

The Counterfeit Ideal of Community

PAUL WALKER CLARKE
Mississippi State University

. . . What is most important, perhaps, is that unlike all other terms of social organization (*state, nation, society, etc.*) *community* seems never to be used unfavourably, and never to be given any positive opposing or distinguishing term.¹

What follows is a critical assessment of the use of the word *community* in contemporary architectural and planning rhetoric, particularly the rhetoric of the planning movement known as New Urbanism. Before proceeding with this argument, one caveat is necessary. The word *community* encapsulates a certain mythology in American society that is often and systematically privileged in ways that New Urbanists borrow, but did not invent and certainly do not monopolize, given the extent of suburban extensions marketed as ideal ‘communities’.²

In his book on the New Urbanist town of Celebration, Florida, Andrew Ross observes:

“Community” is one of the most emotionally ubiquitous and versatile touchstones of American life. As a result, it is one of the more overused words in our daily lexicon, relentlessly mined for all sorts of social, religious, and commercial purposes, and in most instances no more meaningful than a sugary advertising cliché. Of all the things that can be acquired in a market civilization, it is supposed to be one of the most elusive. Like religious devotion or public service, it is not something we can put a price on. . . .

In the last twenty years, “community” has become a competitive feature in the consumer housing industry, where developers bundle it into the package of amenities on offer. Customers can buy into a “strong” community where others appear to be weak or disorganized or in decline. Community then acquires value as a therapeutic asset that can be purchased by those who, among all the groups in society, probably have least need for its restorative virtues. . . . The demand for such a place rests on the perception that community is everywhere else an

endangered species, especially in the nowhere of suburbia.³

There are many aspects of New Urbanism to commend. Proponents consider the locale and role of particular developments as components of regional systems. They struggle to synthesize new developments within a more organic, holistic conception of how cities and regions ought to interact both ecologically and systematically, specifically regarding transportation systems and distribution of resources. Furthermore, relatively small and intimate forms of development are proffered to counter the prevailing horizontally zoned, and large platted, metropolitan sprawl. The precepts of New Urbanism include an exaltation of pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods with single-family lots reduced in area as compared with typical suburban development. This pedestrian emphasis includes tree-lined streets of a comparatively narrower width, further lined with houses with front porches. Within these developments, central locations are reserved for significant civic structures such as schools, churches and local government; all of which are gathered to comprise a veritable ‘town center’. Integral to this planning ideal is an advocacy of civic architecture and the pedestrian street as arenas of sociability. Additionally, New Urbanism has created a venue for reconsidering the relation between work and living; for developing practical and pragmatic means with which to realize ecologically sensitive design, even to address the obdurate and profligate energy requirements of urbanization and suburbanization that is dependent upon the agency of the automobile. “New Urbanism addresses many of the ills of our current sprawl development pattern while returning to a cherished American icon: that of a compact, close-knit community.”⁴

Advocates of New Urbanism proselytize and their rhetoric includes an embrace of diversity and a demand for egalitarian access to the virtues of these new developments. Douglas Kelbaugh describes New Urbanism with evangelical zeal:

New Urbanism . . . is utopian because it aspires to a social ethic that builds new or repairs existing communities in

ways that equitably mix people of different income, ethnicity, race and age, and to a civic ideal that coherently mixes land of different uses and buildings of different types. It is inspirational because it sponsors public architecture and public space that attempts to make citizens feel they are part, even proud, of a culture that is more significant than their individual, private worlds and an ecology that is vertically and horizontally connected to natural loops, cycles and chains. New Urbanism also eschews the physical fragmentation and the functional compartmentalization of modern life and tries “to make a link between knowledge and feeling, between what people believe and do in public and what obsesses them in private.” It is structuralist (or at least determinist) in the sense that it maintains that there is a direct, structural relationship between physical form and social behavior. It is normative in that it posits that good design can have a measurably positive effect on sense of place and community, which it holds are essential to a healthy, sustainable society. The paradigmatic model is a compact, walkable city with a hierarchy of private and public architecture and spaces that are conducive to face-to-face social interaction, including background housing and gardens and foreground civic and institutional buildings, squares and parks.⁵

Despite its brevity, this introductory description of New Urbanism raises serious issues. First, New Urbanism’s ideal of *community* is premised on a peculiarly American mythology that is historically inaccurate in that it evokes a past that never existed in the social and picturesque form that New Urbanism promotes. This mythology presumes a collective memory that is monolithic and comprised of a single, plenary culture. This leads to a second inconsistency: the New Urbanism, which Kelbaugh describes, advocates an inclusive diversity by mixing income, ethnicity, race and age. Can the aesthetics of a singularly defined, cultural memory be sufficient for such inclusiveness? Or is token assimilation the intent? Since all developments of New Urbanism have been speculative projects, the market’s adherence to maximizing profit contradicts any such intention of inclusivity. Without subsidy, affordable possibilities are difficult if not entirely foreclosed. Thirdly, New Urbanism has replicated the very fallacy of the planning it condemns: “that the shaping of the spatial order is or can be the foundation for a new moral and aesthetic order. . . . Does it not presuppose that proper design and architectural qualities will be the saving grace not only of American cities but of social, economic, and political life in general?”⁶

COMMUNITY AS COMMODITY; STATUS OF PLACE

The search for community cannot be described without discussion of the politics of place that has occurred since mid-twentieth century. Prior to World War II, the majority of

Americans rented their domiciles. Changes occurred in the 1950’s that redirected American society; now, home ownership is the norm. The massive military expenditures of the federal government during World War II brought an effective end to the Depression. When the war was over, there was much fear that without ongoing government expenditures, the economy could slide back into an economic recession of equal or greater magnitude. Keynesian policies sought to stabilize capitalism through the maintenance of effective demand. New government programs and public-private coalitions transformed metropolitan areas from centers of production to centers of consumption. Among the federal programs that achieved this transformation, which facilitated suburban development of an unprecedented scale, were the construction of the interstate highway system, the FHA and VA mortgage guarantee programs, tax write-offs of mortgage interest and insurance, and of course, the infamous programs of urban renewal. Powerfully organized state agencies and urban growth coalitions focused investments in land so that circulation of revenues was maximized. Growth-machine politics fueled further, rapid construction – suburbanization – of new physical and social realms. This vector of urban growth became an integral element of the new economy as it guaranteed continuously expanding markets for the circulation of capital within a shrinking relative space. The flight of the middle-class from central city neighborhoods resulted in unprecedented suburban expansion and was achieved under a gloss of consumer sovereignty, a form of monetized individualism in search of community and status during the social upheaval of urban restructuring.

As we redevelop our cities, we reshape our perception of them. The affluence of the post-war era consisted of rising personal incomes, which gave increased emphasis to the role of the family within the resurging consumer economy. The speculative land market initiated multiple strategies to sell community, and access to nature, as commodities. As center cities were redlined and denied any residential reinvestment, access to life chances and social reproduction opportunities became a struggle to define, locate and command social space as a mark of prestige and status. Suburbanization fed upon, and certainly profited by, the social competition of class and lifestyle. Family, class, individualism, community and the state came together into a matrix of political and social power within the Keynesian mode of capitalist urbanization.

Individual and collective affluence within a parochial realm are significant factors in fostering the myth of coherent community life. Money is the medium that can establish the internal composition of a community and delineate its boundaries. Historically, urban neighborhoods were complex because no single working-class constituency had the financial ability to demarcate and shield itself. These urban dwellers did not have the resources to live one family to a house. Their dwellings were not citadels isolated from the intrusion and traffic of commerce or from the successive demographics of American

cities. If these citizens wished to move away from the noise and intensity of urban life, they often lacked the finances to do so. An urban economy of scarcity has historically defied myths of coherence in community composition and internal interaction. Neighborhood borders were blurred and community definition was fluid.

The multiple flows and heterogeneity of processes at work within successive developments ensured that all places are tentative in the face of urban change. Notwithstanding, uneven geographical development is evident as some places are more in flux than others and some more stable and permanent with their borders more securely defined than others. 'The rich command space while the poor are trapped in it.' Abundance and affluence increase the power to create isolation in communal contacts. Citizens of means seek locales by which their social relatedness is confirmed by their similarities rather than their interdependencies. One's affluence is one's own social safety net, no longer solely the benefit of an extended family or one's community affiliations and interactions. The result is solidarity in myth, image and rhetoric, despite isolation in fact.

New Urbanism fits into a continuum of real estate ploys to market *community*, and the failure of New Urbanism to effectively embrace diversity in attracting residents is also historic continuity. The pursuit of home as status (nothing new) and the commodification of community (again, nothing new except the extent and the intensity) invigorate the coercive power of competition between places for capitalist development. The consequence is the eclipse of opportunities for constructions of *home* and *place* that lie outside of capitalist norms.

Those who reside in a place (or who hold the fixed assets in place) become acutely aware that they are in competition with other places for highly mobile capital. The particular mix of physical and social infrastructures, of labor qualities, of social and political regulation, of cultural and social life on offer (all of which can be open to construction) can be more or less attractive to, for example, external capital. Residents worry about what package they can offer which will bring development while satisfying their own wants and needs. People in places therefore try to differentiate their place from other places and become more competitive (and perhaps antagonistic and exclusionary with respect to each other) in order to capture or retain capital investment. Within this process, the selling of place, using all the artifices of advertising and image construction that can be mustered, has become of considerable importance.⁷

A digressive question arises: How many New Urbanism developments can be realized within one metropolitan region before the aesthetic differentiation it offers is exhausted and the market demands a 'newer' urbanism?

COMMUNITY AS A MASK FOR EXCLUSION

New Urbanism denies urbanism. Indeed, its promotion of small-scale community of face-to-face relations can be portrayed as typical American anti-urbanism. One joy of traversing a city is its impersonality, that one can be anonymous. The presence of, and fascination with, strangers is a recurring theme of modern urban literature from Charles Baudelaire to Walter Benjamin to Jane Jacobs to Marshall Berman and innumerable others. Hillary Clinton's oft-quoted phrase, "It takes a village . . ." can be expanded. Urban life challenges any simple encapsulation of self-definition. An urban promenade is an immersion into a less personalized existence, a stimulating challenge to the individual that necessitates greater analysis and description than can be provided here. Nevertheless, the heterogeneities of urban life have particular value in terms of individual self-definition as regards social class, material fortune, and the construction of self as regards others. This is a contested assertion since, as suggested, Americans in so many ways express an anti-urban sentiment that rejects diversity as a common value.

People talk about their understanding of each other and of the common ties that bind them, but the images are not true to their actual relations. But the lie they have formed as their common image is a usable falsehood – a myth – for the group. Its use is that it makes a coherent image of the community as a whole: people draw a picture of who they are that binds them all together as one being, with a definite set of desires, dislikes, and goals. The image of the community is purified of all that might convey a feeling of difference, let alone conflict, in who "we" are. In this way the myth of community solidarity is a purification ritual.⁸

The search for community is the search for self-identity. Place means more than location. It is a nexus of desired social relationships, and desires are desires, clearly, if not solely, by their exclusivity. Interaction with others presents challenges. The process can be uncomfortable, even painful, as one's beliefs and values are contested as not universal. Interacting with others is to engage in discourse, thus self-identification is an ongoing project and an act of making oneself vulnerable. It is a trait of maturity, but not a trait that bestows comfort. Innate to the process of forming a coherent image of community is the desire to avoid confrontation, to avoid actual participation. This aversion of participation is the driving motivation for humans to share a myth of common identity, to seek and express common bonds without the veracity of common experience.

Clearly, the ideal of face-to-face relations is problematic as a political ideal. Critics of contemporary urbanism, its alienation and cacophonous landscape, often appeal to the ideal of community as an alternative vision of social life. Community represents an ideal of shared public life, an intimate and human scaled public realm traversed by residents who are mutually recognized and identified. This argument is intoxicatingly

persuasive, as we all desire a fulfilled sense of home, place and community. The polemics of Murray Bookchin is exemplary:

To restructure our institutions into richly articulated forms, to reorganize our relationships into creative forms of human solidarity, to re-empower our communities and cities . . . and to create a new non-hierarchical and participatory relationship between humanity and nature by means of a sensibility and technics that fosters a participatory form of complementarity rather than atomistic antagonisms—all, taken together as one coherent ensemble, constitute not only a desideratum of major proportions but a new ethical calling. The incarnation of this human project is the immediate, indeed unmediated, community that enters so profoundly into the fashioning of our humanity. This is the community in which we genuinely encounter each other, the public world that is only a bare step above our private world, in short, our towns, neighborhoods, and municipalities.⁹

To privilege face-to-face relations is to champion small, decentralized congregations of citizens as the model of the good society, as agents of participatory democracy. The contradiction, as indicated earlier, is that the pursuit of a homogenous community is indicative of an individual penchant to avoid participation. Furthermore, a heterogeneous society comprised of an archipelago of discrete, decentralized and homogenized communities is unrealistic and politically undesirable. Finally, this model avoids the political question of just distribution of resources between decentralized and disparately different communities, for example, center cities and suburbs.

. . . theorists of community privilege face-to-face relations because they conceive them as *immediate*. Immediacy is better than mediation because immediate relations have the purity and security longed for . . . : we are transparent to one another, purely copresent in the same time and space, close enough to touch, and nothing comes between us to obstruct our vision of one another. . . .

. . . Proponents [of small communities] frequently privilege face-to-face relations in reaction to the alienation and domination produced by huge, faceless bureaucracies and corporations, whose actions and decisions affect most people, but are out of their control. Appeals to community envision more local and direct control. A more participatory democratic society should indeed encourage active publics at the local levels of neighborhood and workplace. But the important political question is how relations among these locales can be organized so as to foster justice and minimize domination and oppression. Invoking a mystical ideal of community does not address this question, but rather obscures it. Politics must be conceived as a relationship of strangers who do not understand one

another in a subjective and immediate sense, relating across time and distance.¹⁰

We are today living in urban and metropolitan conditions that are truly dynamic. The reach of globalization has insinuated itself in most every nuance of daily life. Places, large and small, of every constituency, homogenous or heterogeneous, are no longer self-determining. All spaces have become relational within the marketplace and within the interdependencies of local, national and global economies. Change renders place, neighborhood or community as tentative evocations that may no longer provide the psychic and social compensation sought in such collectivities: personal significance and a sense of local cohesion and stability. Today, when many are realizing that employment is likely to be a series of different careers made necessary by corporate reorganizations, mergers and redefinitions, and state retrenchment from Keynesian expenditures, the individual compensation of stable home and place becomes a more desperate yearning. The struggles between work and place are neither simple to resolve nor certain in their outcome. If neighborhoods, cities, or nations become defensive refuges against a dynamic and often hostile world, it is troubling that they may provide the comfort of personal identity, self-worth and belonging, through practices of exclusion and intolerance.¹¹

In a community, people try to compensate for their dislocations and impoverished experience in the economy with communal coercion and illusion . . . many current building projects are exercises in withdrawal from a complex world, deploying self-consciously “traditional” architecture that bespeaks a mythic communal coherence and shared identity in the past. These comforts of a supposedly simpler age appear in the New-Englisch housing developments designed by the American planners Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk and Andres Duany, in the efforts undertaken by the Prince of Wales to reproduce “native” English architecture, and in the neighborhood renovation work undertaken by Leon Krier on the Continent. All these place-makers are artists of claustrophobia, whose icons, however, promise stability, longevity, and safety.¹²

Since the marketplace is the medium by which the plans of New Urbanism are realized, the domiciles of these developments are expensive, the purchase of which creates a class-defined enclave. The typical defense by architects and planners is that they are politically neutral and they can only act upon the commissions they receive; it is not their role to be agents of integration. The assertion of political neutrality is itself a political statement. Allowing the marketplace to program constituency and residency by class affluence while providing a design rhetoric that purports to be inclusive is to hide, marginalize, disempower, repress, and perhaps even oppress, all kinds of “others” precisely because New Urbanism, with its mask of neutrality, cannot and does not acknowledge the

existence of heterogeneities and differences based on race, gender, age, sexuality, ability, culture, local origins, ethnicity, religion, group affiliation, and consumer needs or preferences. This list is neither exhaustive nor totally inclusive.

The Fourteenth Amendment of the American Constitution, The Civil Rights Laws of the 1960's, and more than four decades of judicial scrutiny and focus have all made discrimination, premised on identities of race, unequivocally unconstitutional. What lies outside of constitutional condemnation and intervention is discrimination based upon economic class. Nevertheless, class exclusion is implicitly racial exclusion since in the United States the majority of racial minorities are poor, very poor. Iris Marion Young lists four wrongs of racial segregation in residential location:

First, segregation violates a principle of equal opportunity and thus wrongly limits freedom of housing choice. Secondly, and most importantly, processes of segregation produce and reinforce serious structures of privilege and disadvantage. The very processes that produce segregation, thirdly, also obscure the fact of their privilege from those who have it. As a result, finally, the social and spatial differentiation segregation produces seriously impedes political communication among segregated groups, this making it difficult to address the wrongs of segregation through democratic political action.¹³

Racial and class segregation can be achieved by subtle means. Indeed, in these times of political correctness, words and phrases are often subterfuge for prejudicial choices. 'Face-to-face social interaction' is an often-repeated design goal of New Urbanism and is offered uncritically as an alternative to the impersonality, commodification, alienation, and bureaucratization of governance in existing mass society. A desire for safety inheres within this goal: a goal by which everyone is known and identifiable. The goal, one surmises, is to create a community with an absence of strangers. Curiously, in the bibliography available on the website for The Congress for the New Urbanism (<http://www.cnu.org>) *Death and Life of Great American Cities* by Jane Jacobs is listed, a book that celebrates the presence of strangers as an integral aspect of cities. Also included in the bibliography, under the key word *social justice* is Oscar Newman's *Defensible Space*, a tome from the Nixon era and one that attempted to express, in architectural form, that period's concern of 'law and order'.

... Architectural design can make evident by the physical layout that an area is the shared extension of the private realms of a group of individuals. For one group to be able to set the norms of behavior and the nature of activity possible within a particular place, it is necessary that it have clear, unquestionable control over what can occur there. Design can make it possible for both inhabitant and stranger to perceive that an area is under the undisputed

influence of a particular group, that they dictate the activity taking place within it, and who its users are to be. This can be made so clearly evident that residents will not only feel confident, but that it is incumbent upon them to question the comings and goings of people to ensure the continued safety of the defined areas. Any intruder will be made to anticipate that his presence will be under question and open to challenge; so much so that a criminal can be deterred from even contemplating entry.

Defensible space is a model for residential environments, which inhibits crime by creating the physical expression of a social fabric that defends itself. All of the different elements which combine to make a defensible space have a common goal – an environment in which latent territoriality and sense of community in the inhabitants can be translated into responsibility for ensuring a safe, productive, and well-maintained living space. The potential criminal perceives such a space as controlled by its residents, leaving him an intruder easily recognized and dealt with.¹⁴

The legitimacy of crime prevention is undeniable, likewise are measures to defend against crime. Newman is correct that architectural design can create thresholds and transitions between public and private realms thus creating territories and 'turf' which residents can survey and defend. These essential, semi-private spaces are not the desires of one particular group and are evident in residential neighborhoods of all classes and constituencies. Yet Newman's architectural polemic can be read to presume a homogenous congregation of residents and his prescriptions border on vigilante response. This is a distant interpretation of the social choreography of the heterogeneity of urban sidewalks that Jane Jacobs admiringly described. Whereas the above quote from *Defensible Space* dates from 1972, it is enlightening to couple it with a 1994 quote from Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, Ph. D., a sociologist.

What's happened is the word "crime" has become a receptacle for a series of concerns we cannot mention, the unmentionables; class and race. . . . [It] has become a euphemism. It is easier to speak about crime, to speak about larceny and burglary and murder than to evoke the images of class and race. That is very, very telling. This is truly Orwellian, a kind of doublespeak. It is an alternative language we have to refer to the problems we see in society. We cannot use the old language of racism. We come up with all sorts of politically correct terms to refer to the same problems. When we say "crime" we're really saying we are afraid of lower-class black people.¹⁵

Equal opportunity, freedom of association and freedom of movement are beyond basic values; they are basic rights. In pursuit and defense of these rights, we must remove any remaining discriminatory barriers in our democracy. Some

groups, in exercise of their rights, may choose to associate and dwell in residential clusters. That, in itself, is not condemnable. What demands scrutiny and intervention is when residential differentiation throws up legal fences and financial barriers that exclude unequivocally, to the result that geographic choice and residential accommodation are held from others. Group differentiation across space should be voluntary, fluid, without distinct borders, and with multiple, overlapping, unmarked, and hybrid, public places. These are not traits of New Urbanism. The primary issue is the just, spatial distribution of benefits to all. Integration that solely pursues mixing and dispersal of groups is blind to the real goal: to provide a better life to all, and most importantly, a better life of one's own choice.

... an: alternative ideal of social and political inclusion ... *differentiated solidarity*. This ideal shares with an ideal of integration a commitment to combat exclusion and foster individual freedom. But, unlike at least some formulations of an ideal of integration, differentiated solidarity also affirms the freedom of association that may entail residential clustering and civic differentiation. At the same time, the ideal of differentiated solidarity notices and affirms that locally and culturally differentiated groups dwell together in a wider region whose structural and environmental conditions affect them all, and where actions and interactions often have distributive consequences that tend to benefit some over others. Thus the ideal of differentiated solidarity affirms that groups nevertheless dwell together, whether they like it or not, within a set of problems and relationships of structural independence that bring with them obligations of justice.¹⁶

CONCLUSION

The task before us is to bring urbanity to New Urbanism, to instill it with real diversity, in its suburban operations and in the low-income neighborhoods of center cities where New Urbanism has yet to significantly engage the issues of low-income housing and neighborhood revitalization. In their design of 'communities' architects and planners must counter any repressive homogeneity, unity, or wholeness in design philosophy or methods, which generates borders, dichotomies, and exclusions.

It is far too great a task for the end of this essay to prescribe in detail alternative possibilities for suburban development and urban redevelopment. A significant obstacle to achieving the richness of the 'democratic city' is the allegiance that planning must proceed from general, immutable rules. The goal is not marketable products that shelter, but an emancipatory process that is egalitarian as regards participation and is equitable in its provision of shelter and other benefits of place.

The process of planning should be inclusionary and participatory. Economic development in low-income neighborhoods, or for low-income tenants in new developments, should be self-inspired. Furthermore, residential location without employment opportunities is no provision of place to those who have been excluded because of price. "Rebuilding the human infrastructure should be the prime purpose, with rebuilding the physical structure as merely the excuse or the means to achieve that first priority."¹⁷ Without a comprehensive economic plan that is collectively formulated and endorsed, housing will deteriorate for lack of funds. Decent-paying jobs are not the only requisites of a viable neighborhood. Other requirements include good schools, easily available retail and public services, and access to mass transit.

Housing typologies must be expanded and provided as tentative designs that are amenable to change and personalization over time, not forever locked to compliance with urban design guidelines or aesthetic mandates. Multi-use buildings should be conceived and provided that combine home and work in manners that low-overhead and home-based businesses can flourish. Diversity can be facilitated by the design of single-family homes which include a rental unit much like the row houses of Montreal that are two-story townhouses over a one-story flat. The flat can be rented out to subsidize the family's mortgage. An alternative tack is to provide minimally sized rental units that can be expanded by tenants over time. This labor-investment can be monetarily converted with a lease-with-option-to-buy contract.

Architectural possibilities abound. Design can be an instrument for inclusive *community* organizing and self-help development. Our responsibility is to advance a more socially just, politically emancipatory, ecologically sensitive, process of *community* construction. Realizing this task will certainly be . . . new urbanism.

NOTES

¹ Raymond Williams, *Keywords, a vocabulary of culture and society; Revised edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 76.

² I wish to thank one of the ACSA reviewers of the blind submission of this essay for this qualification.

³ Andrew Ross, *The Celebration chronicles: life, liberty and the pursuit of property value in Disney's new town* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1999), p. 218-219.

⁴ Peter Katz, *The new urbanism; toward an architecture of community* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1994), p. ix.

⁵ Douglas Kelbaugh, "Three paradigms: new urbanism, everyday urbanism, post urbanism," excerpt from *Repairing the American Metropolis: Common Place Revisited* (Seattle: University of Washington, 2002), taken from: <http://periferia.org/3000/3paradigms.html>

⁶ David Harvey, "The New Urbanism and the Communitarian Trap," *Harvard Design Magazine*, Winter/Spring 1997, p. 68.

⁷ David Harvey, *Justice, nature & the geography of difference* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1996, p. 297-298.

- ⁸ Richard Sennett, *The uses of disorder: personal identity and city life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970), p. 36.
- ⁹ Murray Bookchin, *The rise of urbanization and the decline of citizenship* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1987), p. 267. For similar arguments, see: Christian Bay, *Strategies for political emancipation* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981) Chapters 5 & 6; Peter Manicas, *Death of the state* (New York: Putnam, 1974), pp. 246-250; and Charles Taylor, "The nature and scope of distributive justice," in *Philosophy and the human sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 27-28. These sources are from Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the politics of difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 232.
- ¹⁰ Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the politics of difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 234-235.
- ¹¹ Richard Sennett, "The search for a place in the world," in Nan Ellen, *Architecture of fear* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997), pp. 61-62.
- ¹² Sennett, 1997, p. 67.
- ¹³ Iris Marion Young, *Inclusion and democracy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 205.
- ¹⁴ Oscar Newman, *Defensible space: crime prevention through urban design* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), pp.2-3.
- ¹⁵ Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, quoted in David Harvey, *Justice, nature & the geography of difference* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), p. 293.
- ¹⁶ Iris Marion Young, *Inclusion and democracy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 197.
- ¹⁷ Michael Pyatok FAIA, "Neighborhood development in a democratic city: toward a 'real' urbanism", unpublished essay dated September 30, 1996, p. 2.