



The Multicultural Heritage of European Cities and its Re-presentation through Regeneration Programmes

Stephen Shaw and Joanna Karmowska

In recent times, some cities in the UK and elsewhere in Europe have made explicit use of their 'multicultural heritage' as a theme to revitalise inner city areas. Places that were once regarded as forbidding and 'unsafe' for casual strollers are being re-imaged to attract visitors from the majority culture, and in some cases international tourists. Expressions of ethnic and cultural identity in the built environment, along with markets, festivals and other events in public spaces are being re-presented as testimonies to the historic contribution of immigrant groups to the life of the city. Commercial thoroughfares are being upgraded, refurbished and promoted as exotic backdrops for consumption, especially stylish restaurants, bars and nightclubs (Shaw, Bagwell & Karmowska 2004). From a Neo-liberal stance, this 'self-help' approach is a welcome development that enables ethnic minority and other entrepreneurs to capitalise on an expanding service economy, revitalising long-neglected urban landscapes. Nevertheless, others question the sustainability of initiatives to promote leisure and tourism as disadvantaged neighbourhoods become 'urban quarters': shop windows designed to appeal to the consumption practices of the emerging nouveau riche, their street culture commodified in contrived narratives of place (Zukin 1999; Bell & Jayne 2004; Chan 2004).

Such deliberate aestheticisation of places associated with past or present immigrant communities as an exotic spectacle can be seen in the broader context of 'place-marketing': an emerging body of theories and practices developed by city governments, especially in North

America over the past decade (Ward 1998; Shaw 2004). From this perspective, the urban past offers a quarry of possibilities. In historic cities, the built environment and its associations with former residents provides raw material from which 'heritage products' can be extracted and assembled, usually in combination with contemporary themes. Through interpretation and promotion, diverse elements of urban life and urbanity are integrated to appeal to target audiences, positioned or re-positioned to establish a distinctive, if not unique brand (Ashworth 2001; Morgan, Pritchard & Pride 2002). In an increasingly volatile and globalized market, rival cities compete to attract target place-consumers that may include high-spending visitors, as well as investors, property developers and high-income residents (Karmowska 2003). Historic urban landscapes – chance survivals of earlier phases of a city's development – may be exploited as valuable resources that contribute to quality of life for urban elites.

In the early 1990s, some place-marketing theorists adopted a prescriptive, if not evangelistic approach, advising cities to formulate strategies that will secure them a sustainable competitive advantage. Notable advocates were Kotler, Haider and Rein (1993) who commended city governments in the United States that had demonstrated a flair for competitive niche thinking, defining or re-defining themselves as distinctive places with specific advantages to target stakeholders. The authors highlighted the importance of 'preserving the history of places, their buildings, their people and customs, the machinery, and other artefacts that

portray history' (ibid.:209) in establishing a distinctive place-identity or 'brand'. Even 'difficult destinations' such as Harlem, New York can be re-branded (Hoffman 2003). Cities in Western Europe, with their more hierarchical systems of governance, have generally been less than comfortable with the idea that cities – and districts within cities – should compete with one another without reference to a national or regional plan. However, over the past two decades, UK cities across a wide political spectrum found themselves in an increasingly competitive 'market place', as central government reduced grant aid and encouraged 'municipal entrepreneurship' (Begg 2002).

Faced with the decline of older industries – especially mining, manufacturing and distribution – urban authorities and development corporations in the UK looked to North American models of leisure and tourism-led revitalisation, especially for derelict industrial and waterfront areas in regions that had experienced rapidly rising unemployment. As Urry (2002:107) observes, de-industrialisation created a profound sense of loss, both for old technologies and the social life that went with them. Furthermore, since much of this industry had been based in premises dating from the 18th and 19th centuries, a large stock of buildings became available for refurbishment and conversion to facilitate a 'heritage industry' that would trade, in particular, on nostalgic and patriotic images of 'traditional' working class life (Hewison 1987). Contemporary critics argued that images of continuity and national unity were thus being manipulated and projected by the New Right to legitimise the status quo, the reification of a stable, untroubled social order that the viewer was not encouraged to question (cf. Wright 1985; Walsh 1992).

Many present-day residents of inner city areas in the UK are, however, first or second generation immigrants, especially from former colonies; some are recent refugees and asylum-seekers. With the election in 1997 of a New Labour government committed to the principles of 'social inclusion' through a wide range of public policies and programmes, the heritage industry was encouraged to present cultural

diversity as a positive feature of history and contemporary life in the UK. Nevertheless, there still remains a considerable gap between this policy intent and its translation into the practices of museums and other interpreters of heritage (Maitland Gardner 2004; Mason 2004; Symonds 2004). More broadly, across Europe the ideological turn from nationalistic discourses towards acceptance of a more pluralistic common heritage has been challenging, nowhere less so than in the post-Communist states of Central and Eastern Europe. To what extent is it possible to reconcile Neo-liberal principles of market-led regeneration with a celebration of multicultural heritage and social inclusion?

Whose Place? What Time?

A decade ago, the European Union appeared to be making significant progress towards the pooling of national sovereignty; Ashworth and Larkham (1994) assessed the implications for the presentation of heritage by its twelve Member States that were soon to become fifteen. The authors argued that hitherto, the concept of the modern nation state had been underpinned by a national interpretation of cultural heritage that focussed in particular upon the built environment. An inherently selective process, some features had been selected for re-creation or preservation for the nation, some historical incidents emphasised, others forgotten. A more integrated Europe would, however, require a specifically European heritage interpretation. They noted, in particular, that little had been done to integrate the cultures of recent immigrants, from the Middle East, Africa, India and increasing numbers from other regions of Asia, all of whom were now citizens of Europe. Nevertheless, many were disinherited as their heritage was ignored, or not shown in a favourable light.

This article considers the implications of adopting a culturally and ethnically pluralist perspective at the *local* level, especially in the re-presentation of historic districts on the fringe of city centers as landscapes of leisure and tourism. In some cases, the very names of such localities have, for many years, signified the poverty of minority groups that have been

marginalized, not only in the physical-spatial sense, but also socially and psychologically distanced from the brighter lights of the city centre (Shaw & MacLeod 2000). In public policy, there is however an increasing recognition of the special contribution of migrants to creative life of European cities. Landry and Bianchini refer to the historic examples of Vienna, Antwerp and Amsterdam as cultural cross-roads, while more recently in some areas of UK cities Asian businesses have helped create a 24-hour/7-day economy. They observe that such communities are outsiders and insiders at the same time: '[b]ecause of their backgrounds they have different ways of looking at problems and different priorities' (1995:28).

Within the framework of the system of governance that has been created by the dominant culture, minority communities adapt and invest in the built environment. In Europe, settlements where foreigners were allowed to live, work and trade in commodities and services necessary to the urban economy were generally located in districts symbolically outside the fortifications that surrounded established towns and citadels. As Europeans colonised other continents, spatial-symbolic hierarchies were reasserted in the pattern of urban development. With reference to European and Asian migration to Canada, Kay Anderson's (1995) one hundred-year longitudinal study of Vancouver, critically examines the hegemony of European (mainly British) settlers over 'Chinatown'. In the discourse of public policy, as well as in the local press, the district had long been regarded as a place of sinful and sinister activities. By the mid 1930s, however, some representatives on the city government began to recognise its potential as an exotic destination for sightseeing, like its counterpart in San Francisco. Today, with many of its sites preserved as heritage buildings, Vancouver's Chinatown features as one of the city's 'must see' attractions for cruise-ship passengers and other international tourists.

Arjun Appadurai (1997:33) has described such urban environments as significant features of contemporary cities that are receptors of complex and volatile cultural flows. He refers to them as *ethnoscapes*:

"landscapes of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live: tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guest workers and other moving groups constitute an essential feature of the world..."

Using the metaphor of weaving, he observes that the warp of stabilities is everywhere shot through with the woof of human motion. The suffix 'scape' indicates that multiple meanings are attached to such places through the subjective gaze of different actors. There are, of course, many historical examples of ethnoscapes: urban settings that were the product of diaspora that brought together diverse cultures and thus different ways of looking at the world, and two notable examples are given in the case studies of Spitalfields and Kazimierz below. What is new is the increasing ease with which people, capital, technologies, ideas and images can circulate on a global scale.

The self-conscious use of place-marketing to re-image urban landscapes such as those discussed above, is also a comparatively recent phenomenon. To make such areas accessible to visitors more affluent than local population, municipalities – often in partnership with central government, landowners, developers and not-for-profit stakeholders – need to make a considerable investment to upgrade the public realm. Especial attention is needed to make the 'gateway' entry points from the centre more inviting for strolling pedestrians; in the case of larger cities, routes from public transport or parking areas. The influential economist Michael Porter argued that the thesis he previously set out in *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (Porter 1990) was 'just as relevant to smaller areas such as the inner city' (1995:57). The role of the public sector should therefore move away from direct involvement towards facilitation of a favourable environment for business. Since competitive markets for investment and development operate within as well as between cities, businesses should exploit the strategic advantages of inner city locations, prime examples being proximity to downtown areas, entertainment and tourist attractions, and the entrepreneurial talent among their

immigrant communities.

Porter's arguments had a particular resonance in the UK, where rising unemployment and the untenable financial circumstances of many inner city municipalities had encouraged them to nurture and attract expanding sectors of service industries, especially leisure and tourism. Built heritage and the vitality of contemporary cultural expression – for example in the creation of cultural quarters – could help to stimulate an urban renaissance (Evans 2001). Cities such as Glasgow (Paddison 1993) and Manchester (Schofield 1996; Williams 2003) adopted strategies for re-positioning that were widely acclaimed. Some aspiring world cities cultivated a cosmopolitan image through attractions and events that owed their existence to immigrants from elsewhere in Europe as well as from other world regions. Taylor (2000) discusses the development of Ancoats as an 'urban village' in Manchester's historic Little Italy. Urry (2002:144) describes a 'cultural re-interpretation of racial difference' in Bradford's *Flavours of Asia* to promote Asian restaurants and sari centres in tandem with wider understanding of Asian religions and the history of immigration to the city. Birmingham's ethnic diversity is celebrated in its promotion of music, food and drink offered by its Irish, Pakistani, Chinese and Afro-Caribbean communities (Henry, McEwan & Pollard 2002).

In post-Communist Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), the ideological shift from centralised master planning to place-marketing has been even more challenging. In Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, cities with rising unemployment and world class but neglected urban heritage, have nevertheless identified tourism as an important catalyst for regeneration and re-positioning to international markets. Indeed, in the rationale of public policy it has often been regarded as something of a panacea. For example, in his speech to the United Nations International Council on Monuments and Sites, the former Tourism Minister of Poland, Marek Paszucha (1995:44) expressed optimism for cities such as Cracow: 'Opportunities will present themselves for the care of historic buildings the creation of

a higher technical standard, and also the possibility of the revitalization of the whole historic complexes...' He cautioned, however, that a *firm plan* would be necessary, since 'some threats to the historic places originate from the new economic situation of the free market'.

In the turbulent decade after the demise of Communism, the regulatory powers of city governments were weakened, and municipal finances were not in a strong position. In practice, their ability to plan and manage the growth of local visitor economy was somewhat limited. For example, in the Czech Republic, the attractions of Prague's built heritage stimulated rapid growth of international tourism. Despite strong local opposition, the municipality could do little to prevent over-development of hotels and other tourism facilities that displaced residents from the Old Town and heightened social polarisation (Hoffman & Musil 1999). Hall (2002) observes that the 're-branding' of some CEE destinations has been informed by a desire to portray 'Europeanness': a safe, stable and welcoming environment conducive to foreign investment, membership of the EU and tourism. Conversely, the presentation of national heritage has, in some cases, been manipulated by agencies of the state to disinherit ethnic, religious and cultural minorities. In the more extreme cases of Bosnia, Croatia, Herzegovina, heritage sites and museums were targeted in systematic programmes of ethnic cleansing by opposing factions (Maroevic 1995; Newman & McLean 1998).

As the European Union has expanded once more to include twenty-five Member States (2004), it seems appropriate to consider how the multicultural reality of European cities can be communicated to visitors. The article examines the role of urban governance in facilitating a climate conducive to leisure and tourism in such areas. Will promotion of a visitor economy based on multicultural heritage themes benefit low-income residents and small firms? Or will it cause their displacement? Will the process of re-imaging be a celebration of cultural and ethnic diversity? Or will the simplification that may be deemed necessary to re-brand a locality require de-selection, editing out, disinheritance

of some cultures past or present? The authors reflect upon the continuity of migration in some historic European cities from medieval times to the present day, with reference to two case studies of Spitalfields in the East End of London, and the Kazimierz district of Cracow over decade 1992–2002.

Spitalfields, East London

In medieval London, the settlements beyond the boundary of the city wall were outside the jurisdiction of the mayor and burgesses, as well as the powerful guilds that regulated craft production and other trades. These ‘Liberties’ provided physical space for marginalized groups and institutions whose presence was unwelcome within the city precincts. Thus, they accommodated successive waves of migrants from other areas of the British Isles as well as foreigners. Among the latter, some came at the behest of the monarch, and were tolerated because of the economic functions they performed. As its name suggests, Spitalfields developed in open land around a monastic foundation that cared for the sick, its location being just to the East of the important approach road through Bishopsgate, the main thoroughfare from the North to the river crossing at London Bridge. From the 14th century, cloth-makers from the Low Countries settled, originally at the invitation of King Edward III (1327–77) to improve indigenous textile production, but in 1381 their economic success and foreign customs made them the object of mob violence during the Peasants’ Revolt (Cox 1994).

In the centuries that followed, other migrants arrived in Spitalfields (Shaw 2003). Many were escaping political and religious persecution or extreme poverty elsewhere in Europe. From the 16th century, the Sephardic Jews escaping the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal included some who prospered as moneylenders and merchants, but their safety was not guaranteed until the Commonwealth in 1649 (Porter 1994). Protestant Huguenots, expelled from France, gave the word *refugee* to the English language, and Spitalfields became their largest settlement. Their numbers greatly

increased after 1685, and their contribution to the urban economy included silk weaving and fine instrument-making (Museum of London 1985). By the early 1700s, the area was by far the greatest centre of the textile industry in the capital (Inwood 1998), and their wealth was invested in fine Georgian town houses. After two or three generations, however, they ceased to be distinguishable minority, and industrialization made their skills redundant. Most moved away, but others took their place. The expression ethnic and cultural succession is well illustrated by the *Neuwe Eglise*, built in the early 1700s, a non-conforming church that stands at the corner of Brick Lane and Fournier Street (Hebbert 1998:173):

“The original congregation declined as the French-speaking minority intermarried and became absorbed, until in 1809 the church was taken over by the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. In Victorian times, it served as a Methodist chapel until the influx of north European Jews to Spitalfields at the turn of the century. In 1898 it was converted into the Great Synagogue. From the 1960s, the Jewish congregation dwindled, and the building closed again. It was reopened in 1976 as the London Jamme Masjid, one of the largest mosques in the capital, with a capacity for 4000 worshippers in the prayer hall.”

Until the 1950s, few architectural historians or preservationists acknowledged the merit of 18th century town houses (Delafons 1997). Nevertheless, the Survey of London (1957) reflected a growing recognition of the value of such built heritage in its assessment of *Spitalfields and Mile End Town*. It noted that the area’s ‘evil reputation’ and lack of interest from developers meant that a remarkable number survived into the mid 20th century, albeit in a poor condition. Jacobs (1996:75) observes that these Georgian houses, with their trademark mansard roofs that accommodated silk weavers’ looms, signified ‘a more elegant, more prosperous and acceptably foreign’ Spitalfields. Thus, it became desirable to recover something of the ‘good society’ of the Huguenots, known for their love of

flowers, caged birds and intellectual pursuits. In 1969, using its new powers under the *Civic Amenities Act 1967*, LB Tower Hamlets, the area's local authority, designated three Conservation Areas covering the heart of Spitalfields around (but not including) the late Victorian fruit and vegetable market building.

In 1976, the Secretary of State upgraded the heritage status of Fournier Street to an 'Outstanding Conservation Area', thus confirming its national importance (LB Tower Hamlets 1979). Nevertheless, the continuing loss of the 18th century Huguenot heritage outside the Conservation Areas, as well as the poor state of many within them, prompted the formation of the Spitalfields Historic Buildings Trust (1977). A not-for-profit organization, it was founded by the Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava, and other eminent supporters of the influential 'Georgian Group' of preservationists. Between 1977 and 1987, the Trust bought neatly forty houses to be re-sold or leased to 'appropriate' buyers, and refurbished. Acting as an 'unofficial inner city development organization', the Trust claimed credit for successful restoration of nearly 80 per cent of the nearly Georgian buildings (Blain 1989:9).

As the Jewish population which had been the dominant community in Spitalfields and adjacent Whitechapel from the late 19th century moved away in the 1970s, Bengalis acquired some Georgian and Victorian residences that had established use rights as workshops for the textile and leather trade. Jacobs (1996:86) comments that the other new community of white, middle class gentrifiers, who desired a nostalgic return to a restored Georgian enclave, 'produced an environment that was bathed in a rhetoric of co-habitation, but was antagonistic to the Bengali occupation of the area... It was not surprising that the Trust's activities worked to squeeze Bengali garment workshops out of Georgian houses and into more "suitable" premises and places', with the aim of 'restoring' them to residential use. The Trust was not, however, wholly successful in their attempt to draw this sharp spatial divide, and a number of Asian businesses still occupy Huguenot town houses. The graceful affluence of

these enclaves, by now inhabited by 'bohemian' white gentrifiers was, however, increasingly at odds with the squalor and visible neglect of the public realm in adjacent streets along and to the East of Brick Lane.

According to the Government's social indicators, Spitalfields in the 1970s and 1980s remained one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in the whole of the UK. Racial tension increased as white male activists of the right-wing National Front harassed and assaulted Asians in conscious imitation of the anti-Semitic Blackshirts of the 1930s, and Brick Lane became the focus of intimidation, which continued into the mid 1990s. The majority of the new immigrants, escaping famine and poverty in their homeland, found accommodation in low quality, often high-rise social housing. To address the severe problems of its inner city neighborhoods, LB Tower Hamlets successfully bid for £7.2 million government funding for a programme to revitalise Spitalfields and adjacent Bethnal Green 1992–97. In 1995, a further bid secured £11.4 million 1997–2002 to 'strengthen links with the City and encourage diversification of the local economy', especially into leisure and tourism. The vision for the 'Cityside' program would 'pioneer a new model of regeneration'. Its aims (LB Tower Hamlets 1996:1) were to:

- i) establish the area as one of the most attractive and accessible business locations in the capital;
- ii) develop opportunities between the corporate sector and micro and small firms;
- iii) expand the tourism potential of the area in order to stimulate economic activity, drawing on London's strength as a world city;
- iv) encourage greater integration of economic development in order to both harmonise and add value to existing regeneration initiatives;
- v) break stereotypical images of local people by supporting their entry and progression into the corporate sector and related local employment fields.

In 1997, Cityside set up a 'town management' scheme whose remit included the organization

and promotion of events associated with the local Asian population: Bengali New Year, Brick Lane and Curry Festivals. Businesses and residents from the area's diverse 'communities' were represented on the steering group, and it was through this more broadly-based forum that 'Banglatown' came to be used a brand for the area, especially to promote the new festivals and Asian restaurants. Although London's daily newspaper *Evening Standard* continued to run editorials and features that ridiculed the name (cf. Barker 1998), in time the name became accepted as a neutral place-descriptor, as Cityside's Director Andrew Bramidge (2002 personal communication) commented:

"There was a lot of sensitivity about 'changing the name of the area', but it was never about renaming Spitalfields – a distinctive locality since medieval times. Rather, it was marketing tool to get people to come and visit the area... A minority of people probably did want that – comparing it to Chinatown in the West End – but our view is that this was never an appropriate model. I think that it was quite an effective strategy because today you regularly get references to things happening in Banglatown."

A key aim of Cityside's vision was 'to achieve a quantum leap in the area's status as a visitor/ cultural destination' (LB Tower Hamlets 1996:13). Brick Lane was also identified as a 'Developing Cultural Quarter' by the City Fringe Partnership (1997–2002). It would thus be promoted to 'tourists as well as employees and business visitors, helping to enhance the City's reputation as the premier European business location' (City Corporation 1996:17). In this re-imagining of Brick Lane, special attention would be paid to the main 'gateways' or access points, including its pedestrian subways to improve perceptions of personal safety. The programme thus included the erection of Eastern-style ornamental gateways, signage and brighter street lamps the design of which incorporated 'Asian' motifs. Brick Lane's restaurants would be imaginatively promoted to non-Asian customers, especially businesspeople from the City. The vision recognised that the area would need at

least one 'must see' attraction and identified two vacant heritage buildings from the Victorian era as suitable sites: Truman's Brewery and the nearby 'Moorish Market' (ibid.:14):

"[A] Cultural Heritage Centre will provide the area with its missing flagship attraction. It will foster a sense of pride amongst the local community and promote an image of London as an exciting and vibrant multicultural city... The unique and beautiful Listed building in Fashion Street, inter-connected with the above, provides almost 100,000 square feet and could provide a major 'bazaar/ souk'. This will act as a key motor to the local economy, providing the missing 'ethnic' shopping experience."

These two proposals were soundly based, but neither materialised during Cityside's five-year programme as the site owner had plans for more profitable uses. In 1992, Grand Metropolitan sold its redundant brewery to a local entrepreneur, who refurbished the buildings, gradually converting them to a lively mix of uses. Ten years later these include 250 studios for cultural industries, two bars/nightclubs, cafés, galleries, speciality retailers and an exhibition centre. The same businessman acquired the Moorish Market in Fashion Street, and has recently applied for planning permission to convert it to studios and loft-style apartments. A recent study by Maitland Gardner (2004) suggests, however, that neither the Georgian townhouses of that had been the subject of the Spitalfields Historic Buildings Trust's campaign for protection and restoration, nor more recent attractions aimed mainly at non-Asian visitors have much significance for residents of Bangladeshi origin. The latter group identified a very different set of areas, sites and buildings as important to their sense of identity with the locality. This anomaly raises fundamental questions concerning the ability of the statutory system of heritage protection to address the needs and aspirations of ethnic minority groups.

The commercial success of the converted Truman's Brewery site nevertheless exceeded expectations, as did the rapid rise of 'Banglatown' Brick Lane as a centre for ethnic cuisine.

A survey carried out for Cityside noted that in 1989 there were only eight cafés/restaurants in Brick Lane, with a few additions in the early 1990s. Between 1997 and 2002, however, this rose to 41, of which 16 had opened 2000–02, making Banglatown ‘home to the largest cluster of Bangladeshi/“Indian” restaurants anywhere in the UK’ (Carey 2002:12). All the restaurants (as opposed to cafés) reported that their clientele was ‘overwhelmingly white’, with a clear majority (70%) in the 25–34 age group and predominantly male (ibid.:4). The boom was facilitated by relaxed planning policies that allowed local shops to be converted to restaurants. Furthermore, the central area of 19th century buildings at the heart of Brick Lane was designated a ‘Restaurant Zone’ where restaurants, cafés, hot food outlets, public houses and bars would be ‘favourably considered’ (LB Tower Hamlets 1999). By 2001, however, street canvassing by waiters indicated an excess supply, a problem that became even more pronounced with the downturn after 9/11 and the reluctance of some visitors to enter a predominantly Muslim neighbourhood.

The Council called a public meeting on the issue at which some restaurant owners argued that licences should be extended beyond midnight to boost trade. However, a number of the white, middle class residents of the Conservation Areas to the west of Brick Lane argued that litter and anti-social behaviour by late-night customers was already a serious nuisance. Others argued that conversion to restaurants that commanded higher rents contributed to the loss of local shops. Unfortunately, a stormy exchange led to physical blows and required police attendance. LB Tower Hamlets then commissioned consultants Agroni (2001) to carry out a survey of over 1500 residents from ‘all communities’, which confirmed widespread opposition to the proliferation of bars and restaurants and to any extension of opening hours. At the time of writing, the Restaurant Zone remains in force, but LB Tower Hamlets (2002) has recently used its planning powers to protect the southern section of Brick Lane as a ‘Local Shopping Parade’, a policy that is fully supported by Cityside.

The conversion of the previously run-down, mainly 19th century streetscape of Brick Lane to nightclubs, bars and restaurants has undoubtedly brought wealth to Bengali-owned businesses and job opportunities. Carey (2002) estimated that around 400 workers were employed in Brick Lane restaurants, of whom 96% were of Bangladeshi origin, 92% lived in the Borough, and 99% were men. Nevertheless, some problems identified in recent years have shed doubt on the wisdom of over-reliance on this sector. A third of restaurant owners expressed concern over staff turnover, and many felt that low pay and shifts made the work unattractive to younger Bengalis. Some said that it was risky to hire young local Bengali males who might be heroin or crack cocaine users, so they preferred to employ middle-aged men. Bengali women seemed extremely unwilling to work as waitresses, regarding restaurants as a largely male domain. Gender inequalities in the use of public space resulting from the visitor economy have also become apparent. Planning Officer Andrea Ritchie reported (2002 personal communication) that in a recent focus group facilitated by the Borough:

“Older Bengali women stressed the point that they had to be escorted by their husbands and that they could not walk along Brick Lane at all because there are just too many men there, with all the visitors and [restaurant] staff. So, although it is their area, they are socially excluded from it.”

Kazimierz, Cracow

Like Spitalfields in the East End of London, the present-day urban district of Kazimierz originated as a medieval settlement that lay outside the city wall of Cracow, Poland’s former capital. However, in this case, it was a planned town in its own right. In 1335, King Kazimierz the Great founded the settlement that bears his name on a bend of the Vistula, physically separated from the royal citadel of Wawel and the established city only by an arm of the river. With all the privileges of a burgh including an impressive market, the monarch’s

aim was to make it one of the great trading centres of Europe that could compete with other cities, including the adjacent Cracow. Over the turbulent centuries that followed, the place incorporated both Christian and Jewish cultures, for under the *Oppidum Iudaeorum* it became one of Europe's largest and oldest continuous districts of legalized Jewish settlement. Czech, German, Spanish and Italian Jews migrated to Kazimierz to live alongside Roman Catholic Poles, developing their trades and crafts, especially wood and metalworking. Thus, they contributed to the area's wealth, as well as to its unique identity. Under royal protection, they established their communities with synagogues and prayer-houses, a few of which survive to this day. Now a World Heritage site, the historic built environment of Kazimierz reflects the richness of both traditions that co-existed for six hundred years, as well as its economic vicissitudes, one its most stable and prosperous periods being the 16th and early 17th centuries. Eventually, the end of the 18th century incorporated it as a district within Cracow, with the town walls demolished and the river-arm drained, it was physically united as a continuous urban settlement

In 1939, the Jewish population of Cracow was over 63,000 (about a quarter of the city's population) with a high proportion living in the Kazimierz district (Duda 1991), a presence that was to be terminated abruptly and tragically by the Nazi invasion. Kazimierz has now become a memorial site to the atrocities of the Holocaust, but it is also an urban district whose residents have suffered poverty and social disadvantage. In the post-Communist era of the 1990s, its potential was recognized as a special district requiring physical as well as social and economic revitalization, although sensitivity would be required to reconcile this with its complex duality and memorialization of the former Jewish inhabitants. As Ashworth (1996:59) comments:

“If the atrocity element was the only consideration then it would be relatively easy to accord a paramount status to the national and international memorial function. It was however such a

widespread phenomenon throughout European cities even containing a majority of the population in some Polish cases that it merges into more mundane issues of the local revitalisation and renovation problems of inner city districts. It is the clash of the sublime and mundane, the sacred and the secular, the international and the local that provides much of the complexity now facing the city planners as they embark upon renewal in such districts.”

During the Communist era, Kazimierz lost much of its former identity, and its built heritage deteriorated. Although it remained one of the most densely populated districts of Cracow, much of its housing was rented to its poorest citizens. Through to the 1990s, its physical environment was in visible neglect, and with rents controlled and set at a very low level, landlords had little incentive to carry out even the most basic repairs. Soon after the end of the Communist period, the need for a strategic approach was recognised. With funding from the EU, a team of planners and other officers seconded from the cities of Cracow, Edinburgh and Berlin carried out the specially commissioned study in 1993–94. The team prepared a joint report on the urban renewal and conservation of the built environment of Kazimierz, helping to identify the necessary legal, administrative and financial framework. The aim was to formulate a comprehensive program to revive the run-down but potentially attractive area, and for creating an effective balance of residential, commercial and visitor uses (Cameron & Zuziak 1994). The team produced the *Kazimierz Action Plan*, with short and medium-term horizons:

- 0–2 years (mostly marketing, partnership building and first regeneration works).
- 0–5 years (completions of landscaping of the selected sites, finalising particular regeneration projects).

Unfortunately, there was considerable uncertainty over financial support from the municipality and other public bodies, and it was difficult to set measurable objectives and milestones. Furthermore, the *Detailed Local Master Plan for*

the Historic Quarter of Kazimierz (1987) adopted during the Communist era remained in force as the regulatory framework for land use planning. In practice, five years after publication of the Action Plan, few of its recommendations had been implemented (Brzeski 2000). Perhaps the main value of the project was to identify the potential factors that would be critical to the future development of the district, the role of public participation in this process, and the role which effective place-marketing would play. During the 1990s, several other EU-funded projects and proposals followed (including ECOS II and several seminars and conferences), but these had no more impact on the processes and pattern of development than ECOS I. As with Spitalfields, revitalization has occurred in particular enclaves within the district.

Over the past decade, organisations devoted to Jewish culture and heritage preservation have played an important role in re-establishing the district's former traditions, the 'Centre for Jewish Culture' being a notable example. Established in 1993 under auspices of Judaica Foundation, and with substantial financial support of the United States Congress, the local authorities and the Polish Ministry of Culture, this institute is housed in the former nineteenth-century prayer-house. The nearby Lauder Foundation was also established, its primary aim being to promote and cultivate the Jewish religion, traditions and celebrations in Poland. Unexpectedly, however, one of the most potent agents of change has been tourism inspired by cinema, as the area of Kazimierz around Szeroka featured prominently in Spielberg's (1993) film *Schindler's List*. In pre-war times, like Brick Lane, the high street of the Jewish quarter, Szeroka has thus attained celebrity status and readily included in itineraries of Poland from elsewhere in Europe and from North America, as well as independent travellers and participants in festivals and other events. Other sites and sights visited by international tourists include the Jewish cemetery, the synagogues and the mikveh (the old building of Jewish ritual baths).

Since the mid-90s, many other buildings in this part of Kazimierz, mostly dating from the

19th century, have found new commercial uses as 'Jewish-style' cafés, bookshops, restaurants and hotels. These prominently display signs in Hebrew, and some offer 'traditional Jewish entertainment'. Like the cultural institutions described above, however, nearly all are managed and staffed by Polish Catholics. A few minutes walk from Szeroka, the area around Plac Nowy has become a popular evening entertainment venue for younger Cracovians. With many bars and nightclubs, its somewhat studied decadence is therefore juxtaposed with memorialization of the 'Old Jewish Quarter'. A third sub-district of the World Heritage site has also been marked out on the contemporary tourist map around Plac Wolnica (the old market place of Kazimierz) and on the opposite side of Krakowska Street. Historically, the life of this predominantly Catholic part of Kazimierz took place around its splendid churches and the Old Town Hall (now ethnography and folk museum). Although these impressive urban landmarks feature in guidebooks, and are sign-posted by the municipality for the benefit of visitors, as yet there is little evidence of revitalisation in this area. Although this might be explained in rational terms, such as transport and relative accessibility, it appears that the development of urban tourism is subject to the vagaries of processes that are very difficult for city governments and other public agencies to anticipate or manage.

A key issue in the district is the number of heritage buildings that are of 'uncertain ownership' under the program of restitution. Most are properties that were owned by Jews who either died in the Holocaust, or else survived and left Poland, and whose descendants are entitled to reclaim them. As a result of disputed claims and uncertain ownership, some important historic buildings on prominent sites have not been maintained, and some are now in an unsafe condition. Despite this urban blight, and the district's previous reputation as a low-rent district, pockets of affluence emerged in the mid 1990s. Indeed, today some of the most expensive apartments in Cracow are in Kazimierz. Since the ECOS I report was published, there have been some significant changes in the social

mix of Kazimierz, as tenants on low, controlled rents – especially the elderly and poor are often forced to leave the area. In recent years, this has accelerated, and in 2005 the rent controls are due to end. To some extent, the valorization of older property in Kazimierz has been an unintended consequence of a state-funded renovation program administered by SKOZK (Social Committee for Cracow Monuments Preservation). However, gentrification has not always resulted in the renovation of older buildings, as some of the most sought-after accommodation is in new-build low-rise apartments built to a high standard in a retro-style on infill sites.

The process of commercial, as well as residential gentrification has also been boosted by the voluntary efforts to improve the area by a local association of small businesses. Its initiatives have included a ‘clean up Kazimierz’ campaign to reduce garbage on streets and pavements, late opening of shops and galleries every first Thursday of the month, and a summer soup festival. As in Spitalfields and other inner urban areas of West European cities, the new residents include a mix of artists, scientists and young professionals, who are attracted by the accessible location, ambience and now fashionable address. Most of the district’s former craft industries have also been displaced. Traditionally famous for its metal and woodworking, these have rapidly declined. Without effective planning control over change of use, or support from the state, craftspeople are now unable to pay rents comparable to restaurants and souvenir shops that have located here because of tourism. Thus, the ECOS plan for Kazimierz, with its emphasis on maximizing social and economic benefits – especially to its disadvantaged residents and to the district’s established craft industries – has held very little sway. The Detailed Local Master Plan appears increasingly irrelevant to a post-Communist urban economy; the vagaries of market forces prevail.

Despite the overall lack of progress, one notable achievement of ECOS I was establishment in 1994 of the Local Kazimierz Office: an agency that has worked closely with the local commu-

nity. Its activities have focussed in particular on social revitalisation. Its main strength was as a stable point of contact for residents of the districts, as well as for potential investors. With modest support from the municipality, and from the Prince of Wales Foundation in the UK, it instigated projects that have been widely recognised as important for the community life of Kazimierz during a difficult period of transition. These included promotional activities, surveys to gauge public opinion, and public consultation on key issues that affected community life, educational projects that drew from the area’s rich history, such as ‘Future for the Past’ that encouraged participation from young adults, in particular. In the late 1990s, the activities of Kazimierz Office received very little support from the City Council. Walczak (2002) concluded that, unfortunately, the Kazimierz Office was not functioning effectively. Its staff considered the organisation to be largely powerless and ineffective, with a budget sufficient only to support its own staff overheads and minor promotional initiatives (including newsletter), but without the authority or political support to implement the Action Plan and to achieve its community objectives.

In 2002 the Kazimierz Office was forced to close, but some of its volunteers have set up ‘Friends of Kazimierz’, an organisation that attempts to continue some of the initiatives, including a quarterly magazine *Kazimierz*, published in English as well as Polish. Other publications discuss local issues and promote events to visitors and to the local community. One issue of increasing concern is the effect of the booming ‘Old Jewish Town’ and late-night economy on the everyday lives of residents. Some pavement cafés and restaurants in Kazimierz are open long after those in the Market Square in Cracow have closed, and on warm summer evenings their customers tend to stay outside all night. At weekends, the pavements are lined with parked cars, and young people stand around, drinking and listening to the loud music from the cafés. In the daytime, the public spaces are occupied by groups of weary tourists, and mothers from the local neighbourhood have

to walk some way from their homes to find a quiet area for their children to play. There are also wider concerns that the smartly renovated apartments and business premises will attract wealthy owners and internationally branded retail outlets, causing rents to rise well beyond the means of established residents. Those who are not displaced will also feel increasingly excluded, for example the new 'café society' will encroach upon and perhaps displace the area's local street markets. Ten years on, few of the objectives outlined in the ECOS I report have been achieved. Despite its status as a World Heritage site, and as a district identified for special treatment in the Master Plan, regulation has been ineffectual. And, as yet Cracow City Council has offered very little financial support for the local policies and initiatives that they, in principle, espouse. Market forces have thus prevailed, and the pace, location and type of investment by the private sector have been hard to predict. Only time will tell whether revitalization through leisure and tourism will renovate the historic urban landscape and provide the promised economic and social benefits for established residents and their small businesses.

The somewhat *laissez-faire* approach of the past decade has, however, produced a mosaic of 'scenes' within Kazimierz, sub-areas that cater for different segments of leisure demand: cheap bars for students, Jewish-style hotels and restaurants for international tourists, high class cuisine for the urban elite. Poland's unstable national economy and the current uncertainties over global tourism demand may also be compounded by the vagaries of fashion. The Friends of Kazimierz and other community groups express concern that at some stage, a downturn in some or all of these will leave the district's heritage buildings empty and neglected once again. Such concerns and doubts regarding the sustainability of leisure and tourism-led revitalization in the 'showpiece' district of Kazimierz had been partly addressed by the Mayor and City Council, elected on a programme of reform in November 2002. In the next few years, such concerns and doubts regarding the sustainability of leisure and tourism-led revitalization

in the 'showpiece' district of Kazimierz will have to be addressed by the new Mayor and City Council, elected on a programme of reform in November 2002. By 2004, some preliminary work had been undertaken, most notably the submission of several projects for EU funding. A Task Team for revitalisation of the Kazimierz area has been established with five working groups: entrepreneurship and promotion; space of culture; social space; spatial economy; and housing. In the near future, the municipality plans to announce a competition for a 'complex and interdisciplinary study – conception for the revitalisation of the Kazimierz area, that would influence its economic and social activity' (Gorczyca 2004 personal communication). Whether or not this is the most appropriate way to address the problems of Kazimierz and its established residents and businesses will no doubt be the subject of considerable debate in the near future.

Conclusion

The present circumstances of the two case study areas seem very different, but there are also some significant common themes. Both Spitalfields and Kazimierz have medieval origins as urban quarters where immigrant communities were permitted to settle and establish their trades. Over the following centuries, through the early modern period to the present day, this rich multicultural heritage has left its imprint on the urban landscape. In these and other European cities, such places have complex place-identities that contrast with the 'mainstream' image of the national heritage industry. For many years associated with the poverty of other cultural and ethnic groups, they may contain a large stock of heritage buildings, deemed worthy of conservation because of their architectural merit and/or historic value. Typically, however, there are serious problems of dereliction and poor maintenance. The public realm of streets, community facilities and other infrastructure is also worn out and visibly neglected, as the local tax base is low, and city governments have other priorities. Over the last decade, the opportunity to market and promote an emerging

visitor economy has been seen as something of a panacea to revitalize such areas. Their built heritage has thus been exploited as raw material from which a distinctive heritage 'product' can be developed, the buildings saved and restored.

In the examples described above, particular places associated with one minority of a particular historical period – or else an exotic theme built around the contemporary inhabitants – are marked out, and promoted to appeal to target audiences. Within each bounded enclave, considerable effort is invested to create a safe environment for visitors; a suitable ambience conducive to leisure and tourism consumption. This 'monocultural' approach may help to establish a strong unifying theme that can readily be communicated to prospective place-consumers. An optimistic scenario is that the development of a thriving visitor economy generates badly-needed income and jobs for inner city residents, compensating for the decline of older trades, and raising business confidence. New leisure and tourism-related uses for vacant or under-used heritage buildings may facilitate the restoration of neglected urban landscapes. The creation of a tourism enclave also provides the rationale, and resources to upgrade the public realm, to the benefit of local users and visitors alike (Orbasli & Shaw 2004). Less tangibly, the process may raise 'local pride' in areas where low self-esteem has long been reinforced by negative stereotypes of inner city neighborhoods and their minority residents.

The case studies also serve to illustrate some difficult issues and problems for municipalities that wish to raise the profile of such disadvantaged urban areas through micro-level place-marketing to visitors. The significant cultural legacy of such areas may be far from obvious to the casual observer, especially short-stay international tourists. Likewise, the creative activities of current inhabitants may be hidden from view. From a marketing perspective, a strong and simple theme may be the most effective way of establishing a positive place-brand and playing down less favourable associations. But, as Judd (1999, 2003) has emphasised, with reference to urban tourism

in North America, an essentially false reality may be created through re-imaging inner city areas as constructed 'tourist bubbles' where visitors move, as in a theme park: a process described by Zukin (1995:28) as 'pacification by cappuccino'. In both case studies, there is now an emerging 'mosaic' of enclaves: places presented as 'of' a particular time or group of migrants. Thus, the visitor crosses from the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical heritage of Gothic churches to a re-presentation of a pre-war 'Jewish ghetto'; from elegant Georgian terraces of the Huguenot silk-weavers and merchants to vibrant 'Banglatown'.

A less benign view is that the transformation of public realm into such visitor-oriented enclaves alienates those among established local communities who perceive little personal benefit, marginalising if not excluding some groups. In historic cities that have a heritage of immigration, there are essential difficulties of interpreting complex urban place-histories and territorializing ethnic-geographies that are seldom static. Like holiday resorts in less developed countries that become the playgrounds of more affluent foreign tourists, visitors and wealthy residents may valorize historic inner city areas. In this aestheticized urban landscape of multiple realities, the 'host' population may itself become the object of curiosity, a theatre of extras: actors whose role is to animate the scene (Shaw & MacLeod 2000). Ironically, the sign-posting and marking out of cultural and ethnic difference creates an anodyne homogenous landscape of 'pure consumption', disconnected from life of the local population. The unleashing of market forces may result in an unequal distribution of costs and benefits, and rising property values will drive out low-income residents and small firms, including local shops and craft industries that once provided a sense of place as well as utility and employment.

De-coupled from established systems urban governance and land use planning, urban tourism may take on momentum of its own. City governments and other public agencies may offer a clear vision of desirable outcomes, and some may invest in facilitating infrastructure, including the 'soft' infrastructure of place-marketing

in its widest sense. Nevertheless today, in CEE as well as Western European countries, much depends on the commercial decisions of private-sector stakeholders, especially landowners and developers. In practice, policy-makers and planners can seldom predict with any certainty where, when or what type of investment will actually occur, far less its cumulative impact on the lives of local residents and communities. In a European Union of twenty-five Member States, the vision of an inclusive, pan-European heritage remains elusive. A culturally and ethnically pluralist perspective is far from straightforward, especially in divided cities where pasts as well as presents are deeply contested. However, without such sensitivity, there is a very real danger that urban tourism, while helping to save and conserve vulnerable built heritage, may exacerbate rather than de-fuse tensions in inner cities with turbulent social histories, where violent conflict has periodically re-surfaced.

Notes

1. This article is based on the paper presented by the authors to the US/International Council on Ancient Monuments and Sites (US/ICOMOS) 6th International Symposium, *Managing Conflict and Conservation in Historic Cities: Integrating Conservation with Tourism, Development and Politics*, Annapolis, Maryland, April 2003. The authors would like to thank US/ICOMOS for sponsoring their presentation.

References

- Agroni 2001: *Brick Lane Restaurant Zone Consultation Report*. London.
- Anderson, K. 1995: *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875–1980*. Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Appadurai, A. 1997: *Modernity at Large: Cultural Aspects of Globalisation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ashworth, G. 1996: Realisable Potential but Hidden Problems: A Heritage Tale from five Central European Cities. In: Purchla, J. (ed.) *The Historical Metropolis: A Hidden Potential*. Cracow: International Culture Centre.
- Ashworth, G. 2001: Heritage and Tourism: Managing the Resource Crisis. In: Purchla, J. (ed.) *From the World of Borders to the World of Horizons*. Cracow: International Cultural Centre.
- Ashworth, G. & Larkham, P. 1994: *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Barker, P. 1998: London is no Place for this Ghetto Mentality. In: *Evening Standard*. 3rd August: 11.
- Begg, I. (ed.) 2002: *Urban Competitiveness: Policies for Dynamic Cities*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Bell, D. & Jayne, M. (eds) 2004: *City of Quarters: Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Blain, D. 1989: A Very Brief and Very Personal History of the Spitalfields Trust. In: Girouard, M., Cruickshank, D. & Samuel, R. (eds) *The Saving of Spitalfields*. London: The Spitalfields Historic Buildings Trust, pp. 1–31.
- Brzeski, W.J. (ed.) 2000: *Prospects of the Development of Kazimierz – What Hope for Revitalisation in the Future?* Cracow: Fundacja Krakowski Instytut Nieruchomosci.
- Cameron, D. & Zuziak, Z. (eds) 1994: *Kazimierz Action Plan: A European Union ECOS Funded Project carried out by the Cities of Cracow, Edinburgh and Berlin 1993–94*. Cracow: Viator Co.
- Carey, S. 2002: *Brick Lane, Banglatown: A Study of the Catering Sector*, final report, Research Works Limited, London. Prepared for Ethnic Minority Enterprise Project and Cityside Regeneration.
- Chan, W. 2004: Finding Chinatown: Ethnocentrism and Urban Planning. In: Bell, D. & Jayne, M. (eds) *City of Quarters: Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 173–187.
- City Corporation 1996: *Revitalising the City Fringe: Inner City Action with a World City Focus*. London: City Corporation.
- Cox, J. 1994: *London's East End: Life and Traditions*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Delafons, J. 1997: *Politics and Preservation: A Policy History of the Built Heritage 1882–1996*. London: Spon.
- Duda, E. 1991: *Krakowskie Judaica*. Warszawa: PTTK Kraj.
- Evans, G. 2001: *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* London/New York: Routledge.
- Hall, D. 2002: Branding and National Identity: The Case of Central and Eastern Europe. In: Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. & Pride, R. (eds) *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hebbert, M. 1998: *London: More by Fortune than Design*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Henry, N., McEwan, C. & Pollard, J. S. 2002: Globalisation from below: Birmingham – Postcolonial Workshop of the World? In: *Area*, vol. 34, no. 2, June: 117–127.
- Hewison, R. 1987: *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen.
- Hoffman, L. & Musil, J. 1999: Culture Meets Commerce: Tourism in Postcommunist Prague. In: Judd, D. & Fainstein, S. (eds) *The Tourist City*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, pp. 179–197.
- Hoffman, L. 2003: Revalorizing the Inner City:

- Tourism and Regulation in Harlem. In: Hoffman, L., Fainstein, S. & Judd, D. (eds) *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Spaces*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 145–166.
- Inwood, S. 1998: *A History of London*. London: MacMillan.
- Jacobs, J. M. 1996: *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Judd, D. 1999: Constructing the Tourist Bubble. In: Judd, D. & Fainstein, S. (eds) *The Tourist City*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, pp. 35–53.
- Judd, D. 2003: Visitors and the Spatial Ecology of a City. In: Hoffman, L., Fainstein, S. & Judd, D. (eds) *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 23–38.
- Karmowska, J. 2003: Cultural Heritage as an Element of Marketing Strategy in European Historic Cities. In: Kozłowski (ed.) *Proceedings of the 5th. EC Conference, Cultural Heritage Research: A Pan-European Challenge*. Cracow, pp. 139–141.
- Kotler, P., Haider, D. & Rein, I. 1993: *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States and Nations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Landry, C. & Bianchini, F. 1995: *The Creative City*. London: Demos.
- LB Tower Hamlets 1979: *Fournier Street Outstanding Conservation Area, Planning and Conservation Policy*. London.
- LB Tower Hamlets 1996: *Eastside Challenge Fund Submission*. London.
- LB Tower Hamlets 1999: *Brick Lane Retail and Restaurant Policy Review*, 1st March. London.
- LB Tower Hamlets 2002: *Brick Lane Retail and Restaurant Policy Review*, 9th January. London.
- Maitland Gard'ner, J. 2004: Heritage Protection and Social Inclusion: A Case Study from the Bangladeshi Community of East London. In: *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, March: 75–92.
- Maroëvic, I. 1995: Heritage Wreckers. In: *Museums Journal*, vol. 95, no. 3: 27–28.
- Mason, R. 2004: Conflict and Complement: An Exploration of the Discourses Informing the Concept of the Socially Inclusive Museum in Contemporary Society. In: *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, March: 49–73.
- Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. & Pride, D. 2002: *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*. Oxford: Butterworth and Heinemann.
- Museum of London 1985: *The Quiet Conquest: The Huguenots 1685–1985*. London: Museum of London Publications.
- Newman, A. & McLean, F. 1998: Heritage Builds Communities: The Application of Heritage Resources to the Problems of Social Exclusion. In: *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 4, no. 3: 143–153.
- Orbasli, A. & Shaw, S. 2004: Transport and Visitors in Historic Cities. In: *Transport and Tourism: Issues and Agenda for the New Millennium*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Paddison, R. 1993: City Marketing, Image Reconstruction and Urban Regeneration. In: *Urban Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2: 339–350.
- Paszucha, M. 1995: Managing Places – Cracow. In: *Historic Cities and Sustainable Tourism*, ICOMOS UK conference, pp. 39–53. Bath: ICOMOS.
- Porter, M. 1990: *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Porter, M. 1995: The Competitive Advantage of the Inner City. In: *Harvard Business Review*, May/June: 55–71.
- Porter, R. 1994: *London: A Social History*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Schofield, P. 1996: Cinematic Images of a City: Alternative Heritage Tourism in Manchester. In: *Tourism Management*, vol. 17, no. 5: 333–340.
- Shaw, S. 2003: Multicultural Heritage and Urban Regeneration in London's City Fringe. In: Kozłowski (ed.) *Proceedings of the 5th. EC Conference, Cultural Heritage Research: A Pan-European Challenge*. Cracow, pp. 146–150.
- Shaw, S. 2004: The Canadian 'World City' and Sustainable Downtown Revitalisation: Messages from Montreal 1962–2002. In: *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2: 363–377.
- Shaw, S., Bagwell, S. & Karmowska, J. 2004: Ethnoscapes as Spectacle: Reimagining Multicultural Districts as New Destinations for Leisure and Tourism Consumption. In: *Urban Studies*, vol. 41, no. 10: 1983–2000, September.
- Shaw, S. & MacLeod, N. 2000: Creativity and Conflict: Cultural Tourism in London's City Fringe. In: *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, vol. 2, no. 3: 165–175.
- Survey of London 1957: *Spitalfields and Mile End Town, volume XXVII*. London: The Athlone Press for London County Council.
- Symonds, J. 2004: Historical Archaeology and the Recent Past. In: *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, March: 33–48.
- Taylor, I. 2000: European Ethnoscapes and Urban Redevelopment: The Return of Little Italy in 21st Century Manchester. In: *City*, vol. 4, no. 1: 27–42.
- Urry, J. 2002: *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, second edition. London: Sage.
- Walsh, K. 1992: *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Post-modern World*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Ward, S. 1998: *Selling Places: The Marketing and Selling of Towns and Cities 1850–2000*. London: Spon.
- Williams, G. 2003: *The Enterprising City Centre: Manchester's Development Challenge*. London: Spon.
- Wright, P. 1985: *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain*. London: Verso.
- Zukin, S. 1995: *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts/Oxford: Blackwell.

Zukin, S. 1999: Urban Lifestyles: Diversity and Standardisation in Spaces of Consumption. In: *Urban Studies*, vol. 35, no. 5–6: 825–839.

References to Personal Communications

Bramidge, A., Director Cityside Regeneration 2002: personal interview with S. Shaw, Spitalfields, London, 7th October.

Gorczyca, W. Department for Strategy and Development, Cracow Municipality 2004: personal interview with J. Karmowska, Cracow 28th October.

Ritchie, A. 2002: Planning and Community Liaison Officer, LB Tower Hamlets, personal interview with S. Shaw, Bow Road, London, 27th September.

Walczak, M. Vice-president Friends of Kazimierz Society 2002: personal interview with J. Karmowska, Cracow 27th November.