, like other urban renewal programs before it, been criticized for displacing the poor and for the unevenness of revitalization.
Economic conditions were still harsh: during the 1980s median income was half the city average, joblessness remained high and the number of Harlemnites receiving public assistance had grown from a third to nearly half (see Gill 2011: 423). Yet, while still by most standards among the most impoverished sections of the city and plagued with crime, deplorable health conditions and other social ills, Harlem with its stately brownstones, wide streets, strategic location and ready access to public transportation now was seen by many as being on the verge of a profound transformation. The long recession from 1989 to the mid 1990s, however, undercut Harlem's revitalization mid-stream and the notion of a prospective gentrified Harlem temporarily turned into a dead issue (see Hoffman 2003; Brash 2000).

The recession caused a sharp decline in tourism to the city as particularly the number of out-of-town visitors from other parts of the United States plummeted. Harlem politician David Dinkins, who became the city's first African American mayor in 1989, committed significant resources to Harlem during his four years in office as part of his effort to improve the conditions for poor and low-income New Yorkers, but local leaders, as in earlier boom-and-bust cycles in Harlem's history, were once again reminded how much Harlem's development was driven by outside forces such as the ups and downs in the US economy and New York's economy in particular. As a consequence many long-awaited projects deemed critical for Harlem's tourism infrastructure, such as the plan to build an international trade center and hotel on West 125th Street, once again were thwarted.

53 This took the form of some extension of social services (particularly health care) and housing development as well as the expansion of entrepreneurial opportunities through awarding "set-aside" contracts for "minority" or women-owned businesses.
First proposed in 1978 as a centerpiece of Harlem’s economic renewal and planned for a site bounded by 125th Street, 126th Street, Lenox Avenue and the eastern side of the State Office Building, the trade center was to include a massive hotel, retail and office space, a parking garage, a display arena and a convention hall. After languishing on the drawing board for almost two decades, it was finally abandoned in 1995 when newly elected State Governor George Pataki decided to cancel $64 million pledged to develop the project, citing numerous failed attempts in the years before to raise private capital (Pogebrin 1995). During economically harsh times, as Zukin (2010: 78) points out, many private investors apparently still lacked confidence that there was money to be made in Harlem.54

***

The prevailing sentiment among policy-makers in West Berlin for much of the 1970s meanwhile was not to market Kreuzberg but to radically transform a neighborhood whose social and physical characteristics were deemed unhealthy, out-dated and in need of massive urban renewal interventions (Düspohl 2009). In the Kottbusser Tor area in SO36, which was home to 37,022 people, official plans of West Berlin’s housing and construction department called for the demolition of 84 percent of the existing housing stock. Neither the city nor the district government initially devoted much attention to the potential value of the neighborhood’s historic building stock and evolving cultural life that their policies threatened to eradicate (Düspohl 2009: 123). Protests against local authorities’ brutal Kahlschlagsanierung (“slum clear-

54 Those leading the project would not accept Pataki’s explanation. Representative Charles B. Rangel, one of the project’s main drivers for decades, claimed Pataki’s decision to abandon the project to close the state’s budget gaps resulted from political bias, arguing that “(i)if this was happening in some other community that was strongly Republican, this would not be happening” (Pogrebin 1995).
ance”) on the part of citizen initiatives, leftist students, and housing activists were the result. The emergence of a powerful squatting movement as well as the Alternative Liste, which stood in strong opposition to the urban renewal practices and had close ties to the squatters, in the late 1970s put additional pressure on decision-makers. Planning professionals and architects worldwide also displayed a growing dissatisfaction with post-war urban renewal and modernist planning, while a series of problems additionally plagued existing policies. Most new housing was delayed, what had been completed was costly and unpopular and numerous construction scandals further discredited existing programs as well as those that had been promoting them.

The tensions and widespread discontent with the existing renewal efforts were also reflected in the citywide elections in 1975. The Social Democrats (SPD), who had previously governed the city with an absolute majority for almost twenty years, lost almost 8 percent of their votes, and many observers blamed the party’s shattered image in construction and housing policy for its poor performance. Forced to build a coalition with the liberal Free Democratic Party (FDP), the SPD subsequently gradually changed its course. The appointment of Harry Ristock, a progressive Social Democrat with good relations to citizen associations and activists, as the new coalition’s Senator for Construction and Housing (Senator für Bau- und Wohnungswesen) in 1975 reflected this change of heart. Ristock became a crucial ally for opponents of the city’s “tabula rasa” approach to urban renewal – not only in Kreuzberg but city-wide – and soon after coming into office replaced many of the existing modernist renewal policies with a more sensitive, participatory, and decentralized approach, based on the restoration of the urban fabric inherited from the 19th century – “cautious renewal” (Behutsame Stadterneuerung).
Supported by the local district administration, which from 1981 onwards was governed by the first-ever coalition between the SPD and the Alternative Liste, which only two years after its foundation had polled an impressive 16 percent of the votes in the district elections held in the same year, Ristock’s changed approach to urban renewal led to the implementation of numerous pilot projects in Kreuzberg. These were financed by the Senate and implemented through a high level of coordination between citizen initiatives, public authorities, social organizations, and private companies.

They culminated in the announcement to stage an “International Building Exhibition” (Internationale Bauausstellung, IBA) in West Berlin’s inner city, including Kreuzberg, between 1984 and 1987 (Miller 1993; Kraus and Wunderlich 1987; Couch et al. 2003). As part of the Building Exhibition dozens of previously squatted buildings in Kreuzberg were legalized, and numerous model projects involving the rehabilitation of old buildings and the construction of new ones to complement the existing urban fabric implemented, resulting in a profound transformation of (parts of) the community’s built environment.

The exhibition’s overall achievements were meanwhile contested. Some observers’ criticized the Exhibition’s focus on physical revitalization for failing to address the participating neighborhoods’ bleak socio-economic realities and setting the ground for rent increases and gentrification. Others described its emphasis on experimental, participatory approaches to neighborhood development and support of self-help and community-based rehabilitation as too limited in scope and deflecting attention away
from the need to more generally reform West Berlin’s technocratic top-down approach towards urban development.\textsuperscript{55} Such complaints were also widespread among local residents – and particularly the neighborhood’s squatting scene where protests against the city’s policies continued throughout the 1980s, reaching a peak on May Day 1987 when an initially peaceful rally turned into an (until then) unprecedented street riot (Düspohl 2009).

The IBA was well perceived particularly outside of the neighborhood, however, and from the perspective of the local government a huge success. At a total construction cost of approximately $1.8 billion, it made a significant impression on the neighborhoods within which it took place via an extensive contribution to the city's housing stock and infrastructure, resulting in the production of 3000 new housing units, 5500 renovated units, as well as numerous schools, day-care and youth centers and other infrastructural facilities (Miller 1993; Kraus and Wunderlich 1987; Couch et al. 2003).

Moreover the IBA brought West Berlin worldwide attention: In 1988, one year after the IBA’s official completion as part of the 750th anniversary of Berlin's founding, the \textit{New York Times} reported that “planners, architects and visitors from around the world (had come) to visit West Berlin” to see the “most complete realization of postmodernist planning ideas of the 1970's and early 80's” (Giovanni 1988: C12). For the local government the Building Exhibition – just as in 1957 when the Interbau was held in the city’s Tiergarten district - from the outset had been a marketing instrument. Miller (1993) suggests that the IBA existed indeed for the viewers as much as it did for the users of the projects that were realized: “A significant part of IBA’s insti-

\textsuperscript{55} For further details and critical insights on the IBA experience in Kreuzberg and subsequent renewal practices, see the contribution of Matthias Bernt (Bernt 2003).
tutional structure was dedicated to encouraging visits to the sites. Besides the countless bilingual publications analyzing IBA work, there were newspaper articles, books, maps and official tours that guided visitors through the IBA neighborhoods” (Miller 1993: 202). There can be little doubt that the International Building Exhibition indeed served as a tourist draw for neighborhoods like Kreuzberg. Even years after the official opening celebrations it would be impossible to visit IBA sites without encountering visitors with cameras and sketchbooks (Miller 1993: 202).

In addition to such grand projects, other developments also invited growing shares of tourists to the area. City authorities increasingly began to acknowledge Kreuzberg’s status as a “a cultural happening, a tourist destination and a sightseeing spot” (Suhr 1990: 238) which in part reflected general trends within urban tourism and place marketing practices world-wide, but was also owing to Berlin’s particular political and economic conditions. Selling Berlin had during the Cold War essentially become West Berlin’s main industry and what Berliners’ called “alternative culture” (Alternativkultur) became an important element of the city’s everyday life, identity, and image.

By the 1980s, in spite of the fact that the West Berlin economy continued to be heavily subsidized by the Federal government, it had become increasingly clear that the city needed to intensify efforts to attract capital investment in the growing sectors of the service economy and lure and retain a young workforce. An intensification of marketing and promotion efforts as well as, in line with developments elsewhere, “festivalization of urban policy” (Häußermann and Birkhuber 1993) ensued. The “street-courtyard culture” and urbanity of the Kiez (Till 2005: pp.45) - a typical Berlin
concept referring to a dense neighborhood of tenement blocks characterized by mix of uses, cultures and social groups and a strong social and cultural life – as well as the rich array of alternative scenes that inhabited them in this context came to be seen as unique, valuable features of the city to be capitalized upon (Colomb 2008). It was also for this reason that Kreuzberg, which in the course of the late 1970s and early 1980s had become (in-)famous across Germany and elsewhere as a byword for a unique blend of alternative lifestyles, multicultural scenes, leftist activism, young art and legendary nightlife, was increasingly domesticated into the official city image (Schütz and Siebenhaar 1996: 40; Lang 1998).

Particularly puzzling in light of the increasingly violent conflicts between the city’s establishment and parts of Kreuzberg’s leftist milieus was the lack of reservation on the part of some of Berlin’s elites. In fact this went to such lengths that the city’s mayor in the late 1980s wrote a forward to an alternative tour guide about Kreuzberg. As The New Yorker reported in 1988 with amazement, he gave “Oranienstrasse [a main artery of SO 36 and central hub of its countercultural and squatting scenes] his official imprimatur as a cultural happening, another one of Berlin’s amazing tourist attractions, like the restored Reichstag or Herbert von Karajan or the Wall” (Kramer 1988: 70).

Not that Kreuzberg would have needed much promotion. By the mid-1980s the neighborhood, as the The New Yorker’s correspondent put it, had become “the fantasy of half the teenagers in West (and East) Germany and on the European backpack circuit” and a flourishing industry of bars, pubs and nightclubs was prepared to cater to them. Additionally, a dense, publicly subsidized network of socio-cultural
institutions existed that over the years also became increasingly adept at creating venues or staging events that drew larger crowds from farther afield and in doing so made Kreuzberg - both in terms of its actual material conditions and its image - more and more attractive to tourists.

In Kreuzberg’s governance arena the development of tourism in the district meanwhile was looked at with ambiguity. Especially the growing number of tourists that were carried through the neighborhood in coach busses was considered a nuisance by many, and local politicians and activists of the neighborhood’s progressive urban social movements became increasingly convinced that a greater exposure of the community to tourism was not desirable.

The borough’s administration certainly approved of community-based cultural activities that aimed to develop alternative, positive images towards external visitors and by supporting and/or providing (socio-)cultural programs itself indeed was active in this regard. Significantly, however, such activities – festivals, exhibitions, and other events – remained until the late 1980s for the most part driven by other than economic goals. They were encouraged in the hope that they would yield positive results in terms of social integration, community-building, cross-cultural understanding etc., even while the cultural sector as a whole became more and more regarded as an increasingly important component of localized urban and economic development strategies. Programs thus continued to be less oriented to tourists than to the local population (Martin Düspohl, personal interview).
3. A RENAISSANCE AND A REUNIFICATION. HARLEM AND KREUZBERG IN THE 1990s

After the economic woes of the late 1980s and early 1990s, Harlem’s transformation by the mid-1990s gathered pace. New York City’s housing market once again kicked into high gear during this time and Harlem began feeling the pinch. Demand for affordable housing grew, middle-class property-seekers in growing numbers purchased and upgraded Harlem’s run-down but attractive stock of brownstones and other late 19th- and early 20th-century homes, and property developers - running out of real estate in lower Manhattan and frequently working with local development corporations such as that of the influential Abyssinian Baptist Church - also became increasingly active in the neighborhood. Soon, national and international magazines and newspapers fell over themselves heralding “Harlem’s comeback” (Siegal 1999) and in doing so added to the momentum the neighborhood was gaining. Without certain macro-level forces in place, this renewed economic investment in Harlem clearly would not have been possible, yet changing federal, state, and city policies along with the accumulated power of a new generation of entrepreneurial leadership in Harlem also were of utmost importance in setting Harlem’s transition in the course of the 1990s into motion (Smith 1996). Acknowledging this and exemplary of a string of reactions among national and international media outlets, Business Week reported enthusiastically in 1999:

Harlem is back, thanks to intense community efforts, Manhattan’s booming economy, and more than $550 million in government funds and tax incentives. These days, tourists and trend-setting young professionals shop in Harlem
boutiques and lunch in refurbished cafes. At night, taxis disgorge passengers from downtown at hot new clubs. After years of ignoring Harlem, Corporate America is discovering it, too (Brady 1999).

A significant role in changing the economic prospects of Harlem is in this context attributed to the election of Rudolph Giuliani as New York's mayor in 1993. A former prosecutor, Giuliani soon after beating incumbent Democrat David Dinkins introduced numerous, highly contentious tough-on-crime, “zero tolerance” policies that - rightly or wrongly - were credited for reducing New York's crime rate, improving the quality of life in previously crime-ridden neighborhoods and in doing so creating an important precondition for the subsequent development frenzy that ensued in many of them.56

Related to this and congruent with the more general shifts at the time towards neoliberal modes of governance, Giuliani also bolstered developments by aggressively advancing privatization, deregulation and social-welfare retrenchment, effectively dismantling much of the remainder of the city’s Keynesian welfarist tradition that had survived the reforms of previous administrations in the course of the 1970s and 1980s (Smith 1998; Weikart 2001). This happened in conjunction with changing attitudes towards housing development and the inner city on the federal and state levels. Both the Clinton administration and State Governor George Pataki, who was elected in 1995, were fierce advocates of homeownership, privatization and the use

56 It should also be mentioned that there are also many commentators who argue that Giuliani is wrongly credited for bringing crime down in New York as crime and specifically the city's homicide rate started its dramatic decline already while Dinkins was still in office. Furthermore, many of the reforms that helped reduce crime, such as the expansion of neighborhood patrols that increased the presence of police officers on New York's streets were indeed conceived and implemented by Giuliani's predecessor (see Bowling 1999).
of market forces to spur economic development and rebuild low-income inner-city neighborhoods. Influenced by policy experts such as Harvard economist Michael Porter and those associated with Porter’s “Initiative for a Competitive Inner City” (Porter 1995, 1998) the Clinton administration achieved enactment of the Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community program (EZ/EC) in 1993. The establishment of the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone (UMEZ) was the largest of a total of six urban Empowerment Zone initiatives nationwide under this program.$^{57}$

![Figure 12 Elected and appointed officials at the January 19, 1996 signing of the New York Empowerment Zone’s Memorandum of Understanding](image)

Referred to as “a third way antipoverty approach”$^{58}$ and seeking to revitalize the most impoverished parts of Upper Manhattan and the South Bronx with the help of a $300

---

$^{57}$ In a controversial, though highly influential article published in the *Harvard Business Review*, Porter asserted that past strategies of inner city economic development had failed because they mistakenly focused on the redistribution of wealth, instead of its creation. A sustainable economic base, he posited, could only be created through private for-profit initiatives and investment based on economic self-interest and competitive advantage.

$^{58}$ This is the subtitle of a 1999 *New Republic* article on the Empowerment Zone approach written by Manhattan Institute fellow Tamar Jacoby and urban theorist Fred Siegel.
millions of dollars in development fund and $250 million in tax incentives to be spent over a 10-year period, the establishment of the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone soon turned out to be something of a game changer for Harlem, both substantively as well as symbolically. It not only funneled millions of city, state, and federal dollars into the community but also, and arguably even more importantly, transformed the political climate of Harlem. Downtown business elites had long considered Harlem an extremely difficult terrain in which to do business because of fear of crime as well as the alleged disdain of outside interference and cronyism on the part (of parts) of its elites (see Hoffman 2003). With corporate leaders like Richard Parsons, the former president of Time Warner, Richard Kiley, the former chairman of the NYC Partnership, or former investment banker and city official Deborah Wright to name but a few holding leadership positions at the Empowerment Zone, corporate businesses and entrepreneurs from outside of the community now had people of their own kind to talk to - people that due to their professional background signaled that Harlem was “open for business” and constituted a safe and profitable place in which to invest.

In concert with state and city officials and drawing upon Michael Porter’s argument that inner-city neighborhoods should capitalize on their “true” competitive advantages in order to escape poverty and improve economic opportunities, UMEZ came forward with a three pronged, market-oriented development strategy. Emphasizing big business recruitment and retention, small business development, and workforce development it promised economic growth and employment in four key industries:

---

59 Of that pool, $50 million was designated for the Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation, leaving $250 million for investment in Upper Manhattan, i.e. East and Central Harlem, as well as parts of West Harlem and Washington Heights.

60 Legislation enacted in 2000 extended the Empowerment Zone’s operations through December 2009.
retail, health services, business services and entertainment and tourism (Gitell 2001: 81; Hoffman 2003). As regards the latter, UMEZ claimed that Harlem’s status as one of the world’s most famous communities positioned it to benefit from the city’s booming tourism industry. It found, however, that “numerous obstacles” prevented the local visitor economy from “realizing its full economic potential”, including particularly the lack of a cluster or critical mass of attractions, information, transportation and security deficiencies, as well as the community’s image as a dangerous neighborhood (UMEZ 2000: 27).

Identifying “destination building”, the improvement of the local tourism infrastructure as well as integration with New York City’s existing entertainment/tourism industry as key priorities, UMEZ subsequently embarked on various initiatives to overcome these obstacles and strengthen Harlem’s tourism and entertainment sector. In doing so, UMEZ in the years that followed emerged as a – if not the – key catalyst of tourism development in Harlem, both financially and organizationally. Doughing out more than $38 million on “tourism & cultural industry development” between 1996 and 1999 alone (UMEZ 2000:4), it steered marketing and promotion efforts, provided tax breaks, loans and grants to encourage the start-up or expansion of tourism-related businesses as well as local arts and culture groups; and (co-)financed various projects to

Figure 13 Diagram of UMEZ's “focus areas“ (UMEZ 2000: 27)
improve Harlem’s tourist infrastructure and restore or revive beloved cultural and historical attractions.

UMEZ was by no means successful with all of its projects. Rather, many of them, such as the plan to create a “Tourism Advisory Council” to coordinate tourism development or the idea to establish a “Visitor Center Network”, were either short-lived or failed to proceed beyond the planning stage. Moreover, UMEZ over the years failed to draw down and spend a large portion of the funds it had at its discretion. Repeated staff changes, misspending charges as well as political infighting among Albany, City Hall and Democratic Congressman Charles Rangel, who was a prime sponsor of the Empowerment Zone legislation in Congress, further hampered the implementation of Zone programs. Particularly during the first years of UMEZ’ operations, these travails tainted the agency’s reputation (Gitell 2001: pp.78), which was grist to the mill for conservative critics like Manhattan Institute fellow Tamar Jacoby and urban theorist Fred Siegel, to whom the Empowerment Zone approach involved too much “politics as usual” and too much bureaucracy to be truly efficient (Jacoby and Siegel 1999).

While UMEZ according to them – despite constituting a “clear improvement over Great Society liberalism” - stopped short of promoting a “truly market-based approach”, observers from the left also turned against UMEZ’ efforts. They deemed them to be too market-centered and not sufficiently comprehensive. Of particular concern to them was UMEZ’s deliberate emphasis on the attraction of outside capital and the development of larger, capital-intensive projects, which led several observers to proclaim that local businesses and entrepreneurs were left of out Harlem’s
economic rebirth. According to these critics UMEZ pursued a “somewhat Darwinian free-market approach … – only the strong survive and that’s the way it ought to be” (Kelley 2007: 68, see also Maurrasse 2006, Chinyelu 1999, Oakley and Tsao 2006). This charge is supported by the agency’s own numbers. Of the $115 million in loans approved by UMEZ between 1996 and 1999, $42 million fell under the heading of “Business Recruitment and Retention” — meaning that the funds went mostly to big projects like Harlem USA, a 285,000 square feet retail development located at the intersection of 125th Street and Frederick Douglass Boulevard. Owned by a consortium of three developers, one of them from the neighborhood and two from outside it, and drawing in such chain retailers as Old Navy, Nine West, HMV Records as well as the Magic Johnson Theaters, Harlem USA received a loan of more than $11 million — or 17 percent of its total costs, while “Small-Business Development” in the same time period accounted for only $18 million, or 16 percent of the $115 million in loans that UMEZ approved between 1996 and 1999. Moreover, many local entrepreneurs complained that UMEZ unfairly discouraged, delayed, or rejected applications for loans or grants and would charge interest rates that were too high to justify the borrowing (Dávila 2004; Keegan 2000; Saltonstall 2001).

UMEZ, for its part, responded to such charges by arguing that it was often hard to identify promising local businesses and that revitalizing Harlem required both local entrepreneurship and larger operators (Saltonstall 2001). Its critics countered by maintaining that UMEZ’ approach not only came at the expense of small businesses and Harlem’s most vulnerable population groups but was also devoid of any vision or

61 Similar explanations were also put forward in personal communications the author had with UMEZ representative Julia Lu who moreover emphasized that the share of loans and grants for local businesses substantially increased in later years of UMEZ’ operations.
appreciation for how special Harlem was. Says Michael Henry Adams, a historical preservationist and renown neighborhood activist (cited in Keegan 2000): “the whole notion of Harlem is this large collection of broken-down old buildings that ought to be swept away and replaced with something you might find in Paramus, N.J. That’s like taking Paris and just knocking it down.”

Perceived by many as a sort of shadow government, acting largely independent of community concerns or intentions, UMEZ was also from the beginning controversial among Harlem’s leaders. Voices emphasizing black ownership and control - which for decades had dominated Harlem’s political arena –clearly lost influence over the years, and many of the new leaders running the neighborhood’s development engines seem significantly less suspicious of outside investors and profit-centered approaches to urban and economic development than many of their predecessors (see Hoffman 2003: 293).

A fierce ally of the Empowerment Zone, the 125th Street Business Improvement District (BID) emerged in recent decades as another important player promoting tourism development. Founded in 1993 to replicate the successes of BIDs in promoting commercial districts further downtown in Times Square and the Grand Central area, the Harlem BID covered 125th Street between Morningside Avenue and 5th Avenue. The BID’s main aim is, as its president Barbara Askins (2004: 9) describes it, “to enable property owners, retailers and commercial tenants to enhance the business environment and to ensure a better quality of life for all residents and tourists visiting the area”. Promoting tourism development is in this context of particular interest to the BID, as increases in tourism promise to generate higher profits for its member
base. Thus, the business association since its establishment has initiated - or supported - a wide range of activities to improve 125th Street’s appearance and safety and boost consumer confidence. Moreover, it regularly supports various cultural events and community celebrations and clearly established itself as a vocal voice in discussions surrounding Harlem’s future more generally as well as tourism development in particular. For this reason, almost all my informants, when asked about critical players in Harlem’s governance and development arena, would refer to the BID rather than formal government institutions such as the Community Board and elected officials. Just like UMEZ, it is perceived by many as a “shadow government” of sorts that exerts widespread and substantial influence but operates largely outside the formal decision-making structures and in doing so can evade responsibility for controversial development decisions.

As a consequence, tensions and conflicts with residents and community activists are common. Only months after its formation the BID became involved in the long-simmering controversy over the increasing number of – mostly unlicensed - street vendors who had set up tables on 125th Street to sell African or African-American-themed artifacts, souvenirs, food, cassette tapes, and books. A major attraction for shoppers from other parts of New York City and beyond, many of these merchants came from West Africa and the Caribbean after the United States changed its migration laws in 1985. They were a nuisance to many BID members, who contended that they would choke the main thoroughfare, litter the street with debris, trade with pi-
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62 Unfortunately neither Barbara Askins nor one of her colleagues were available for an interview.

63 For a full discussion of Business Improvement Districts and issues of public-private responsibility and accountability see: Gross 2005 or Ward 2007; for a discussion of the “Empowerment Zone” concept see Giteell 2001
rated and even stolen goods, and create unfair competition to existing storefront businesses.

Consequently, the BID was one of the most vocal advocates of the street vendors’ removal carried out in October 1994. The Giuliani administration sent hundreds of police officers to 125th Street to clear the thoroughfare, and people were arrested as scuffles broke out between the street vendors and officers (Hicks 1994). Subsequently, the vendors were relocated to two vacant lots at Lenox Avenue between 116th and 117th Street, an area owned by the Malcolm Shabazz Mosque and largely off the Harlem tourist circuit. Many community leaders, including the Reverend Al Sharpton, attacked the BID for privileging the rights of business owners over those of street vendors, and diminishing the street-fair atmosphere that was part of 125th Street’s (tourist) appeal (see Gates 1997). The BID and other local actors such as the newly established Harlem Business Alliance (HBA), supporting the city’s decision to take action against the street vendors, meanwhile maintained that congestion, unfair competition, parking problems, as well as filth and noise all constituted severe problems.

They had to be addressed to help 125th Street businesses and ultimately undo the devastation of earlier periods of abandonment and bring back the street’s former glory as a unique commercial strip. This dispute reached a tragic crescendo on December 8, 1995 with the killing of seven people at Freddy’s Fashion Mart on 125th Street following the racially charged controversies surrounding the planned eviction of the Record Shack, a black-owned store that had been a sub-tenant of the Jewish-owned fashion store. In retrospect it exemplifies tensions that had long simmered in
Harlem’s political and civic arena and that now came more and more to the surface as Harlem’s transition progressed.

At its core lay not least fundamental disagreements about 125th Street’s future – as well as Harlem’s future development more generally. Stakeholders like the 125th Street BID, HBA, UMEZ as well as various other influential players like the Chamber of Commerce or the not-for-profit Harlem Commonwealth Council, which controls several key properties along 125th Street, believed that 125th Street, just as Harlem more generally, required larger investments. By this they meant commercial investment from outside the community that in their opinion was discouraged by the chaos and anarchy street vendors were accused of spreading. They regarded the presence of the vendors along with the lack of chain and anchor stores as remainders of past
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At its core lay not least fundamental disagreements about 125th Street's future – as well as Harlem's future development more generally. Stakeholders like the 125th Street BID, HBA, UMEZ as well as various other influential players like the Chamber of Commerce or the not-for-profit Harlem Commonwealth Council, which controls several key properties along 125th Street, believed that 125th Street, just as Harlem more generally, required larger investments. By this they meant commercial investment from outside the community that in their opinion was discouraged by the chaos and anarchy street vendors were accused of spreading. They regarded the presence of the vendors along with the lack of chain and anchor stores as remainders of past
decades of economic ghettoization. Progress in their opinion required promoting both “legitimate” local entrepreneurship within Harlem’s community and also luring outside investment and corporate projects with high-quality services and stores to Harlem’s long under-served commercial strips.

Many residents and community activists, while not necessarily denying that some big stores with decent prices and quality food shopping were indeed lacking, meanwhile claimed that Harlem’s informal activity and mom-and-pop culture were worth protecting. They attacked leaders for selling Harlem to community outsiders instead of addressing other problems troubling Harlem’s business landscape such as the community’s pervasive unemployment and lack of spending power as well as the insufficient availability of low-interest loans for minority-owned businesses.

This conflict intensified over the years as branches of Pathmark, HMV, Starbucks, the Disney Store, Old Navy, Magic Theaters and other national franchises bit by bit made their appearance on 125th Street. Significantly, business owners too are divided over this issue, with some arguing that bringing in more chain stores would not only work to the detriment of small businesses by driving up rents and forcing smaller competitors out of business but also – in the long-run - could harm Harlem’s appeal as a destination. “Many of the new stores on 125th Street really don’t offer anything you can’t find Downtown, I don’t think that they are the reasons why tourists are coming”, said Clara Villarosa, the founder and former owner of Hue-Man Books, adding that Harlem now found itself at the center of a global economy and that more needed to be done to preserve what gave Harlem its uniqueness and help local en-
trepreneurs to stay competitive and accommodate new trends and clientele (Clara Villarosa, personal Interview).

Located in the above-mentioned Harlem USA complex and one of the country's largest book stores specializing in black history and culture, Hue-Man Books meanwhile serves as a testament that individually owned stores are also playing a big part in Harlem's commercial revival. Its opening in 2002 was made possible by a low-interest loan from UMEZ yet this does not prevent Villarosa from voicing criticism about the agency's operations. "I've never felt like a poster child", she says, but concedes that in retrospect she would understand those who claim that Hue-Man Books as a successful black enterprise played precisely this role for an institution that failed to do enough for business owners living and working in the community.

"Not enough" is certainly also what many local businesses felt citywide institutions were doing for the most part of the 1990s and early 2000s to promote tourism in Upper Manhattan. Rather they were seen as conducting what Gross (2009: pp.24) called a "world city approach" in which mega projects, iconic architecture, and privately led, publicly supported developments dominated development strategies. The Koch, Dinkins and Giuliani administrations, as Gross (2009: 25) points out, all approached tourism promotion within a framework of mass tourism and left it, in spite of occasional rhetoric suggesting otherwise, largely to the Manhattan business community to author and guide the city's tourism policy. Its organized bodies – most notably New York's Convention & Visitors Bureau, meanwhile had neither the interest nor the resources required for concerted action to promote communities like Central
Harlem and it was only in the second half of the 2000s for reasons that will be discussed later that this would change.

***

With the collapse of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and subsequent reunification of the city in 1990 Kreuzberg more or less overnight lost its isolated status at the periphery of West Berlin and found itself back in the city center. Soon, worries about a sudden revalorization to the detriment of long-time residents, particularly of SO36, escalated, but in the first years after the city’s reunification surprisingly little development occurred. With most attention – and investments - citywide directed at the city’s historic center and neighborhoods in former East Berlin surrounding it, Kreuzberg - apart from a few loft and attic conversions and the opening of a number of pricier bars and restaurants here and there - saw little investment.

The much-feared gentrification of SO36 did not take place. Instead Kreuzberg’s socio-economic conditions worsened as Berlin, after a short-lived period of euphoria right after 1989, experienced a sharp economic downturn (Düspohl 2009: 149). Predictions that Berlin would regain its status as a leading world city and major economic center did not materialize and the expected relocation of major German and international companies to the city did not occur. The breakdown of East and West Berlin’s previously state-subsidized industrial base in the course of the early 1990s had a profound impact on the employment situation of Kreuzberg’s (working class) population. At the same time outmigration added to the neighborhood's woes as middle-class families relocated to suburbs near Berlin or to “new” neighborhoods in
former East Berlin and young professionals, students, artists and other “alternative” residents also moved away in large numbers. They moved to neighborhoods in former East Berlin like Mitte, Prenzlauer Berg and Friedrichshain, which offered cheap and attractive housing and quickly turned into new hubs of the city’s subcultural scenes. Greater economic distress and a higher concentration of disadvantaged groups was the consequence (Bernegg 2005; Cochrane and Jonas 1999).

In addition, Kreuzberg’s regained position in Berlin’s geographic center in the first years after the fall of the Wall did not translate into more attention on part of the city’s urban planning and development realm either. Rather, planners and policymakers’ attention was overwhelmingly directed at the city’s historic center and its adjacent neighborhoods in former East Berlin and a significant share of the resources that had previously been allocated to the district’s regeneration was diverted to finance the redevelopment of Berlin’s eastern districts (Düspohl 2009: 151; Bernt 2003). The “no mans lands” alongside the Wall and particularly areas bordering Berlin’s historic center Mitte were included in the city’s planning efforts to redevelop the city center and saw their share of real estate speculative activities, but Kreuzberg as a whole remained largely unaffected by the (short-lived) real estate boom and associated planning frenzy which characterized reunified Berlin in the years after the Wall fell.

Also, tourism was in this context at first, if anything, of secondary importance to policy makers. Major decisions about the city’s future development had to be made, the reunification of the city government had to be organized, and the German parliament’s decision to move the government seat from Bonn back to Berlin compounded the daunting challenges officials found themselves confronted with even further. Po-
Politically, tourism first became a topic of discussion in 1992. In the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the Berlin Wall, tourism numbers had skyrocketed as reams of visitors from all over the globe flocked into the city to sense a whiff of the festive atmosphere that engulfed Berlin as world history unfolded (Nerger 1998: 814). Already by 1991, visitor numbers and revenue began to decline, however, which led policy makers in the city-state’s parliament, members of Berlin’s tourism industry as well as the city’s Chamber of Commerce called for measures to stem the tide and put the tourism sector back on the growth track.

The main issue under discussion was the perceived need to re-organize and strengthen the city’s tourism marketing activities (see Colomb 2008). At the time tourism marketing was still managed by two public sector organization – the **Fremdenverkehrsamt** and the **Informationszentrum Berlin** – and the ruling grand coalition (**Große Koalition**) of Christian Democrats (CDU) and Social Democrats (SPD) as well as members of Berlin’s tourism and hospitality sector were in agreement with one another that a greater involvement of the private sector was needed in order to develop a more effective and up-to-date tourism marketing. As a consequence, the decision was made to dissolve the two organizations that had previously dealt with the tourism promotion of West Berlin and replace them with a new public-private partnership organization - the **Berlin Tourismus Marketing GmbH** (BTM). Set up in 1993 as a company under private law and later renamed “visitberlin”, the BTM was established to fulfill two main roles: that of a service agency for its partners in the
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64 The term **Große Koalition** refers in Germany to coalitions between the country’s two biggest political parties (the SPD and the CDU). Led by the Christian Democrat Eberhard Diepgen as the city’s mayor, these two parties shared power in Berlin throughout the 1990s before the SPD left the coalition in the wake of a multi-million Euro corruption scandal in 2001 and following a short interim government with the Green Party and new elections – formed a coalition with the Socialist Party **Die Linke** (formerly known as PDS).
tourism industry, and that of an active broker for the travel industry and for tourists and travelers to Berlin (see Colomb 2008: 143). With this step, Berlin’s policy makers created a key element of the organizational structure that would shape the city’s marketing activities for years to come. This organizational structure was completed in 1994 when a second marketing company named Partner für Berlin - Gesellschaft für Hauptstadtkartmarketing ("Partner for Berlin - Company for Capital City Marketing") was created. Also set up as a public-private partnership commissioned to work in close collaboration with, but independently from, the Berlin Senate, Partner für Berlin became responsible for the marketing of Berlin as Germany’s new capital city as well as the enhancement of its image as a business location and from 1994 onwards launched a cornucopia of projects and programs to sell the positive attributes of Berlin to the world.

To several scholars the creation of these two companies – the BTM and Partner für Berlin - both exemplified and contributed to a more general shift in governance and urban development within which place marketing and, along with it, tourism promotion became a cornerstone of urban policy (see i.a. Colomb 2008, Häußermann and Colomb 2003). Concerned with the emergence of new governance arrangements following the city’s reunification as well as the rise and diffusion of urban entrepreneurialism as the new dominant policy strategy, Häußermann and Colomb (2003) indeed even speculated about the emergence of a public-private “tourism coalition” engaging in various activities to promote the city as a destination and reorganize its urban landscape according to the needs of visitors and the tourist industry. But despite this place marketing, tourism advertising and forms of “image making” in the immediate post-reunification period ascribed if anything less importance to Kreuz-
berg and its associated qualities than in the years before. Instead, as Colomb (2008) in her analysis on place-marketing in the 1990s has argued, the city’s policy-makers and promotion experts overwhelmingly focused their attention on the positioning of Berlin as an aspiring global (or at least) European service metropolis; a fresh, non-threatening capital city of reunited Germany, and a “traditional” European metropolis displaying classical “European” urban virtues of urbanity, density, livability and cosmopolitanism. Along with imagery of Berlin’s historic center, particularly new, frequently not even completed urban development and flagship projects such as Potsdamer Platz or the redeveloped Reichstag moved center stage in the city’s marketing and promotion efforts.

In a sense then, the motto *Das Neue Berlin* (“The New Berlin”), a 1920s phrase that was adopted as a marketing slogan in the mid-1990s by the city’s governing grand coalition and *Partner für Berlin*, succinctly captured the development and marketing emphases of the time (Colomb 2008). The focus rested on a radical re-imagining; a reimagining with the stated aim to enhance Berlin’s image as a “leading, competitive, future-oriented and international metropolis” (Partner für Berlin 1998) and within which not only Kreuzberg but the city’s Kieze more generally along with their associated qualities, at least at first, played next to no role.

The focus of the BTM’s efforts was similar. Whereas its predecessors in West Berlin had from the late seventies onwards begun to integrate the city’s Kiez-based qualities and particularly Kreuzberg’s tourist appeal into its campaigns (Siebenhaar and Schütz 1998; see discussion above), the dominant promotional message of the BTM in the first years of its existence largely refrained from such “experiments”. Set within
the wider objectives of urban development and place marketing of the time, its activities instead were geared toward a conventional, mainstream tourism. Accordingly, its promotion activities were almost exclusively focused on Berlin’s historic monuments and new architecture, traditional venues and symbols of mainstream culture, large events, as well as the city’s vast natural and recreational amenities. There was a clear spatial focus on the city’s most central districts: Mitte, the nucleus of the city, center of former East Berlin, and administrative, commercial, and governmental heartland of the “New Berlin”; and the “City West”, former West-Berlin’s center around the transport hub “Zoologischer Garten” which during the city’s division had become the main location for West Berlin’s hotel industry (Novy and Huning 2009).

References to geographically, culturally and/or socially peripheral spaces meanwhile were, in the initial years of the BTM’s promotional campaigns rare, even if selected “marketable” qualities originating from them detached from their respective spatial context at times found their way into the organization’s promotion lyrics and image building efforts. Asked about the reason for the BTM’s heavy emphasis on the central city and conventional attractions, BTM representatives explained that this focus was a reflection of tourists’ interests and needs and that the organization particularly during the first years of its operations had only limited financial resources (Gerhard Buchholz, personal interview). Other informants in the course of my research suggested that the BTM’s marketing focus was first and foremost a reflection of the disproportionate influence of the city’s tourism and hospitality industry, which until recently was mostly active in the city’s central areas, on the company’s activities.65 No-
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65 As of 2009, hotels held 40 percent of the BTM’s shares. Other shareholder included: the Investitionsbank Berlin (25 percent), the State of Berlin (15 percent), the Messe Berlin GmbH (5 percent), Berlin Airports (10 percent) and TMB Tourismus-Marketing Brandenburg GmbH (5 percent) (see Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Frauen 2009). Moreover, representatives of the city’s tourism and hospitality sector have also been dominant on the company’s boards.
tably, as regards the particular case of Kreuzberg, not even established events or destinations like the bi-weekly and hugely popular *Markt am Maybachufer* or the annual *Karneval der Kulturen* (“Carnival of Cultures”) initially found place in the city’s tourism promotion.66
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**Figure 15 Berlin's Karneval der Kulturen (“Carnaval of Cultures“)**

Currently in the sixteenth year of its existence and gathering together community and minority groups, cultural initiatives, youth centers and other non-profit associations for what today represents one of the largest celebrations of its kind continent-wide, the multi-ethnic street parade celebrated on Pentecost weekend, the Carnival today attracts several hundred thousands of spectators and represents Kreuzberg’s largest

66 Strictly speaking located in neighboring Neukölln and often referred to as Berlin’s “Turkish market”, the *Markt am Maybachufer* offers everything from fruits, vegetables, fish, meats, spices, cheese, flowers and plants to clothes, household goods and appliances and draws twice a week thousands of customers to the banks of the Landwehrkanal between Kreuzberg and Neukoelln. According to a 2004 study 60 percent of its customer base is made up of visitors not from the area (see Bezirksamt Neukölln von Berlin 2004).
regular event (Nadja Mau, personal interview). Its long-time neglect by tourism promoters meanwhile can be interpreted as evidence that Berlin’s tourist boosters – as well as, the city at large – have had difficulties in coming to terms with Berlin’s de facto multicultural character and emerging intercultural realities. While the BTM throughout its existence was anxious to sharpen Berlin’s image as a cosmopolitan metropolis that is “weltoffen”, i.e. “open to the outside world”, it did not regard Berlin’s migrant communities and (multi-)ethnic scenes as an asset big enough to build upon. This is supposedly because “other cities are more multicultural than Berlin” (Soysal 2007: 40), yet arguably also because of the more general ambivalence in attitudes in the city towards issues related to immigration and multiculturalism.

The emergence of city areas like parts of Kreuzberg in which so-called minority cultures have come or are about to represent the majority of the population causes misgivings (Bockmeyer 2006). This ambiguity, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, persists even if the Carnival itself has in recent years found its place on the event calendar of the BTM as well as the city’s first comprehensive tourism concept (Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologien und Frauen 2004) which was published in March 2004 by the city government in conjunction with the BTM and has since then been actively promoted.

Significantly this increased incorporation into the city’s tourism trade is not unreservedly welcomed by the organization responsible for the Carnival of Cultures, Werkstatt der Kulturen (Nadja Mau, personal Interview). Strictly located in neighboring Neukölln, the non-profit organization instead attaches great importance to the event’s cultural integrity and educational purpose and sees a danger in its commodi-
fication and commercialization. Such concerns reflect a more general sentiment in Kreuzberg that persisted throughout the 1990s and arguably explain the notable absence of efforts to boost tourism in the community at the time on the part of the district’s administration and other stakeholders in the district’s governance arena. While several high-profile developments, including Daniel Liebeskind’s acclaimed Jewish Museum, were built during this period at the district’s fringes, tourism as a policy concern – for instance to support the neighborhood’s economy – remained only of peripheral interest to authorities on the district level (Dr. Peter Beckers, personal interview).

4. AT THE CROSS ROADS – HARLEM AND KREUZBERG 2000-2010

By the beginning of the new millennium, New York City was widely perceived to be in the midst of a veritable boom. While the city’s financial sector played a significant role in raising economic activity in the city, other key sectors such as new media, healthcare, real estate, entertainment and tourism also contributed importantly to the city’s economic growth. Reaching new heights almost year after year, particularly tourism during the late 1990s and 2000s experienced a period of rapid and sustained growth. Even in the aftermath of September 11th 2001 tourism was able to rebound within eighteen months of the terrorist attack and in 2008 an estimated 47 million people came to visit – more than ever in the city’s history.
Harlem meanwhile reported some 800,000 visitors in 2000 according to a survey commissioned by the Empowerment Zone (Audience Research & Analysis 2000) – a number that, while only capturing unique visitors coming by tour buses or visiting cultural destinations - for the first time provided local stakeholders with solid empirical evidence that there was a market for tourism in Uptown Manhattan whose potential could possibly be expanded with more financial and institutional support (Julia Lu, personal Interview). The neighborhood’s crime rate, which had long constituted a main reason for community outsiders to dismiss the idea of promoting Harlem or investing in the community, had fallen rapidly for years and continued to decline. Vacant properties and blighted buildings gave way to new construction, while growth in entertainment services, which accounted for just 5 percent of jobs in 1991 but 10 percent in 2000, had brought new vibrancy to the community in the form of clubs, restaurants, galleries and boutiques. When former President Bill Clinton announced in 2001 that his office would move to 125th Street, many considered this a final confirmation that the neighborhood was well on its way towards shaking off the doldrums of previous decades of neglect and indeed was increasingly reintegrated into the city - economically, physically and otherwise. Similarly considered a milestone by many was the multi-million dollar restoration of the Apollo Theater as well as the opening there of Harlem Song, a Broadway-like musical chronicling Harlem's history through song, dance, and film. Its premiere was well-received at the landmarked theater in mid-2002 and was soon praised inside and outside of the community for bringing visitors Uptown who would usually not make the trek to Harlem, raising awareness that culture and entertainment indeed could serve as potent economic generators. All the greater was the shock when the musical, instead of becoming a multi-annual

67 Conducted by Audience Research & Analysis (ARA), the survey was the first-ever visitor count study of Upper Manhattan and, unfortunately, has not been repeated since.
engagement as initially planned, had to close after only a few months at the end of 2002 due to financial reasons (Pogrebin 2002b). Significantly, in trying to explain the play’s economic woes, its creators besides citing a lack of money for marketing also claimed that “psychological barrier(s)” prevented many theater goers from coming Uptown. George C. Wolfe, the show’s producer, told a reporter shortly before the play closed: “People are still getting over the fact of going up to Harlem. … Hopefully, Manhattan can keep expanding its definition of what comprises Manhattan” (in Pogrebin 2002a).

Leaving the question aside whether reservations about venturing Uptown truly constituted a reason for the musical’s economic difficulties, its ultimate failure clearly left many stakeholders disappointed and constituted a severe setback to their efforts to strengthen Harlem’s position in New York’s economic and cultural landscape. Moreover, some voices inside and outside of the community saw Harlem Song’s failure as exemplifying a more general pattern of disappointments and missteps, arguing that Harlem’s contested political environment and lack of coherent leadership all too often had caused promising projects to fail in the past that had previously been touted as ushering in a new era for Harlem. Exemplary of this position is a report by the Center for an Urban Future (CUF) (2002: 31) on local cultural and economic development in which Harlem is described as a community with an incredible number of cultural assets and institutional resources that unfortunately “at times” finds itself “stuck in a dynamic of discord”.

Recognizing that historically a combination of adverse economic factors and social ills, largely stemming from racial discrimination, was the prime cause for Harlem’s
woes, CUF found that efforts to better capitalize upon Harlem’s wealth of cultural resources were hampered by an “absence of collaboration” between Harlem’s numerous community development, business and cultural organizations such as the Abyssinian Development Corporation; the Harlem Congregations for Community Improvement (HCCI), the Upper Manhattan Chamber of Commerce, the 125th Street Business Improvement District, the Harlem Arts Alliance (HAA), the Apollo Theater Foundation, Aaron Davis Hall, the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, or The Studio Museum as well the community’s political leaders such as (former) State Senator David Paterson, Assemblyman Keith Wright, or Congressman Charles Rangel.

Though not without its problems as it could easily be read as an attempt to shift responsibility to where it doesn’t belong and distract attention from forces outside of the community that have historically prevented Harlem from thriving, this point of view is also frequently put forward by locals when discussing the state of tourism policy in the area. There have been efforts to address this issue to be sure, the most notable being the establishment of the “Harlem Strategic Cultural Collaborative” (HSCC) in the late 1990s which represented an attempt of several Harlem-based institutions (including the Studio Museum, the Dance Theater of Harlem and the Harlem Boys Chorus) to pool expertise and resources. Such efforts notwithstanding, rivalry and unhealthy competition rather than cooperation and collaboration are typically emphasized in conversations about the increasingly complex web of actors and institutions dealing with tourism on the local level – thus, as Gross (2009: 33) suggests, a “more divided political environment might be the best descriptor for this area’s tourism politics.”
Notably, no single person, institution, group or coalition, as is frequently the case in less diverse and pluralistic communities, controls or channels discussions on its own and dominates the political process. Generally a platform for both controversial discussions and consensus seeking on neighborhood affairs, the local community board, supposedly the formal institution of neighborhood democracy within New York’s municipal government structure,\(^{68}\) never took on this role – and arguably never was in the position to do so. UMEZ, which early on had expressed its ambition to become “both an architect and catalyst” of a comprehensive tourism initiative to couple Harlem’s wealth of resources with organized economic development (UMEZ 2000: 27), also failed to live up to these ambitions.

UMEZ’s Tourism Committee, one of four of subcommittees of the organization’s Board of Directors, like the organization more generally, showed little interest in bringing together Harlem’s stakeholders. The organization’s Cultural Investment Fund, which was set up in 1998 for “strategic investments to stimulate production, increase audiences, create jobs, and realize the economic benefits of heritage tourism in Harlem” (UMEZ 2000: 34), spent most of its $25 million grant and loan fund to support investments in physical infrastructure like the Apollo Theater’s renovation. The Museum for African Art received $2.7 and $2.5 million respectively towards its relocation to the Harlem area, and individual projects and programs devoted to culture, heritage, and the arts such as the Lenox Lounge, RAICES Archive of Latin Mu-
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\(^{68}\) In NYC’s decentralized political system the city’s five boroughs are divided into 59 community districts, each with its own community board which function as local planning bodies and serve in an advisory role on issues like: long-term community planning, land use and zoning matters as well as the allocation of city funds in their districts. They officially became part of the city’s political system in 1961 in an attempt to create “competing legitimate entities to neighborhood party organization(s)” (Katznelson 1981: 142).
sic (in East Harlem) and the Studio Museum also received assistance. Strategic
planning and capacity-building efforts were – judged on the funding provided for
them – of rather secondary importance. Some efforts were put into marketing. They
included the partnering with the city’s tourism bureau, now renamed NYC & Com-
pany, as well as other local as well as state actors to establish a Visitor Information
Kiosk located in the plaza of the New York State Office Building on 125th Street and
Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. Blvd which opened in 2003; the launch of a marketing
campaign named “Swing Uptown” which was introduced in early 2004, as well as, in
2007, a $250,000 two-year grant for Harlem One Stop, a destination marketing or-
ganization for Upper Manhattan to help continue its marketing and tourism promotion
activities in Upper Manhattan (UMEZ 2007).

Co-financed by JP Morgan Chase, a leading global financial services firm deeply
involved in Uptown real estate, the visitor kiosk, as even stakeholders conceded off
record, would soon after its opening run into numerous problems.\(^69\) They only
seemed resolved after a fresh start in 2009 when the kiosk was relocated to the Stu-
dio Museum, an arguably much better location. This notwithstanding, the kiosk’s
opening in 2003 still marked an important moment for local tourism boosters in gen-
eral and UMEZ in particular as the kiosk fitted well to the organization’s self-declared
goal to better integrate Harlem with New York City’s existing entertainment/tourism
industry as well as the economy at large. During the ribbon-cutting ceremony, Har-
lem heavyweights like Congressman Charles Rangel, Lloyd Williams, President of
the Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce, as well as Ken Knuckles, the then
president and CEO of the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone to name but a few

\(^{69}\) During numerous fieldwork visits of the author in 2006 and 2007 the kiosk either failed to have even the most
basic information materials available or was closed altogether.
were joined by numerous representatives of the business world and city- and state officials. All of them emphasized the importance of tourism development for Harlem and significance of Harlem for tourism citywide in their ceremonial remarks.

Among the ribbon-cutters were Governor George E. Pataki as well as two key players that both were still relatively new in their leadership positions and both represented institutions that – at least in part due to their efforts – would soon play a critical role in developments to come: Daniel L. Doctoroff, who served as deputy mayor for economic development and rebuilding under Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg from 2001 through 2007; and Jonathan Tisch, the new Chairman of the city’s official tourism marketing agency and convention and visitors bureau NYC & Company which was formed in 1999 as the result of a merger of the New York Convention & Visitors Bureau with New Yorkers for New York, a business group supporting the hospitality industry and major events such as the Olympics. In praising the occasion, Doctoroff made clear that the kiosk only constituted a first step in a larger process: “Harlem has a tremendous story to tell the world, and this kiosk will play a large part in connecting visitors from around the globe and throughout the five boroughs to its vibrant culture and history. …The Bloomberg administration is committed to working with all of its partners to develop creative ways to spur tourism throughout the five boroughs, and this effort is a demonstration of our commitment to coming up with new ways to achieve those goals and the neighborhood’s dreams” (cited in NYC & Company 2003).

At the city level, the election of Michael R. Bloomberg in 2002 as mayor certainly turned out to be a dream come true for the city’s tourism and entertainment industry.
His predecessors had already, as was discussed, paid heightened attention to the sector and recognized its symbolic and economic significance, yet it was particularly under his leadership that the development of tourism would truly move center stage. The temporary shut-down of the city’s tourism industry after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 plainly and painfully demonstrated the industry’s central role for the city’s wider economy, and Bloomberg soon after taking office implemented several initiatives to revive and expand what he would later describe as “the backbone of [New York City’s] local economy” (Office of the Mayor 2006a). This support of tourism tied to broader efforts to overhaul the city’s infrastructure, boost market-rate development across the five boroughs, and enhance New York’s status as a world-class, high-amenity city.

Often linked to the administration’s “five borough” economic development strategy (Office of the Mayor 2006b) and realized in concern with the city’s private elites, the Bloomberg’s administration as well as public agencies under its watch thus launched numerous large-scale development projects with a strong tourism and leisure component, rezoned unprecedented amounts of “underutilized” land for new commercial development and recreation, and increased funding for tourism and attention attracting events and cultural projects throughout the city. In addition and at least as important, Bloomberg initiated a profound overhaul and expansion of the city’s tourism marketing activities. Prior to Bloomberg’s taking action NYC & Company had been a (quasi-)private organization of relatively modest means that was mainly financed by dues collected from its members and primarily committed to serving their interest. Committed to luring 50 million visitors a year by 2015, Bloomberg merged the organization with two other marketing entities - NYC Big Events and NYC Marketing -
and tripled the city's contribution to the annual marketing budget, to $22 million, in an effort to, as Bloomberg put it, create “the world's leading municipal tourism, marketing, and events organizations” (Office of the Mayor 2006b).

Equipped with additional financial resources and now effectively controlled by the city, NYC & Company in subsequent years evolved from being an organization that primarily promoted the interests of its members to an organization working on behalf of the Mayor’s office. Along with this reorganization, Bloomberg also pushed for changes with regard to NYC & Company’s operations. A two-tiered approach was developed, emphasizing New York’s image as “luxury city” of high-end consumption on the one, as well as the city’s cultural diversity and funkier sides on the other hand (see Greenberg 2010: 118). These shifts overlapped with intensified efforts to encourage urban economic development outside of Manhattan’s core and became over the years also noticeable with respect to NYC & Company’s approach to tourism in Harlem. As part of NYC & Company’s newly launched "This is New York City" campaign, the neighborhood figured prominently in television commercials featuring a contemporary version of Ella Fitzgerald’s classic “Take the A Train” (Office of the Mayor of New York City 2007) and the organization’s “Official Visitor Map”, which in previous editions - like most other tourist maps - had either omitted Harlem or snipped off at least parts of the neighborhood (from anywhere between 96th and 125h Streets), now covered the entire community. Programs like the annual “Harlem for the Holidays” promotion, launched in 2007 in cooperation with local organizations, also illustrated that Harlem indeed was increasingly on the radar of NYC & Company and promoted accordingly. A growing local membership base both contributed to and resulted from this: by 2004 membership of Harlem-based business
had increased “from a handful of businesses” to “about 50” and by 2010 several more members had joined (Fickenscher 2004; Townsend, personal interview).

NYC & Company Harlem-based members include institutional actors like UMEZ, established businesses like Sylvia’s and the Apollo, as well as a growing number of new restaurants, bars, and other tourism-oriented businesses. Hotels meanwhile were not among them until 2010 for the simple reason that no hotels of average or higher standards able to serve a large flow of visitors existed in Central Harlem. In August 2010, however, when a branch of Starwood’s budget brand “Aloft” opened its doors on 124th Street. It was the first new hotel in Harlem in more than 40 years, which caused its opening to carry a certain symbolic significance. For decades ambi-

Figure 16 “Harlem for the Holidays” (Brochure Cover)
tious hotel developments plans had created buzz in the community but ultimately never materialized – the latest prominent example being “Harlem Park”, a $236 million development project featuring a large Marriott Hotel which, three years after a groundbreaking ceremony featuring both the Mayor and the Governor in 2003, was silently scrapped in 2006.

Harlem’s lack of hotels had long constituted a major obstacle to the development of tourism in the community and was frequently cited as a reflection of the ongoing wariness towards Harlem among hoteliers who for years preferred to venture into non-traditional hotel destinations in the Outer Boroughs rather than build Uptown (Fickenscher 2004). Although at least in part owing to the New York-wide demand for new hotels that resulted from the city’s ongoing tourism boom and lacking avail-
ability of undeveloped and affordable land in Mid- and Downtown Manhattan, the new hotel illustrated that Harlem’s integration into the city’s wider tourism and leisure economy had made a significant leap forward. Indeed, with a company like Starwood entering and other national and international players about to enter the Harlem market, it seems not to be too farfetched to argue that the community’s integration is nearing its completion. Contributing to this upsurge of hotel development activity – both in direct as well as indirect terms - is also the rezoning of 125th Street which was first proposed in the early 1990s and finally approved in the summer of 2008. Highly contested and a centerpiece of Mayor Bloomberg’s extensive physical and economic development efforts, it allows for increased density, more mixed-use, residential and commercial properties, taller buildings and more cross-town transportation. According to both proponents and opponents of the plan, it represents one of the biggest changes to Harlem of the past century and is likely to dramatically affect the character of the neighborhood in the years to come (Michael Henry Adams, personal Interview; see also Tucker 2007).

***

Berlin, in spite of the poor performance of its economy as a whole, also entered the new millennium with record-breaking tourism growth rates that by 2004 turned the city into the third most-visited European urban destination after London and Paris.\footnote{This trend came to a brief halt in 2001, when visitor numbers declined for the first time since 1993. In addition to the negative impact of the terrorist attacks of 9/11 on international travel, Berlin’s tourism marketing agency pointed to macro-economic conditions, such as the economic recession in Germany and the introduction of the Euro, which triggered cautious economic behavior and discouraged tourism from overseas (BTM 2002).} These developments along with the fact that policy makers by the end of the 1990s had come to accept Berlin’s persistent economic woes and lack of competitiveness
as a business destination in more general terms if anything heightened the relevance of tourism to the city’s authorities. In the beginning of the 1990s, after the city’s reunification there were more or less euphoric expectations of population growth and economic upswing. Berlin’s population, however, stagnated at about 3.3 million inhabitants and total employment not only did not increase but rather decreased notably.\textsuperscript{71} Tourism, along with a few other industries especially in the realms of cultural production and consumption, was meanwhile in striking contrast to the city’s overall development, doing remarkably well; consequently these emerged as core areas of the city’s economic development policy (Häußermann and Colomb 2003; Krätke 2004; Novy and Huning 2009).

Contributing to the impetus for tourism promotion was arguably the demise of the previously governing Grand Coalition of Christian-Democrats (CDU) and Social-Democrats (SPD) and subsequent formation of a coalition of the center-left SPD with the Socialist Party (\textit{Die Linke}, formerly PDS) in 2001. Instead of frightening away investors and stifling the private sector, as some had predicted, the “red-red coalition“ embraced a decisively neoliberal outlook prioritizing the imperatives of public austerity and growth-oriented investment over other considerations and, if anything, intensified the local state’s efforts to boost the city’s image as a destination and expand its tourism trade. Describing tourism as a “top priority“ of his administration, Klaus Wowereit, the city’s new mayor, declared in a 2004 interview that marketing was key to realizing Berlin’s full potential and that more needed to be done to ensure the city’s long-term success as a destination (see Spiegel Online 2004). A roundta-

\textsuperscript{71} From 1991 to 2000, to illustrate this, Berlin’s labor force decreased from 1.88 million in 1991 to 1.77 million in 2000. Employment declined from 1.69 million in 1991 to 1.47 million in 2000 which among others led temporarily to an unemployment rate of almost 20 percent
ble involving the city’s key tourism stakeholders to optimize the city’s tourism marketing activities and improve the cooperation of public and private stakeholders was formed; Berlin’s first comprehensive tourism strategy (*Tourismuskonzept für die Hauptstadtregion Berlin-Brandenburg*) developed, and various other policy initiatives were set up to promote the city as a destination and reorganize its urban landscape according to the needs of visitors and the tourist industry which led Hanns Peter Nerger, the long serving President and CEO of the Berlin Tourismus Marketing GmbH, to proclaim that Wowereit’s administration was doing more for the advancement of tourism in Berlin than any of its predecessors (in Sontheimer 2004; see also Novy and Huning 2009; Novy 2011). Significantly, the city’s tourist strategy, which was released by the Senate in 2004, explicitly highlighted the potential of destinations beyond the city’s core. The need to consider visitors’ desire to experience the “authentic” and the “original” was cited (Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologien und Frauen 2004) and visitor economies beyond the city’s conventional attractions as well as areas previously not visited, or less frequented by tourists, gained a growing share of attention (see Novy and Huning 2009).

Resources were made available through economic development programs such as the “Local Coalitions for the Economy and Labour” (*Bezirkliche Bündnisse für Wirtschaft und Arbeit* or, for short, *BBWA*) to encourage Berlin’s district administrations’ – the second directly elected tier of government - to enhance their tourism promotion and infrastructures; a citywide signage system to facilitate way-finding throughout the city developed; and non-mainstream locations, including particularly Berlin’s famed subculture and creative scenes, were given more attention in the city’s promotional campaigns. Not only seen as attractive destinations in their own
right and supplements to the city’s conventional attractions, they also embodied various virtues that in the course of the early 2000s, as a result of the so-called “creative turn” in urban policy-making sparked by the works of Landry (2000) and Florida (2002), began to take on a central role in the city’s urban and economic development efforts more generally. Gradually replacing conventional icons such as Potsdamer Platz and the Reichstag, images of sub-, alternative and counter-cultural scenes such as the makeshift “urban beaches” on Kreuzberg’s (and neighboring Friedrichshain’s) banks of the river Spree now figured prominently on brochures, posters, websites and other promotional materials. City leaders increasingly sought to capitalize upon and consolidate Berlin’s image as one of the world’s leading creative cities and present it as a dynamic, tolerant, diverse, experimental, and youthful place where anything goes and where trends are set (see also Vivant 2007; Colomb 2008; Novy and Huning 2009; Novy 2011).

(Re-)framed as “playgrounds” for artists, bohemians, creatives, and tourists, areas that embodied these attributes, including Kreuzberg, hence came increasingly to be seen as important resources for a city that obviously lacked the luster of London or the beauty of Paris but was increasingly seen as captivating visitors because of its contrasts and contradictions, as well as its dynamism and diversity (Novy and Huning 2009). Travel media now present the appeal of present-day Berlin’s everyday culture and life in general and alternative, bohemian, creative and countercultural

72 The theme of the “Creative City” appeared for the first time in a promotional campaign of the Berlin city marketing company Partner für Berlin in 2000 when the creative city policies of the type championed by Richard Florida and Charles Landry began to gain momentum in the field of public policy in Berlin (see Colomb 2008; Kalandides and Lange 2007). Over the years, as policymakers became increasingly aware of the role played by “creative industries” as an important location, image and economic development factor, the “selling” of Berlin’s creativity became a core area not only of marketing activities but also urban and economic development more generally in Berlin.
atmospheres and lifestyles in particular (Vivant 2007). Significantly more attention is devoted to “off” scenes as well as their physical manifestations in the form of bars, cafés, design, shops, clubs, neighborhoods and so on as attractions on their own and demonstration of Berlin’s uniqueness as a destination. The city meanwhile is not only increasingly marketing “new tourism areas” but is also active in creating them. Spatial planning and particularly area-based neighborhood regeneration programs, for instance, are directed at strengthening existing visitor economies and infusing new artistic and/or economic life into areas that previously had not been identified as sites of tourism and leisure consumption as programs focusing on collective consumption have increasingly been put aside in favor of a more market-based and growth-oriented urban development agenda. Numerous major redevelopment projects that seek to transform underutilized, often industrial city land into creative clusters and/or new destinations for tourists, creative people and other urban professionals to live, work, and play in - the contested “Media Spree” development project, in part located in Kreuzberg, being a case in point (Scharenberg and Bader 2010; Bader and Scharenberg 2009; Novy and Colomb forthcoming). An increased emphasis on culture- and consumption-oriented strategies of the city’s local area managements was also introduced within the scope of the federal/state “Socially Integrative City” program (Stadtteile mit besonderem Entwicklungsbedarf – Soziale Stadt or “Soziale Stadt” for short). Its purpose is to regenerate or, as critics claim, gentrify specific “disadvantaged” areas of the city (see Marcuse 2006). In order to stimulate development in “districts with special development needs”, events, spectacles, and guided tours are organized, neighborhoods’ tangible and intangible assets advertised, and the development of artistic and creative scenes from multimedia to galleries and theaters promoted.
The city’s district administrations, though to a varying extent, in many cases actively support the mobilization of urban spaces as arenas for leisure and tourism consumption and have also set up a number of projects to market the young, alternative cultural scene, the creative economy and the ethnic diversity within their boundaries (Huning and Novy 2009; Novy 2010). Kreuzberg has been no exception to this.

Instead, the borough administration of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, which emerged in 2001 in the course of an administrative reform that reduced the number of boroughs citywide from 23 to 12, was involved in several initiatives to promote tourism. Drawing on co-financing by the European Union, an initiative named “District Tourism as a Means of Income Generation” (*Einkommenssicherung durch Stadtteiltourismus im Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg*), which aimed at promoting neighborhood tourism to create jobs and revenues for local residents, was implemented. A local tourism
marketing organization named “Multi-Kult-Tour e.V.” was established to prepare tourist maps, brochures and promotional events, and a public-private “roundtable” pertaining to tourism development formed (Novy and Huning 2009; Novy 2011).

Such strategies of local tourism development have for the most part been small in scale and short in duration but nonetheless illustrate that Kreuzberg has increasingly embraced the idea to develop and market itself as a destination for leisure and tourism (Dr. Peter Beckers, personal interview). Notably and in contrast to policy efforts elsewhere, such efforts typically are driven by a public policy rationale that is less concerned with economic growth as such than with social and community-based development (see next chapter). They are hence exemplifying both:

- the fact that politics on the district level has not remained untouched by the broader of recent decades, i.e. that approaches to consumption-oriented place promotion etc. are also put to work in Kreuzberg, despite the area’s reputation as a stronghold of leftist sentiment and a long history of skepticism towards market- and growth-oriented development; but also
- the limitations that characterize today’s efforts in the district to present Kreuzberg as a destination as well as their rootedness in other than purely market-oriented policy.

The latter is partly because the district has relatively little authority and even fewer resources to more aggressively push for tourism development. In addition, Kreuzberg apparently deliberately refrains from the excessive marketing that has become commonplace elsewhere; its history of alternative, community-oriented modes of
urban and neighborhood development, which emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, still exerts influence over politics today (see Latham 2006a). Exemplifying this, not only instruments to nourish the neighborhood’s visitor economy gained traction in the community in recent years but also efforts to counter tourism’s increasingly evident detrimental effects.

While tourism development efforts on the citywide level remain characterized by an almost exclusive focus on generating growth, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg’s administration has been at the forefront of attempts to develop instruments to control tourism’s negative externalities – most notably the uncontrolled growth of hotels and tourism-related conversion of residential buildings to other uses (Myrrhe 2010; Linde 2010). And it is actively working on policies to increase the benefits of tourism for the community at large, among other things by pushing for a local “visitor’s tax” through which tourists would pay their share for the provision and maintenance of the resources they enjoy while visiting the district (Alberti 2010; Dr. Peter Beckers, personal interview). Such efforts along with the strong impetus of existing tourism policy to use tourism as a tool for social and community empowerment suggest that Kreuzberg, while certainly adapting to the changing realities of urban policy making, manages to retain at least some of the deeply embedded - and powerfully defended - sense of place it acquired during the battles against the city’s urban renewal plans.

A densely knit and engaged network of grassroots activists, as well as a strong presence of (primarily Green Party) politicians who once were themselves members of urban social movements, continues to attempt to push for alternatives to capitalist forms of urban inhabitation. District politics in other words remains sensitive to de-
developments that are considered dangerous for the neighborhood’s character and integrity and retains an orientation towards issues of collective rather than conspicuous consumption (Huning and Novy 2006; Novy and Huning 2009; Novy 2010).  

73 That local development politics in Kreuzberg continue to be slightly different was exemplified by recent clashes between the global fast food chain McDonalds and local residents and stakeholders who fiercely fought against the company’s plans to open its first restaurant in the district (McDonalds ultimately was able to open its eatery in September 2007, yet the local protests attracted global media attention and underscored Kreuzberg’s image as stronghold of left-wing, alternative and anti-capitalist sentiment).
The last chapters have shown that tourism in poor or socially disadvantaged neighborhoods for more than a century has been a prevalent, even if at times unremarkable phenomenon. Concerns about the negative implications of tourism in such areas meanwhile are as old as the phenomenon itself and have with the recent growth of tourism in neighborhoods like Kreuzberg or Harlem gained significant traction in academic and popular discourses. Particularly critical urban and tourism studies research has a rich history of attending to tourism’s negative effects, with general consensus emerging around the idea that tourism development does not challenge but rather reinforces class and racial inequalities. Two main, closely intertwined arguments are put forward by critics of tourism and leisure-induced urban development (see Zukin 1995; Gotham 2005b; Dávila 2004; for a discussion see also Shaw et al. 2004): Scholars argue that

- tourism and leisure development involves an unequal distribution of costs and benefits as profits are disproportionally reaped by community outsiders and local elites while commercial and residential gentrification, rising living costs as well as other adverse effects put additional burdens on low-income and other disadvantaged social groups;

- the transformation of cities or neighborhoods into “places to play” (Fainstein and Judd 1999) solidifies social distance, obfuscates the social inequality facing the community, commodifies and distorts places’ inherent qualities, and frequently sets in motion revalorization processes that do not foster but threaten places’ distinctiveness, and often result in an erosion of precisely
those qualities that constituted the original attraction to visiting consumers in the first place.

Less frequently considered in analyses of urban tourism in poor neighborhoods remain strategies of “tourism from below” (Gotham 2005: 312) that rather than being based on an agenda of economic growth and profit, prioritize community needs, community involvement and community interests. Such efforts go by a range of names, including “alternative tourism” “sustainable tourism” or “community tourism” to name a few. Many scholars, however, have shown that they, despite the best intentions of their advocates, frequently do not live up to the promises associated with them. Thus, the contention that alternative types of tourism are always beneficial and will be supported by local communities is contested. Butler for instance is outspokenly critical and charges that “alternative tourism” efforts can even have more negative effects on the host community and destination, as they tend to “penetrate further into the space of residents, involve them to a much greater degree, [and] expose often fragile resources to greater visitation” (1992: 39).

Moreover Scheyvens (2002: 13) notes that supposedly community-oriented tourism products have over time become increasingly institutionalized and consequently diluted, a view that he is not alone in proposing. Indeed, there can be no doubt that the notion of alternative tourism over the years has not only become one of the most widely used but also one of the most abused phrases in the tourism literature (Brohman 1996 in Scheyvens 2002: 12). Developments in both Harlem and Kreuzberg involve plenty of examples that illustrate how offer that once used to be “alternative” have become mass-marketed and co-opted. All of this lends support to the
Scheyvens’ suggestion (2002: 13) to conceptualize distinctions between alternative and conventional tourism as “occurring along a continuum” and not, as is often the case, as polar opposites.

These critical caveats being made, it would nonetheless be inappropriate to ignore or brush over attempts by community members in Harlem and Kreuzberg that have sought to utilize tourism for the benefit of their communities and their members. Such attempts involve strategies to enhance the prosperity of disadvantaged communities’ residents and stakeholders and improve community resources and amenities as well as efforts that seek to utilize tourism’s representational power to challenge negative perceptions of disadvantaged communities by promoting alternative narratives that reclaim communities as “subjects”, raising awareness concerning marginalized communities’ manifold social problems and highlighting their - frequently structural - causes.

Due to the community’s long exposure to tourism, discussions concerning the utilization of tourism for neighborhood advancement and empowerment have particularly long roots in Harlem. Here, as has been discussed, it was particularly the neighborhood’s business community and most notably the Chamber of Commerce that from the mid 1970s onwards advocated tourism as a means to serve and advance the community. Significantly, neighborhood advancement to them meant - and continues to mean - primarily economic advancement, i.e. the creation of economic opportunity and integration of Harlem into the wider economy, to which tourism is believed to contribute. “Harlem Week” was born in this spirit in the 1970s, and many other projects and programs that have been established since then similarly reflect this deci-
sively business/market oriented approach to community advancement that dominates tourism development in the community. Revealing far-reaching changes in ideology and leadership structure in post-civil rights era’s Harlem, it embodies the premises of today’s mainstream urban policy, seconding its underlying idea that capitalism - not government funds but more private investment – will move Harlem forward.

The entrepreneurial fervor exhibited by Harlem’s business community is shared by many of Harlem’s churches, which also take on an important role in Harlem’s visitor trade. Sunday church services, which attract thousands of visitors each week, belong to the most popular attractions in Harlem and many of the neighborhood’s more than 300 churches have established strong ties with tour operators and developed elaborated systems for welcoming tourists. These programs are said to allow poorer churches to sustain themselves, finance important social services such as after-school programs and soup kitchens, and moreover pay for much needed renovations. They hence make a direct contribution to community development and improvement but at the same time perhaps more than any other example illustrate why promoting tourism development, whether community-based or not, at the very least constitutes a double-edged sword.

Complaints by regular churchgoers about tourists’ lack of manners and decency, particularly when visiting churches in large groups, are as old as the church sight-seeing cycle itself; fears about a dilution or degeneration of Sunday services represent a widespread concern, and churches’ reliance on the “few bucks” tourists bring in is considered “sad” and regarded as evidence of the continuous “underdevelop-
ment ... imposed upon [Harlem].“ With some tour operators charging up to $100 for a Sunday tour and churches typically receiving only a fraction of this amount, it is difficult not to think of the church tourism trade as inherently exploitive and inappropriate. At the same time I also learned during my visits that worshippers also feel pride about the interest their congregations receive, and more than once I heard people emphasizing that tourism to Harlem’s churches constituted a great opportunity to rectify misinformation about the community and communicate positive images of the African-American community.

The idea of tourism as a point of pride and image changer for the community is a theme that is also frequently highlighted by tour operators. The African-American owned company Penny Sightseeing, which was established in the 1960s as the first tour operator to exclusively offer tours of Harlem, is a case in point (MacCannell 1999: 40; Sandford 1987). It started its operation with the stated goal to combat the image of Harlem that was being sold by the media and “re-educate” the public about Harlem:

Harlem with almost half a million residents has two faces. One is a stereotype, the other is a Harlem of hard work and hope. Harlem tours of Penny Sightseeing Company are operated by Black Americans who feel that there is more to this great community than the sensationalism of the published story (Penny Sightseeing, promotional brochure, cited in Sandford 1987: 102).

Since the days of Penny Sightseeing there have been numerous other tour operators – some for-profit, some, though less frequently, non-profit – that have made well-
motivated and serious attempts to utilize tourism to educate tourists about Harlem’s past and present realities and instill an understanding and appreciation of its people and places.

Significantly, such efforts are quite frequently not a result of conscious decision-making but instead based upon a sense of what is suitable and “right” by those running the tours. Carolyn Johnson, a local business woman who regularly offers tours through the neighborhood with the her company “Welcome to Harlem”, for instance, does not follow a fully fleshed out “script” on her tours. She does not gloss over or downplay Harlem’s past and present problems or succumb to voyeuristic “negative sightseeing.” “I wouldn’t do it any other way”, she said to me one afternoon during an interview, adding that telling “real” stories about Harlem’s history as well as its contemporary struggles, including for instance gentrification, is also, from a business standpoint, a matter of plain common sense, as this is what tourists choosing a “local company … expect” (Carolyn Johnson, personal interview).

Even if many of her tours have themes relating to Harlem’s “Golden Age”, Johnson not only addresses past housing, economic, and unemployment problems and their causes but also uses specific sites and places she passes by on her tours to tell participants about issues the community currently faces. On a tour of the Mount Morris historic district in 2008, one of the first New York neighborhoods to be declared a historic district by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, the area’s beautifully refurbished brownstones were not only discussed with an emphasis on architectural and historic aspects or issues relating to historic preservation. Rather the area’s changing demographics and gentrification were also explicitly ad-
dressed, and even tourism’s role in the neighborhood’s transformation as well as long-simmering controversies such as the one surrounding the Marcus Garvey Drummers Circle in Mount Morris Park reflected upon.\footnote{Mainly African-American or from Africa and the Caribbean and a permanent presence in Mount Morris Park for several decades, the drummers in recent years found themselves increasingly confronted with complaints by new residents who considered their music a nuisance and asked the city’s Department of Parks & Recreation to relocate the drummers or ban them from the park. Unresolved until the present-day, the dispute over the years became a flash point in the heated debates over Harlem’s transformation, a flash point Johnson feels visitors should also be exposed to.}

The Mount Morris District meanwhile also was selected for one of the first citywide attempts to implement an “alternative” and sustainable tourism initiative. In 2001 the Conference Board, a business and research organization, initiated a pilot community tourism project “to promote tourism in areas of NYC off Manhattan’s beaten tourist paths” by partnering with community groups at sites in each borough, including Harlem’s Mount Morris neighborhood (Hoffman 2003). Known as “Promoting Community Tourism in New York City,” the official goal of this project was to “encourage tourism in ways that 1) maximize dollars coming into the community; 2) build civic pride in the area and respect for the neighborhood among others; and 3) respect the environmental integrity of the neighborhood.”

Six community-based, nonprofit institutions in all of the city’s five boroughs including the Mt. Morris Park Community Improvement Association in Harlem were selected in a three-year initiative to develop tours within their own neighborhoods. Its results, however, were by most accounts meager. There were problems from the beginning as the project got off to a late start, had difficulties in partnering up with local organizations, and lacked sufficient funding to properly market and promote its offers to tourists (Fainstein and Powers 2005). For these and related reasons, the program’s
stated goal to jumpstart enduring community-based tourism programs was not achieved, as most of the activities it supported either failed to get off the ground or were not continued after the initiative’s funding period came to an end.

The selected local partner organization in Harlem, the Mount Morris Park Community Improvement Association, and its approach to tourism meanwhile illustrate the problematic relationships between tourism programs, no matter how supposedly “alternative” or “community-oriented”, and gentrification. Dominated by homeowners, it regularly offers tours of the area’s historic homes and invites participants to visit the interior of selected houses, talk to their owners, and learn about the local real estate market. While tourism’s impact on gentrification and real estate activity in other contexts is oftentimes more indirect, such approaches illustrate a rather straightforward example of the way tourism development is employed to promote real estate activity (see also Sandford 1987).

***

Walking tours and other activities spearheaded by community members, while unable to eradicate the root causes of communities’ marginalization, can serve as correctives to the stereotypes of marginalized neighborhoods. Such representational practices involve the potential for self-definition, agency, visibility and voice and for this reason, as Scheyvens (2002: 102) has suggested, can be seen as playing a role in marginalized communities’ struggle for greater equality and empowerment. Recognizing this, activists in Kreuzberg have in recent years also developed a number of programs and projects that seek to utilize tourism for these ends.
One example is the program X-BERG-TAG. Eine Reise in das multikulturelle Berlin ("X-Berg day. A journey into the multicultural Berlin"), which was set up in 2001 by the non-profit organization Gesellschaft für interregionalen Kulturaustausch e.V. in cooperation with the district’s own Kreuzberg Museum. The museum operates under auspices of the district’s government and features both permanent and visiting exhibits of which many inform visitors about the (social) history of the neighborhood. It seeks to offer “walking tours against prejudices” and invites visitors to explore Kreuzberg with trained local youths who act as tour guides and present “their” Berlin through visits to a mosque, a tea house, an ethnic restaurant, local shops and the museum itself.

According to Nadja Sponholz, who has taken groups on tours since the program’s founding days, the value of the approach is twofold: first, the tours both implicitly and explicitly reframe the usual host-visitor relationship by constructing the tourists as the “other” and reframing the host community as subjects; second, they put forward alternative representations of the neighborhood and particularly its migrant communities and in doing so demystify the community (Nadja Sponholz, personal Interview). And demystifying the tour is: in fact, when I asked participants on a recent tour, several people I talked to remarked that Kreuzberg was not the chaotic place they imagined it to be. One participant, for example, said: “Considering that I had never been to Kreuzberg before, I was impressed by the difference of the way Kreuzberg is said to be, and the way Kreuzberg really is.” Another participant concurred, stating, “I had not been to Kreuzberg either, and I thought it was actually cool. I mean, it [was] not at all [the] ghetto the media makes it seem.”
As of 2009 more than 15,000 visitors had participated in one of the program’s tours and while some of its elements have not been without problems – finding and educating guides remains a problem – the project nonetheless is widely praised for its successes and has won several awards for its attempt to combine tourism and (museum) pedagogy. Significantly, the program is run on a not-for-profit basis. Prices are decisively below the average price for comparable tours (about EUR 5-10), only the guides receive a honorarium, and the remaining revenues are distributed among the non-profits that the tours visit on their way through the neighborhood (Nadja Sponholz, personal interview).

Other community-based organizations pursue similar approaches. The Regenbogenfabrik, one of Kreuzberg’s many nonprofit neighborhood centers that emerged out of the squatter movement of the 1980s, for instance, has in the course of the last years expanded its range of activities and added several tourism-related components to its “social economy” programs. Supported through public funds like the European Union’s EQUAL program, previously unemployed people with different qualification levels and from different ethnic backgrounds or origins currently work at the Regenbogenfabrik’s hostel and bike-rental shop, offer guided walking and bicycle tours, and moreover receive training in tourism-related subjects like foreign languages, tourist guiding, marketing, computer skills, and bookkeeping (Christine Ziegler, personal interview; see also Huning and Novy 2006; Novy and Huning 2009). At the same time, such efforts have been criticized as they can – and indeed must – be viewed in light of the more general transformation of neighborhood centers and other nonprofit, community-based organizations in Germany and elsewhere in response to
the retrenchment of the welfare state and the increasing influence of neoliberal governance patterns (Mayer 2006, 2009).

In this process, they have not only increasingly become “repair networks” against cities’ intensifying economic and social disintegration but have also often been institutionalized as part of the so-called third sector or co-opted into partnerships with state organizations for service delivery and neighborhood regeneration (Mayer 2006: pp.131, 2009). Against this background, the Regenbogenfabrik’s tourism activities also has to be seen as an effort to plug gaps that have resulted from public funding cuts and come to terms with the changed realities of the world around them which requires them to engage more entrepreneurially to stay afloat. This ambivalence notwithstanding, the Regenbogenfabrik’s efforts as well as the “X-Berg Day” initiative

![Figure 19 Kreuzberg's socio-cultural center “Regenbogenfabrik”](image)
nonetheless represent programs that in many ways give testimony as to how tourism strategies from below can bring about positive effects.
V. RESEARCH ISSUES AND FINDINGS

This chapter evaluates the implications of recent trends in leisure and tourism on the neighborhood level for conceptualization and research. It brings the different themes and subjects raised during the previous chapters together, and synthesizes its key findings to propose new ways of looking at what to date represents a relatively neglected type of urban tourism. Lastly, while sometimes more and sometimes less direct comparisons between Harlem and Kreuzberg have been presented throughout the preceding pages, this chapter will discuss the main differences and similarities between our two case studies more in detail and make an attempt to explain what accounts for them.

1. HARLEM AND KREUZBERG COMPARED: PROMOTING NEIGHBORHOOD TOURISM, PROTECTING NEIGHBORHOODS FROM TOURISM AND A LOT IN BETWEEN

An in-depth look at the last three decades of engagement with tourism on part of local and city-wide actors in Harlem and Kreuzberg in many ways confirms but also at times departs from other accounts of urban and neighborhood tourism. Both neighborhoods certainly stand out in that the development of tourism in them has a long history, a history that in the case of Harlem stretches back nearly 100 years and compels us to remember that tourism in neighborhoods such as Harlem and Kreuzberg is older than we occasionally appreciate. As regards the two neighborhoods’ recent history, the study meanwhile has revealed a number of interesting similarities and differences that provide some support for theoretical arguments on policy making and tourism but at the same time also indicate that reality at times is more com-
plex than theory has it. Local actors in Harlem such as the Chamber of Commerce, for instance, advocated tourism as a means of neighborhood development and potential source of empowerment already in the early 1970s. Well before tourism as a supposed silver bullet to alleviate economic underdevelopment and regenerate disadvantaged communities was talked about in the scholarly realm and well before other scholarly accounts on tourism in Harlem usually date the rise of tourism as a policy concern. Likewise, our account of Kreuzberg meanwhile has shown that marketing on the citywide level in Berlin had already by the early 1970s begun to incorporate elements of Kreuzberg’s appeal as an off-mainstream location into its promotional campaigns - way before scholars noted a departure from mass marketing of travel and notions such as niche marketing became even discussed. What follows from this is that both Harlem and Kreuzberg to a certain extent illustrate the need not to overstate differences between past and present marketing patterns and practices. The marketing and selling of commodities and experiences that reflect the local, the off-beat, the marginal and so on clearly has been elevated to higher grounds and a more prominent position over the years. Into and onto itself it does not represent a new phenomenon, however, which, as has been a central theme of this thesis, is also illustrated by the way many marginalized neighborhoods were marketed during the early days of modern urban tourism in the Western world.

At the same time both Harlem and Kreuzberg also reveal that the incorporation of places “beyond the beaten path” in tourism development strategies is by no means as pervasive or prevalent as is occasionally assumed. Tourism boosters in both neighborhoods to this day lament the lack of support of authorities on the city level. In fact, the two cities’ official tourism marketing bodies were, despite Kreuzberg’s
and Harlem’s long encounters with tourists and tourism, until recently rather hesitant in cashing in on the two neighborhoods’ potentials as destinations. Kreuzberg occupied a more central place in citywide place marketing and other promotional activities in the 1970s than it did in the 1990s and early 2000s, and Harlem remained until the opening years of the twenty-first century mostly neglected in official tourism campaigns and other promotional efforts on the citywide level.

The reasons for this are manifold and difficult to disentangle. As regards Harlem, the neighborhood’s dilapidated physical and social conditions, safety concerns as well as stigmatizing discourses portraying the neighborhood as a site of crime, terror, and violence played a big part. New York’s quasi-private tourism marketing board, driven by its Manhattan-centric membership, for a long time lacked the will and means to allocate more resources to a neighborhood to which few of its members belonged. Leaving sporadic gestures such as Harlem’s inclusion into the State of New York’s “I Love New York” program aside, public authorities also left the community, like many other non-traditional tourism destinations and particularly minority neighborhoods, short changed in resources and development support until its rebound in the 1990s - along with the coming into existence of UMEZ - changed the political and institutional context of Harlem and Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, as part of broader efforts to transform New York’s image and political economy, began to overhaul and expand New York & Company’s marketing operations.

What these developments left unchanged was Harlem’s highly contested political environment that for decades has been a defining feature of politics Uptown and to this day affects the area’s tourism politics. Neither a longer term-cross-sectoral “re-
gime", to employ the language of regime theory, nor an issue-based coalition coordinating tourism development in other words exists. Instead, Harlem’s governance arena consists of numerous organization and actors with multiple, often conflicting agendas. While many of them, as part of a larger shift towards entrepreneurial governance, have increasingly embraced tourism as a emerging area of economic development, parts of Harlem’s local leadership and particularly many neighborhood groups at the same time strongly reject what they consider a sell-out of Harlem, as was particularly evident in the described conflicts about 125th Street’s rezoning.

Their ongoing influence has, at times, helped to protect and support local interests – the above-mentioned rezoning of 125th Street, which saw at least some modifications to overcome community opposition before its final approval by the City Council on April 30, 2008, is a point in case. On the downside, however, one could also claim that Harlem’s divided political environment and the absence of cooperation among critical actors most likely also represents a main reason for the notable lack of strategic, concerted action on the part of the community with regard to tourism policies and its difficulties to represent community interests in the city’s development arena more generally, which prevents the community from profiting more from the growing tourism and leisure market in Upper Manhattan and/or more effectively fight its adverse effects.

A look across the Atlantic to Kreuzberg meanwhile illustrates the importance to understand places' regulatory and institutional contexts when examining tourism development within them. Here local politics were characterized until the opening years of the 2000s by an almost complete lack of engagement with tourism. Contrary to the
situation in the United States, where local economic development at the neighborhood level represents a traditional feature of cities’ political life and communities are used to competing for jobs, resources, revenues and investments, economic development historically barely constituted a domain of public sector authorities and other actors on the district or neighborhood level in Berlin (see Strom 2001).

Figure 20 Hotels and Hostels have become an ubiquitous sight in Kreuzberg

It was only in recent years that business promotion and in this context tourism development gained significance in sub-local governance arenas when, as a result of a growing influence of neoliberal governance patterns, additional responsibilities were
devolved to actors on the local level while resources from higher levels of government dwindled. Today, Kreuzberg’s district administration promotes tourism as part of its economic development strategy. Nevertheless, although efforts such as the establishment of a public-private roundtable as well as local marketing organization ostensibly might suggest a reorientation conducive to the “entrepreneurial city”, it is also important to consider the limitations of local actors’ activities. Faced with a rapidly changing institutional context, the district recognizes place marketing as an important responsibility and moreover increasingly considers tourism an important element of its local economy, yet resources devoted to tourism remain limited and no written tourism policy exists.

Moreover, various decisions make clear that a majority of local decision makers reject a growth-at-all-costs approach to tourism development. Instead, the district council which is dominated by Berlin’s three left-leaning parties, the Greens, the Social Democrats, and the Socialist Party Die Linke pushes for the citywide implementation of a visitor tax which would be charged in all accommodation facilities and whose revenues would be earmarked for cultural and environmental conservation and development on the district level (Alberti 2010). In addition, the district council has decided to press for a control of hotel development within its jurisdictional boundaries by opting for a moratorium on further building permits (Myrrhe 2010; see also Linde 2010). Whether the policy adopted by the district politicians will stick remains to be seen – as of now zoning legislation makes it extremely difficult for local district authorities to curb hotel development and several hotel operators have al-
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75 Districts in Berlin have no power to impose taxes themselves but the concept of a visitor – or tourism – tax has found the support of other, mostly inner-city districts, was recently approved by the “Council of (District) Majors” (Rat der Bürgermeister), which advises the Senate, and is expected to be decided upon on the citywide level after the upcoming citywide elections in 2011.
ready threatened that they would challenge the new provisions in court (Dr. Beckers, personal interview). The intention of the local authorities nonetheless suggests that many local decision makers – akin to what regime theorists associate with middle-class “progressive” or “maintenance/caretaker” regimes (Stone 1991; Mossberger and Stoker 2001) – are determined to protect the district from excessive (tourism) development and find ways so that tourism’s benefits are more equally shared. This signifies not only that inherited legacies of earlier modes of regulation as well as the remains of a political climate and network of actors prioritizing use over exchange value and issues of collective consumption over conspicuous consumption which continue to exert influence over the district administration’s politics. Rather, it also points to a crucial difference between the institutional and regulatory settings within which tourism development takes place in the two examined cases: the degree of political power and public control on the district/neighborhood level as Berlin’s democratically elected district administrations have significantly more political powers than sub-local governmental bodies in New York.

Such fundamental differences that shape the context within which tourism development occurs, but not the chosen approaches to tourism development on the citywide level, clearly set the two cities apart. Looked at isolated, tourism policy in the narrow sense - and particularly the ways Harlem and Kreuzberg as destinations are today dealt with on the citywide level - are not that different from one another. Differences exist with regard to the overall policy context activities by place promoters are nested or embedded in, institutionally and otherwise, and it is primarily owed to them - e.g. divergent infrastructures of law and policy pertaining to land use and urban development, the degree of private sector involvement in policy making and modes of
public control - that differences exist with regard to the way tourism unfolds and is dealt with on the neighborhood level. The scope, scale and pace with which the Bloomberg administration has transformed New York to foster market-oriented economic growth and elite consumption practices, to give an example, and particularly the extent to which it prioritized powerful business interests - and worked in concert with them - would be unthinkable in Berlin today. Despite the profound changes in governance Germany’s capital experienced over the past two decades.

2. **NEW TOURISM, NEW CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

Much of this thesis has sought to lay out the continuities that link past and present forms of tourism activity on the neighborhood level. It was argued that rigid and absolute distinctions between tourism under modernity or Fordism and tourism under post-modernity or post-Fordism that portray the two as diametrically opposed are too polarized. Contemporary urban tourism in practice combines features of both, and particularly tourism in marginalized neighborhoods has a long history that is occasionally omitted in accounts which portray the search for off-beat and alternative experiences in them as inherently post-Fordist or post-modern. At the same time, the thesis has also argued that shifts in tourism demands and practices are sufficiently real to merit consideration. While new post-Fordist modes have not swept away old Fordist production and consumption principles, there can be no denial that the face of urban tourism is changing. From the 1980s onwards, we have seen a proliferation of “new” or “niche” tourisms such as cultural/heritage, eco- and adventure tourism, and visiting theme parks/mega-shopping malls, increasingly flexible and consumer-
focused forms of supply, as well as a move towards more individualized forms of consumption in tourism (see Shaw and Williams 2004). And we can observe particularly in cities an increasing dissolving of tourism’s specificity, i.e. its de-differentiation, due to general increases in mobility in affluent societies – e.g. the growing presence of second home owners, business travelers, exchange students and other people voluntarily on the move - as well as changing consumption patterns and lifestyles on the part of city dwellers.

Distinctions between tourism and other forms of migration on the one hand, as well as tourism and other forms of recreation or place consumption on the other hand, hence have become increasingly blurred. The result is the literal and figurative transformation of meanings of place and space and, as this thesis has posited, significant changes with regard to cities’ tourism and leisure landscapes. It is thereby debatable whether it is accurate to talk about the emergence of a new stage of tourism or whether it even should be considered to follow Urry’s suggestion that that there is no tourism anymore but only production, consumption and mobility (Urry 2001). What’s clear, however, is that the old face of urban tourism is being challenged and that we can observe the emergence of new micro-geographies of place consumption; micro-geographies that, interconnected with other processes at work – larger changes in the urban economy, new waves of gentrification and the efficacy of investment in arts and culture and the creation of amenity in turning around the fortunes of declining cities or areas in need of regeneration - change cities’ internal geographies in fundamental ways and challenge earlier scholarly accounts which considered tourism to be overwhelmingly limited to cities’ cores and a few, mostly centrally located districts and zones (e.g. the “entertainment zone”, the “tourist bubble” etc.).
Incomplete reliable data and particularly the limited availability of data on new forms of tourism or other forms of mobility make it difficult to develop a comprehensive picture of the extent, nature, and implications of the described trends, yet our two case studies allow for some general observations. Kreuzberg in this context certainly stands out as an almost prototypical example of what Maitland and Newman (2007, 2009) have described as “new tourism areas”. As one group of “city users” (Martinotti 1999; Costa and Martinotti 2003) or place consumers, tourists here have jointly with new residents and workers set in motion a profound process of urban change that reconfigures parts of the neighborhood in response to the shared demands and values of members of what Fainstein et al. (2003: 243) have coined the “cosmopolitan consuming class”. The often told story of conflict between “hosts” and “guests” or “tourists” and “residents” seems increasingly inappropriate to capture the changes the neighborhood is experiencing. Instead it is the conviviality of certain types of city users - the relatively “privileged”, those enjoying higher levels of employment, income, and education - that appears noteworthy, while lines of conflicts seem to run along other, particularly socio-economic lines, between those appreciating and being able to afford the neighborhood’s revalorization and those who stay behind. The precise role of “temporary users” in the neighborhood and whether “anglophone gentrification” is occurring, as Holm (2010) has recently suggested, remains unclear.

Developments in Harlem meanwhile ostensibly seem to be more in line with conventional wisdom about urban tourism. Indeed almost all discussions of tourism in Harlem have been narrowly fixated around established tourism practices including particularly (cultural) heritage tourism as well as what is sometimes described as racial
or ethnic tourism, i.e. the interest and curiosity of members of the so-called majority culture as well as international tourists in experiencing Harlem as an “ethnic” commodity and a place to experience the foreign “other” and the poor (Hoffman 2003; Dávila 2004; Sandford 1987). Such traditional forms of tourism consumption admittedly seem to represent an important force driving tourism dynamics Uptown, yet are accompanied by various other, oftentimes less visible forms of tourism and place consumption that equally deserve attention.

The latter includes minority tourism and African-American tourism in particular (Butler et al. 2002), whose impact on urban tourism destinations of common heritage in general and Harlem in particular is to this day not elaborated upon in the literature. It also includes students, visiting scholars and other temporary affiliates of Uptown’s many academic institutions. And it includes a broad array of other temporary city users or place consumers, be it out-of-towners or New Yorkers from other parts of the city that come to Harlem to shop, to visit one of the neighborhood’s cultural institutions or have a fun night out. For the respective neighborhoods within which increases in tourism activity can be observed, such trends prompt both new opportunities and new pathologies. For discussions on cities and urban life a fundamental question arises: if it becomes increasingly difficult to determine what it means to be a tourist, one is conversely also confronted with another, arguably even more fundamental issue: who qualifies as a “local” in light of the more and more prevalent patterns of (temporal) mobility in the current era of globalization.
3. TOURISM’S IMPACTS. NOT “PLACES” BUT “PEOPLE” WIN OR LOSE

Tourism development on the neighborhood level is, as the discussion of developments in Kreuzberg and Harlem exemplified, often lauded by coalitions advancing this process (e.g. private sector interests, city authorities and elements of the local community) for its broad array of allegedly positive effects, e.g. for strengthening communities both economically and socially, changing negative perceptions and acting to support their cultural and natural assets for the benefit of present and future residents and visitors alike. While tourism definitely can provide benefits and opportunities, numerous studies illustrate, however, that the full picture of tourism’s impacts is more complex, especially in neighborhoods that have historically found themselves confronted with deprivation, discrimination, and exclusion.

Assessing the benefits and the costs related to tourism development is far from easy, particularly if one embraces a broader, more comprehensive understanding of tourism as a “system” with myriad interconnected elements and backward and forward linkages. Specifying clear lines of demarcation of what constitutes tourism is inherently problematic, and many impacts of tourism are difficult to disaggregate from those of other activities and evaluate – let alone express in dollars (for an attempt to categorize tourism’s effects see Table 9). In fact even precise conclusions concerning those impacts that in theory can be quantified, e.g. tourism’s economic effects, are difficult to draw, particularly if one is interested in developments on the neighborhood level as data concerning the generation of employment and of income
or the encouragement of entrepreneurial activity is limited and usually not disaggregated to the district- or neighborhood-level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts upon urban heritage and diversity</th>
<th>Impacts upon cultural practices and representations</th>
<th>Impacts upon urban economies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive:</td>
<td>Increased awareness of shared history</td>
<td>Creation of job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased protection of urban landscapes</td>
<td>Rediscovery or keeping alive of local values and/or traditions</td>
<td>New fields of commercial activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage valorisation</td>
<td>Diversification, multiplication and improvement in cultural offer</td>
<td>Tourists spend in local stores, restaurants, cafes, hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requalification of otherwise lost places of interest</td>
<td>Benefits of cultural exchanges</td>
<td>New sources of revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new infrastructures</td>
<td>Changes to urban space use</td>
<td>Multiplier effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spaces better cared for</td>
<td>Development of short term events and animations</td>
<td>Attraction of enterprises and residents by soft locational effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative:</td>
<td>Increased feeling of safety resulting from better care of public realm</td>
<td>Risk of monosectorialisation and overdependence on tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage erosion</td>
<td>Conflicts between local inhabitants</td>
<td>Augmentation of real estate prices and price increase of commodities in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist pollution</td>
<td>Loss of community spirit</td>
<td>Increased expenses for a town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degradation or destruction of urban landscapes</td>
<td>Changes to urban space use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of monofunctional spaces</td>
<td>Local alienation, feeling of loss of town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion and parking issue</td>
<td>Obliteration of alternative histories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization and standardization of architecture</td>
<td>Loss of theatricalisation of local values and/or customs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettification and petrification of urban spaces</td>
<td>Adverse stereotyping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Attempt to categorize tourism’s effects by Dumont, Ruelle, and Teller (2005: 3)

In addition to this, tourism usually involves different impacts for different social groups and individuals within a given area. Attempts to account for tourism’s benefits and costs within a given area all too often seek to identify impacts for a given terri-
tory, e.g. a neighborhood, as a whole and in doing so neglect that different groups within them - the very wealthy and those on welfare; tenants and home owners, those with the capital to invest and/or spend and those without to name only a few – will be affected differently by tourism development.

While the rhetoric of tourism development usually does not differentiate between those benefiting and those that do not, tourism development in practice in other words does produce “winners” and “losers” – even if some developments tourism can contribute to – such as the creation of new infrastructures or an increased feeling of safety – can of course work for the collective and equitable benefit of all. Existing inequalities of wealth and power in this context skew the distribution of costs and benefits. Nevertheless, the sector offers economic opportunities to a variety of people, including particularly population segments with lower educational attainments and for this reason can positively affect income and employment levels of disadvantaged population groups (Rath 2005; Fainstein et al. 2003; Gladstone and Fainstein 2003). As regards Harlem and Kreuzberg we can assume (but not prove) that such positive economic effects exist, even if we know little about the quality of jobs and prospects created about which next to no data exists. At the same time it is also well established that tourism typically brings about higher costs of living – i.e. inflated prices of goods, services and land/housing – that all residents, those with income from tourism as well as those without, have to deal with and that this disproportionately poses challenges to the poorer segments of a host community’s population.

Again lack of data prevents drawing firm conclusions about tourism’s impacts on property prices, rents and costs of living in the two neighborhoods under investiga-
tion. Indeed we can, particularly in the case of Kreuzberg, not even with certainty “prove” that such developments occur as solid statistical evidence is still too thin to make definitive judgments about the neighborhood’s current transformation. Tourism’s impact on Harlem’s and Kreuzberg’s built environment, culture and particularly the two neighborhoods’ commercial landscapes is more obvious. As regards them, developments in Harlem and Kreuzberg suggest that future research would be well advised to move beyond the simple “good” versus “bad” verdicts that have characterized much that was written about urban tourism in the past.

A debate about a “Harlem-themed restaurant” offering “Miles Davis omelets” and “Denzel Burgers” (Pogrebin 2005), to provide a particularly stark example, illustrates that the common claim that tourism erodes local culture in the process of repackaging places and spaces for tourist consumption, is not without merit. Significantly, however, while tourism in both Harlem and Kreuzberg at times caricatures and oversimplifies certain aspects of the neighborhoods’ culture, it also strengthens local culture and identity. One the one hand it does so by supporting big institutions like Harlem’s Apollo, the Schomburg or the Studio Museum which all belong to the neighborhood’s top destinations and rely to a varying degree on tourism dollars (Audience Research & Analysis 2000).

On the other hand, it helps smaller and new establishments to sustain themselves and grow. The recent revival of traditional jazz in Harlem, for instance, would have been unimaginable without the demand and interest of visitors, as many of its protagonists like Alvin Reid, the owner of the Lenox Lounge, an internationally renowned art-deco jazz club, readily confirm. Reid initially had not planned to eye tour-
ists when buying and re-opening the legendary music venue in 1988, but in retrospect he claims that it was they who “made it work. I have to be totally honest. Without them, jazz would not be in here right now” (cited in Chappell 2001, see also Richardson 2000). Different and sometimes even contradictory characteristics and effects meanwhile also exist with regard to the neighborhoods changing commercial landscapes. The overwhelming majority of new consumption opportunities in the two communities is not devoted primarily, let alone exclusively, to visitors. Rather we observe an increase of more upscale shops, restaurants, bars and other establishments catering to a higher-end consumer market more generally, including commercial chains as well as independent establishments targeting particularly young, upwardly mobile leisure consumers. Interacting synergistically with the developing tourism trade, the positive effects of these developments are not to be underestimated, as particularly Harlem’s residents had long complained about the lack of basis services in the community.

Many of the new independent clothing designers, cafes, and restaurants that had initially been eyed with suspicion when entering Harlem and Kreuzberg seem to have managed to establish themselves within a few years as much-liked neighborhood institutions that would most likely be sorely missed if they left. At the same time, however, one cannot deny that developments have also created tensions. Many residents are concerned about the loss of long-established businesses, particularly those providing products and services affordable to low-income people. Part of this loss results from commercial gentrification and points to the unequal distribution of costs and benefits that tourism brings to a host community’s business owners. A local business community after all is not monolithic, and while a wide range of dif-
ifferent businesses can benefit from tourism, different businesses nonetheless are affected differently. The dynamics tourism can set in motion thus also creates winners and losers among local businesses.

Quite often these losers tend to be small business owners that have been around for decades, as Zukin (2010) has shown in the case of Harlem. They not only face increasing rents but also find themselves confronted with heightened competition from larger businesses as well as a changing customer base. Particularly in Harlem the accelerating displacement of long established neighborhood institutions has turned into a contested political issue as many commentators argue that only chain stores as well as more upscale shops, bars and restaurants can afford the neighborhoods’ soaring rents, which were estimated to have doubled in the early and mid-2000s (Gill 2011: 445). This threatens the community’s uniqueness and also might negatively affect its future development – for example in terms of its potential as a destination: “What could be found in Harlem”, Maurrasse (2006: 39) posits, “could not be found anywhere. A Gap, an HMV, a Starbucks, an Old Navy, and other similar chains can be found in just about any American city or suburban strip”.

During my research I saw several neighborhood institutions being washed away by Harlem’s transformation. Numerous traditional soul food restaurants such as “Charles’s Southern Style Kitchen” or “Copeland’s” closed over the years, and music producer Barry Robinson, the first African-American to ever own a store on 125th Street, shut the doors of his music store “Bobby’s Happy House” in January 2008 as a consequence of massive rent increases. I participated in several - ultimately fruitless - rallies against the displacement of Sikhulu Shange’s “Harlem Record Shack”,

another “landmark of Harlem’s black heritage” on 125th Street, as the New York Times (Eligon 2007) put it. After the incidents at Freddy’s Fashion Mart in 1995, it had been able to relocate to a new store but in the summer of 2008 was forced to close for good after 36 years in operation to make way for a new retail and office building. Although tourism alone does not account for these changes, there can be no doubt that Harlem’s current transformation, which includes and has been significantly fueled by an increasing encroachment of the tourism and leisure industry, represents a critical force behind the changing commercial landscape of the neighborhood.

This transformation, as Hoffman (2003: 107) has eloquently argued, illustrates “a new mode of regulation, making for greater social/political and economic inclusion, but with the associated costs as well as benefits.” Costs, which some community members fear are too high, while others see them as maybe regrettable but ultimately insignificant side effects of a generally welcome revalorization. In this context it is important to bring Harlem’s current situation to mind. In the past, Harlem was regularly described as in many ways divided or excluded from Greater New York; now observers note that it is increasingly self-divided. At once familiar and startlingly new, internal tensions and struggles of race and class have been a constant and ever-present feature of the neighborhood’s more recent transformation and are fueled by the growing social cleavages among the different groups residing – or merely spending time - in Harlem. Harlem has increasingly become an attraction for the affluent yet at the same time – in part due to the high concentrations of public housing
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76 Instead both the demise of soul food as well as the struggle of record stores of course also need to be seen against the backdrop of other developments than the neighborhood’s revalorization – e.g. changing tastes and eating habits in the case of the former and a rapidly changing distribution landscape (e.g. online music distribution etc.) in the case of the latter.
in the area - continues to belong to the most impoverished neighborhoods of the city which creates new conflicts and sources of division.77

Against this background and taking Harlem’s long history of discrimination and injustice into account, worries about an alleged “colonization” and “sell out” of the neighborhood (Chinyelu 1999:125) loom high in present-day Harlem. Questions related to the beneficiaries of the neighborhood’s transformation as well as who controls the process are controversially discussed. The perceived inequities in Harlem’s current resurgence are on many Harlemites’ minds, evoking memories of widespread concerns during Harlem’s first supposed Renaissance. As Langston Hughes’ memorable recollection of Harlem during the 1920s and 1930s illustrates (1940: 228):

Some Harlemites thought the millennium had come. … I don’t know what made any Negroes think that - except that they were mostly intellectuals doing the thinking. The ordinary Negroes hadn’t heard of the Negro Renaissance. And if they had, it hadn’t raised their wages any. As for all those white folks in the speakeasies and nightclubs of Harlem—well, maybe a colored man could find some place to have a drink that the tourists hadn’t yet discovered.

Of course one should not stretch the comparison too far. After all, many protagonists and beneficiaries of Harlem’s current transition belong to the community’s black elites. Nonetheless, the long-standing concern that tourism development is inherently exploitive in nature to which it alludes has not lost its relevance and represents one reason why tourism scholars and practitioners have pushed for alternative forms

77 As of 2006, over a third of residents continued to receive some sort of public assistance and socio-economic gains among low-income residents are marginal (Maurrasse 2006).
of tourism that are more sustainable and equitable than what frequently is the status quo.

4. CAN NEIGHBORHOOD TOURISM BE EQUITABLE AND SUSTAINABLE AND, IF SO, HOW?

Sustainable tourism represents a goal that at least rhetorically is held in high esteem by tourism researchers and practitioners alike (see i.a. Scheyvens 2002: pp.53; Sharpley 2002; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). The concept has particularly in other than urban settings made quite a career in the policy world in recent years, even if it is due to varying and competing definitions of the term not always clear what it entails. Butler, who was one of the first in the domain of tourist studies to discuss sustainability in the context of tourism, defines sustainable tourism as

> tourism which is developed and maintained in an area (community, environment) in such a manner and at such a scale that it remains viable over an indefinite period and does not degrade or alter the environment (human and physical) in which it exists to such a degree that it prohibits the successful development and well being of other activities and processes (Butler 1999: 12).

In practice, however, Butler too concedes that sustainable tourism continues to mean different things to different people and has different meanings depending on the context within which the concept is employed. One issue that deserves particular attention is the question “sustainable to whom and for whom?” as sustainable tour-
ism in practice is often driven more by a concern for “sustained” tourism growth than an interest in the well being, economic, environmental, and otherwise, of the communities within which tourism takes place. Ever since the Brundtland Commission published its landmark report “Our Common Future” (WCED 1987) in 1987 and injected the concept of sustainability into mainstream political debates, proponents typically emphasize the need to integrate social, economic and ecological goals and consider the needs of both today’s and future generations. Accounts of sustainable tourism practices on the ground, however, suggest that economic considerations in practice frequently outweigh other concerns and that there are moreover significant conflicts and trade-offs between the environmental, social, and economic goals typically associated with sustainable development within which the latter will usually trump the former (Sharpley 2002: 328; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). Sustainable tourism’s rise to prominence in recent decades meanwhile can be attributed to two, separate but intertwined developments:

(1) a growing recognition of tourism’s negative externalities (“spillover” effects) for host communities, the frequent unfair distribution of tourism-related costs as well as the perceived lack of benefits for a majority of community members; and

(2) an increased awareness that tourism contains the seeds of its own destruction - that is, that unregulated tourism growth under certain circumstances can diminish the prospects of tourism in the long run.

Tourism as a resource industry relies heavily upon the exploitation – and hence also the continued existence - of natural and human resources, and history has shown
that overuse and overdevelopment produce detrimental externalities that can involve a degeneration of the very assets that constituted the original attraction.

Tourism’s capacity for self-destruction as well as the need to ensure the continuing existence of natural as well as man-made resources as basic “ingredients” of the tourist product are in other words increasingly acknowledged. Particularly in traditional holiday resorts and more rural destinations initiatives to help the tourism industry put itself on a more sustainable path and diminish the negative consequences of mass tourism, including especially the impacts on destination areas’ environmental resource base, have increasingly become commonplace (Sharpley 2002; Scheyvens 2002; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). Cities meanwhile have been rather slow in developing goals and policy instruments for sustainable tourism development. The pressure to take action in them is, with the exception of “classical” destinations like Venice, often less acute than in natural settings. Moreover, cities’ supply structure is known to be particularly fragmented and dispersed which complicates cooperation and productive interaction among key stakeholders; Finally, defining, measuring and evaluating urban tourism’s impacts, e.g. through conventional tools such as carrying capacity analyses, let alone influencing them, is particularly challenging (Hinch 1996; see also Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). There are a few examples to the contrary to be sure. Confronted with over-crowding, congestion and other tourism-related problems, Venice for instance has over the past decades initiated several policies and programs to address the gradual deterioration of its tourism product and make tourism more sustainable (Weaver 2006: 190). Other cities including San Francisco have meanwhile adopted guidelines that encourage tourism businesses to become more sustainable, following a set of criteria developed
by the Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria Partnership, a recently established network of international conservation, development, and travel industry organizations initiated by the Rainforest Alliance, the United Nations Environment Program, the United Nations Foundation, and the United Nations World Tourism Organization (see Table 10). 78

Significantly, such non-binding guidelines cannot compensate for the lack of coordinated tourism planning and management, which is described by numerous scholars as a critical prerequisite for achieving more sustainable forms of tourism development (see Table 11, see also Scheyvens 2002: pp.169; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). In spite of occasional rhetoric suggesting otherwise, however, urban public sector officials rarely concern themselves with tourism planning. Instead tourism policy in urban destinations beyond tourism marketing and promotion represents a rather underdeveloped policy field whose development and delivery occurs largely on the margins of - or disconnected from - mainstream policy making (and mainstream political debates). Berlin and New York are no exception to this, as most tourism policy is developed as a discrete and marginal element of wider urban and economic development policy and much of what happens with respect to tourism policy in the narrow sense of the word remains overwhelmingly driven by representatives within the tourism sector rather than elected representatives.

78 An attempt to harmonize elements from more than 60 existing sustainable tourism certification systems from around the world, the network’s criteria are organized around four main themes - effective sustainability planning; maximizing social and economic benefits for the local community; enhancing cultural heritage; and reducing negative impacts to the environment. In order to get listed as participating in the Sustainable Tourism Program in San Francisco, tourism companies, including lodging, tour operators, restaurants and other businesses and non-profits providing services for tourists must implement a minimum of 75 percent of the criteria (GSTC Partnership 2010).
### Table 10 The GSTC Partnership’s Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Demonstrate effective sustainable management.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1. The company has implemented a long-term sustainability management system that is suitable to its reality and scale, and that considers environmental, socio-cultural, quality, health, and safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2. The company is in compliance with all relevant international or local legislation and regulations (including, among others, health, safety, labor, and environmental aspects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3. All personnel receive training regarding their role in the management of environmental, socio-cultural, health, and safety practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4. Customer satisfaction is measured and corrective action taken where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5. Promotional materials are accurate and complete and do not promise more than can be delivered by the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6. Design and construction of buildings and infrastructure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6.1. Comply with local zoning and protected or heritage area requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6.2. Respect the natural or cultural heritage surroundings in siting, design, impact assessment, and land rights and acquisition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6.3. Provide access for persons with special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6.4. Use locally appropriate principles of sustainable construction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7. Information about and interpretation of the natural surroundings, local culture, and cultural heritage is provided to customers, as well as explaining appropriate behavior while visiting natural areas, living cultures, and cultural heritage sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Maximize social and economic benefits to the local community and minimize negative impacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1. The company actively supports initiatives for social and infrastructure community development including, among others, education, and health and sanitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2. Local residents are employed, including in management positions. Training is offered as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3. Local and fair-trade services and goods are purchased by the business, where available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4. The company offers the means for local small entrepreneurs to develop and sell sustainable products that are based on the area’s nature, history, and culture (including food and drink, crafts, performance arts, agricultural products, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5. A code of conduct for activities in indigenous and local communities has been developed, with the consent of and in collaboration with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6. The company has implemented a policy against commercial exploitation, particularly of children and adolescents, including sexual exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7. The company is equitable in hiring women and local minorities, including in management positions, while restraining child labor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8. The international or national legal protection of employees is respected, and employees are paid a living wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9. The activities of the company do not jeopardize the provision of basic services, such as water, energy, or sanitation, to neighboring communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Maximize benefits to cultural heritage and minimize negative impacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1. The company follows established guidelines or a code of behavior for visits to culturally or historically sensitive sites, in order to maximize visitor impact and maximize enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2. Historical and archeological artefacts are not sold, traded, or displayed, except as permitted by law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3. The business contributes to the protection of local historical, archeological, culturally, and spiritually important properties and sites, and does not impede access to them by local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4. The business uses elements of local art, architecture, or cultural heritage in its operations, design, decoration, food, or shops; while respecting the intellectual property rights of local communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Maximize benefits to the environment and minimize negative impacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1. Conserving resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.1. Purchasing policy favors environmentally friendly products for building materials, capital goods, food, and consumables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.2. The purchase of disposable and consumable goods is measured, and the business actively seeks ways to reduce their use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.3. Energy consumption should be measured, sources indicated, and measures to decrease overall consumption should be adopted, while encouraging the use of renewable energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.4. Water consumption should be measured, sources indicated, and measures to decrease overall consumption should be adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2. Reducing pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2.1. Greenhouse gas emissions from all sources controlled by the business are measured, and procedures are implemented to reduce and offset them as a way to achieve climate neutrality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2.2. Wastewater, including gray water, is treated effectively and reused where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2.3. A solid waste management plan is implemented, with quantitative goals to minimize waste that is not reused or recycled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2.4. The use of harmful substances, including pesticides, paints, swimming pool disinfectants, and cleaning materials, is minimized; substituted, when available, by innocuous products; and all chemical use is properly managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2.5. The business implements practices to reduce pollution from noise, light, runoff, erosion, ozone-depleting compounds, and air and soil contaminants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3. Conserving biodiversity, ecosystems, and landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3.1. Wildlife species are only harvested from the wild, consumed, displayed, sold, or internationally traded, as part of a regulated activity that ensures that their utilization is sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3.2. No captive wildlife is held, except for properly regulated activities, and living specimens of protected wildlife species are only kept by those authorized and suitably equipped to house and care for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3.3. The business uses native species for landscaping and restoration, and takes measures to avoid the introduction of invasive alien species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3.4. The business contributes to the support of biodiversity conservation, including supporting natural protected areas and areas of high biodiversity value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3.5. Interactions with wildlife must not produce adverse effects on the viability of populations in the wild; and any disturbance of natural ecosystems is minimized, rehabilitated, and there is a compensatory contribution to conservation management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet even if there were a more vigorous and pro-active engagement with tourism planning and policy on the part of the public sector, the question would remain as to how a more “sustainable” tourism should be conceptualized - let alone be achieved. Tourism, as several scholars have emphasized, is much easier to promote and initiate than to effectively manage and control, and the notion of sustainability, as hinted at above, is susceptible to multiple interpretations (Richards and Hall 2000: 12).

| -The approach sees policy, planning and management as appropriate and, indeed, essential responses to the problems of natural and human resource misuse in tourism |
| -The approach is generally not anti-growth, but it emphasizes that there are limitations to growth and that tourism must be managed within these limits. |
| -Long-term rather than short term thinking is necessary. |
| -The concerns of sustainable tourism management are not just environmental, but are also economic, social, cultural, political and managerial. |
| -The approach emphasizes the importance of satisfying human needs and aspirations, which entails a prominent concern for equity and fairness. |
| -All stakeholders need to be consulted and empowered in tourism decision-making, and they need to be informed about sustainable development issues. |
| -While sustainable development should be a goal for all policies and actions, putting the ideas of sustainable tourism into practice means recognizing that in reality there are often limits to what will be achieved in the short and medium term. |
| -An understanding of how market economies operate, of the cultures and management procedures of private-sector businesses and of public and voluntary sector organizations, and of the values and attitudes of the public is necessary in order to turn good intentions into practical measures. |
| -There are frequent conflicts of interest over the use of resources, which means in practice trade-offs and compromises may be necessary. |
| -The balancing of costs and benefits in decisions on different courses of action must extend to considering how much different individuals and groups will gain or lose. |

**Table 11 Principles of sustainable tourism management (Bramwell et al. 1998, in Richards and Hall 2000: 8)**
In Berlin Burkhard Kieker, since 2009 the new CEO of the city’s tourism marketing agency BTM, has been relatively outspoken about the need to address problems associated with tourism’s growth and encourage sustainable practices - at least as regards the potential challenges arising from the continuous growth of hotel supply over the years (see Stengel 2009), as well the possibility of a degradation of Berlin’s distinctive cultural and environmental attributes and “soul” due to tourism-induced development activity (Rada 2010; Schmid 2010). In Berlin there is in other words an increasing awareness that tourism growth has its dark side, that is, that “tourism can kill tourism” (Butler 1980; Glasson, Godfrey and Goodey 1995). An update of Berlin’s above mentioned tourism concept (Tourismuskonzept für die Hauptstadtregein Berlin-Brandenburg) at the time of writing was under preparation. Whereas its last formulation, which was implemented in 2004, refrained from setting other than economic goals and devoted almost no attention to tourism’s negative externalities or issues related to sustainability (Novy 2011), the new concept is expected to address problems resulting from unchecked, excessive development and also encourage more sustainable practices (Gerhard Buchholz, personal interview).

Significantly, such efforts are more driven by a concern about the integrity of Berlin’s resource base as a destination than by a concern over the integrity of the city and its neighborhoods as lived-in environments. Hence it will most likely leave many implications of concern to permanent residents unaddressed unless they affect the promise of economic gain. Gentrification, for instance, is not problematized because of its inherent social costs. Rather there is concern that too much “capitalist exploitation pressure”, as Kieker in an almost Marxist terminology once described it to the left-leaning newspaper Die Tageszeitung (Rada 2010), might jeopardize some of the
city’s main competitive advantages as a destination. Thus, there is fear that particularly its famed subculture of temporary clubs and bars as well as its more general creative and alternative flair might be at risk.\textsuperscript{79}

If one were to adopt a comprehensive understanding of sustainability, one accounting for host communities’ concerns and balancing economic, social and ecological matters, several issues would have to be considered. Implicit in virtually every approach to sustainable development are for instance the concepts of limits and control (Scheyvens 2002; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006). There are limits to growth; in relation to tourism this means that too much tourism development may lead to a situation where the costs of additional growth begin to outweigh the benefits and areas become unattractive in the long term. Determining when and where tourism’s extent becomes unsustainable in urban settings, however, is a daunting task, as standard indicators of flows of visitors, revenues generated, and numbers employed are not the only criteria that must be considered, and competing interests, values and viewpoints make the idea of universally agreed-upon thresholds and management objectives elusive.

The issue of control meanwhile has several implications. One is that if tourism is to be sustainable in the long run for local communities, they must be part of the decision making process. Compared to New York, Berlin’s administrative system, with its relatively strong and democratically elected district representatives, who exercise

\textsuperscript{79} During the last Tourismus tag, the annual convention of the city’s tourism industry, on April 26 2010 Kieker and numerous other speakers repeatedly emphasized the importance of Berlin’s image as Europe’s “capital of cool”, a title Time Magazine attributed to Berlin in 2009 (Gumbel 2009), as well as the need to maintain its authenticity and creative charm. In addition the Berliner Zeitung suggested a few weeks later that Kieker shared the conviction that gentrification constituted “the greatest threat for Berlin” (Schmid 2010) as it would threaten many of the distinctive cultural and environmental attributes that contributed to the city’s rise to prominence as a destination.
authority over local planning and zoning matters (unless the Senate deems them to be of “city-wide significance”) seems to be advantageous in this respect. Tourism in Kreuzberg has become, as has been discussed, a controversial topic among members of the district council and first measures to curb the developments currently underway have been implemented. The different roles and powers of sub-local political bodies notwithstanding, scholars have also stressed the importance to involve the community members themselves, including particularly those that are usually voiceless or excluded, in tourism planning and development. Despite difficulty of defining community and coming to terms with the typical unequal power relationships within them, there seems to be a degree of consensus that for the achievement of truly sustainable tourism on the community level, there is a need to establish techniques that ensure the widest participation and input possible from the whole community (for a discussion on the significance of dealing with unequal power relationships and participation as a critical pillar of sustainability see Hall 2000: pp.101). Successful blueprints that would indicate how this can be achieved are few and in between but a variety of techniques have been mentioned in the tourism literature. These include:

- the establishment of a permanent tourism committee or forum with the widest possible community representation acting in advisory and consultative capacity;
- public meetings and community ballots on key questions pertaining to tourism development;
- regular surveys to monitor community attitudes and perceptions towards the development of tourism on the neighborhood level;
- the input of impartial outside experts to inform the community, facilitate decision-making and/or resolve possible conflicts;
- the dissemination of information to educate, and empower community members (see Scheyvens 2002; Hall 2000; Richards and Hall 2000; Beeton 2006).

In this regard both neighborhoods have a long way to go, as the emerging governance arrangements with regard to tourism in both Harlem and Kreuzberg remain overwhelmingly limited to networks and exchanges between public sector actors and members of the tourist industry. Having said this, democratic control and community participation in tourism planning and development decision-making is a necessary but not a sufficient condition to guarantee the appropriateness of tourism development on the neighborhood level. Rather, the wider context also must be addressed. Sustainable tourism, particularly if one wants it to be about more than sustaining the “status quo” (Marcuse 1998b) and believes that social justice and equity concerns should equally be addressed, in other words cannot develop in a broader social and political context that essentially reproduces and reinforces unsustainable and socially unjust dynamics.

Wages and working conditions, rent increases and gentrification or, worse still, the displacement and exclusion of local communities, as well as many other of the adverse effects that have led many commentators to be critical of neighborhood tourism represent issues that need to be addressed by governments in their regulation of private sector development and planning. They require in other words more than a commitment to sustainable tourism but a commitment to more sustainable, equitable forms of development more generally. This is not to say that “bottom-up” approaches
of which some have been discussed in previous chapters, are without merit. Not only can many of them, as we’ve seen in Kreuzberg, make a difference despite constraining political-economic conditions within their respective communities, rather they can also be seen as sparking awareness and making a real contribution to advancing the understanding of policy alternatives and their implications.
CONCLUSION

Responding to the observable rise of tourism and leisure development in previously neglected neighborhoods, this thesis sought to provide a comprehensive account of the causes, characteristics and consequences of previously neglected urban areas’ selection and redefinition as new destinations for leisure and tourism. Focusing on Kreuzberg and Harlem, an attempt was made to reflect upon the multi-layered – and in contemporary studies at times omitted - historicity of the phenomenon, describe the current processes through which such places are reconfigured, both physically and socially, into new destinations for leisure and tourism, and elaborate upon the ambivalent implications of such transformations.

It is believed that several of the study’s findings have repercussions for urban research and practice. Conceiving tourism as a complex, dynamic system with a plethora of backward and forward linkages that extend from the highly localized to the global in areas such as the economic, the social, the cultural, the political/governmental, and the environmental, I traced the long roots of the phenomenon in question and challenged the widely held view that tourism in marginalized neighborhoods represents an altogether novel phenomenon tied to recent changes in the global regime of accumulation. Familiar clichés and generalizations about “typical” tourists were juxtaposed with an account of the plethora of different expressions and manifestations of contemporary urban tourism. An examination of place marketing and associated activities to incorporate marginalized neighborhoods into cities’ postindustrial economies and development cycles revealed that they are not as all-encompassing and penetrative as occasionally implied in dominant scholarly inter-
pretations and underscored the importance to account for the contextual embeddedness and frequent incompleteness of processes through which areas become re-imagined and reconstructed as destinations for tourism and leisure consumption. At the same time there are several limiting aspects of this study, stemming from both: my theoretical orientation as well as the methodological approach I employed. These as well as possible avenues for further research will be elaborated upon in the remainder of this last, concluding chapter.

1. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The point of this thesis was to provide a comprehensive account of the phenomenon under investigation and the host of variables from the changing global economy, national and urban policy, changing tastes and behaviors on part of tourists and leisure consumers as well as associated actions within the communities themselves. The result has been a sort of “tour de force” through an array of topics of obvious relevance to the thesis’ main concern, and some readers might be dissatisfied with the level of depth I ascribed to each individual issue touched upon in this thesis. Another issue that some readers may consider a weakness is the study’s apparent lack of systematic hypothesis testing and its eschewal of a more rigid comparative approach. This is something I regret myself but was the side effect of what I consider a tremendous learning process after having embarked on the intellectual journey that led to the thesis at hand. As I began to work on tourism on the neighborhood level and began to conceive and conceptualize this thesis, my research was guided by a rigid research agenda that focused on a comparative analysis of tourism politics in Kreuzberg and Harlem and included several hypotheses. Over time, while engaging with my research topic and the steadily expanding body of literature on tourism, I
became more and more became convinced, however, that I could make a greater scholarly contribution by moving beyond the worn out paths of previous urban tourism research. I, in other words, decided that I should widen the scope of my thesis to include perspectives on the ways the old face of tourism is being challenged by the actual realities of contemporary travel. This decision obviously affected the content and contribution of this thesis both positively and negatively and inevitably implied that my research became more exploratory, interpretative, and, also, tentative in nature and while a number of steps have been undertaken to guarantee a maximum level of rigor, integrity and quality, I am well aware that some readers might question the decisions I made.

Moreover, a number of general limitations apply to the findings reported in this thesis. For one, it should be reiterated that the research has not been conducted with the objective to produce insights that have the capacity for formal generalization across places. Rather it aimed at enhancing our understanding of a subject that is not yet well understood in scholarly circles, questioned preconceived views and assumptions and provided solid justification for the need for more research. The project in other words was not intended to prove anything, but to describe and explore the topic at hand in its multiple dimensions and in doing so help increase awareness and encourage further research. Likewise, the research, as any other qualitative research, is open to concerns about objectivity, an issue I already addressed in Chapter 1 when discussing issues of objectivity and subjectivity in qualitative research more in detail. Additionally, limitations stemming from practical problems also deserve mention. An obstacle when carrying out the research was the difficulty to get access to and interview informants. Even though I spent a significant amount of time
in both neighborhoods, particularly Harlem proved to be a difficult place to do re-
search in and I am well aware that I interacted with only a tiny fraction of the people
and organizations that were relevant to my research interests. Furthermore, I had
clearly underestimated the difficulties of getting hold of tourism statistics and other
systematic tourism-related information as much data I had planned to look at turned
out to be non-existent, unavailable or unreliable.

All in all, however, to conclude on more optimistic note, writing this thesis was an
important experience. It in many ways, to use a metaphor that fits in the context of
this thesis, resembled travelling in a foreign city without a map. Doing so may well
imply spending some time getting lost but also enables one to see and learn much
more. The more one learns, however, the more one understands the limits of what
can be done in a PhD study. The following are proposed as key areas for further re-
search that have emerged from the author’s insights while writing this dissertation:

1. Consumers

Following the lead of scholarly contributions in sociology and neighboring disciplines
and drawing upon a range of primary and secondary data sources, this thesis has
attempted to make a case for a broader, more encompassing understanding of tour-
ism activity on the neighborhood level. In general there is, as hinted at early, an ur-
gent need for more empirical research on tourism’s demand side in cities, i.e. their
demographics, motivations, activities and so on, but the data deficiencies are even
worse at the neighborhood level.
Future research should address the most glaring data gaps through quantifiable surveying and qualitative interviews, and research the supply-side trends identified in this thesis in other settings with other conditions. Furthermore, future research should focus on a number of particularly un- or underexplored topics. One is the ways in which recent developments in information and communications technologies such as the Internet, social networking sites and mobile devices are shaping and changing tourism and leisure in cities (see Gretzel and Jamal 2009). Another one is the growing number of ethnic and racial minority tourists, who constitute both in the US and in Europe a growing proportion of the travel market, visiting areas populated by their own ethnic or racial group. As regards theory, there are numerous issues that demand further attention, the most important arguably being the question what the increasing pervasiveness of mobility and tourism as well as its increased dedifferentiation - i.e. the blurred boundaries between tourism and non-tourism activities - imply for critical concepts in urban studies such as belonging, community and citizenship.

2. Contexts

Furthermore we still know relatively little about the way place-specific factors shape tourism development on the neighborhood level. How do particular forms of governance, specific institutional settings and different structural contexts of national regulation etc. influence the politics of tourism? Where and why do “new tourism areas”, as Maitland and Newman coined them, develop and to what extent do specific place characteristics influence their trajectories? More research focusing on different contexts and particularly (cross-national) comparative studies, on both the demand and supply sides of urban tourism will be required to get a clearer picture concerning
these and related questions, and provide more robust base for generalizations contributing to a better understanding of the issues at stake.

3. Consequences

Related to this, further research is also required to obtain a more accurate and complete understanding of tourism’s positive and negative effects on neighborhoods. Familiar data problems, difficulties in isolating the effects of tourism as well as the lack of universally accepted methods to measure them make this a particularly daunting task. Still, even if it is true that it is impossible to evaluate tourism’s impacts with any degree of precision, future research should nonetheless be directed toward developing better methods and tools, more knowledge and more imagination to assess tourism’s impacts on the neighborhood level. Lastly, emerging practices to strive for sustainable urban tourism clearly are deserving of more systematic attention on the part of researchers. Thus, there is also a need for further empirical investigations concerning the effectiveness of strategies and practices in the pursuit of sustainable urban tourism as well as the limitations of such approaches. This is so particularly as the described developments are likely to stay with us for the foreseeable future. The possibility of supply-side shocks resulting from terrorism, epidemics and natural catastrophes or sharply rising mobility prices notwithstanding, tourism both as an industry and a social phenomenon in other words will not go away anytime soon which is why more attention and more research is needed to understand – and deal with it.
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VI. APPENDIX

Appendix 1. List of Interviewees

The following actors and informants agreed to talk to me during my research (those marked in bold sat down with me for longer, typically semi-structured and recorded interviews).

Kreuzberg, Berlin:
• Dr. Peter Beckers, Bezirkstadjrat Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, October 6, 2010
• Franz Schulz, Borough Mayor (“Bezirksbürgermeister”) Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, July 2, 2008
• Nadja Sponholz, Entrepreneur/Activist (“Ich bin ein Berliner”), September 15, 2009
• Katrin Moderer, Entrepreneur & Chair “Runder Tisch Tourismus”, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, September 11, 2010
• Gerhard Buchholz, Berlin Tourism Marketing GmbH (Date of interview n.a.)
• Natascha Kompatzki Berlin Tourism Marketing GmbH, August 20, 2007
• Ursula Luchner-Brock, IHK-Berlin (Branchenkoordinatorin Tourismus, Gastgewerbe)
• Lisa Paus, (then) Member of the Berlin Parliament for the Green Party (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen), July 16, 2006
• Joachim Künzel, Senatskanzlei Berlin, Wirtschaft, Stadt- und Regionalentwicklung (III B), May 25, 2010
• Martin Düspohl, Director “Kreuzberg Museum”, September 4, 2008
• Philipp Mühlberg, Department for Urban Development (“Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, Referatsleiter Soziale Stadt”), September 3, 2008
• Lars Viehmeyer, District Manager (Quartiersmanagement Mariannenplatz), October 21, 2007
• Renate Liebsch, "Ich bin ein Berliner" von FiPP e.V., October 21, 2007
• Nadja Mau, Werkstatt der Kulturen. November 23, 2007
• Christine Ziegler, Regenbogenfabrik. (Date of interview n.a.)

Harlem, New York:
• Valerie Bradley, Activist/Entrepreneur, November 12, 2008
• Michael Henry Adams, Author/Activist, June 10, 2008
• Edwin Marshall, Department of City Planning, 07 May, 2008
• Tiffany Townsend, New York & Company, May 20, 2008,
• Abdul Kareem Muhammad, Harlem Tenant Alliance, June 12, 2008
• Clara Vilarosa, Founder of Harlem’s Hue-Man Book Store, June 18, 2008,
• Julia Lu, Upper Manhattem Empowerment Zone, June 18 & November 17, 2008
• Carolyn Johnson, Entrepreneur (“Welcome to Harlem”), June 18, 2008
• Angie Hancock, Entrepreneur (“Experience Harlem”), June 4 2008,
• Jacqueline Orange, Entrepreneur (“Harlem Taste“), June 6, 2008
• David Maurrasse, Professor & Author of “Listening to Harlem“, April 2, 2008
• Marquis Devereaux, Entrepreneur (“The Harlem Ambassador”), July 20, 2008
• Geneva T. Bain, District Manager, Community Board 10, May 22, 2007
### Appendix 2. Sources of all Figures and Tables

<p>| Figure 1: | Author’s Own &amp; PA/dpa/ZB/Arno Burg. Available Online: <a href="http://jungle-world.com/artikel/2011/12/42875.html">http://jungle-world.com/artikel/2011/12/42875.html</a> [last accessed on 22 March 2011] |
| Figure 2: | Author’s Own (drawing upon material included in NYC &amp; Company’s Official Visitor Map) |
| Figure 3: | Author’s Own (drawing upon material available online: <a href="http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d1/Berlin-Kreuzberg_Karte.png">http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d1/Berlin-Kreuzberg_Karte.png</a> [last accessed on 22 March 2011] |
| Figure 4: | First published in Manhattan Magazine (1932). Available Online: <a href="http://bigthink.com/ideas/22867">http://bigthink.com/ideas/22867</a> [last accessed on October 1, 2010]. |
| Figure 6: | Available Online: <a href="http://www.tagesspiegel.de/mediacenter/Photostrecken/berlin/wolfgang-krolow-ich-bin-kreuzberg/1934020.html">http://www.tagesspiegel.de/mediacenter/Photostrecken/berlin/wolfgang-krolow-ich-bin-kreuzberg/1934020.html</a> [last accessed on October 1, 2010]. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Author's Own (Source Statistisches Landesamt Berlin/Brandenburg, <a href="http://www.nyc.gov">www.nyc.gov</a>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Author's Own (Source Census 2000, Statistisches Landesamt Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Shaw and Williams 2001: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Author's Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Author's Own (after Holden 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Author's Own (after Torres 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Jansen-Verbeke (in Page 1995: 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Dumont, Ruelle, and Teller (2005: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>Available Online: <a href="http://www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=192&amp;Itemid=373">http://www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=192&amp;Itemid=373</a> [last accessed on October 1, 2010].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Bramwell et al. 1998, in Richards and Hall 2000: 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>