

# REDEVELOPMENT FOR WHOM AND FOR WHAT PURPOSE? A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR URBAN REDEVELOPMENT IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

Kevin Fox Gotham

## INTRODUCTION

Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social relations, everlasting uncertainty and agitation, distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier times. All fixed, fast-frozen relationships, with their train of venerable ideas and opinions are swept away, all new-formed ones become obsolete before they are ossified. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and men at last are forced to face with sober senses the real conditions of their lives and their relations with fellow men (Marx & Engels 1948, p. 12).

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels describe modern society as a society of chaos and turmoil, where class conflict is endemic, and social stability is a fleeting and ephemeral condition. For Marx and Engels, the modern city concentrates and expresses most vividly the peculiarities of capitalism including, for example, the antithesis between wage labor and capital, the valorization of exchange-value, and proletarianization of the populace. Yet the city is also an important birthing area for class consciousness and the development of revolutionary social movements that can challenge the exploitative conditions of capitalist social relations. As Engels notes, this

---

**Critical Perspectives on Urban Redevelopment, Volume 6, pages 431–454**  
Copyright © 2001 by Elsevier Science Ltd.  
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.  
ISBN: 0-7623-0541-X

“double tendency” of capitalist urbanization makes visible and intensifies the problems of poverty, unemployment, and deprivation that, in turn, provoke agitation and calls for reform and “redevelopment.” Local attempts to eliminate the slums in one area of the city, however, mean their simultaneous appearance and growth in another part of the city. As Engels (1969b) states in his essay on urban housing, “the bourgeoisie has only one method of settling the housing question . . . The breeding places of disease, the infamous holes and cellars in which the capitalist mode of production confines our workers night after night are not abolished; they are merely *shifted elsewhere!* The same economic necessity which produced them in the first place produces them in the next place also!” (Quote appears in Saunders 1981, p. 23). In particular, Engels observes that in modern cities, the rich and poor live in segregated spaces, neighborhoods and land-uses are in a state of flux, and movement, migration, and “everlasting uncertainty” are the defining characteristics of urban life (1969a).

Marx and Engels’ vision of the modern city as a city of upheaval, fragmentation, and discontinuity sheds light on the nature of urban redevelopment and the transformation of metropolitan space and life at the beginning of the twenty first century. Traditionally, urban scholars have connected the term “redevelopment” to the central city, although rural towns and suburbs have become increasingly locked in a competitive struggle to redevelop themselves and attract capital. Since the 1960s, urban areas in the United States have been subjected to a series of unprecedented socio-spatial changes, including a decrease of population and employment in the “rustbelt,” redevelopment of the inner core of some older metropolitan areas, increase in minority populations in central cities, rapid growth of “edge cities” on the metropolitan fringe, and the economic decline of older suburban communities, among other changes. Moreover, urban politics has moved away from the days of generous federal funding through fiscal austerity to the present period of limited resources, privatization of services, and combined public/private partnerships in pursuit of growth. Today, in virtually all cities, policy-makers and elites have perceived their economic base as endangered from competition from other cities and have struggled to develop various programs, fiscal policies, and other subsidies to attract businesses. The contributors have outlined and discussed these concerns in detail throughout the preceding twelve chapters. At this stage, I wish to bring together common themes for making some preliminary suggestions as to the way forward for a research agenda in urban redevelopment in the twenty first century.

All of this volume’s contributors have discussed the significance, characteristics, and consequences of urban redevelopment on urban life and change. Yet a satisfactory and agreed upon definition of “redevelopment” is

elusive since the term assumes that someone or something is “undeveloped.” What and who is need of “redevelopment” needs spelling out: is it the tax base? Downtown property values? Neighborhoods where poor people and racial minorities live? Other questions inevitably arise: What are the positive effects and negative consequences of redevelopment? Which groups and interests benefit or suffer from redevelopment? How has the nature, pace, and character of urban redevelopment changed throughout the decades? How are these changes connected to macrostructural changes in the state and the economy? The contributors to this volume have addressed these and other important questions in an effort to shed empirical and theoretical light on novel and enduring features of urban redevelopment. To this end, I propose identifying five areas in which the contributors here have identified as key points of concern which may help to propel research on urban redevelopment into our new century. I will then discuss these substantive concerns more broadly under the umbrella of recent developments in theory and method in urban sociology. We can therefore identify the five points of concern arising out of the chapters collected here: growth coalitions and growth conflicts; globalization; gentrification and the transformation of urban space; culture and history in urban redevelopment; class, gender, and race issues.

### **GROWTH COALITIONS AND GROWTH CONFLICTS**

Most of the contributors comment on the various dimensions and meanings of economic “growth” in their studies of urban redevelopment. Indeed, what connects the empirical work in this volume with the various growth-theories of urban redevelopment – for example, the growth machine, the growth regime, the entertainment machine, and so on – is the contention that city leaders seek to create or sustain economic growth and private profits to maintain government services, fiscal health, and project an image of a “good” business climate (Imbroscio 1998). In their seminal work, *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*, Logan and Molotch (1987) argued that the formation of coalitions in pursuit of growth permeates all facets of local life, including the political system, as well as local utility companies, unions, media, and cultural institutions such as professional sports teams, theaters, symphony orchestras, and universities (Molotch, 1976, 1999; Logan & Molotch, 1987). The contributors to this volume note that local politics and the pursuit of “growth” is shot through with conflict at multiple levels: from struggles over the use of public monies to finance large-scale redevelopment projects to the role of local government in engineering new growth or containing the negative consequences of past growth initiatives. Not all pro-growth coalitions use the same strategies

to influence local politics and policy and the balance power in any community is contingent upon a variety of local and external conditions (Gotham, 2001a). The theoretical and empirical literature recognizes that different cities can embrace different “growth” strategies (pro-growth, managed growth, slow-growth, no-growth, anti-growth) and not all support the same kinds of growth (population growth, manufacturing versus tourism-based growth, downtown revitalization versus outlying residential development, and so on) (Purchell, 1999; Hamilton, 1999; for an overview, see Logan, Whaley & Crowder, 1997).

Over the last two decades, much research has investigated the role of progrowth coalitions in the formulation and specific character of local redevelopment drives, influence of economic elites in local politics and decision-making, and the diverse growth strategies used by elites to promote their agenda (Cummings, 1988; Feagin, 1988; Jonas & Wilson, 1999; Squires, 1989). Who promotes growth and local economic development are central to urban theory, the politics of cities, and places in the global economy. While scholars acknowledge the interconnectedness of local, national, and global forces in the dynamics of urban growth, scholars do not agree on whether research should “start with the local details and build up” (Molotch, 1999, p. 255) or eschew “bottom-up methodology” and examine wider economic and political forces and processes to understand local conditions (Jessop, Peck & Tickell, 1999, pp. 142, 144; Imbroscio, 1998). Most empirical research using growth machine theory embraces the former, more inductive and agency-centered focus to concretely situate actions, events, and processes in broader historical contexts. Future research should relate growth issues – meanings of growth, growth coalition formation and dissolution, mobilization of opposition to growth, and so on – to wider economic and political contexts. In the arena of local redevelopment strategy and policy, we should also focus on how “growth” is itself contested terrain, a battlefield of contending interests with losers and winners. While empiricism and local study is important, “the big story remains beyond the local horizon,” according to Flanagan (1993, p. 164). While case studies add descriptive depth, richness of analysis, and contextualization of explanations, we should also strive to be explicit about the frame of reference guiding the research. Moreover, the focus on “the case” should not divert us from being precise about the definition and logic of connection between concepts, and the obligation to attend to the theoretical aspects of our empirical investigations.

The chapters by Aguirre and Brooks, Bures, Crowley, and Clark and Lloyd bring needed attention to the important role that political factors play in shaping urban redevelopment and mediating struggles and conflicts over growth. Some scholars argue that local governments are dependent on the national and global

economy (Dear & Clark, 1981, pp. 1278–1283; Clark & Dear, 1984) whereas others argue that local and political institutions remain critical for promoting growth (Friedland, Piven & Alford, 1977). According to Logan, Whaley, and Crowder (1997), scholars have typically viewed the local state as a “limiting force” in the effectiveness of no-growth or anti-growth forces, or a “stabilizing force” for pro-growth coalitions, “maintaining a predictable tilt in favor of development proposals despite minor shifts in the governing coalition” (see also Horan, 1991; Calavita, 1992). Yet this view of the local state has been subject to criticism from scholars who argue that the growth machine approach has failed to consider the efficacy of local political structures and formal politics (Logan et al., 1997), and neglected to specify the connections between the local state and the national state (Kirby & Abu-Rauss, 1999, pp. 214–215; Jessop, Peck & Tickell, 1999, p. 159; Nelson & Foster, 1999). Much research has examined how a growth coalition can unify otherwise disparate groups of investors and capitalists through the ideology of “growth” but few studies have focused on the role of the state arrangements and agencies in fomenting discord within a growth coalition. For Kirby and Abu Rass (1999, p. 215), “the local state is in large measure defined as the locus of growth and of the political issues that surround it.” As the chapters in this volume show, the local state plays a crucial role in unifying and stabilizing a growth coalition (Crowley), facilitating the adoption of some growth strategies rather than others (Clark & Lloyd), and mediating conflicts over meanings and growth and redevelopment (Aguirre & Brooks).

Urban scholars will continue to disagree over the dimensions “growth” and the efficacy of growth machine theory, as Lloyd and Clark point out. Although empirical research is beginning to recognize variations in the influence and effect of progrowth coalitions on local redevelopment initiatives, few studies have documented the locally – and historically – specific sources of variation in the composition and operation of a growth coalition. Moreover, few scholars have clearly identified the specific political, organizational, historical, and cultural factors that explain how and why cities pursue some growth strategies rather than others. The chapters by Crowley, Bures, Lloyd and Clark, and Eeckhout offer some suggestions for future research and they acknowledge, in various ways, the necessity of pushing research toward examining the role of culture and history as growth strategies, the internal workings of growth coalitions, the various roles played by their different members, the tactics these actors employ, and the conflicts that develop among them. In particular, scholars should avoid totalizing views and overgeneralizations about the so-called “functions” the local state (or national state) performs, concentrating instead on charting state actions and consequences of actions in a grounded reflexive

fashion. Moreover, we clearly need more historical and comparative studies that connect different growth strategies at the local level with the changing character of both U.S. economic and political structure. Other important issues such as territorial or spatial conflict, spatially based power relations, rise and fall of different fractions of capital (property, finance, industrial, etc.), community resistance as a component of political economy, and the consumption and production of space need more attention.

### GLOBALIZATION

One debate that has significant implications for the transformation of cities and which appears to be increasingly high on urban scholars' agenda overall is that of globalization. In many respects, urban redevelopment appears to be a global phenomenon (with the requisite synonyms and metaphors) – as Paquin's case study of Seoul, South Korea illustrates. Citing the growth of transnational corporations and the enhanced mobility of goods, services, and money, proponents of the globalization thesis argue that the transition to a globalized economy has created new forms of power and influence that are beyond the reach of federal regulatory agencies, national labor unions, and other forms of democratic decision making and citizen action. Defined in this manner globalization has undermined the scope and role of the welfare state, depressed wages and living standards, and intensified the salience of place-bound identities (Cox, 1997; Wilson, 1997; Amin, 1994; Sassen, 1991, 1998; Featherstone, 1990; for an overview see Riain, 2000). The problem here, as many scholars have noted and several contributors to this volume show, is that the study of globalization suffers from conceptual ambiguity and lack of specificity. Urban scholars have criticized proponents of the globalization thesis for portraying "globalization" as a monolithic and inexorable process following its own internal logic, for downplaying the significance of political variables, and for de-emphasizing the impact of national state arrangements in mediating local impacts of economic change (Logan, Whaley & Crowder, 1997, pp. 84–85; Logan, 1993, 1991; Logan & Swanstrom, 1990; Molotch, 1999, pp. 260–262). Others have argued that the term is a buzzword and a cliché that ignores history and hides the enduring features of capitalism (Giddens, 1996, p. 61; Harvey, 1989; Cox, 1997; Abu-Lughod, 1989; Gottdiener, Collins & Dickens, 1999, p. 7; Silver, 1993).

Despite these conceptual and analytic problems, the concept "globalization" has a key role to play in the study of urban redevelopment throughout the world, whether they are cities in Europe or the United States or cities in less-developed nations (Sassen, 2000). As such, balancing the sometimes

contradictory juxtaposition of local history, political and cultural practices, national state arrangements, and the globalizing tendencies of multinational corporations is very important, as Paquin and Indergaard note. Jan Lin's (1995, 1998) work on redeveloped ethnic places as "polyglot honeypots" and Christopher Mele's (1995) discussion of the redevelopment of the Lower East of New York draw attention to the contradictions and conflicts, as well as opportunities presented by globalization. According to Cox and contributors (1997), Wilson and colleagues (1998), and Van Kempen and Marcuse (1997, p. 285), globalization entails different processes that produce different spatial consequences including, for example, loss of local autonomy, displacement, socioeconomic polarization in and between places, racial and ethnic conflict, among others. The growing feeling that – despite conflicting definitions of urban "redevelopment," "globalization," and the like – we all share the same globe and face some form of the balance between the homogenizing tendencies of capitalism and the determination of local people to affirm their unique character has massive implications for the future of cities and communities. The ways in which cities manifest the tensions between global process and local actions should therefore represent a key concern of scholars into urban redevelopment, in the United States and elsewhere.

### **GENTRIFICATION AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF URBAN SPACE**

Urban scholars have long discussed central cities in terms of decay, poverty, and fiscal crisis. Yet in recent decades, new images have been articulated, envisioning central cities with new investment, rejuvenation of central city neighborhoods, and a so-called back-to-the-city movement of affluent whites. Traditionally, scholars have described gentrification as a process of residential development in central city areas that involves renovation for middle- and upper-income people and the displacement of poorer residents. However, Neil Smith (1996, p. 70) astutely observes that "Gentrification is a back-to-the-city movement all right, but a back-to-the-city movement by capital rather than people." This comment brings attention to the notion that key actors and organized interests of real estate and finance capital have much at stake in enhancing the exchange value of urban space in redeveloping the city. Therefore, in order to understand the causes and consequences of gentrification and how it affects socio-spatial organization, we should first examine the role of capital in the process of gentrification, proceed to examine the conflicts between residents and powerful economic and political actors in redeveloping the city, and the move towards an analysis of the social and cultural aspects of creating gentrified

spaces. Indergaard draws attention to the impact of new media technologies in creating “commercial gentrification” in New York City’s Silicon Alley, and Bures discusses the racial conflicts over gentrification and the control of residential space. More broadly, Wyly and Hammel show that debates about gentrification link recent socio-spatial changes in our cities to a number of different issues including, for example, policy discussions over fair lending, racial discrimination in urban housing markets, urban design and growth strategies, anti-poverty policy, privatization, and the devolution of certain federal housing programs to states and cities.

Several contributors bring needed attention to the role of federal policy, housing programs, and national regulatory arrangements in the transformation of urban space generally and public housing specifically. Wyly and Hammel’s chapter connects with an embryonic evaluation literature that has documented the progress of the redevelopment of public housing funded through the HOPE VI program. A recent series of reports from HUD maintain that HOPE VI is reducing isolation by providing opportunities for employment and education and engaging residents in the life and prospects of the community (Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), 2000, 1999, 1996). Other accounts are not so optimistic. According to a 1998 report from the General Accounting Office (GAO, 1998), from 1993 to 1998, only eleven public housing sites around the nation had developed new units for residents and none of the sites’ capital improvement plans had been completed by the middle of 1998. In addition to slow implementation, cost-overruns and resident opposition to demolition and displacement have plagued HOPE VI revitalization efforts in many cities, including Cincinnati, Boston, and Charlotte, North Carolina (Pitcoff, 1999). Gayle Epp (1996) found considerable local variation in the success and implementation of HOPE VI funded comprehensive social and community support services for residents in Seattle and Indianapolis. More recently, Jerry Salama’s (1999) comparison of three public housing developments in Atlanta, Chicago, and San Francisco showed that HOPE VI programs were only marginally successful in meeting their goals due to lack of standards for improved physical design and resident involvement. Recent research recognizes the complexity and trade-offs of trying to meet the diverse and overlapping goals of the HOPE VI legislation (Vale, 1997). Yet lack of data at the project level, anecdotal data on indicators of success at the PHA level, and lack of comparability of data between PHAs, make the definition and evaluation of redevelopment “success” problematic (Epp, 1996, p. 567–568; Salama, 1999; Vale, 1997, 1996; 93).

My chapter with Shefner and Brumley, and the chapter Wyly and Hammel suggest that the redevelopment of public housing is the newest form of state-sponsored redevelopment that seeks to transform public housing authorities into

public/private redevelopment agencies. Here the effort is to eradicate the blight of public housing and transform these derelict urban spaces into privatized sites of middle-class residential consumption. The rhetoric and language is that of renewal, progress, revitalization of poverty-plagued neighborhoods. Yet behind the vernacular of urban progress lies the efforts of private developers and state actors to exclude, segregate, and make invisible the poor and homeless. These disadvantaged groups typically represent negative externalities, endangering the exchange value of space, and threatening the ability of upscale settings to deliver style, distinction and exclusivity, and culture. Thus, as we note, the redevelopment of public housing is a form of “exclusive” redevelopment that is designed to exclude the very poor from the revitalized spaces and render them safe for resettlement by the wealth and affluent. Not surprisingly, one of the major sources of conflict and delay in the implementation of public housing revitalization around the country has been persistent resident opposition to demolition and relocation (General Accounting Office, 1998; Epp, 1996; Pitcoff, 1999). In an article on the relationship between public housing and urban redevelopment in New Orleans, Cook and Lauria (1995) argued that public housing was an obstacle to urban redevelopment and that the political component of the city’s downtown redevelopment strategy was the containment of low-income people within public housing. My chapter with Shefner and Brumley and the chapter by Devine and Sam-Abdiodun suggests that this strategy of spatial containment may be giving way to a strategy of spatial dispersal and dislocation. Whether this strategy is occurring in other cities remains to be seen. Nevertheless, detailed fieldwork is a necessary step in documenting the impact of public housing redevelopment on cities.

The key point here is that the widely praised downtown resurgence and latest attempt to “reinvent” public housing is yet another chapter in the long term process of uneven development across cities, a process with winners and with losers. Yet, all too often, policy analysts take for granted that gentrification and redevelopment benefits everyone. What are the consequences of gentrification when political officials and other elites deny access to space? How far does the denial of that access determine people’s experience of city life? Again, the tendency in most urban research is to discuss gentrification in an overgeneralized fashion, with little attempt to contextualize the socioeconomic experience of those who suffer from gentrification. In this respect, research into urban gentrification should tackle the issues of spatial segregation, inclusion and exclusion, and ask how redevelopment in one area of the city can mask the decline and disinvestment of other areas of the city. Wyly and Hammel correctly point out that the analysis should focus on the ongoing deregulation of the nation’s real estate and financial institutions, and recent changes in federal regulatory policy and mortgage financing as starting points for understanding

the causes and consequences of gentrification. Critical urban scholars have called into question the claim that consumer desires or individual preferences are forces to which capital merely reacts (Feagin, 1998). Consumer taste for gentrified spaces is, instead, created and marketed, and depends on the alternatives offered by property capitalists who are primarily interested in producing the built environment from which they can extract the highest profit. As Wittberg (1992, p. 23) noted, "the invisible hand postulated by urban ecology and neoclassical urban economics to shape the pattern of urban land use is an 'ideological smoke screen' hiding the power of those who stand to benefit by such obfuscation."

A number of chapters pick up on themes of gentrification, regulation, and surveillance of everyday life in the city. Proponents of the "fortress city" thesis relate the "militarization of space" to the proliferation of new forms of segregative planning, security, and control to keep out the urban underclass from the gentrified spaces of the affluent (see, for example, Davis, 1992; Christopherson, 1994; Judd, 1995). As Aguirre and Brooks observe in their chapter, the increasing use of war rhetoric accompanies the stigmatization of the homeless by urban officials as they decry the encroachment of the very poor upon the public spaces of the city. Yet the connection between urban redevelopment, gentrification, and the "end of public space" is only one side of the story. In addition to attempts at enhancing police control of "deviant" populations, local officials publicly proclaim the importance of promoting the "diversity" and vitality of urban spaces, revealing a much more complex and ambivalent relationship between gentrification and the city than notions of the "fortress city" consider. Nevertheless, Aguirre and Brooks connect the rhetoric of crime and the reclaiming of public space with the privatization of public space as commercial imperatives increasingly define what is "normal" behavior and attempt to impose their own image of a "good" city on the built environment. One challenge for future research is to explain how city officials imagine urban space, carry out their conceptions, and rationalize their plans and developments by invoking the rhetoric of "progress" or conversely the rhetoric of "safety." At the same time, research should focus on instances of collective resistance to these dominant images and representations of space, asking how and why such resistances appear, and about the classed, gendered, and racialized identities of the peoples involved in these acts of resistance.

### **CULTURE AND HISTORY IN URBAN REDEVELOPMENT**

One of the more interesting lines of urban research looks at how powerful actors and organizations are redeveloping cities as sites of fun, leisure, and entertainment. This scholarly focus reflects a broader interest in the political

economy of tourism, the transformation of public spaces into privatized “consumption” spaces, and the latest attempts by urban leaders to provide a package of shopping, dining, and entertainment within a themed and controlled environment – a development that Eeckhout and other scholars have called the “Disneyfication” of urban space (Sorkin, 1992). Scholars have examined the commodification of history and culture in the marketing of cities (Boyer, 1992; Reichl, 1997, 1999; Strom, 1999), the use of imagery, theming, and other signifying practices (Kearns & Philo, 1993; Gottdiener, 1997), and the role of “cultural representers” and “urban imagineers” in engineering urban redevelopment (Short, 1999; Holt, 2000). In many cities, political and economic elites are attempting to commodify and market culture and develop various cultural facilities – e.g. art shows and galleries, opera halls, museums, festivals, symphony halls, and so on – to stimulate the local economy by attracting consumers and supporting inward investment (Bassett, 1994; Zukin, 1995). Other cities are emphasizing the aesthetic or historic value of their architecture, redeveloping their river and canal waterfronts, designating areas of the city as artistic quarters, and preserving or reconverting old buildings and archaic technology (adaptive reuse), a process discussed by James Dickinson in his chapter on the “monuments of tomorrow.” A common element in these and other “cultural strategies of economic development,” according to Zukin (1997, p. 227) is that “they reduce the multiple dimensions and conflicts of culture to a coherent visual representation.” Thus, cultural, historical, or architectural materials “can be displayed, interpreted, reproduced, and sold in a putatively universal repertoire of visual consumption” (p. 227).

James Dickinson’s chapter points out that many older “rustbelt” cities are increasingly involved in marketing their industrial history and architecture, converting their derelict and abandoned factories and buildings into tourist attractions and places of consumption. During the 1970s, urban areas in the Midwest and northeast that had flourished in the postwar Keynesian boom, entered a phase of chronic industrial decline. Cities such as Kansas City, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, Buffalo, and the like, were forced to deal with the triple problems of deindustrialization, falling tax base, and declining public expenditures in an era of intense interurban competition for capital and consumers (Gotham, 1998a). To revive their declining economies, cities have attempted to transform their derelict spaces of industrial production into spaces of consumption such as shopping malls, themed restaurants, casino gambling, mega-complexes for professional sports, and other sites for sales that rely on glitz, hype, and spectacle (Gottdiener, 1997; Gladstone, 1998; Lord & Price, 1992). In the process, redevelopment interests and advertising agencies thematize local traditions, famous buildings and

landmarks, and other heritage sights to the point that they become “hyperreal,” whereby people lose the ability to distinguish between the “real” and the “representation.” (Baudrillard, 1988; Smith, 1996). As far as possible, urban imagineers, cultural representers and other redevelopment interests attempt to remake the industrial city of the past, according to Dickinson, into a “theme park” city (Sorkin, 1992), a city of simulations and visual consumption for entertainment, a point also highlighted by Eeckhout and Lloyd and Clark.

The use of culture and history as marketing strategies in the economic redevelopment of cities has a long history in the United States and elsewhere (Kearns & Philo, 1993; Harvey, 1989; Strom, 1999). However, several chapters in this volume corroborate other studies that have focused on how the increasing dominance of multinational corporations has transformed the marketing of places from a relatively amateur and informal activity into a professionalized and highly organized activity (Holcomb, 1993, p. 133; Judd & Fainstein, 1999). In his recent book on the rise of the “fantasy city,” John Hannigan (1998) points out how corporations such as Disney, Universal, Time-Warner, and Sony, among other entertainment giants are becoming the key actors in redeveloping the city. Interestingly, what makes these entertainment companies unique to urban redevelopment is that they control almost every aspect of the redevelopment process, including design and planning, land acquisition and preparation, marketing, and operations. Moreover, as Hannigan (1998, p. 104) notes, urban redevelopment projects today must deliver more than just location, structure, and leases; they must also provide “meaning” and “feeling” to entice the targeted consumer. Thus, large entertainment companies have become highly organized developers, merging culture and capital to “become impresarios, locations their venues, facades and interiors their sets and stages, and retail tenants their characters and chapters in their story” (p. 104).

Several chapters bring needed attention to how local elites and redevelopment actors attempt to market urban images – city myths, localized cultures, identities – to promote the investment potential of cities (Hannigan, 1998; Judd & Fainstein, 1999; Strom, 1999; Sadler, 1993). In particular, Eeckhout and Lloyd and Clark intimate how local institutions have established resource links with the advertising industry to supply products, services, and commodified experiences to tourists. Yet we need more research on how local institutions and elite are inserting “culture” into the “place marketing” strategies of cities as a mechanism of social control to engineer consensus, discourage opposition, and coopt resistance to various redevelopment efforts (Kearns & Philo, 1993). Future research should move beyond the purely descriptive studies and develop sophisticated accounts, informed by political economy, that document the “structural” linkages between the various institutional actors – corporate actors,

entertainment companies, real estate developers, retail operators, and public agencies – and the development of the tourist city generally, and the redevelopment of cities specifically. In addition, we need more empirically grounded examinations of the mechanisms that link macrostructural changes in the state and the economy with the development of tourist-led redevelopment in specific cities. Future research needs to examine how “spaces of consumption” are important to the “production of space” of contemporary capitalism.

### **CLASS, GENDER, AND RACE**

Recent years have witnessed a sea change in the way urban scholars conceptualize class, gender, and race and link these categories and processes to theories of power and urban space. Most scholars agree that class, gender, and race are not unilateral or constant but involve different dimensions or “layers” that interpenetrate with each other in complex, multifaceted, and historically changing ways. Patricia Hill Collins’ (1991) work shows how a “both/and” reality as opposed to an “either/or” distinction shapes race, class, and gender identities and processes. Urban scholars such as DeSena (2000), Spain (1993), and McDowell (1999), among others have focused on the interlocking dimensions of class, gender, and race, and the connection of these social attributes to spatial arrangements. We can examine spatial arrangements, such as spatial segregation, differential access to public and private spaces, and so on as the context for understanding how class, gender, and race interconnect to shape life experiences, social conflict and action. Segregated spaces and various racialized, gendered, and class-based meanings attached to spaces exist as recurrent patterns of action involving large numbers of people. If we acknowledge that race, class, and gender are sources of inequality and division expressed in space, we have to identify who does what to whom, how do they do it, and how are these spatialized divisions maintained over time. Clearly, we need sophisticated, data-rich analyses that are capable of dealing with material conditions, actions within and coordinated across space, and the “durability or “fragility” of social structure.

Recent work in urban sociology has explored the use of various overt and covert “gendering” and “racializing” strategies used by urban elites to create maintain segregated spaces (Gotham, 2000; Miranne & Young, 2000). Decisions about urban redevelopment always express class and racial interests and particular groups win and lose, regardless if conflict becomes overt. Indeed, as the history of urban renewal, gentrification, and urban expressway building shows, central city disinvestment and reinvestment are part of the dynamics of urban racial relations, with African Americans and other minorities having to

bear the brunt of displacement and neighborhood destabilization (Gotham, 2001a, b, 2000, 1998; Squires, 1994; Feagin & Parker, 1990, pp. 145–146; Kaplan, 1999). In *Race, Culture, and the City*, Stephen Nathan Haymes (1995) argues that “in the context of American cities the category ‘race’ is used metaphorically as a way to juxtapose the different ‘social spaces’ that make up the urban landscape, describing some as ‘normal’ and ‘order’ and others as not.” For Haymes, “contemporary urban forms are the spatial expression of racialized values,” especially the ideology that equates land value with whiteness, and the residential presence of blacks with neighborhood deterioration and declining property values. As Short (1999) and Beauregard (1993) have pointed out, racial minorities are widely if not always blamed for the deterioration of cities making “urban decline a virtual stand in for race” (Beauregard, 1993, p. 291). Yet “as the focal point of America’s social problems, race displaces decline from the political economy of cities and relocates it in the cultural deficiencies of racial minorities” (p. 291). While journalists, politicians, and others may identify victims and actors, most commentators refuse to place them in institutional settings or critically examine the role of social structure.

Much research has focused on the racial and class-based conflicts that accompany urban redevelopment drives but scholars have devoted less attention to the implications and conflicts over attempts to market local racial and ethnic identities as commodities for tourist consumption. Jan Lin (1998, p. 315) has drawn attention to this issue, pointing out that the redevelopment of the “new ethnic places” in many cities may authenticate “difference” and “diversity” while reinforcing class distinctions, serving as arenas for the investment and further accumulation of capital. Moreover, Zukin (1997) and Wright and Hutchison (1997), among others, have pointed out that local histories and traditions of various racial and ethnic groups have become marketable commodities – resources and strategies to advance the interests of redevelopers and their allies. Smith’s (1996) work on the Lower East Side and Hoffman’s (2000) case study of the redevelopment of Harlem show how redevelopers package ethnicity and race as culture and art, using frontier motifs and imagery to “tame” a neighborhood, touting images of exotic and benign danger to pull in consumers. This strategy is apparent in Times Square, as Eeckhout points out, where various ethnic and racial groups, foreign subcultures, and domestic subcultures are appropriated, disemboweled, and then marketed as safe, sanitized versions of the original. Hannigan (1998, p. 71) calls this phenomenon “riskless risk” in which “many contemporary leisure and tourist attractions are calculated so as to package our fantasy experiences within a safe, reassuring predictable environment.”

The chapters by Bures, Lloyd and Clark, and Eeckhout connect with the work of Zukin (1997) and Reichl (1997, 1999) who note that the marketing of terms

like “multiculturalism” and “diversity” allows developers to acknowledge eclecticism, allotting each ethnic and racial group some form of representation, while avoiding ranking oppressed groups in terms of the justness of their claims. Not surprisingly, critics have assailed this strategy for sanitizing and distorting history, ignoring the present reality of racial discrimination and social injustice, and reinforcing social inequalities (Holt, 2000; Hodder, 1999; Eisinger, 2000). Croucher (1997) has focused on how local elites in Toronto construct images of ethnic harmony and diversity to divert public attention away from urban problems, legitimate elite definitions of urban reality, and generate support for some urban growth initiatives rather than others. Yet there are tensions and conflicts in the use of ethnic imagery, community typifications, and local narratives to mobilize support for various urban redevelopment. Indeed, urban redevelopment is always a site of struggle where the powers that be are often forced to compete and defend what they would prefer to have taken for granted. The “undetermined” nature of the imagery, discourses, and typifications surrounding urban redevelopment often allow challengers such as social movements to offer competing constructions of reality in ways that go beyond elite definitions and interpretations of urban reality. Indeed, a nascent literature has begun to identify the various sentimental imagery, nostalgia, rhetorical devices, and various techniques of “framing” that anti-growth activists use to build community identity at the local level to challenge various revitalization initiatives (Gotham, 1999; for an overview, see Gieryn, 2000).

Part of the process of coming to understand the role of race, class, and gender lies in changing the ways in which we understand the city, and the ways in which we translate these understandings into urban research and public policy. Focusing on implications raised by the use of marketing techniques and the racial and spatial consequences of redevelopment means focusing on questions of political accountability, equity, and justice (Merrifield & Swyngedouw, 1997; Kearns & Philo, 1993; Bird, Curtis, Putnam, Robertson & Tickner, 1993; Harvey, 1973). Such an agenda demands a move away from the dead-end of policy “evaluation” and preoccupation with so-called “value-free” “measures” of redevelopment “success” that marketing firms and developers rely on to legitimate their projects. Indeed, constructing an image of the city, as a form of advertising promotion, is an exercise in the manufacture and transfer of meaning. As the chapter by Bodnar points out, the city is not a unitary community nor is it a neutral space that political and economic elites redevelop with all citizens in mind. A downtown is not simply a “downtown”, but a social space that caters and privileges some particular segments of a population over other groups. In a world of diminishing spatial boundaries and increasing inequalities, the control of space is becoming more contested and more

obviously the source of struggles for power and resources, a point highlighted by Castells and Harvey, among other urban scholars. Theorists of class, gender, and race can benefit from more scrutiny of spatial arrangements while theorists of space should consider how spatial arrangements intersect with class, gender, and race to structure differential access to space, power, and resources.

### **THEORY AND METHOD IN URBAN SOCIOLOGY**

Today, research in urban sociology is in a state of theoretical and methodological flux. Ideas about how to proceed vary tremendously and in somewhat opposite directions. They range from the advancement of strong research programs grounded in political economy (Feagin, 1998; Gottdiener, 1994), and feminist research (DeSena, 2000; Spain, 1992; McDowell, 1999), to interactionist-based theories (Milligan, 1998), discursive analysis and textual deconstruction (Liggett, 1994; Beauregard, 1993), and postmodernist readings of the city (Soja, 2000; Zukin, 1997). In diverse ways, the chapters in this volume borrow something from these very different and contrasting approaches. Some embrace a case study approach and begin at the local/neighborhood level while others focus on the global level, using large data sets and generalized analysis. Some emphasize the cultural dimensions of urban redevelopment while others privilege political and/or economic factors in their research. Indeed, the methodological and theoretical concerns animating this volume suggest that the new urban realities that are emerging do not lend themselves easily to analysis by existing approaches that aim for sweeping generalizations of change or rely on aggregate statistical evaluations to recreate pictures of urban reality. Wylie and Hammel, Devine and Sams-Abiodun, and Aguirre and Brooks take issue with single-method and –data approaches and suggest that research into urban redevelopment should aim for some combination of generalized analysis and ethnographic accounts of cities and urban life. The best kind of methodological strategy relies on multiple kinds of data – quantitative and qualitative – using and weighing them to improve our understandings and explanations.

The study of urban redevelopment is about more than just the study of the redevelopment of deteriorated parts of the city. As the chapters by Crowley and Paquin point out, far from being a spontaneous and isolated phenomenon, urban redevelopment operates within broader socio-cultural, economic, and political contexts and histories. Theories of urban redevelopment connect to theories of the state and the economy (Fainstein & Fainstein, 1986; Zukin et al., 1996; Feagin, 1988; Gottdiener, 1987), modes of consumption (Miles & Paddison, 1998; Urry, 1995), and theories of socio-physical space (Wright, 1997). For instance, one paradigmatic strand of urban research begins at the macro level and

describes the functions that cities serve within the large context of capital accumulation (Harvey), or manage crises through collective consumption (Castells). In contrast, a more agency-centered urban sociology begins at the local level to study conflicts over different meanings and conceptions of urban space, including battles between those who seek to maximize the exchange-value of space versus those who value it for its intrinsic use (Logan & Molotch, 1987; Molotch, 1999). One disagreement between the advocates “globalism” and those who emphasize “localism” is whether we can systematically study global level changes and forms of organization without losing sight of local struggles? Is it necessary to eschew depth methods and ground-level scrutiny of action to understand processes at the macro-level? Crowley, Hammel and Wyly, and Paguin do not think so. They all show, in different ways, that the reshaping of urban redevelopment strategies, conflicts, and outcomes under the influence of national and global level restructuring is not a one-way process, and it is not necessary functional or even rational. In fact, when we examine the concrete activities of people and organizations involved in urban redevelopment we find considerable evidence of irrational and contradictory actions, a point highlighted time and time again by the contributors to this volume.

No discussion of urban redevelopment would be complete without acknowledging the growing influence of postmodern urban analysis. According to many urban scholars, we live in a time of the “posts” – postsuburbs, post-metropolis, postindustrialism, postfordism and postmodernism (Soja, 2000; Knox, 1993; Swanstrom, 1993; Watson & Gibson, 1995). The term “post” is a periodizing term that signifies the passing of the old and the advent of the new. Indeed, a number of scholars have written books describing the end of the metropolitan era and the coming of a new postmetropolis era that blurs and makes incomprehensible the boundaries between cities and suburbs, celebrates the demise of class based politics and stresses the centrality of “new social movements.” Edward Soja (2000, p. 152), for example, argues that there has been a “restructuring of territorial identity and rootedness amidst a sea of shifting relations between space, knowledge, and power that has given rise to a *new cultural politics* in the postmetropolis, significantly different from the politics of the economy that dominated modernist urbanism” (emphasis in original). Others such as Beauregard (1993) and Liggett (1994) champion new postmodern methods such as textual deconstruction and discursive analysis, problematize the “city” as an empirical referent, and employ “texts” and “stories” as units of analysis. More critical are those who decry a “crisis of representation,” pronounce the end of grand narratives and of modern theory, and call for new postmodern theories and politics to deal with the striking novelties of the present (King, 1996; Knox, 1993). The variety of postmodern readings of the city

emphasize difference, plurality, fragmentation, and complexity; abandon representational epistemology and unmediated objectivity; and embrace perspectivism, anti-foundationalism, hermeneutics, intertextuality, and simulation (Agger, 1991; Best & Kellner, 1997; Dickins & Fontana, 1994).

Several contributors point to usefulness of postmodernism in highlighting the varieties of culture, difference, and symbolism in cities; the impact of marginalized city residents whom urban scholarship has ignored; and the interconnectedness of discourse and materiality. While often scholars use the term "postmodern" and its most common derivatives "postmodernism" and "post-modernity" in a confusing range of ways, these terms can sensitize us to a series of cultural and economic changes that suggest a more fundamental set of transformations of cities, metropolitan space, and social structures. The contributors also acknowledge the limitations of postmodern urban analysis including its relativism, radical indeterminacy, and lack of normative grounding, among other problems. In particular, Feagin (1998, p. 6) has recently noted that "a postmodern analysis that privileges cultural complexity and diffuseness in cities runs the danger of ignoring or playing down the still central structure-process factors of class, race, and gender." As Ellin (1996) and Best and Kellner (1997) note, too much emphasis on the autonomy of urban subcultures and identities can help hide unequal power relations, downplay race/class/gender antagonisms, and legitimate profound inegalitarian social hierarchies that still shape cities and metropolitan areas. Indeed a lacuna of postmodern urban analysis has been the inability to formulate a critical theory that illuminates the mechanisms of domination in society, the interconnectedness of agency and structure, and the complex mediations among new forms of urban and metropolitan organization, economy, and culture.

Amid the competing debates and controversies over the relative merits of postmodern urban analysis, skeptical epistemology, or textual deconstruction it is vital that urban sociologists not lose sight of the grounding of material life and the centrality of sociological theory in understanding cities and urban life. Sociological theories are not just a description of the past and present, nor an explanation of how and why various institutions, groups, and actors are interconnected. Theories also provide a prescription for social action and change, as Marxism and variants of feminism have done. Henri Lefebvre noted that representations of the city are not politically neutral, nor are they without social implications. Indeed, many dominant representations play down equality, social justice, and issues of power and control in the city.

In our case, urban theories tell us what is urban "redevelopment," why is urban redevelopment undertaken, who are the key actors and organized interests responsible for undertaking urban redevelopment, who benefits and who suffers from various urban redevelopment schemes, and how does urban redevelopment

affect cities overall and different groups in particular. The agenda for research on urban redevelopment is to understand how past and present structural arrangements affect cities, redevelopment efforts, and local people. Focusing on the why things are, how they got that way, and how to change them gives us some key answers to some of the most vexing problems in the city today.

## REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, J. (1989). *Before European Hegemony: The World System A. D. 1250–1350*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Agger, B. (1991). Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, and Postmodernism: Their Theoretical Relevance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 105–131.
- Amin, A. (Ed.). *Post Fordism: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bassett, K. (1993). Urban Cultural Strategies and Urban Regeneration: A Case Study and Critique. *Environment and Planning A*, 25, 1773–1788.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983). *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Beauregard, R. A. (1993). *Voices of Decline: The Postwar Fate of U.S. Cities*. Blackwell.
- Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1997). *The Postmodern Turn*. New York: Guilford.
- Bird, J., Curtis, B., Putnam, T., Robertson, G., & Tickner, L. (1993). *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Boyer, C. (1992). Cities for Sale: Merchandising History at South Street Seaport. In: M. Sorkin (Ed.) *Variations on a Theme Park* (pp. 181–204). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bullard, R. D. J., Grigsby, E., & Lee C. (Eds) (1994). *Residential Apartheid: The American Legacy*. Los Angeles: CASS Urban Policy Series.
- Calavita, N. (1992). Growth Machines and Ballot Box Planning: The San Diego Case. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 14, 1–24.
- Christopherson, S. (1994). The Fortress City: Privatized Spaces, Consumer Citizenship. In: A. Amin (Ed.) *Post Fordism: A Reader*. (pp. 409–27). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, G. L., & Dear, M. (1984). *State Apparatus: Structures of Language and Legitimacy*. Boston: Allen and Unurn, Inc.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Cook, C., & Lauria, M. (1995). Urban Regeneration and Public Housing in New Orleans. *Urban Affairs Review*, 30, 538–557.
- Cox, K. (Ed.) (1997). *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*. New York: Guilford.
- Croucher, S. L. (1997). Constructing the Image of Ethnic Harmony in Toronto, Canada: The Politics of Problem Definition and Nondefinition. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(3), Jan. 1997.
- Cummings, S. (Ed.) (1988). *Business Elites and Urban Development: Case Studies and Critical Perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Davis, M. (1992). *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Dear, M., & Clark, G. L. (1981). Dimensions of Local State Autonomy. *Environment and Planning*, 13, 1277–1294.
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (2000). *HOPE VI: Community Building Makes a Difference*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- Department of Housing and Urban Development (1999). *HOPE VI: Building Communities, Transforming Lives*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (1996). *An Historical and Baseline Assessment of HOPE VI*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- DeSena, J. N. (2000). Gendered Space and Women's Community Work. In: R. Hutchison. (Ed.), *Constructions of Urban Space*. Research in Urban Sociology, Vol. 5 (pp. 275–297). Stamford: CT: JAI Press.
- Dickins, D. R., & Fontana, A. (Eds) (1994). *Postmodernism and Social Inquiry*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Eisinger, P. (2000). The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(3), January, 316–333.
- Ellin, N. (1996). *Postmodern Urbanism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Engels, F. (1969a). *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. St. Albans: Panther Books.
- Engels, F. (1969b). The Housing Question In: K. Marx, & F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Epp, G. (1996). Emerging Strategies for Revitalizing Public Housing Communities. *Housing Policy Debate*, 7(32), 563–588.
- Fainstein, S. S., & Fainstein, N. I. (1986). Economic Change, National Policy, and the System of Cities In: S. S. Fainstein, N. I. Fainstein, R. C. Hill, D. R. Judd & M. P. Smith (Eds), *Restructuring the City: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment*. (2nd ed.) (pp. 1–26). New York: Longman.
- Feagin, J. R., & Vera. H. (1995). *White Racism: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.
- Feagin, J. R. (1988). Free-Enterprise City: Houston In: *Political-Economic Perspective*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Feagin, J. R., & Parker. R. (1990). *Building American Cities: The Urban Real Estate Game*. (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Feagin J. R. (1998). *The New Urban Paradigm: Critical Perspectives on the City*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Feagin, J. R. (1994). A House Is Not a Home: White Racism and U.S. Housing Practices, In: R. D. Bullard., J. E. Grigsby, III, & C. Lee (Eds.), *Residential Apartheid: The American Legacy*. Los Angeles: CASS Urban Policy Series.
- Featherstone, M. (1990). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization, and Modernity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Flanagan, W. (1993). *Contemporary Urban Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedland, R. F., Piven, F. F., & R. R. Alford. (1977). Political Conflict, Urban Structure, and Fiscal Crisis. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 11(October): 447–471.
- General Accounting Office (GAO). (1998). *HOPE VI: Progress and Problems in Revitalizing Distressed Public Housing*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Giddens, A. (1996). *In Defence of Sociology: Essays, Interpretations, and Rejoinders*. New York: Polity Press.
- Gieryn, T. F. (2000). A Space for Place in Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 463–496.
- Gladstone, D. L. (1998). Tourism Urbanization in the United States. *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 34(1), September, 3–27.
- Gotham, K. F. (2001a). A City Without Slums: Urban Renewal, Public Housing, and Downtown Revitalization in Kansas City, Missouri. Forthcoming in *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 60(1), January 2001.
- Gotham, K. F. (2001b). Growth Machine Up-Links: Urban Renewal and the Rise and Fall of a Pro-Growth Coalition in a U.S. City. Forthcoming in *Critical Sociology*, 26(3).

- Gotham, K. F. (2000). Urban Space, Restrictive Covenants, and the Origin of Racial Residential Segregation in a U.S. City, 1900–1950. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(3), 616–633. September 2000.
- Gotham, K. F. (1999). Political Opportunity, Community Identity, and the Emergence of a Local Anti-Expressway Movement. *Social Problems*, 46(3), August 1999.
- Gotham, K. F. (1998a). Blind Faith in the Free Market: Urban Poverty, Residential Segregation, and Federal Housing Retrenchment, 1970–1995. *Sociological Inquiry*, 68(1), Winter 1998.
- Gotham, K. F. (1998b). Suburbia Under Siege: Low-Income Housing and Racial Conflict in Metropolitan in Kansas City, 1970–1990. *Sociological Spectrum*, 18(4), 1998.
- Gottdiener, M. (1987). *The Decline of Urban Politics: Political Theory and the Crisis of the Local State*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Gottdiener, Mark. (1997). *Theming of America: Dreams, Visions, and Commercial Spaces*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gottdiener, M. (1994). *The Social Production of Urban Space*. (2nded.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gottdiener, M., Collins, C. C., & Dickens, D. (1999). Las Vegas: The Social Production of an All-American City. New York: Blackwell.
- Hamilton, D. K. (1999). Organizing Government Structure and Governance Functions in Response to Growth and Change: A Critical Overview. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 22(1).
- Hannigan, J. (1998). *Fantasy City: Pleasure and Profit in the Postmodern Metropolis*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1973). *Social Justice and the City*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. New York: Free Press
- Haymes, S. N. (1995). *Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy for Black Urban Struggle*. SUNY Press.
- Hodder, R. (1999). Redefining a Souther City's Heritage: Historic Preservation Planning, Public Art, and Race in Richmond, Virginia. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 21(4).
- Hoffman, L. M. (2000). Tourism and the Revitalization of Harlem. In: R Hutchison (Ed.) *Constructions of Urban Space*. (pp. 207–224) Vol. 5 of Research in Urban Sociology. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Holcomb, B. (1993). Revisioning Place: De- and Re-constructing the Image of the Industrial City. In: Kearns, Gerry, & C. Philo (Eds). *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. (pp. 133–44). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Holt, W. G. (2000). Distinguishing Metropolises: The Production of Urban Imagery. In: R. Hutchison (Ed.) *Constructions of Urban Space*. (pp. 225–252) Vol. 5 Research in Urban Sociology. JAI Press.
- Horan, C. (1991). Beyond Governing Coalitions: Analyzing Urban Regimes in the 1990s. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 13, 119–135.
- Imbroscio, D. L. (1998). Reformulating Urban Regime Theory: The Division of Labor Between State and Market Reconsidered. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 20(3).
- Jessep, B., Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (1999). Retooling the Machine: Economic Crisis, State Restructuring, and Urban Politics. In: A. E. G. Jonas & D. Wilson (Eds). *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (pp. 1411–1462). Albany: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.
- Jonas, E. G., & Wilson, D. (1999). The City as a Growth Machine: Critical Reflections Two Decades Later In: A. E. G. Jonas & D. Wilson (Eds), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (pp. 3–20) Albany: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.
- Kaplan, D. H. (1999). The Uneven Distribution of Employment Opportunities: Neighborhood and Race in Cleveland, Ohio. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 21(2).

- Kearns., Gerry., & Philo, C. (1993). *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- King, A. (Ed.) (1996). *Re-Presenting the City: Ethnicity, Capital, and Culture in the 21st Century Metropolis*. NYU Press.
- Kirby, A., & Abu-Rauss, T. (1999). Employing the Growth Machine Heuristic in a Different Political and Economic Context: The Case of Israel. In: A. E. G. Jonas & D. Wilson (Eds), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (pp. 195–212). Albany: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.
- Knox, P. (Ed.) (1993). *The Restless Urban Landscape*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Liggett, H. (1994). City Talk: Coming Apart in Los Angeles. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 29(3), 454–467.
- Lin, J. (1995). Ethnic Places, Postmodernism and Urban Change in Houston. *Sociological Quarterly*, 36(4), 629–647.
- Lin, J. (1998). Globalization and the Revalorization of Ethnic Places in Immigrant Gateway Cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(2), 313–339.
- Logan, J. (1991). Gambling on Real Estate: Limited Rationality in the Global Economy. *Sociological Perspectives*, 34(4), 391–401.
- Logan, J. (1993). Cycles and Trends in the Globalization of Real Estate. In: P. Knox (Ed.), *Restless Urban Landscape* (pp. 33–54). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Logan, J. R., & Swanstrom, T. (Eds) (1990). *Beyond the City Limits: Urban Policy and Economic Restructuring in Comparative Perspective*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Logan, J. R., Whaley, R. B., & Crowder, K. (1997). The Character and Consequences of Growth Regimes: An Assessment of 20 years of Research. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(5), 6303–6330.
- Lord, G., & Price, A. C. (1992). Growth Ideology in a Period of Decline: Deindustrialization and Restructuring, Flint Style. *Social Problems*, 39(2), 155–169, May.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1948). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. New York: International Publishers.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, Identity, and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mele, C. (1995). Globalization, Culture, and neighborhood Change: Reinventing the Lower East Side of New York. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(1), 3–22.
- Merrifield, A., & Swyngedouw, E. (Eds) (1997). *The Urbanization of Injustice*. New York: NYU Press.
- Miles, S., & Paddison, R. (1998). Urban Consumption: An Historiographical Note. *Urban Studies*, 35(5/6), May.
- Milligan, M. (1998). Interactional Past and Potential: The Social Construction of Place Attachment. *Symbolic Interaction*, 21, 1–33.
- Miranne, C. B., & Young, A. H. (Eds) (2000). *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries and Visions of Urban Life*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Molotch, H. (1976). The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 309–330.
- Molotch, H. (1999). Growth Machine Links: Up, Down, and Across. In: A. E. G. Jonas & D. Wilson (Eds), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (pp. 247–266). Albany: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.

- Nelson, A. C., & Foster, K. A. (1999). Metropolitan Governance Structure and Income Growth. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 21(3).
- Pitcoff, W. (1999). *New Hope for Public Housing?* Shelterforce. March/April.
- Purchell, M. (1999). The Decline of Political Consensus for Urban Growth: Evidence from Los Angeles. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 22(1).
- Riain, S. O. (2000). States and Markets in an Era of Globalization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 187–213.
- Reichl, A. (1999). *Reconstructing Times Square: Politics and Culture in Urban Development*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Reichl, A. (1997). Historic Preservation and Progrowth Politics in U.S. Cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(4), March, 513–535.
- Sadler, D. (1993). Place-Marketing, Competitive Places and the Social Construction of Hegemony in Britain in the 1980s. In: G. Kearns & C. Philo (Eds), *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present* (pp. 175–92). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Salama, J. J. (1999). The Redevelopment of Distressed Public Housing: Early Results from HOPE VI Projects in Atlanta, Chicago, and San Antonio. *Housing Policy Debate*, 10(1).
- Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*. New York: The New Press.
- Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City: New York, London, and Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, S. (2000). New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Millennium. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 143–160, January/March.
- Saunders, P. (1981). *Social Theory and the Urban Question*. London: Hutchinson.
- Short, J. R. (1999). Urban Imagineers: Boosterism and the Representations of Cities. In: A. E. G. Jonas & D. Wilson (Eds). *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (pp. 37–54). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Silver, H. (1993). National Conceptions of the New Urban Poverty: Social Structural Change in Britain, France, and the United States. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 17(3), 336–354, September.
- Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge.
- Soja, E. (2000). *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*. New York: Blackwell.
- Sorkin, M. (Ed.) (1992). *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Spain, D. (1993). *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Squires, G. D. (1994). *Capital and Communities in Black and White: The Intersections of Race, Class, and Uneven Development*. State University of New York Press.
- Squires, G. D. (Ed) (1989). *Unequal Partnerships: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment in Postwar America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Strom, E. (1999). Let's Put on a Show! Performing Acts and Urban Revitalization in Newark, New Jersey. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 21(4), 423–435
- Swanstrom, T. (1993). Beyond Economism: Urban Political Economy and the Postmodern Challenge. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 15(1), 55–78.
- Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming Places. London and New York*: Routledge.
- Vale, L. J. (1997). Empathological Places: Residents' Ambivalence Toward Remaining in Public Housing. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 16, 159–175.
- Vale, L. (1993). Beyond the Problem Projects Paradigm: Defining and Revitalizing Severely Distressed Public Housing. *Housing Policy Debate*, 4(2), 147–174.

- Vale, L. (1996). Public Housing Redevelopment: Seven Kinds of Success. *Housing Policy Debate*, 7(3).
- Van Kempen, R., & Marcuse, P. (1997). A New Spatial Order in Cities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(3), 285–298, November/ December.
- Watson, S., & Gibson, K. (Eds) (1995). *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Wilson, D. (Ed.) (1998). Globalization and the Changing U.S. City. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 551, May, 1997.
- Wittberg, P. (1992). Perspectives on Gentrification: A Comparative Review of the Literature. Gentrification and Urban Change. *Research in Urban Sociology*, Vol. 2 (pp. 17–46). JAI Press.
- Wright, T., & Hutchison, R. (1997). Socio-Spatial Reproduction, Marketing Culture, and the Built Environment. In: R. Hutchison New Directions in Urban Sociology. Vol. 4, *Research in Urban Sociology* (pp. 187–214). Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.
- Wright, T. (1997). *Out of Place: Homeless Mobilizations, Subcities, and Contested Landscapes*. Albany, NY: State University of New Press.
- Zukin, S. et al. (1996). From Coney Island to Las Vegas in the Urban Imaginary: Discursive Practices of Growth and Decline. *Urban Affairs Review*, 33(5), 627–654, May.
- Zukin, S. (1997). Cultural Strategies of Economic Development and the Hegemony of Vision. In: A. Merrifield & E Swyngedouw *Urbanization of Injustice* (pp. 233–242). New York: New York University Press.
- Zukin, S. (1995). *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.