CMS Working Paper Series | No. 006-2006

Tourism as an Engine of Neighborhood Regeneration? Some Remarks Towards a Better Understanding of Urban tourism beyond the 'Beaten Path'

Sandra Huning
Berlin/Halle

Johannes Novy
Columbia University

The content of this paper was presented at the Center for Metropolitan Studies' ThinkCity event series in November 2006. A slightly modified version has been submitted to the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.

We owe gratitude to the students who participated in our seminar "Tourist City – Social City?," an urban planning studio jointly organized by the Technical University in Berlin (Institut für Soziologie, Fachgebiet Stadt- und Regionalsoziologie) and Columbia University's Urban Planning Program. Their contributions have strongly benefited our work.

A. Introduction

Over the last decade an extensive amount of research has been dedicated to the massive growth of urban tourism and its manifold impacts on cities around the globe.[1] While academic interest with regard to urban tourism in the past has concentrated primarily on the inner city – the areas commonly "hit hardest" by tourism –, it is only recently that scholars focus on the development of tourism in urban neighborhoods "beyond the beaten path". Particularly edgy, transitional and allegedly authentic urban settings such as industrial and warehouse districts, ethnic or immigrant enclaves and other neighborhoods where people on the margins of urban society live and work are today part of a growing number of tourists' travel itineraries.[2] This is a consequence of a broader trend towards a more individualized and differentiated mode of traveling, a significant diversification of tourists' interest and desires as well as an increased desire of travelers to transcend the areas primarily dedicated to, or taken over by tourism.[3]

However, empirical evidences suggest that tourists don't only "push" into neighborhoods beyond the beaten path but are also increasingly "pulled" into these areas. On the one hand, policy makers and other actors concerned with urban development, tourism marketing and planning have started to recognize the potential of places left over from tourism, i.e. places normally not inhabited by tourists and therefore lacking the infrastructure common to tourist areas, as tourist infrastructure has become a critical asset in the heightened competition among cities to position themselves in what Harvey calls the "spatial division of consumption".[4] On the other hand, actors concerned with neighborhood development pay increasing attention to tourism – along with other consumption based strategies – as a potential means to contribute to the regeneration of neighborhoods in disrepair.

A review of the literature suggests that particularly critical urban scholarship has in the past either been conspicuously silent or upfront dismissive with regard to the rising significance of tourism in neighborhoods beyond the beaten path. The phenomenon was thus apart from a couple of noteworthy exceptions[5] either ignored or criticized mostly for its alleged negative effects for local communities. Frequently embedded in broader critiques of contemporary urban development policies and practices and their emphasis on competitiveness and entrepreneurialism, tourism development on

[1] *see inter alia* Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd, *The Tourist City*, 1999; Christopher Law, *Urban Tourism*, 2002; Lily Hoffman et al., *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*, 2003.

[2] Dennis Judd, "Visitors and the Spatial Ecology of the City", 2003.

[3] see *inter alia* Lily Hoffman, *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*, 2003; Dennis Judd, "Visitors and the Spatial Ecology of the City", 2003.

[4] David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, 1990: 389.

[5] Dennis Judd, "Visitors and the Spatial Ecology of the City", 2003; Elizabeth Grant, "Race and Tourism in America's First City, 2005; Lily Hoffman, "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem", 2003; Michelle Boyd, "Reconstructing Bronzeville: racial nostalgia and neighborhood redevelopment", 2000.

the neighborhood level has been attacked for commodifying and exploiting local communities' culture and heritage for the benefit of developers and other private sector actors, fuelling processes of gentrification and paying little, if any, attention to the needs of the urban poor and other vulnerable population groups.[6]

In this paper, we argue that these and similar claims are not unsubstantiated, but that it is unfortunate that the dangers inherent to tourism-induced changes (named e.g., "tourist gentrification")[7] seem to make scholars overlook the potential benefits tourism can bring for neighborhoods that are isolated and cut off "mainstream" economy and society. Building on more recent research by US-American scholars,[8] this article aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of tourism's effects on neighborhoods in disrepair. We argue that an increased influx of tourists into neighborhoods beyond the beaten path should neither be conceived as generally "good" nor "bad" but that its effects are instead shaped by:

1. the kind and extent of tourism entering a neighborhood;
2. the institutional and regulatory context (national and city politics, as well as their underlying power relations etc.);
3. the way tourism development is planned on the local level as well as
4. the host communities' particular (social, ethnic, spatial etc.) characteristics tourism impinges upon.

Rejecting one-sided boosterish or overly dismissive interpretations of tourism development, and conceiving the phenomenon instead as a double-edged sword involving different and sometimes even contradictory characteristics and effects, we believe that there are two simple reasons that demand for greater scholarly attention towards the ways tourism enters and alters disadvantaged neighborhoods:

1. Tourism is, depending on who you read, either the world's largest industry or on its way there, and represents one of the few urban economic sectors with growth potential within reach of many neighborhoods struggling for economic opportunity.
2. A priori rejections of tourism development brush over the fact that many of the negative effects of tourism development are not inevitable. Tourism has despite its risks and pitfalls not only the potential to encourage economic development and physical improvements within a community, but can under certain circumstances also contribute to neighborhoods' long term and sustainable regeneration in other ways.

Hence, we wish to propose in this article that tourism deserves attention as a means of

[6] see *inter alia* Arelene Dávila, "Empowered Culture? New York City's Empowerment Zone and the Selling of El Barrio", 2004; Kevin Fox Gotham, "Tourism Gentrification: The Case of New Orleans' Vieux Carre (French Quarter)", 2005.

[7] see *inter alia* Kevin Fox Gotham, "Tourism Gentrification: The Case of New Orleans' Vieux Carre (French Quarter)", 2005.

[8] Elizabeht Grant, "Race and Tourism in America's First City", 2005; Lily Hoffman, "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem", 2003; Susan Fainstein and John Powers, "Tourism and New York's Ethnic Diversity: An Underutilized Resource?" 2006; Michelle Boyd, "Reconstructing Bronzeville: racial nostalgia and neighborhood redevelopment", 2000.

neighborhood regeneration. We furthermore assume that concepts of cultural and social capital can – in spite of their contested character in the community development literature – help us to capture some of the effects an increase of tourism activity in deprived neighborhoods can bring about. Two case studies – Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, New York – will illustrate our argument.

B. A theoretical framework: concepts of capital as public and individual resources

Studies concerned with neighborhoods have for a long time focused almost exclusively on economic capital when analyzing processes of development or decline. Similarly, economic capital was also prioritized until recently as a concern in neighborhood development policies and practices. Dependent on the research question, analyzing tourism development in terms of its economic effects for disadvantaged neighborhoods implies a number of things: it could involve an analysis of the jobs and revenues that are generated through tourism; an assessment of tourism's effects on land value prices, on financial investments in businesses, houses, commercial buildings, and infrastructures; an examination of rents and other living expenditures, as well as a joint analysis of all of these categories. Obviously, every analysis of tourism's economic effects needs to differentiate between the individual and the collective level, as neighborhoods consist of different social groups and actors and not everyone is affected by tourism development in the same way.

Not surprisingly - given the urban studies' rather skeptical stance towards tourism in low-income neighborhoods discussed above - there is relatively little research regarding the sector's possible economic benefits for low-income neighborhoods and their vulnerable population groups. Research by Rath and Hoffman represent noteworthy exceptions.[9] Their work suggests that tourism as an export industry has the potential to generate positive effects in low-income neighborhoods, which – by definition – lack spending power, by providing an "avenue of opportunity" for highly skilled and unskilled immigrants[10] and incorporating communities' local economies into the broader economy of the post-Fordist-Age.[11] Tourism's economic effects on neighborhoods in disrepair are manifold as tourists pay for accommodation, shop, eat and drink, pay entrance fees to museums, theatres and concert halls, and along the way frequently alter the property values ascribed to the places the visit. We believe that an analysis of these effects is crucial and that there is more research needed to advance our understanding of tourism's economic impact on low-income neighborhoods.

That said, economic effects alone are not determining neighborhoods' trajectories. While economic capital today is still prioritized in the scholarly realm as well as policy arenas, it is at the same time increasingly recognized that explorations of other forms of capital – most prominently social and, still to a much lesser extent, cultural capital – are also critical in order to gain a sound understanding of issues related to neighborhood change. Built on the premise that a true understanding of neighborhoods' trajectories requires an analysis of different forms of capital and that many of tourism's effects exceed the economic realm, we will in this paper examine the three different forms of capital. We will focus on social and cultural capital concepts, for we believe that particularly

[9] Jan Rath, "Feeding the Festive City. Immigrant Entrepreneurs and Tourist Industry", 2005; Lily Hoffman, "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem", 2003.

[10] see Jan Rath, "Feeding the Festive City. Immigrant Entrepreneurs and Tourist Industry", 2005: 252.

[11] Lily Hoffman, "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem", 2003.

their careful consideration is beneficial to shed light on the risks and benefits of neighborhood tourism apart from its immediately tangible – and as a matter of fact intrinsically related – economic effects.

Social capital concepts in the context of community development

First introduced in the early 20th century by the US-American educationalist L. J. Hanifan, the idea of social capital has influenced researchers and thinkers in the social sciences throughout the 20th century – both as a category for empirical analysis and as a normative ideal.[12] Probably best known in community development literature, Robert D. Putnam developed a rather normative concept of social capital – understood as features of social organization such as social trust, norms of general reciprocity, and networks of civic engagement – and presented it as a decisive prerequisite for societies', communities' and other social units' well-being or – as the title of his study suggests – as the "key to making democracy work".[13] However, his arguments are by no means uncontested: scholars have pointed out that the mechanisms translating social capital into political commitment – or any other kind of social engagement for the community – are not clear, and that there is furthermore little empirical evidence that social capital has any capacity to change the socio-economic conditions people live in.[14] Evidence from the community development literature rather suggests that social capital in form of trust-based networks, ties and mutual trust is, as a matter of fact, frequently a strong feature of deprived urban neighborhoods that allows residents to cope with the living conditions they are confronted with, but in the end has little effect on their capacity to change the same.[15] What follows is that deprived neighborhoods don't necessarily lack social capital as such, but rather have deficits with regard to certain networks, ties and forms of mutual trust and kinship to certain members of society and institutions that appear to be crucial for neighborhoods' favorable development.[16] Somewhat related is the argument that the social capital discourse tends to explain spatial inequalities in general as well as neighborhoods' deprivation in particular in terms of individualistic characteristics as well as local deficiencies. Many scholars have stressed that the current interest in ideas of empowerment, self-help, self-activation and mutuality must not distract from the fact that the reasons for disadvantaged neighborhoods' deprivation and exclusion is decisively influenced by trends and developments beyond communities' boundaries.[17] Last, but not least, a neighborhood is not a collective actor. Usually, it does not even have its own political board. There are conflicts and different interests among neighborhood residents, and there is certainly a diverging availability of social, as well as all other kinds of capital.

Social capital and issues of power, inequality, and exclusion

One of the main weaknesses of Putnam's social capital concept is that it does not address the conflicts suggested above, and thereby neglects issues of power, dominance and exclusion. For this reason, we

[12] for an overview see e.g. Michael Woolcock, „Social capital and economic development: Towards a theoretical synthesis and policy framework", 1998.

[13] Robert Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy,* 1993: 185.

[14] Carl Boggs, "Social capital and political fantasy: Robert Putnam's Bowling Alone", 2001: 153; Michael Foley and Bob Edwards, „Escape From Politics? Social Theory and the Social Capital Debate", 1997.

[15] James DeFilippis," The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development", 2001: 798.

[16] Ray Forrest and Ade Kearns, "Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighborhood", 2001: 2141.

[17] Ray Forrest and Ade Kearns, "Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighborhood", 2001: 2139.

turn to Pierre Bourdieu's concept of social capital, which is only occasionally applied in the community development literature, but which represents an invaluable corrective – if not even an alternative – to Putnam's work. Social capital represents for Bourdieu one of three interrelated forms of capital (the other two being cultural and economic capital) that structure capitalist societies' stratified social system, reproduce power and privilege, and determine individuals' life chances. Bourdieu defines social capital as

> "(...) the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition."[18]

In short: social capital is the sum of those resources which go along with the possession of acquaintances and memberships. It is closely related to and never independent of cultural and economic capital.[19] In Bourdieu's view, all forms of capital have the function to secure or improve an individual's or a group's social position, and can be transformed into each other, e.g. knowledge is convertible into economic capital. Bourdieu depicted social capital as a resource which is intrinsically tied to existing power structures and socio-economic inequalities. As part of his broader examination of the persistence of societies' stratification and other entrenched forms of inequality, Bourdieu viewed social capital primarily as an asset used by elites to maintain their privileges. Therefore, he did not analyze social capital in terms of its potential contributions to processes of social cohesion or integration, but rather very much to the opposite examined its role in the (re-)production of social inequalities by exerting a "multiplier effect" on the varying volume of capital individuals and groups have at their disposal.[20]

This effect can be illustrated: An empirical study that accompanied young people in disadvantaged inner city neighborhoods showed how they used the social capital available to them in order to find work, but, by doing so, their future prospects grew worse and worse "because the social capital they accessed embedded them more deeply in a declining sector of the economy".[21] The findings of the study suggest that – just as Bourdieu stated – social capital acts as a multiplier which strengthens existing economic and cultural capital. Knowing the "right" people is often linked to economic success, whereas a "culture of poverty" may emerge within a close network of people who dispose of the same low economic and cultural capital. We think that Bourdieu's approach is useful with regard to our concern here because it addresses the conflicts and different interests of the various social groups beyond territorial boundaries, and shows the mechanisms of power reproduction.

The potential impact of cultural resources/cultural capital

Individuals' and groups' uneven stock of cultural capital was for Bourdieu also a decisive factor in the continuous (re-)production of power and privilege in societies' stratified social system. Cultural capital

[18] Pierre Bourdieu and Loic J.D. Wacquant, *An invitation to reflexive sociology*, 1992: 119.

[19] James DeFilippis, "The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development", 2001: 783.

[20] Pierre Bourdieu, "The forms of capital", 1986; Sebastian Braun, "Putnam und Bourdieu und das soziale Kapital in Deutschland", 2001: 341; James DeFilippis, "The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development", 2001: 783.

[21] Michael Edwards and Bob Foley, "Escape From Politics? Social Theory and the Social Capital Debate", 1997: 673.

existed for Bourdieu in an embodied state ("long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body"; e.g. tradition, knowledge), objectified state (e.g. "cultural goods"; architecture, museums, books, art), and institutionalized state (forms of its recognition; diplomas, certificates).[22]

Bourdieu goes a long way to explain how different forms of art and music, for example, are perceived by and linked to different social groups. Simply put: "High culture" is for the elites, "entertainment culture" for the masses. But the recognition of which piece of art belongs to which culture is the result of a long and continuous process. The point at which a cultural resource actually turns into capital, and which value cultural capital then receives, is determined by the outside, not necessarily by its owner. Cultural resources that were not appreciated in the past may turn into capital as soon as they are recognized by a certain number of people.

We hinted at this mechanism with regard to neighborhood tourism "beyond the beaten path" in the introduction of this paper. Former no-go-areas have (been) turned into desired travel destinations, as their "authenticity", the alternative lifestyles of their residents and their different tangible and intangible cultural resources – music, art, history, traditions, the aesthetic of their built environment etc. – became attractive for outsiders. The transformation of many local communities' inherent characteristics into "marketable commodities", and particular the usage of a place's culture and history for the purpose of economic development and neighborhood regeneration, is a delicate matter for some scholars have shown that this strategy raises a whole set of problematic questions surrounding rights, representations, and identity.[23] We know, for example, that particularly neighborhoods' tangible cultural resources such as their built environment or heritage frequently stimulate gentrification processes once their aesthetics are recognized by the middle and upper classes. Cultural capital then serves as a catalyst for development which results in concentrations of economic capital involving the displacement of local residents and businesses as well as the transformation of the neighborhoods' local characteristics according to the needs and tastes of the gentrifying classes.[24] "Boosterish interpretations" which depict cultural capital as a kind of resource that can easily be built up across neighborhoods and cities with implied benefits for all are highly questionable because of the long-lasting history of gentrification. If we indeed accept that cultural capital continues to be a source of class distinction, we also need to recognize that members of the middle and upper classes are the ones that not only utilize their own cultural capital most effectively, but also possess the means to usurp and adopt others' cultural resources for their own benefit in the contemporary city.[25]

"The course of cultural capital does not always run smoothly", as Bridge points out,[26] and gentrification, a powerful physical and social manifestation of cultural capital's new relevance for neighborhood change, is not inevitably the only imaginable path deprived neighborhoods' trajectories may take after their endogenous resources are recognized. The effects decisively depend on the way they are interrelated with dynamics and resources resulting from the diverse availability social and

[22] Pierre Bourdieu, "The forms of capital", 1986: 243.

[23] see e.g. Sharon Zukin, *The Culture of Cities*, 1995.

[24] see Gary Bridge, "Perspectives on cultural capital and the neighborhood", 2006.

[25] see Gary Bridge, "Perspectives on cultural capital and the neighborhood", 2006: 728.

[26] Gary Bridge, "Perspectives on cultural capital and the neighborhood", 2006: 722.

economic capital. What follows is that researchers interested in neighborhood change have to disentangle the complex web through which economic, cultural, and social capital are related on the local level, in order to gain an understanding of neighborhoods' different trajectories.

C. Neighborhood tourism in Harlem, New York City, and Berlin-Kreuzberg

The following discussion of tourism development in the low-income communities Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, NYC, will show how neighborhood tourism is related to neighborhoods' stock of social and cultural capital. Both cases show that tourism development does not automatically generate positive outcomes for neighborhoods in disrepair. The effects of tourism development, very much to the opposite, rather depend on the kind of tourism development that occurs, the community's inherent characteristics and resources, the extra-local context in which they find themselves embedded, as well as on the way tourism development is planned and regulated.

Tourism in Harlem

Harlem is a centrally located neighborhood right north of Central Park that is on the one hand known for its history as a center of African-American culture and life and on the other hand infamous for its decline in the course of the second half of the 20th century when the neighborhood fell into a severe state of disrepair.[27] Struggling with urban blight, institutionalized racism, crime and poverty, the neighborhood was in fact until the 1980s and early 1990 considered a "no-go area" by most New Yorkers and visitors alike. Since then Harlem has experienced a significant development boom, however, and commentators argue that tourism played a main role in what some describe as the neighborhood's "second renaissance" and others view as an expression of a sort of "revanchist" urbanism that targets at the "reconquering" of cities through the middle and upper classes.[28]

Tourist activity has as a matter of fact grown substantially in the long time stigmatized neighborhood in recent years as a consequence of a growing interest of tourists in the neighborhood, intensified tourism marketing efforts by local and non-local players such as the Upper Manhattan's branch of the Federal Empowerment Zone initiative (UMEZ), as well as a number of other, often more general trends such as the generally favorable economic climate of the time and the substantial reduction of crime in the area.[29] Currently attracting about 500.000 visitors per annum, Harlem has thus evolved into an internationally recognized tourist destination as tourists of various social and cultural backgrounds flock into the neighborhood by foot or by bus, on their own or in organized groups, to attend Gospel and Jazz concerts, search for traces of the "Harlem Renaissance", experience the vibrancy on the neighborhood's streets, explore the areas' historic sights and sites, and – undeniably also a motive for some – satisfy their curiosity with regard to the neighborhood's alleged "ghetto culture".

[27] Harlem is, as Maurasse (2006: 4) points out, a "neighborhood of neighborhoods" that is home to almost 500.000 residents and takes up a solid chunk of Manhattan north of 110th Street. The following discussion focuses primarily on Central Harlem, the "Black Mecca" of the United States, but occasional reference will be made to developments in West and East Harlem since the boundaries between these three districts that together constitute Harlem are anything but rigid.

[28] see e.g. Mamamdou Chinyelu, *Harlem ain't nothing but a Third World Country*, 1999.

[29] David Maurasse, *Listening to Harlem. Gentrification, Community and Business*, 2006: 31; Lily Hoffman, "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem", 2003.

Tourism & Cultural Capital in Harlem

Over decades a symbol of urban decay, Harlem today enjoys an increasingly positive reputation. Harlem's improved image is both accompanied and spurred by a greater appreciation and valorization of the neighborhoods' culture and history. Harlem's history as the "Black Mecca" of the United States as well as its cultural richness ranging from the legacy of the Harlem Renaissance to the community's role as an epicenter of contemporary Black culture, are not only sources of local pride and confidence, but are also increasingly recognized as marketable assets to build upon – by actors within and beyond the community's boundaries. Tourists began to venture into the neighborhood at a time when cultural richness and historical significance had almost entirely fallen into oblivion. Through their interest in the community, they contributed to the renewed appreciation and valorization of many of Harlem's endogenous resources.[30] An anecdote in a New York Times article[31] about the re-opening of the Art-Deco Jazz-Club Lenox-Lounge exemplifies how tourism has helped to challenge Harlem's image as the domain of youth gangs and drug dealers: Harlemnites and New Yorkers, a local explains, did at first not visit the club when it re-opened in the late 1990s because of its location on a street block infamous in the 1980s and early 1990s for drug trafficking. Europeans and Asians Jazz fans – not aware of the stretches' infamous past – did, and by doing so challenged Central Harlem's long-lasting perception as a crime-ridden place that should be avoided.

Besides bringing revenues and publicity to the community,[32] tourism thus helped to challenged Harlem's reputation and shaped the awareness of the broader public as well as many influential actors within and beyond the community of the assets Harlem calls its own. It were tourists that contributed to the transformation of the community's inherent cultural and historical resources into a recognized and valuable currency by creating interest and demand. Many observers criticize these developments, raise questions about the banalization, commodification, and exploitation of Harlem's local identity, and worry about a dilution of the neighborhood's cultural integrity.[33] These objections are not unsubstantiated as a recent debate about a "Harlem-themed restaurant" offering "Miles Davis omelets" and "Denzel Burgers" exemplifies.[34] A comparison of the present situation of Harlem's cultural life with its condition 10-20 years ago suggests, however, that the tourism-induced change has been as much of a threat to the neighborhood's culture as it has been a contributor to its revival: neighborhood institutions such as the Apollo Theatre, a historic incubator of African-American performers, are renovated, local institutions such as the annual Harlem Week festival flourish, and bars, galleries, concert venues and other facilities committed to Black or Latino culture benefit from tourists' interest and spending power and seem to do well – despite the fears of a „white take-over" of

[30] Lily Hoffman, "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem", 2003.

[31] Lynda Richardson, "Longing for Authenticity; Is the Jazz Really Jazz in Harlem Without the Locals?" 2000: B1.

[32] It is estimated that tourism's economic impact accounts for approximately $ 167 Million of annual revenue as well as 1,674 jobs in Upper Manhattan. Taking the fact into account that tourism's economic impact is difficult to measure and that the study on tourism's impact in Harlem was commissioned by one of the main protagonists of tourism development in Harlem (i.e. UMEZ), these numbers should not be taken for face value.

[33] Paul Keegan, "Who owns Harlem", 2000: 64; Arlene Dávila, "Empowered Culture? New York City's Empowerment Zone and the Selling of El Barrio", 2004.

[34] Robin Pogrebin, "Groups Vie to Reimagine Historic Theater in Harlem," 2005.

the neighborhood[35]. Just as the original Harlem Renaissance would have been unimaginable without the patronage of visitors, tourism today also supports many of Harlem's businesses and institutions by elevating the recognition of Harlem's culture and history, spurring innovation, and – as a classical export industry – providing much needed revenues.

Tourism & Social Capital in Harlem

Tourism inevitably involves a degree of physical proximity and interaction between tourists and residents. Particularly interaction represents a prerequisite for the overcoming of neighborhoods' exclusion and isolation, their integration into some kind of "mainstream society" as well as for the generation of social capital. That said, it is certainly also true that not all forms of interaction inevitably bring about positive effects – they can on the contrary also lead to conflicts and tensions. The tourism literature confirms this view for there are numerous studies that exemplify how tourism based on stereotypes and involving exploitive relationships between guests and hosts (re-) produce patterns of domination and dependency. Tourism has because of these concerns frequently been described as a form of "(neo-) colonialism" or "imperialism."[36] Thus, the issue at stake is whether local residents are being reduced to a tourist object or, quite on the contrary, emerge as subjects of a new tourist practice in the city.[37]

In Harlem, both developments take place simultaneously: commenting on bus tourism in the neighborhood, Lloyd Williams, the president and CEO of the Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce for examples intones: "Sometimes tourism here is handled like it's a jungle safari (...). Like they're in the wild kingdom looking at the animals running around" (Williams in Keegan, 2000). Harlem residents are in fact frequently objectified as part of the "package" of standardized bus tour offerings, their traditional roles perpetuated within an industry that feeds on stereotypical images grounded in notions of 'otherness' and 'exoticism'. Not all tourism practices build on voyeurism and prejudices, and not all tourism practices reinforce power differentials, however. Some tourism practices, particular when not confined to the interior of coach busses, are less exploitive, allow for two-way interaction, and clarify that residents are not inevitably powerless tourist objects, but rather can also represent subjects engaged with their environment that are able to influence the tourist practices around them. It is under such circumstances that we believe that tourism can affect local residents' stock of social capital on the one hand by facilitating mutual exchange between hosts and guests, and fostering a sense of understanding for different ways of life, as well as on the other hand by sharpening local residents' interest, knowledge, and sense of belonging concerning their community as well as the networks and ties within them.

Positive effects in terms of social capital can also be identified on the institutional level, particularly when examining efforts by entrepreneurs or nonprofit organizations to link tourism and community development, empower Harlem's residents and contribute to the socio-economic

[35] Black and Latino businesses and institutions certainly don't do well on 125th Street however where skyrocketing real estate prices as well as a proliferation of chain stores threatens to displace the remaining owner-led stores.

[36] Erik Cohen, "The Sociology of Tourism: Approaches, Issues, and Findings", 1984; Erik Cohen and Graham Dann," Sociology and Tourism", 1991.

[37] see Jan Rath, "Feeding the Festive City. Immigrant Entrepreneurs and Tourist Industry", 2005: 248.

advancement of the neighborhood. One example is the "Harlem One Stop" project which is run by Harlem's performance center "Aaron Davis Hall" and aims to reinforce the connection between increased cultural tourism in Upper Manhattan with the community's socio-economic revitalization. Funded by a cultural tourism grant from the Arts & Business Council/NYSCA, "Harlem One Stop" aims to intensify partnerships among Upper Manhattan actors (such as neighborhood groups, community based development organizations, members of the cultural industries & the business community etc.) and develop connections with tourism-relevant actors outside of Harlem in order to promote tourism – not for the sake of tourism development itself but with the stated goal to positively impact the neighborhood's development.

Projects such as "Harlem One Stop" illustrate the mechanism tourism can set in motion on the institutional level: the neighborhood's tourism-induced appeal – which we tried to describe with the help of Bourdieu's cultural capital concept – prompts an incentive to establish or strengthen bonds and ties among local actors and allows them to create networks and partnerships with extra-local actors previously beyond reach. This is how the theory goes, in practice this mechanism unfortunately does not always play out that nicely in Harlem. Projects such as "Harlem One Stop" are here of relatively little impact compared to other tourism-driven or tourism-related projects and initiatives put forward by large developers and corporations as well as local and non-local elites. Their efforts frequently either lack the comprehensiveness or the will to exploit tourism's potential to contribute to the socio-economic advancement of the community's residents which is not surprising taking into account that tourism development in Harlem takes place within a political context that is shaped by an emphasis on entrepreneurial and corporate-led development, characterized by a lack of democratic accountability as well as continuous power struggles among local leaders, and hallmarked by a weakening role of community involvement and participation.[38]

What is the consequence of all of this? Tourism contributes to the neighborhood's integration into the "mainstream" economy and society, but many of tourism's potential benefits don't materialize as publicly sponsored efforts to promote tourism in Harlem rarely target at more than strictly economic rationales, whereas most private actors that try to exploit Harlem's new attractiveness are also primarily concerned with their own profits. This means in terms of tourism's effects on what Putnam would call the neighborhood's stock of social capital that social capital is – apart from the more general and less tangible effects discussed above – disproportionately generated in the ranks of the elites as well as among selected local businesses and entrepreneurs who benefit from new linkages and ties with actors formerly beyond reach, and are able to capitalize on the tourism-induced revalorization of the neighborhood's cultural and historical resources. Some of their profits may trickle down to local residents and businesses in the form of revenues, jobs or human capital building and it is also reasonable to assert that their efforts have brought additional attention and respect from local governments and other institutions. Ultimately, however, it is disappointing to see how little community-based institutions – the historic engine of African-American pride and socio-economic advancement – and for that matter also the local community more generally were included in the

[38] Marilyn Gitell, *Empowerment Zones: An Opportunity Missed. A six-city Comparative Study*, 2001: 82; see also David Maurasse, *Listening to Harlem. Gentrification, Community and Business*, 2006.

tourism development and marketing efforts of UMEZ and other driving forces of the neighborhood's transformation.

Today, at a point in time where the development of a new Marriott-Hotel on 125th Street hallmarks a new stage of tourism development in the community, the case of Harlem thus illustrates that tourism as such does not automatically work for the advantage of low-income communities, as rents and property prices in the neighborhood have skyrocketed while poverty and public assistance rates remain high and local residents, excluded from the discourse and most of the benefits tourism generates, feel increasingly threatened by a development over which they seem to have little control.[39]

Tourism in Berlin-Kreuzberg

The district Berlin-Kreuzberg is, similar to Harlem, a "neighborhood of neighborhoods", home to about 145.000 residents and situated in the south of Berlin's inner city. Characterized by abundant Wilhelminian tenement buildings and a lively ethnically diverse residency, Kreuzberg's existing pockets of affluence can not change the fact that the neighborhood as a whole belongs to the socio-economically weakest and most problematic areas of Berlin. Yet Kreuzberg is by no means exclusively defined in terms of social problems and conflicts, but enjoys very much to the opposite also a very favorable image – at least among a young, alternative "subcultural" scene – as one of the most exciting, socially and culturally heterogeneous neighborhoods of Berlin (see Bernstein, 2005). Kreuzberg became (in)famous during the 1970s and 1980s as center of West Germany's subculture and a haven for squatters, hippies, punks and left-wing intellectuals. In the 1970s, Kreuzberg's inhabitants were among the first in Western Germany to fight an urban planning strategy which aimed at the total demolishment of existing housing structures and its replacement by uniform social housing, by occupying empty houses in order to save them from being torn down. Kreuzberg was site of frequent street riots (and still is during the yearly labor movement parades on the occasion of the international labor day, May 1st, see Rucht 2003) and has until today the image of a center of rebellion and political protest.

Dozens of cultural venues and community organizations keep the neighborhood's cultural scene alive. Kreuzberg is not only notorious as a refuge of alternative lifestyles, but is also known for its ethnic diversity and its large Turkish community – the largest outside of Turkey. The Carnival of Cultures, Germany's biggest multi-cultural street festival which attracts between 500.000 and 1.000.000 visitors annually, takes place on Kreuzberg's streets. Many of Kreuzberg's endogenous qualities such as its lively alternative scene or its multicultural atmosphere represent characteristics that are of great interests to tourists and depicted as such by most Berlin travel guides as well as by Berlin's marketing agency, the Berlin Tourism Marketing GmbH (BTM). Kreuzberg's endogenous qualities thus represent a strong tourist draw in their own right. Since German reunification, Kreuzberg has become an important location for the city's accommodation industry – dozens of lodges are located in Kreuzberg ranging from a few four star hotels, primarily located in the northern fringe of the neighborhood close to the city's central district Mitte, to hostels and guesthouses for budget-

[39] David Maurasse, *Listening to Harlem. Gentrification, Community and Business*, 2006: 38; see also John Jackson, *Harlem World: Doing Race and Class in Contemporary Black America*, 2001: 156.

oriented travelers scattered throughout the borough. Many local grassroots organizations which evolved and established themselves in the course of the last decades in opposition to the orthodox planning measures of the 1960s and in social work today devote attention to tourism development, and think about strategies how tourism could benefit the neighborhood's overall development.

Tourism & Cultural Capital in Kreuzberg

After 1990, Kreuzberg's border situation was turned into a central geographic position within the city of Berlin. Since then, the Haus am Checkpoint Charlie (already opened in 1963 at the border between East and West Berlin, dedicated to the people who fled the GDR, and to their creative ways of flight), the Museum of Technology, the Jewish Museum (opened in 2001, dedicated to Jewish history in Germany), and the Berlinische Gallerie (art museum, opened in 2005) – all of them of citywide significance – attract every year hundreds of thousands national and international tourists who for the most part differ quite a bit from the "alternative" crowd which had come to Kreuzberg in cold war times. These tourist attractions can be considered as anchors which have contributed to a normalization of the Kreuzberg image in recent years, and to its becoming a regular tourist destination without being marketed as such to a great extent. Multinational and multicultural[40] Kreuzberg, the neighborhood's nightlife and cultural events as well as its preserved housing stock from pre-war times became generally acknowledged attractions. Shops and bars, clubs and restaurants attract visitors from other parts of Berlin as well as from all over the world. The Kreuzberg museum shows the history of urban renewal and local social movements. Guided tours lead visitors through Kreuzberg, with guides being not only professionals, but also pupils from local schools and young adults who get special training to show Kreuzberg from their everyday perspective (e.g. organized by the association FIPP e.V.). The visitors of these "insider" tours do not only come from abroad, but also from other parts of Berlin, a fact which also leads to a changed image of Kreuzberg within Berlin. Some grassroots organizations have started to exploit income-generating opportunities induced by tourism, e.g. by opening up hostels, bike stations, etc. (e.g. the Regenbogenfabrik – rainbow company – project). These are partly marketed as "social projects", and try to integrate and combine their efforts by applying for funding (see plan b concept). These projects own a special attraction for those visitors who would like to benefit the district by their expenditures. The feeling of "authenticity" and the casual integration of tourists into the streetscape are also supported through the high number of tourists who stay with friends or family in the district (which is the case for Berlin in general), and by the many Kreuzberg residents from abroad.

One important actor who is pushing socially oriented tourism to a certain extent is the borough's mayor for economy. Co-financed by the European Union, he supported an initiative titled "Neighborhood tourism as a means of income provision in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg"[41] which aims to promote tourism in the neighborhood in order to spur the local economy and create job and revenue opportunities for its residents. This includes the marketing of products, e.g. local wine or handicraft

[40] We intend to use these expressions descriptive – in the sense of the everyday presence of residents from many nations and with many different cultural backgrounds – rather than normative.

[41] Bezirksamt Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, „Tourismusförderung im Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg", 2003; KOMBI Consult GmbH, „Einkommenssicherung durch Stadtteiltourismus im Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Darstellung Projektstand", 2005.

from local work-shops, as well as the development of small and large-scale events which are supposed to make Kreuzberg popular as a venue for alternative and "cool" happenings (such as fashion shows by local designers). A round table of tourism-related actors has been established which is supposed to sustain its work beyond the project duration (www.multi-kult-tour.de). Kreuzberg is supposed to become a "brand" for a young and creative target group.

Resentments against tourism continue to exist as residents recall the time before the fall of the Berlin Wall when tourist buses drove through the neighborhood to let tourists have a glance at the neighborhood's squatted buildings and its counter-cultural atmosphere. Many residents are moreover afraid of the potential changes tourism might bring about, and worry that an increase of tourism might lead to processes of gentrification and displacement. These concerns have to be taken seriously, but so far, the extent of gentrification in Kreuzberg has been limited.[42] Specific reasons for what we would consider a rather successful integration of tourism activity into Kreuzberg's daily life are difficult to assess – particularly since there is almost no detailed statistical data available about the number and type of tourists that visit the area. Possible explanations include that Kreuzberg primarily attracts tourists who prefer to travel on their own, it is thus not a mass tourism destination – and that many tourists that visit the neighborhood blend relatively well into its social fabric in terms of lifestyle[43]. Tourists' expenditures contribute to the local economy, but this is often not realized as national and international travelers as well as visitors from other parts of Berlin patronize the same shops, bars, restaurants and cultural institutions as residents do, and are thereby frequently not even recognized as tourists. This also has to do with the high number of non-German Kreuzberg residents from Europe and all parts of the world.

Tourism & Social Capital in Kreuzberg

The new recognition of Kreuzberg's cultural capital has led to a restructuring of the social relations within the borough, and to the outside. New networks have been built up by the above mentioned EU-co-funded project. Though without spending money and without democratic legitimacy, the round table acts as a platform for exchange, and eventually for common projects. Its members cover a wide range of activities and actors, from the district administration, commercial businesses offering boat trips on the river Spree and the Landwehrkanal, to social projects which run a hostel and a bike station, or which educate young people to be professional tour guides. Only recently, Kreuzberg and other boroughs have become included into Berlin's official international marketing campaign by Berlin Tourist Marketing (BTM). The cultural resources are now generally acknowledged. This leads to a slow shift of perspectives also on the official agenda.

Kreuzberg has always been home to people from all different areas of the world. Nevertheless, it is a habitat with a very specific milieu. The increased tourism activity has contributed to an opening of this milieu. Not only the image changes, and people from outside get to know Kreuzberg from a new

[42] Pockets of revalorization notwithstanding, it seems that it is not the moving in, but rather the moving out of middle-class residents that appears to be the main problem most parts of the neighbourhood are confronted with.

[43] This is not the case for the hundreds of thousands visitors who visit the main tourist destinations in the area, e.g. the Jewish Museum. Research of our students showed that the greater part of them does not spend further time in the neighborhood. Kreuzberg seems to be more of a second-visit attraction, when mainstream sights have been visited.

perspective, but also the local guides, many of them pupils or students, and tourism-related social projects gain new insights of the world outside this special habitat, everyday realities and people with different backgrounds and lifestyles. The commodification of Kreuzberg has not yet happened to a degree that local residents and their milieus were seriously "damaged", i.e. manipulated or staged. A strong local elite, based on the associations and initiatives founded since the 1970s, consists of self-confident local actors with a strong orientation towards community well-being. Local elites are oriented towards securing the status quo, and they are taken rather serious by government officials and projects. For example, the construction of a huge commercial observation wheel – which the mayor of Berlin favored as an attraction especially for young couples, aiming to add some kind of romantic Parisian flair and reminiscent to the London Wheel – was prevented in Kreuzberg by protests of residents because the wheel was planned at a site currently used as a recreation area for residents. The failure of this and other similar projects suggests that residents and local elites have a high influence on many public issues (even though their formal power may be limited).

D. Conclusion

Tourism development is not a panacea that is able to annihilate the myriad problems people in deprived neighborhoods are confronted with, but it would also be wrong to prematurely dismiss tourism as inevitably harmful to local residents and businesses. The examples of tourism development in the low-income communities Berlin-Kreuzberg and Harlem, NYC, very much to the opposite suggest that the recent trend towards "urban tourism beyond the beaten path" has the potential to contribute to the regeneration of deprived neighborhoods and therefore deserves further scholarly scrutiny. We argued in this paper that tourism development in deprived neighborhoods represents an interesting phenomenon because it can not only bring about economic benefits or improvements in terms of neighborhoods' built environment, but also sets in motion less tangible dynamics that can be captured through conceptualizations of cultural and social capital. By strengthening local communities' capacity to organize themselves, represent their interests and interact with external social groups and actors as well as the endogenous cultural resources through the greater recognition and appreciation of marginalized communities', we believe that tourism can make a contribution to the regeneration of deprived neighborhoods and their integration into mainstream society. Particularly the case of Harlem suggests, however, that tourism development as such does not automatically work for the advantage of low-income communities. In part owed to the increase of tourism activity, the neighborhood finds itself today integrated into New York City's economic development cycles, but the benefits for most of its residents and local businesses are – particularly because of rising rents and costs of living – in doubt.

Is it true, as Fainstein and Powers suggest,[44] that neighborhood-based tourism must exist at a low-level equilibrium in order to be sustainable for the respective communities? Evidence suggests that tourist destinations in fact frequently fall victim to their own success when a tipping point is reached at which the negative effects begin to outweigh the benefits tourism can bring about. Our analysis on the other hand suggests, however, that tourism's effects in the cases of Harlem and

[44] Susan Fainstein und John Power, "Tourism and New York's Ethnic Diversity: An Underutilized Resource?" 2006.

Kreuzberg depend not so much on tourism's extent alone but rather on the kind of tourism that takes place, the way tourism development is planned and regulated, as well as on the context in which tourism development occurs. The latter thereby involves both: neighborhoods' inherent social, spatial, as well as political characteristics as well as the institutional and regulatory environment they are embedded in. A high orientation of local actors towards equitable development and a strong formal and informal influence of residents seem to be crucial in order to maintain a neighborhood's identity without giving way to a purely capitalist rationale. Kreuzberg's multicultural residency itself may in this context be an advantage, since tourists are only recognizable by the guidebooks in their hands, not by the color of their hair and skin, which is more or less the case in Harlem where the majority of tourists continues to be white while particularly the neighborhood's socio-economically weakest residents continue to be predominantly black.

An answer to Fainstein and Power's question requires a clearer understanding of what "sustainable" neighborhood tourism development actually means and how one should assess tourism's risks and potentials. We find that social and cultural capital approaches have been useful here for they allowed us to account better for the complex and frequently contradictory effects neighborhood tourism can bring about. Particularly Bourdieu's work on cultural and social capital, which is frequently neglected in the urban studies literature, sharpened our recognition of the heterogeneity of contexts and developments, as well as of the power relations within a community in which different social groups are actively involved. The importance of neighborhoods' regulatory framework became similarly clear as the need to carefully examine the complex web through which social, economic, as well as cultural capital resources and dynamics are interrelated on the neighborhood level in order to gain an understanding of neighborhoods' different trajectories.

Can the "tourist city" be a social city – to paraphrase the main concern of our inquiry? Our research has only been a first step towards a better understanding of tourism's manifold effects on deprived neighborhoods. More theoretical input and empirical data is needed to determine how exactly tourism's effects in deprived neighborhoods should be evaluated. That said our preliminary findings nonetheless suggest that tourism can as a matter of fact contribute to the regeneration of neighborhoods in disrepair if tourism occurs within an institutional and regulatory context which doesn't exacerbate but instead eases social and political inequalities, and if the actors involved in tourism development on the local level show a commitment to an integrated mode of tourism that places the interests of local residents and businesses at the core of their efforts. Neighborhood tourism that truly benefits local residents and businesses moreover requires in our opinion an incorporation into a broader set of policies tailored at the specific needs of deprived neighborhoods and depends on the involvement of the community itself.[45] Only sensitive and participatory strategies of neighborhood tourism on terms defined by local actors and involving the input of local residents and businesses are able to fully exploit the potentials tourism brings about, provide new opportunities of integration, and keep tourism's potential pitfalls at bay.

[45] Richard Butler, "Problems and issues of integrating tourism development", 1998; Stefanie Röder, „Potenziale des differenzierten Städtetourismus. Stadtplanung und Stadtteiltourismus im Frankenberger Viertel in Aachen", 2002.

References

Bernstein, Richard. "Berlin: Go West, Young Clubgoers." In *The New York Times*, October 30, 2005.

Bezirksamt Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. *Tourismusförderung im Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg*, 2003.

Boggs, Carl. "Social capital and political fantasy: Robert Putnam's Bowling Alone." In *Theory and Society* 30 (2001): 281-297.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The forms of capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, ed.* John Richardson. Greenwood Press: New York, 1986.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Wacquant, Loic J.D. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1992.

Boyd, Michelle R. "Reconstructing Bronzeville: racial nostalgia and neighborhood redevelopment." In *Journal of Urban Affairs* 22, 2 (2000): 107-122.

Bridge, Gary. "Perspectives on cultural capital and the neighborhood." In *Urban Studies* 43, 4 (2006): 719-730.

Braun, Sebastian. „Putnam und Bourdieu und das soziale Kapital in Deutschland." In *Leviathan* 29, 3 (2001): 337-354.

Butler, Richard. "Problems and issues of integrating tourism development." In *Contemporary Issues in Urban Tourism Development*, eds. Douglas Pearce and Richard Butler. Routledge: London and New York, 1999.

Chinyelu, Mamamdou. *Harlem ain't nothing but a Third World Country*. Mustard Seed Press: New York, 1999.

Cohen, Erik. "The Sociology of Tourism: Approaches, Issues, and Findings." In *Annual Review of Sociology* 10 (1984): 373-392

Cohen, Erik and Dann, Graham. "Sociology and Tourism." In *Annals of Tourism Research* 18 (1991): 155-169.

Coleman, James. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." In *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (supplement) (1988): 95-120.

Dávila, Arlene. "Empowered Culture? New York City's Empowerment Zone and the Selling of El Barrio." In *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 594 (2004): 49-64.

DeFilippis, James. "The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development." In *Housing Policy Debate* 12, 4 (2001): 781-806.

Edwards, Bob and Foley, Michael. "Social Capital and the Political Economy of Our Discontent." In *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, 5 (1997): 669-678.

Fainstein, Susan and Judd, Dennis. *The Tourist City*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 1999.

Fainstein, S. and Powers, John. "Tourism and New York's Ethnic Diversity: An Underutilized Resource?" In *Tourism, Ethnic Diversity and the City, ed.* Jan Rath. Routledge: London and New York, 2006.

Foley, Michael and Edwards, Bob. "Escape From Politics? Social Theory and the Social Capital Debate." In *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, 5 (1997): 550-561.

Forrest, Ray and Kearns, Ade. "Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighborhood." In *Urban Studies* 38, 12 (2001): 2125-2143.

Fox Gotham, Kevin. "Tourism Gentrification: The Case of New Orleans' Vieux Carre (French Quarter)." In *Urban Studies* 42, 7 (2005): 1099-1121.

Geißel, Brigitte. „Zur Bedeutung von sozialem Kapital bei städtischer Bürgerbeteiligung: US-amerikanische Fallbeispiele." In *Globalisierung, Partizipation, Protest*., eds. Ansgar Klein, Ruud Koopmans and Heiko Geiling, 275-292. Leske & Budrich: Opladen, 2001.

Gitell, Marilyn. *Empowerment Zones: An Opportunity Missed. A six-city Comparative Study*. Research Report. Published by the Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center at the Graduate School and The University Center of the City University of New York, 2001.

Grant, Elizabeth. "Race and Tourism in America's First City." In *Journal of Urban History* 31, 6 (2005): 850-871.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell: Malden, MA, 1990.

Hoffman, Lily. "Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regeneration in Harlem." In *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*, eds. Lily Hoffman, Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd. Blackwell: Oxford, UK, and Cambridge, Ma., 2003.

Jackson, John. *Harlem World: Doing Race and Class in Contemporary Black America*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2001.

Judd, Dennis. "Visitors and the Spatial Ecology of the City." In *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*, eds. Lily Hoffman, Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd. Blackwell: Oxford and Cambridge, MA., 2003.

Keegan, Paul. Who owns Harlem. *Inc.com Magazin*, websource: http://www.inc.com/magazine/20000801/19764.html, August 2000.

KOMBI Consult GmbH. *Einkommenssicherung durch Stadtteiltourismus im Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Darstellung Projektstand.* 01.2005.

Krishna, Anirudh. "Enhancing Political Participation in Democracies. What is the Role of Social Capital?" In *Comparative Political Studies* 35, 4 (2002): 437-460.

Law, Christopher. *Urban Tourism. The Visitor Economy And The Growth Of Large Cities*. Continuum: London and New York, 2002.

Maurasse, David. *Listening to Harlem. Gentrification, Community and Business*. Routledge: London and New York, 2006.

Mayer, Margit. "The Onward Sweep of Social Capital: Causes and Consequences for Understanding Cities, Communities and Urban Movements." In *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27, 1 (2003): 110-132.

Misztal, Barbara. *Informality: social theory and contemporary practice*. Routledge: London, 2000.

plan b Konzept: Kreuzberger Verbundprojekt zur Berufsorientierung, Qualifizierung und Beschäftigungsförderung im Stadtteiltourismus, without year.

Pogebrin, Robin. "Groups Vie to Reimagine Historic Theater in Harlem," In The New York Times, B1, February 1st 2005.

Putnam, Robert. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1993.

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster: New York, 2000.

Rath, Jan. "Feeding the Festive City. Immigrant Entrepreneurs and Tourist Industry." In *International Migration and Security: Opportunities and Challenges*, eds. Elsbeth Guild & Joanne van Selm. Routledge: London and New York, 2005.

Richardson, Lynda. "Longing for Authenticity; Is the Jazz Really Jazz in Harlem Without the Locals?" In *The New York Times,* B1, November 16th 2000.

Röder, Stefanie. „Potenziale des differenzierten Städtetourismus. Stadtplanung und Stadtteiltourismus im Frankenberger Viertel in Aachen." In *Reiseräume. Touristische Entwicklung und räumliche Planung,* eds. Jörg Borghardt, Lutz Meltzer, Stefanie Röder, Wolfgang Scholz and Anke Wuestenberg. IRPUD: Dortmund, 2002.

Rucht, Dieter. *Berlin, 1. Mai 2002: Politische Demonstrationsrituale*. Leske und Budrich: Opladen, 2003.

Woolcock, Michael. „Social capital and economic development: Towards a theoretical synthesis and policy framework." In *Theory and Society* 27, 2 (1998): 151-208.

Zukin, Sharon. *The Culture of Cities*. Blackwell: London and New York, (1995)

CMS Working Paper Series

Huning, Sandra und Novy, Johannes. *Tourism as an Engine of Neighborhood Regeneration? Some Remarks Towards a Better Understanding of Urban tourism beyond the 'Beaten Path.'* CMS Working Paper Series, No. 006-2006, published by the Center for Metropolitan Studies, Technical University Berlin, D-10587 Berlin at

http://www.metropolitanstudies.de/workingpaper/huning-novy_006-2006.pdf

CMS Working Paper Series

Editors Ignacio Farias
ignacio.farias@metropolitanstudies.de

Pe-Ru Tsen
pe-ru.tsen@metropolitanstudies.de

Oliver Schmidt
oliver.schmidt@metropolitanstudies.de

Center for Metropolitan Studies
Ernst-Reuter-Platz 7 / TEL 3-0
D-10587 Berlin

Tel: +49-30-3142 8400
Fax: +49-30-3142 8403
Web: www.metropolitanstudies.de