

# The Marketing of Diversity in the Inner City: Tourism and Regulation in Harlem\*

LILY M. HOFFMAN

This article connects regulation theory and the broader post-Fordist debate with an ongoing study of the emergence of tourism in the disadvantaged, racially segregated inner-city community of central Harlem, New York.<sup>1</sup> What are the consequences of a restructuring economy and accompanying institutional change for this beleaguered area and its residents? How will they fare socially, spatially and economically in the post-Fordist city? What is the role of tourism in this process?

A regulation framework allows us to address the relation between large-scale external forces and local conditions — the issue of scale. Its focus on social/institutional structure also helps clarify the complex web of cultural, political and economic factors which are central to this case study and to tourism in general. Harlem has been chosen on methodological as well as substantive grounds. First, analyzing intra-urban difference allows us to disaggregate areas within cities in relation to tourism, thereby allowing a more complex analysis. Second, Harlem is a critical site because its rapid transformation allows us to examine the interplay of consumption and production at the heart of the new economy. Tourism — in this context — embodies the relationship between the economic development of ghettos and the marketing of diversity.

## Social/spatial inequality in the post-Fordist city

Regulation theory, broadly conceived, assumes two partially autonomous systems: the macro economy, or regime of accumulation; and a comprehensive mode of 'regulation', an institutional system that stabilizes a given regime of accumulation (Amin, 1994). Despite numerous issues, a consensus has developed as to the elements of the emerging macro economy: changing market trends, flexible specialization for niche markets, globalized industries and processes, and information technology. In contrast to the Fordist paradigm of mass production for mass markets, the restructuring of production, management, marketing and consumption has been characterized as post-Fordist.

However, there is much less agreement about the basic elements of the institutional framework or mode of regulation. Differing and conflicting views of the post-Fordist future are due partly to neo-institutionalist expectations of social/cultural variation but also to the belief that outcomes are uncertain — a matter of political contest. Drawing on

\* This article is drawn from a chapter of a forthcoming book in the Studies in Urban and Social Change series published by Blackwell, *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets and City Space* (Hoffman et al., 2003). I want to thank Gina Neff and Elizabeth Wissinger for research assistance. Earlier versions of the article have been presented to the International Tourism Research Group in Amsterdam and Barcelona (1998-2000) and at the Urban Affairs Association, 1999 and American Sociological Association, 2000. A PSC-CUNY Research Grant provided graduate assistance (1996-98).

1 Central Harlem is bounded on the south by Central Park, to the north by the Harlem River, and runs east to west from Fifth Avenue to Morningside Avenue.

Ash Amin's synthesis of the regulation/post-Fordist discussion, we will identify several debates with implications for social and spatial inequality and reframe them in terms of the marginalized inner city.

#### Local/global effects of economic restructuring

One issue is the spatial impact of economic restructuring. Will flexible specialization make for greater or lesser localization of economic activities and, with it, more or less opportunity for revitalizing and integrating localities into regional and/or global networks (see *inter alia* Storper and Scott, 1989; Amin and Malmberg, 1994; Sabel, 1994; Storper, 1994)? As noted above, to study a marginalized inner-city area which is demographically and economically distinct, we need to examine how aspects of economic restructuring influence specific areas and their populations.

#### Culture and social/spatial polarization

Does the increasing importance of culture and consumption to cities exacerbate existing forms of social and spatial inequality (Harvey, 1994) or provide new opportunities for marginalized areas and populations? The differentiation of formerly standardized markets has valorized multiculturalism and diversity, giving rise to new forms of cultural capital and creating interest in formerly unattractive places. This cultural capital may translate into social, economic and/or political clout for formerly disadvantaged groups, or may become a new form of commodification, controlled by old elites.

The geography of the cultural sector also seems to be shifting. Studies of nonprofit arts and cultural organizations have found that they are concentrating in economically and ethnically diverse neighborhoods (Stern, 1997; 1999). Urban planning initiatives such as cultural districts promote this trend. Agglomeration effects related to cultural production draw related businesses and jobs and enhance commercial and residential real estate.

#### Politics and policy

The question here is whether politics and policy are becoming more democratic and inclusive as they become more market driven (Hirst and Zeitlin, 1991; Lipietz, 1994; Mayer, 1994), or more exclusive, restrictive and unaccountable (Esser and Hirsch, 1994). Trends include: greater involvement of localities in economic regeneration and cultural development; new actors, types of social and political alliance, and methods of decision-making (Hirst and Zeitlin, 1991; Jessop, 1994; Mayer, 1994).

A related issue is the role of social capital. A mostly progressive literature has tied social capital to community development and political inclusion by means of bonding within communities and linkage to outside resources (Gittell and Vidal, 1998; Putnam, 2000; Body-Gendrot and Gittell, 2003). Programs like the Empowerment Zone<sup>2</sup> exemplify this approach, requiring the participation of differing levels of government as well as public and private sectors, to make for new working relationships (Gittell and Vidal, 1998). But these approaches are susceptible to accusations of cooptation and ineffectiveness.

This analysis, based on an ongoing case study of the emergence and consequences of tourism in Harlem, argues that:

- Changes in Harlem's political economy and culture are a response to the restructuring macro economy, although not determined by it;
- As development occurs, the nature of regulation (e.g. organizational structure for development, political elites, policies, marketing, security, etc.) pertaining to Harlem also begins to change, to stabilize and support the restructuring economy;
- Tourism-based development has the potential to be an equalizing force, helping to rebalance the uneven social/spatial development symbolized by places like Harlem in the past (Fordist) era.

<sup>2</sup> The federal program grants tax credits over a ten-year period to stimulate economic development in depressed areas.

## Global forces/local conditions: tourism and development in Harlem

Demand by foreign visitors stimulated tourism to Harlem beginning in the late 1980s (Hoffman, 1997; 2000). Although they came to see New York City, which was enjoying a tourism boom, many had Harlem on their itinerary and the Harlem tour was paid for and organized abroad. Over the next decade tourism to Harlem increased exponentially so that by 2000 over 800,000 people were coming annually, including an increasing number of domestic visitors (Audience Research & Analysis, 2000). This growth *preceded* the development of a tourism infrastructure and the decline in the crime rate (NYCEDC, 1997). Initially there were no jazz clubs, only a few restaurants that could handle a busload of visitors, and few places to shop. Security was an issue and guidebooks warned against traveling Uptown alone.

For visitors, Harlem represented Black America and its music and entertainment traditions. Their interest was fueled by trends in the music and pop culture industries such as the resurgence of classic jazz, the revival of soul and funk, and the interest in gospel music. US movies and TV also disseminated an image of the inner city as a source of cultural innovation — from clothes to music to graffiti. Visitor demand, in turn, jump-started a fledgling tourism industry, giving rise to Harlem-based tours and activities initiated by local (Harlem) entrepreneurs as well as city-wide tour bus operators. At first, Harlem did not capture many tourism dollars as visitors only got off the bus in a few designated places. By the later half of the 1990s, however, an economic revival was underway which made tourism development more possible.

To understand the interplay of external and internal forces that bring tourism and development to Harlem, we need to look more closely at trends in the tourism and entertainment industries and at their 'fit' with a ghetto economy and culture. For although Harlem is a unique community with global name recognition, it shares social and demographic characteristics with other disadvantaged urban areas, namely a distinctive political economy and cultural diversity. During a period of economic restructuring marked by a shift to flexible production for targeted markets, these same social/demographic characteristics acted as a draw for industries including tourism and entertainment, and brought into play public and private actors at city, state and local level.

### The political economy of the inner city

Urban economists have noted that declining inner-city neighborhoods take on distinctive patterns in regard to economic activity. Modeling ghetto economies according to type and size of enterprise, Bingham and Zhang (1997) found that economic activities change early in the poverty cycle. When the poverty rate reaches 20%, 'economic ghettoization' occurs; most activities associated with a middle-income neighborhood (supermarkets, commercial banks, legal and accounting services) disappear. Used merchandise outlets, check cashing operations, liquor stores, job training and family services replace them — the hallmarks of a transfer economy based upon government-funded services and informal activity.

Harlem fits this profile. In 1996, Upper Manhattan — an area larger than Harlem — was densely populated (520,000 residents) and characterized by the small-scale retail and service establishments of a ghetto economy. The net result is unmet shopping demand with residents making 60–70% of their purchases elsewhere (Schaffer, 1996; ICIC, 1998).

#### Market demand

In a seminal article that redirected policy to the inner city, Michael Porter put a different spin on these figures (1995). Reinterpreting the statistics from a marketing perspective, Porter argued that local market demand is one of the 'true' competitive advantages of economically disadvantaged inner-city areas. Compared to suburbs and other urban areas, it is under-serviced and under-retailed. Although average household income is

low, the dense residential population has an aggregate buying power comparable to that in other parts of the city.

But few businesses entered these markets by themselves. Porter's 'economic' model, disseminated by his non-profit Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC), played an important role in encouraging investment by providing convincing analytic support for the inner city as a new economic frontier. The ICIC influenced such Harlem-based organizations as the Abyssinian Development Corporation<sup>3</sup> and the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone (UMEZ) — the organization begun in 1996 which administered the largest of the six federal urban empowerment zones.<sup>4</sup>

UMEZ commissioned a study of Upper Manhattan and used the findings to target four high-growth industries, one of which was tourism and entertainment. The plan was to recruit leading companies in each sector to locate in Harlem, develop and grow small businesses, and develop the local workforce. Entertainment and heritage tourism would build on Harlem's well-known connections to music and performance and on its unique cultural and historical attractions.

Building social capital, providing political reassurance

Red tape and political conflict between city and state (which provided matching funds) delayed the start of the project until 1996; then stalled the grants process for another year. Although critics claimed that UMEZ had done too little, too late, the EZ made Harlem appear to be a safe place for investors and visitors. New and emerging markets require support and reassurance. UMEZ's importance, aside from projects, was in its concerted efforts to build a 'bridge' to the downtown business community. The initial UMEZ Board formed in 1996 — composed of public officials and chaired by Richard D. Parsons, then CEO of Time Warner — reached out to relevant institutions and actors to expand Harlem's social capital and capacity, and to attract national and international publicity.

The 1990s marked the ascendance of a new generation of leaders. To revive Harlem, they believed that Harlem had to be open to investment, albeit with watchdogs in place to make certain that there were local stakeholders and that Harlem was not 'given away'. A symbolic marker of Harlem's success in building bridges was the Abyssinian Development Corporation's first fundraiser — a black-tie affair held in an Uptown venue and attended by a large cross section of the city's business, social and political elite.

## Marketing diversity

Multiculturalism and diversity have recently become a positive demographic characteristic for business and tourism. Contributing to this sea change is the move toward 'niche' or targeted production and marketing, an aspect of flexible specialization which coincides with the saturation of traditional markets, heightened global competition and the search for new economic frontiers (i.e. non-traditional markets/populations).

Local entrepreneurs potentially can take advantage of this shift. However, given the inner city's lack of access to loans, financial know-how and adequate technology, exploiting these opportunities has required politically organized efforts typically related to federal policy initiatives. Commercial banks have not willingly entered the inner city despite evidence of profit, unless required to do so under the fair banking/fair lending

3 The Abyssinian Development Corporation (ADC), begun by the Abyssinian Baptist Church in 1989, has engaged in housing and large-scale commercial developments such as the Pathmark supermarket on 125th Street. ADC has received national recognition for its community development activities.

4 New York city and state matched the federal grant for a total of \$300 million. UMEZ, which administers the project for Harlem and Washington Heights, manages 83% of the \$300 million NYEZ budget.

provisions of the 1977 Community Reinvestment Act (Grogan and Proscio, 2000). UMEZ's small business lending arm has targeted restaurants and tourism-related activities for start-up and expansion along with ethnically based retail or service providers (e.g. cosmetics, clothing). It has had some success, mainly with established businesses such as a well-known Harlem soul food restaurant. Overall, small business start-ups and expansions struggle, particularly in economically depressed areas (Pristin, 2001).

### Branding and place

The logic of niche marketing becomes a form of 'branding' that has also brought new productive activities and jobs to Harlem. Pushed by rising commercial rents in lower Manhattan, a number of businesses and organizations have opted to move to Harlem to take on its place-based identity.

Although some ventures have become victims of economic recession and the post September 11th environment, published interviews with businesses relocating Uptown give some insight into this process: Edison Schools, the nation's largest school management company, together with the Museum for African Art, proposed in 2000 to build a combined corporate headquarters, school and museum at 110th Street and Fifth Avenue, the gateway to Harlem. Edison Chairman Benno C. Schmidt, Jr. said: 'That particular location stands as a crossroads between the Latino and the African-American communities, which made it a perfect location in terms of representing the communities that are our partners around the country'. The Museum of African Art, which originally moved from Washington DC to Soho to be in the art scene, said in 2000: 'We want to be located in a community with a significant population of African-Americans' (Wyatt, 2000). The best known example of place-branding belongs to former President Clinton, who established his office on Harlem's main commercial thoroughfare.

The pursuit of ethnic and cultural branding reflects the fact that minorities are the fastest growing (new) consumer population. Discussing their 'aggressive targeting of minorities,' Time Warner executive Derek Johnson stated: 'Both the US and world populations are becoming less homogenous and we want to reach out and touch the entire population base' (Block, 2000).

### Trend-setting and innovation

The trend-setting sensibility of the inner city is another potential attraction for tourism and entertainment. This quality made Harlem great during the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, but has been a concern during the present 'revival'. When international tourism began in the late 1980s, there was no live music scene in Harlem; cutting-edge music and performance had long since moved to downtown clubs, and the annual jazz festivals, which spread out to a number of locations in Manhattan, did not even have an Uptown venue. Although response to demand prompted jazz nights with old 'greats' at a few local clubs, this was nostalgia rather than an authentic jazz scene.

Beginning in the late 1990s, however, Harlem has begun to attract committed leadership to the cultural as well as the economic development arena. African-American curators have left downtown institutions to build Harlem's many cultural institutions. Harlem has begun to have an active arts scene with galleries, openings, new clubs, theater and boutiques (Lee, 2002; Soccar, 2002). Under the auspices of UMEZ's first tourism director, an umbrella organization of Uptown cultural institutions emerged and made concerted efforts to enhance their position within the NYC cultural scene. UMEZ proposed a \$25 million grant and loan fund to 'stabilize and expand' uptown cultural institutions. Although opponents on the UMEZ board contended the initiative did not constitute 'economic development', the program was finally approved and the first grants totaling \$5 million were awarded in Spring 2001. This coincided with a citywide effort by arts organizations to lobby for city and state support by presenting 'culture as infrastructure' much as any other source of economic growth (Soccar, 2001). In the aftermath of September 11th, which triggered a sharp downturn in visitors to the city, it has become widely recognized that tourism and culture are potent economic generators.

## Tourism and the revalorization of Harlem

Reinforcing the move toward niche marketing, several other trends accentuate the tourism industry's post-Fordist characteristics and have relevance for Harlem. Cultural tourism has emerged as the fastest growing market segment, differentiated tourism products aim for targeted markets, and information technology has been applied to marketing and sales.

### Cultural tourism

In a relatively short time, the concept of cultural tourism has broadened beyond the focus on museums and theaters to include an anthropological concern with people and place. Ethnicity and diversity are central to this perception. As tourism officials and organizations in the city and state began to position themselves competitively by promoting cultural sites and building on the theme of diversity, Harlem took on special importance. This has increased the flow of resources to Harlem with both political and economic significance. Several examples illustrate these processes.

Over the past decade, historic preservation and heritage tourism, key forces in building bridges between cultural tourism and the development community, have begun to celebrate the ethnic heritage of minority and ethnic working-class communities (Barthel, 1996). During 1998–99, Harlem was spotlighted at several conferences bringing together developers, community leaders, professionals and commercial interests to link development to preservation and cultural tourism. Emphasizing the benefits of getting on the heritage/preservation bandwagon for low-income, minority communities, the message was — there is something here for everyone.

New York's business community has also become pro-active for cultural tourism. New York's convention and visitor's bureau (NYC&Co) is a case in point. Funded by members and driven by political as well as financial realities, its fundamental mission had been to market the city by drawing overnight visitors to midtown hotels. At a 1998 conference spotlighting Harlem, however, the director did the equivalent of a U-turn and outlined a strategy to turn New York's diversity from disadvantage to unique advantage, calling on each community to define itself so the CVB could actively market *all* boroughs and uptown as well as downtown Manhattan (Reiter, 1998). This vision has gradually been taking shape. 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 the Mount Morris neighborhood of Harlem (Fried, 2001). The objectives include community economic benefits, civic engagement and earned income (Dykstra, 2001). As of 2002, all New York City boroughs sponsor cultural and tourism initiatives funded by a variety of public and private sector organizations.

The New York State Division of Tourism's about-face in response to this fast growing market is no less remarkable. Its first advertising venture — the well known 'I love NY' campaign in 1977 — was decidedly anti-urban and featured commercials depicting upstate parks and waterfalls. In 2001, the tourism division added a director of cultural tourism whose first project was an 'I love NY' travel guide and related website entitled *Explore New York State's Diversity*. The theme was 'cultural connections' with tourist attractions color-coded on a map *by ethnicity* (African-American, European, Hispanic, multicultural and Native American). Harlem accounted for six of the 27 NYC attractions and this popular guide received 58,000 requests in the first few months.

In spring 2001, New York State Governor George Pataki told a luncheon of Harlem business leaders that the Fall 2001 'Isle of NY' tourism campaign would feature Harlem. NY State's development agency (Empire State Development Corporation) committed funding in 2001 to Harlem's tourism/entertainment infrastructure (the Victoria and Apollo Theaters) as well as to gospel production. In the words of a senior state official: 'We need to take a neighborhood view of economic development. In Upper Manhattan it is tourism and small business — not just the Pathmarks [supermarkets]' (personal communication, n.d.).

### Information technology and the marketing of place

The Internet has both facilitated tourism to Harlem and enabled Harlem-based businesses to enter the tourism market. Low-budgeted city and state agencies, whose mandate includes tourism promotion, have established websites to promote events and attractions, including those in Harlem. Overall, this technology allows small places and small business to compete for tourists with big places and big business by increasing local independence from tourism industry networks. For the many local restaurants, clubs, tour operators and bed and breakfasts which operate on the margin, the ability to book events electronically enables them to plan ahead, expanding the local tourism industry and keeping more tourism dollars in the community.

### Global forces: the entertainment industry moves uptown

The entertainment/media conglomerates need global cities like New York, not only as command centers but as sites for mass national and international consumption, and tourism has encouraged this function. To reach this market, the industry is investing in the urban equivalent of theme parks — the urban entertainment destination — a complex that includes high-tech and live entertainment, theme restaurants, cinema multiplexes, sports venues, retail outlets and production studios, and that allows the conglomerates to cross-market their brands and products (Braun, 1995; Roost, 1998). Although most of these complexes and studios are in central locations, the entertainment giants have begun to reach out to diverse urban sites in their marketing plans. Harlem provides examples of two different types of projects: Harlem USA, a retail/entertainment complex, and the Apollo Performing Arts Center, proposed in 2000.

Harlem USA, a new retail and entertainment complex on Harlem's main commercial thoroughfare, 125th Street, was the first such project in the community, opening in June 2000. It has a 6,000-square-foot Disney Store, a Magic Johnson/Sony 9-screen multiplex theater and the outlets of several national retail chains. Harlem was a logical choice for Disney, which has been expanding its retail stores to the commercial centers of NYC's outer boroughs. So far, Magic Johnson Theaters is the only existing multiplex in Harlem. Its first-run movies and amenities make it a potent symbol of change for the community.

In contrast to the multiplex, the proposed Apollo Performing Arts Center will be a major cultural institution involved in production as well as consumption. The plan is to link the legendary Apollo Theater to a nearby theater to create a complex with performance space, rehearsal studios, a television facility and gift shops. Many believe the Apollo will be a key element in the economic development of Harlem and expect it to lead Harlem's cultural rebirth. Time Warner (now AOL Time Warner) was involved with the Apollo Theater and Harlem's revitalization from the start. Richard D. Parsons, current president of AOL Time Warner, chaired the UMEZ Board from its inception (January 1996) and became board chairman of the restructured Apollo Theater Foundation in Spring 2001. The first president of the restructured Apollo Foundation was a former AOL Time Warner executive, and a nationally prominent board of directors has been recruited for prestige and fundraising.

What led Time Warner to Harlem? Like other industries over the past decade, the entertainment/movie industry has become increasingly concentrated, diversified and dependent upon global marketing for profits. Like many corporations, Time Warner was pursuing an intensive multicultural strategy, purchasing black businesses — magazines, digital media units, book publishers (Block, 2000). Given this objective, identification with the Apollo Theater — a highly symbolic black cultural institution — was branding that advertising alone could not buy. Moreover, in a highly concentrated industry with a small number of companies offering everything from movies to theme parks, Time Warner lacked a live performance site such as Disney's successful New Amsterdam Theater on 42nd Street. Indeed, initial reports viewed the Apollo as the Uptown equivalent of 42nd Street, but local criticism led to re-envisioning the Apollo

along more community-minded lines. With corporations such as AOL Time Warner, Harlem would have global players interested in initiating business and products related to minorities. At the same time, multinational corporations would be under pressure to remain on good terms with a wary Harlem community regarding issues of authenticity, control and local participation. In the aftermath of economic recession and September 11th, the proposed expansion of the Apollo and other NYC cultural institutions has been scaled-back (Pogrebin, 2002).

These different projects illustrate some of the tensions and pitfalls in these ongoing processes and in the relation between tourism and development. There is synergy, but up to a point. Too many multiplexes can degrade the cultural attractiveness of 125th Street. Yet too few will mean that the community fails to capture tourist and residential spending related to entertainment and tourism. The Apollo project also raises questions as to the relation between use and exchange value. How would the planned performance center respond to the needs and claims of residents, visitors, producers and consumers?

### Emerging issues – the view from Harlem

Although consensus is hard to reach in the politicized central Harlem community, tourism-based development gained support from a diverse group of local leaders. Tourism was not viewed as a strategy foisted on Harlem by the outside development community, but one with a history within Harlem that drew upon Harlem's unique assets.

The late Ron Brown, a native Harlemiter and former Secretary of Commerce, was a force behind the first White House Conference on Travel and Tourism to which he invited a Harlem delegation (29–31 October 1995). They joined with others to express minority concerns, using the concept of multicultural or ethnic tourism to focus attention on the cultural heritage of minority communities and the need for economic development. The idea was to 'get into our own neighborhoods and develop the ethnic products we have overlooked' (*Harlem Week*, 1996). Tourism fit the emergent thrust of African-American politics toward cultural empowerment and entrepreneurialism. For local actors, tourism has many advantages as a development strategy, particularly because it combines cultural and economic objectives.

As tourism has grown, however, a number of concerns have emerged related to development in general and tourism development in particular. First and foremost is the question of whose Harlem? Faced by rapid change, the interest of the outside developers in Harlem has made residents uneasy and given rise to opposition. Although the entertainment and retail establishments planned for 125th Street will benefit both residents and visitors, rising rents have forced out small businesses and black ownership has generally declined.<sup>5</sup> For Harlem, development resonates with a long, bitter history of resentment over perceived economic colonization by white outsiders. Consumer boycotts and civic disturbance have undercut efforts at economic revitalization. Historic experience has engendered an anti-market, anti-business attitude and some might opt to give up development if the outcome is a further 'sharing' of Harlem.

Debates about competing models of development reflect a struggle over political control between generations with differing experience and outlooks. An 'old guard' emphasizes black ownership and control but is accused of having nothing to show for millions of dollars in federal, state and city funds — 'not a single brick' (Horowitz,

<sup>5</sup> According to the 125th Street Business Improvement District, between 1996 and 1998 rents rose from \$10–\$35 to \$40–\$65 per square foot, and black ownership declined from nearly half to one-fifth of the storefronts. Residential displacement, due to a general upgrading of commercial and residential properties is also an issue within the community, but is not specific to Harlem or to tourism. Tourism has a more direct impact on commercial gentrification, and in Harlem most residential redevelopment has been of vacant city-owned property.

1997; Hernandez, 2002). Many of the new leaders now running the development engines are Ivy League trained professionals who have left corporate careers to rebuild their community. They want capitalism to enter the inner city and support a Porter-style model which stresses integrating the inner-city economy with the larger city via partnerships. Harlem has been cut off from the market by poverty and by an economy based upon government transfers, and they argue that the issue is not just available funds, but know-how and networks.

Commercial gentrification is also an issue. Some residents believe that 125th Street is being transformed from an 'economic and cultural icon for blacks' to a 'center of mainstream youth-culture and merchandising ... in which black culture will be only part of the marketing package' (Johnson, K[irk], 1998). Others argue just as forcefully for upscale shopping in their community. This debate has a strong economic basis with middle income long-term residents opting for better retail and commercial services and poorer residents fearing their ultimate displacement. The interests of residents and visitors may also diverge along these lines. From the standpoint of the tourism industry, Harlem's attraction is its ethnicity and the removal of eye-catching, car-stopping street vendors along 125th Street cost the street much tourist appeal.<sup>6</sup> But many residents (and merchants) want an upscale shopping street with quality services and stores rather than an Afro-centric street market.

To add to the complexity, much of what visitors hear and see is already a tourism product — a reconstruction of the past, and some tourist 'discoveries' like the many professional gospel choirs in Harlem, have become the basis of new productive activity — recording and touring. Cultural tourism projects like the renewed Apollo encourage production and innovation.<sup>7</sup> Economic development, which has accompanied tourism, stimulates creative activity. Niche production and marketing may play an interesting role in this process. By revalorizing that which is ethnic, cultural tourism and related activities may strengthen cultural difference.

Development pressures have also begun to clash with the nascent Harlem preservation movement, and landmark status has gained opponents among community leaders. The Abyssinian Development Corporation, a leader in community development, is now cited among the offenders, a case in point being the Renaissance Ballroom on 138th Street. It argues that landmark status would raise the cost and time needed to return the building to active commercial use (Johnson, K[emba], 1998). Having courted low income, minority communities, preservationists now find that the perspectives and objectives of these groups do not always mesh.

Community resentment of visitors is a significant issue. As tourism has grown, so has general antagonism towards tour buses, tourists in local churches and on residential streets. Members of Harlem's hard-pressed minority community feel wary of what they experience as racial voyeurism — 'whites on safari'. According to heritage tourism guidelines, only the active involvement of local residents in the tourism project can help negate this problem. The Empowerment Zone held focus groups to explore these concerns and to plan how to control the flow into tourist areas with input from local residents. The Conference Board's Community Tourism project is directed at just this issue. Although tourism and development create similar problems elsewhere, these issues take on important symbolic as well as social/political dimensions given the history of race relations in US cities in general, and Harlem in particular.

6 Businesses on 125th Street wanted them out and their removal fit Mayor Guiliani's 'quality of life' campaign.

7 The Apollo's programming includes: *Harlem Song* (2002) by the Tony Award winning Broadway director George C. Wolfe, and in 2003, the Royal Shakespeare Company's production of Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, in collaboration with Columbia University and the University of Michigan (Pogrebin, 2002).

## Tourism and changing social/political realities

There is a tendency within the regulation perspective to view Fordism as the ‘golden age’ of capitalism — the age of the affluent worker — a period when steady work and rising wages gave workers access to middle-class consumption patterns (Elam, 1994). However, Fordism was not a golden age for all workers. Minorities (and women) were, for the most part, left out of this equation. In the US cities of the Midwest, minorities held only a small proportion of the well-paid unionized jobs in heavy manufacturing; in northeastern cities like New York, jobs in industries like clothing manufacture were less well paid and much less secure.

Overall, inner-city minority communities in the US did not do well under Fordism (Florida and Jonas, 1991; Painter, 1995).<sup>8</sup> They were marginalized economically, socially, spatially and politically,<sup>9</sup> and isolated by the resulting differences in economy, society and culture (see Figure 1). Social/spatial isolation along with economic exclusion from the American Dream (based on mass consumption), gave rise to a variety of distinct innovative cultural patterns such as street-culture, black English, graffiti, rap.

FORDISM	POST-FORDISM
1. Distinct 'ghetto' economy	Increased integration into mainstream urban economy
2. Social/spatial isolation and exclusion	Social capital and contact
3. Negatively perceived culture	Revalorized culture
4. Political patronage	Political player
5. Social policy	Economic policy

Figure 1 Repositioning of inner-city minority community

At present, economic restructuring is making for a new fit between the larger political economy and the inner city. Revalorized by a shifting economy, increasingly integrated into a leading edge of the NYC/NYS economy and linked by development to an entrepreneurial urban regime, Harlem is at an interesting political moment. Less dependent on NYC, Harlem finds itself being wooed by NYS for reasons that range from electoral politics to economic development.

One possibility is that tourism may act as an equalizing force; in part because of the redistribution of public and private resources; in part because of the ability of multinational capital to influence local sites. Tourism development may help to rebalance the type of uneven urban spatial development characteristic of Fordism and symbolized by the social isolation and concentrated poverty of the racial ghetto. Using a conventional non-scaled urban framework, we might conclude that Harlem is being increasingly integrated (and co-opted) into the wider urban entrepreneurial regime. The strength of a regulation framework in mapping the larger forces at work is that it makes us balance this view with Harlem’s propensity for ‘stepping out’ of the city map.

8 Florida and Jonas (1991) link federal urban policy to Fordism, citing the subsidization of suburban growth and the greater polarization of city and suburb. Along similar lines, one could argue that the Great Society Programs helped consolidate the inner city’s social/spatial marginality as well as creating new tensions with local government.

9 Theorists in the ‘development of underdevelopment’ tradition rightly point out that these asymmetric relationships serve a variety of economic and political functions.

A weakness of the regulation/post-Fordist literature is a failure to link the elements of the restructuring economy to outcomes for specific areas of the city and their residents — for places like Harlem. One result is an overly pessimistic view of the future for inner-city minority communities — increasing marginalization and exclusion, or gentrification and displacement. As shown above, economic restructuring can create new opportunities for Harlem and its residents. Although there may always be winners and losers, they are not necessarily the same areas or populations.

### Tourism, economic development and difference

The study of tourism illuminates the interplay of production and consumption in the new economy. In Harlem, cultural capital is the engine of growth, fueling the development of Harlem with multiplier effects for residential and commercial development as well as retail and services. We see the synergy between cultural capital and economic development at work with real estate development, preservation, heritage tourism, entertainment and retail. Both residents and visitors use facilities such as movies, shopping centers and restaurants, and the power of tourism derives, in part, from the fact that we cannot disentangle the two groups of users (Hoffman and Musil, 1999). The recognition of this cross-promotional quality is illustrated by the tendency among economic development actors such as the Empire State Development Corporation and the UMEZ, to broaden and redefine economic development so as to include cultural and tourism activities. This reality calls into question the tendency to dichotomize production and consumption — the city of work and the city of play

The role of culture in the revitalization of Harlem has meant that revitalization promotes cultural differentiation along with standardization. The need to produce differentiated products for targeted markets — to mine culture for commodity — means more, not less ethnic production. Thus, Harlem USA, the retail/entertainment center noted for its mainstream retail outlets like Disney and Old Navy, also houses a 4,000 square-foot bookstore which specializes in African-American subjects, stocks at least 10,000 titles and features a busy schedule of readings by African-American authors (Dunlap, 2002).

### Tourism as a mode of regulation

The increased importance of urban tourism and related development has led to changes in urban policy for Harlem, ranging from land use, housing, transportation and security, to economic development. Overall, tourism gives political and economic actors new incentives and resources with which to reach out to this hitherto neglected area as well as providing the means — a possible consensus-building agenda (Dowding, 2001). However, there are some constraints.

The requirements of cultural tourism are complex. Cultural tourism requires substantial *civic* as well as public/private participation. Cultural experience must be codified, scripted and presented. Community groups must agree on what to preserve and how to mark it. To go after funding, they must work collaboratively with other groups and with the public sector. Based on ethnicity and place, cultural tourism also gives rise to claims of legitimacy that require a degree of compliance. Tourism to Harlem is a case in point. Negative interactions with visitors walking through neighborhoods — in the words of a proponent of heritage tourism — ‘ruin the experience for visitor and resident’ (Heritage Trails Conference, 1998). Like eco-tourism, the goal is sustainability. In fact, Heritage Trails advises that to work well, the community must give the tours as well as provide the sites.

For the Harlem community, tourism has stimulated group formation and networking. Social contact has brought new resources for upgrading and defending place as well as the tools (historic preservation, heritage tourism) used by others to control development and shape it towards their own interests. For the urban regime, tourism development serves broad political functions of inclusion and political stabilization and

helps to extend a development agenda into areas of the city formerly perceived as no-mans land.

Civic engagement is a two-way street. It gives the community control, but at the same time, disciplines and stabilizes. Community pride and collaboration also instill civic values. Support for Harlem's rich cultural assets also creates cultural capital (tourist sites) for city, state, and the general business community. Many benefits for visitors (improved streets, security) are also benefits for residents. We can see the interactive, synergistic qualities of cultural tourism at work in the social and political sphere as in the economic, promoting grassroots along with regime objectives — something for everyone. Thus, *urban tourism incorporates a new mode of regulation*, making for greater social/ political and economic inclusion, but with the associated costs as well as benefits.

### Winners, losers

Harlem — in many respects a world unto itself over the past 60 years — is being rewoven into the urban fabric with a capitalist agenda. The entry of multinational capital, accompanied by public/private partnership programs that stress entrepreneurial skills, presages a transition from a 'transfer' economy based upon publicly funded services. Economic integration will most likely polarize winners and losers in Harlem just as it has in the former state socialist societies in East Central Europe, undermining a solidarity based upon a relatively flat opportunity structure. During the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, the dominant strategy was to advance the race through cultural achievement. Lacking an economic base, the movement faltered with the end of Prohibition and the beginnings of the Great Depression.

Tourism's strength as a development strategy for Harlem (and other similar communities) stems from the fact that it *combines* economic with cultural and political objectives. In this context, the concern — often voiced by community leaders over the past decade — is that an economic recession will undercut Harlem's revitalization midstream. Although there are obvious costs to development, without a viable economy Harlem will remain marginalized.

Lily M. Hoffman (Lilymhoff@aol.com) Department of Sociology, The City College, The City University of New York (CUNY), 138th Street and Convent Avenue, New York, NY 10031, USA.

### References

- Amin, A. (1994) Post-fordism: models, fantasies and phantoms of transition. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- and A. Malmberg (1994) Competing structural and institutional influences on the geography of production in Europe. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Audience Research & Analysis (2000) *Upper Manhattan tourism market study*. Audience Research & Analysis, New York, NY.
- Barthel, D. (1996) *Historic preservation: collective memory and historical identity*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Bingham, R.D. and Z. Zhang (1997) Poverty and economic morphology of Ohio central city neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review* 32, 766–96.
- Blair, J. (2002) For the crossroads of the world, far less traffic. *The New York Times* 14 April.
- Block, V. (2000) Time heads media majority in targeting minorities. *Crain's New York Business* 16 October, 4.
- Body-Gendrot, S. and M. Gittel (eds.) (2003) *Social capital and social citizenship*. Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Braun, R.E. (1995) Exploring the urban entertainment center universe. *Urban Land* 54.8, 11–17.

- Dowding, K. (2001) Explaining urban regimes. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25.1, 7–19.
- Dunlap, D.W. (2002) The changing look of the new Harlem. *The New York Times* 12 February.
- Dykstra, G. (2001) I love New York ... neighborhoods: community tourism emerges in New York. Unpublished report, April.
- Elam, M. (1994) Puzzling out the post-Fordist debate: technology, markets and institutions. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Esser, J. and J. Hirsch (1994) The crisis of Fordism and the dimensions of a 'post-Fordist' regional and urban structure. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Florida, R. and A. Jonas (1991) US urban policy: the postwar state and capitalist regulation. *Antipode: A Journal of Radical Geography* 23.4, 349–84.
- Fried, J.P. (2001) Harlem sites to be pitched in campaign for tourists. *The New York Times* 15 February.
- Gittel, R. and A. Vidal (1998) *Community organizing: building social capital as a development strategy*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Grogan, P.S. and T. Proscio (2000) *Comeback cities: a blueprint for urban neighborhood revival*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Harlem Week (1996) A tribute to Ron Brown. The Economic Development Conference and exposition, anonymous speaker. Seminars. New York.
- Harvey, D. (1994) Flexible accumulation through urbanization: reflections on 'post-modernism' in the American city. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Heritage Trails Conference (1998) Celebrating Our Heritage: New York's New Tourism Market. J.M. Kaplan Center, The New School, New York, 25 February.
- Hernandez, R. (2002) Rangel's star grows dim as democrats lose ground. *The New York Times* 30 November.
- Hirst, P. and J. Zeitlin (1991) Flexible specialisation versus post-Fordism: theory, evidence and policy implications. *Economy and Society* 20.1, 1–55.
- Hoffman, L.M. (1997) Antecedents of 'ghetto' tourism in a global city: the case of international tourism to Harlem. Paper presented at the Meeting of Research Committee 21, International Sociological Association, Berlin, July.
- (2000) Tourism and the revitalization of Harlem. In R. Hutchison (ed.), *Constructions of urban space*, JAI Press, Stamford, CN.
- and J. Musil (1999) Culture meets commerce: tourism in postcommunist Prague. In D. Judd and S. Fainstein (eds.), *The tourist city*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CN.
- , S.S. Fainstein and D.R. Judd (2003) *Cities and visitors: regulating people, markets and city space*. Blackwell, Oxford and Malden, MA.
- Horowitz, C. (1997) The battle for the soul of Harlem. *New York Magazine* 30.3, 22–31.
- ICIC (Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and Management Horizons) (1998) The inner-city shopper, preliminary findings. Boston Consulting Group, Boston, MA.
- Jessop, B. (1994) Post-Fordism and the state. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Johnson, K[emba]. (1998) Landmarks omission. *City Limits* 23.7, 19–22.
- Johnson, K[irk]. (1998) Uneasy renaissance on Harlem's street of dreams. *The New York Times* 1 March.
- Lee, D. (2002) Exeunt Omnes, neighbors say to theater seeking new home. *The New York Times* 17 November.
- Lipietz, A. (1994) Post-fordism and democracy. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Mayer, M. (1994) Post-Fordism city politics. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- NYCEDC (New York City Economic Development Corporation) (1997) *Economic revitalization in NYC's poorest neighborhoods: executive summary*. New York City Economic Development Corporation, New York.
- Painter, J. (1995) Regulation theory, post-fordism and urban politics. In D. Judge, G. Stoker and H. Wolman (eds.), *Theories of urban politics*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Pogrebin, R. (2002) Apollo Theater postpones expansion; foundation's chief resigns. *The New York Times* 10 September.
- Porter, M.E. (1995) The competitive

- advantage of the inner city. *Harvard Business Review* May-June, 55–71.
- Pristin, T. (2001) Harlem development program not much help, critics and officials say. *The New York Times* 29 June.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling alone: collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Reiter, F. (1998) Panel speaker at 'Celebrating Our Heritage — New York's New Tourism Market' conference sponsored by Heritage Trails, NY and J. M. Kaplan Center of New York City Affairs, The New School, NY, 25 February.
- Roost, F. (1998) Recreating the city as entertainment center: the media industry's role in transforming Potsdammer Platz and Times Square. *Journal of Urban Technology* 5.3, 1–21.
- Sabel, C.F. (1994) Flexible specialization and the re-emergence of regional economies. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Schaffer, R. (1996) Report on economic base of Upper Manhattan. Columbia University Empowerment Zone Monitoring and Assistance Project, 8 February.
- Soccar, M.K. (2001) A change of art. *Crain's New York Business* 4 June, 3.
- (2002) Uptown Bohemia. *Crain's New York Business* 1 July, 3.
- Stern, M.J. (1997) *Representing the city: arts, culture and diversity in Philadelphia*. Working Paper No. 3, University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, Social Impact of the Arts Project, Philadelphia, PA.
- (1999) *Is all the world Philadelphia? A multi-city study of arts and cultural organizations, diversity and urban revitalization*. Working Paper No. 9, University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, Social Impact of the Arts Project, Philadelphia, PA.
- Storper, M. (1994) The transition to flexible specialisation in the US film industry: external economies, the division of labour and the crossing of industrial divides. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-fordism: a reader*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- and A. Scott (1989) The geographical foundations and social regulation of flexible production complexes. In J. Wolch and M. Dear (eds.), *The power of geography: how territory shapes social life*, Unwin Hyman, Winchester, MA.
- Wyatt E. (2000) School-managing company and museum plan Harlem Headquarters. *The New York Times* 7 July.