Contingent Urbanism: Agency in (Re)Making Contemporary Places

The July 2013 edition of Architect magazine featured an article entitled "Newest Urbanism." In their word play on what design praxis might succeed the popular late twentieth century New Urbanism movement in the United States, Architect introduced to the uninitiated the concept of tactical urbanism. Their narrative rooted tactical urbanism's contemporary origins in 2005 in the transformation of a parking space into a small park in San Francisco by the firm Rebar.

B.D. WORTHAM-GALVIN
Portland State University

Defining tactical urbanism as "temporary, cheap, and usually grassroots interventions—including so-called guerrilla gardens, pop-up parks, food carts, and 'open streets' projects—that are designed to improve city life on a block-by-block, street-by-street basis," the article claims that it took this approach to shaping the city less than a decade to mainstream into the practices of U.S. cities and firms alike.[1]

While Architect used the term tactical urbanism, to characterize this effort (borrowing it from the Street Plans Collaborative and their guidebook Tactical Urbanism 2: Short-Term Action, Long Term Change), other terms abound: participatory urbanism, open-source urbanism, pop-up urbanism, minor urbanism, guerrilla urbanism, insurgent public space, city repair, or DIY urbanism.[2] The elision between these terms and their definitions does contain overlap, but they are not exact synonyms. This essay will use the term contingent urbanism to discuss how ordinary people are engaged in making place and how designers and planners might learn from it. This discussion of contingent urbanism will define the term and its current manifestation, and raise questions about contingent urbanism role in the making of place in the twenty-first century.[3]

THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY CITY

Douglas Kelbaugh's adroit analysis of latter twentieth-early twenty-first century urban praxis in the United States (and as exported globally) assesses New Urbanism as "an explicit combination of noble ends and practical means" in contrast to Post Urbanism's "argument that shared values or metanarratives are no longer possible in a world increasingly fragmented [...]".[4] The former engages historical precedents, employs typology, and is stylistically neotraditional (despite protestations to stylistic inclusion, this is the as-built reality of New Urbanism) while the later manipulates topology "without formal orthodoxies or principles" with a resultant focus on surface and skin in the name of newer. freedoms for the

twenty-first century global city.[5] Notwithstanding their varied aims and methodologies, both primarily focus on formal and spatial manipulations in order to create (or dismantle) the public realm that we understand as the city. Despite both New and Post Urbanisms conviction in their formally driven design methodologies, it is difficult to ascertain what designing the "public realm" really means in the context of increasing privatization, globalization, digitization, and commercialization of urban space. The city designed is assumed to be a public space; but what precisely does that mean? It is certainly more than the mere spatial circumscription of a town square or piazza. By defining space as "public" what are we referring to? Ownership? If so, how does a place like Times Square fit this definition? Even though most of the land that constitutes the space of Times Square is, indeed, owned by the city and is, therefore, "public" land, the space is not publicly managed. The structures that define the space are all controlled by private interests; and, the space is dominated by commercial messages and corporate slogans rather than a socio-cultural identity. As Blaine Merker asserts:

> Contemporary industrialized societies have generally accepted the banishment of unscripted, generous exchange in the public realm in favour of a hyper-commercial alternative. […] In the North American city, public behaviors unrelated to commercial exchange or economic production fall into two basic categories: loitering or other illegal and disruptive activity; and assembly, celebration, and cultural spectacle, which are heavily scripted and contained by permits and other official permissions.[6]

Ironically in many (sub)urban places, it is the shopping mall that has become the new forum, playing host to a myriad of "public" activities, including: seniors taking group walks in the morning, girl scout sing-a-longs, flu shot clinics, job fairs, and teenagers working hard at doing nothing. Is the public to be found, then, in more than just a physical circumscription, but also in a set of activities that reinforce community and civic identity, and are, therefore, culturally conceived of as public?[7]

As the physical and socio-cultural have become inextricably intertwined in the defining of the public, contingent urbanism is useful in unravelling that knot. Even more so, because what is missing from synoptic accounts of the plurality of urban design mythologies in action at the turn of the twenty-first century in the United States is a discussion of contingent urbanism.[8] Merker believes that, "Offering the public something without expectation of anything in return is at once subversive, suspicious—and potentially profound and transformative."[9] Contingent urbanism becomes a method wherein new cultural value is produced without ties to commercial consumption and production. As Jeffrey Hou notes, "If public space is where identities, meanings, and social relationships in cities are produced, codified and maintained, it is through insurgent public space that alternative identities, meanings, and relationships can be nurtured, articulated, and enacted. "[10] By these rubrics, contingent urbanism is about a group of people engaged in actions that are subject to chance and/or dependent on certain circumstances that operate outside of power structures and/or official modes of operation; and, it is through actions of these agents that we might reclaim publicness from its current corporate/government sanctioned morass.[11]

CONTINGENT URBANISM
Conversations about contingent urbanism in the past decade are often framed by unsanctioned efforts and/or by the temporary. Tactical urbanism, as defined by

the Street Plans Collaborative, features short-term realistic actions, the development of social capital, a focus on the local, and a phased approach to permanent change. As Mike Lydon notes:

> When you're yard bombing something, it's a really cool and interesting piece of public art and it can have some social and political commentary that goes along with it, but the intent generally is not to create a longer term physical change. Most of the things that we include in the guide generally are aiming at doing something larger. They're not just for the sake of doing it. And of course in a lot of ways, to make that work, you need to have whatever you're doing to become sanctioned or supported, either with funding or with being allowed by the municipality.[12]

The distinction Lydon makes is an important parsing of the various contingent urbanism efforts. Activities such as guerrilla gardening, weed bombing, chair bombing, yarn bombing, ad busting, camps, food trucks, pop up town halls, Depave, PARK(ing) Day, parklets, Street Seats, Open Streets, Build a Better Block, Parkways, and others get merged together with no distinction. To wit the Seattle chapter of the AIA held an exhibition in Winter 2013 that featured parklets, guerrilla gardens, yarn bombs, temporary infill, retail housed in shipping containers, sticker bombing and more all curated as falling under the same rubric of creative urban inventions.[13]

Many of these activities involve revising or reinterpreting existing infrastructures for alternative purposes with a sense of socio-political agency underlying the action. They operate outside of officially sanctioned structures as they temporarily claim public or private infrastructures for protest or other cultural practices. While these projects are communal, hands-on and sometimes critical, they are fleeting, ephemeral additions to the built environment, not permanent ones. They eschew the slow moving and often costly bureaucracies of professionalized urbanism (proffered by planners, architects, landscape architects, preservationists and their ilk), for flexibility, rapidity, dynamisms and what Kelli Anderson terms "disruptive wonder" or I call "making the familiar strange".[14] They seek to disrupt naturalized assumptions and defy conventions about how and/or where we live. In this version of contingent urbanism, the city is seen as a (public) democratic process, not a (private) consumable product.

The difference, as Lydon notes, is that some of these activities—like yarn, chair or weed bombing, ad busting, and guerrilla gardening—fall more into the vein of performance art and provocation, than with an eye toward permanence.[15] These often illegal works are proffered to provoke conversation for a day, but once out of sight are often out of mind. At the other end, food trucks, pop up retail, and Street Seats are ways for commercial enterprises to make private entrepreneurial insertions into the city (whether one is selling food or jewelry for one's own profit, or designing outside café seating in a former parking space as Portland's Street Seats permitting process encourages). In addition, at this end the agent of change is usually a design or planning professional with agency being understood as someone acting on behalf of others.[16]

Somewhere in the middle are those activities that started as temporary—often political—stagings that become codified processes, with the agents of public change moving from the insurgent toward the intermediary and often, finally, assuming the presumption of public representation. PARK(ing) Day is one example that started as performance art piece "Portable Architecture" by Bonnie Ora

Sherk in 1970 when she began converting pavement to parks in San Francisco. This action re-emerged in 2005, again in San Francisco, with the transformation of a parking space into a public park. Within six years this transformation became reified as PARK(ing) Day and had spread globally with thirty-five countries across six continents reclaiming 975 parking spaces.[17] The ultimate codification came in 2013 when the city of Portland established its Street Seats program that permits businesses to build small "parklets" in current on-street parking spaces. In the trajectory described above municipal resources (i.e. parking spaces) transform: first, into an artist's provocation challenging the use of those resources (should city rights-of-way be for cars or for people); second, into small public spaces for people to use and share at will; and, finally, for private interests to expand their resources (café seating, while enlivening the pedestrian experience, is still privately managed and restricted in its inhabitation). Thus, while contingent urbanism in the media is often characterized as interventions within the city that are instigated by activists who want to provocate the allocation of space and resources, it is also happening via government sanctioned private investment in the transformation of city resources. The shift in the agents staging this urbanism has consequences regarding the actions. While parking spaces turned into places to sit may, on their face, look alike, ownership of those parklets affects how public these spaces truly are. For whom are these Street Seats? Those shepherding the move for Seattle to adopt its own sanctioned parklet program provide such a cautionary guide.

Contingent urbanism, then, is not only a subaltern cultural movement, but also a mainstream one. The whom, or agents, of contingent urbanism range from those on the outside to those in power. Contingent urbanists are activists, neighbors, groups, non-profits, developers, businesses, and city governments. The variety of agents represent a continuum of action from the illegal and unsanctioned to those codified into regulatory processes and laws—with the former often prompting the latter (e.g. PARK(ing) Day, Build A Better Block, Depave, Open Streets). And these actions take place on both public and private sites (often merging and/or conflicting the two interests).

Contingent urbanism, as defined in this essay, affirms much of what Lydon parses. It is urban action that is: small and/or incremental; responding to immediate needs (that engage discourses of publicness); stewarding change that is wanted (defined by some group of people); implementable relatively quickly and with low initial investment. Contingent urbanism is not defined by who is leading it (whether it is everyday people, activists, or professional experts), but by the actions taken (small, but tangible), how they are taken (quickly), and that there is a tangible impact. What contingent urbanism is not is professionally led charrettes stewarding large-scale development projects (often masquerading as community-based design).

The activism of the 1960s-70s in the United States prompted professionals interested in community-based design to co-opt the term charrette to promote a more public-oriented design process. The charrette has re-emerged with new strength from its 1960s-70s launching in large part due to the success of the New Urbanism movement and, most recently, from a post-Katrina desire to help revive the Gulf Coast region. In the New Urbanists' desire to establish strong neighborhoods, both formally and socially, they use the charrette as one of their formidable tools, alongside form- and typology-based codes. Within their paradigm the charrette becomes a way to facilitate change in participants'

perceptions and positions with the end goal being a buy-in to the design. But what does consensus mean when the desire is to change people's minds in order to have them buy-in to the design? Is everyone supporting a plan derived from the charrette or pre-conceived before hand? And in that case, then, for whose benefit is the review, critique and refinement during the charrette? Just the participants and not the designers? Has the charrette become a mode for defusing implementation challenges instead of collaborating on critical questions and potential answers within a community? As Ana Paula Baltazar and Silke Kapp outline,

> [...] the World Bank introduced participation in its development projects to overcome the resistance of people, not to substantially change the projects themselves. In many cases participation is used as just another strategy of imposition. But even when real discussion is intended by architects or urban designers, they are still in a position of power: they determine the framework of discussion, provide specialized information, judge what would be acceptable solutions, make the ultimate design decisions and finally translate them into technical codes.[18]

If public space and urban design are to be embedded in the cultural construction of place, then residents should be seen not merely as an audience to receive the wise wisdom of the expert, but as experts in their own right who bring a large body of local and social capital to the process; and in fact, can and perhaps should instigate the process.

This is why the charrette does not appear on the list of contingent urbanism activities; its use as a community-based tool is too broad in its implementation depending on who is using it (and more importantly) to what purpose. Some design professionals who work intensively with communities seek alternatives to the charrette in order to design with not for communities. The work of designers like Teddy Cruz, Walter Hood, Bryan Bell, Maurice Cox and in projects such as Crown Heights (initiated by architect Manuel Avila) engage alternative practices that elevate residents to experts and give them significant roles in the decision-making process of design.[19] While laudable, this work, however, is not what this paper means by contingent urbanism—where incremental, tangible, immediate action are paramount over (en)visioning and conceptual speculation.

The critique of the charrette as an expert-driven, value-laden process should be applied to contingent urban activities as well. Certainly this is easiest to observe when the activities are supported by government sanctioned regulations and codes, such as the Street Seats program. For whom is the extra café seating in Portland? Those who can afford to frequent such upper-middle class establishments are whose cultural values and assumptions are now literally expanding into the streets. These café parklets are certainly not mega projects like Bilbao, and yet, because they belong to the same taste-culture, it needs to be acknowledged that this type of urbanism often replaces existing urbanism with the "latest and greatest" and leverages the development of this architecture to attract the accoutrements of a cosmopolitan experience—fine cuisine, global brand stores, and a thriving night scene predicated on a new sense of "safety." And while this constituency has a right to lay claim to one of the cities' cultures, it should not be reified into representing The Culture of the city and assume that is how all citizens would like to see those individual 200 square feet parcels put to use. This

technology. The economic downturn stopped big development projects (be they "public" or private) cold. The disappearance of these mega projects left communities with a bevy of vacant and abandoned properties (further compounded by the demise of smaller businesses caught in the wake of the big money disaster). This made it easier for insurgent intervention to take hold because: 1. A little money could now make an impact because big money was no longer available to compete or push out small projects; and, 2. Municipalities were more forgiving of the unsanctioned because these undertakings filled a void of inaction and/or displaced negative, crime related activities.

While the economy downturned precipitously after 2008, the uptick in the proliferation of social media orientated platforms and the ubiquity of portable devices on which to access them meant it was easier to mobilize people and resources. As quickly as one can tweet, one can gather the left over and left behind people and resources for action. Facebook was founded in 2004. Twitter in 2006. San Francisco's first renewed interest in turning parking spaces into parks started in 2005 and has grown global in less than a decade. These are not coincidences. This is the foundation for the twenty-first century version of contingent urbanism which mobilizes quickly into action and disseminates those actions for easier replicability, digitally—with the highest profile example being that of the Occupy movement.

Jonathan Massey and Brett Snyder rename contingent urbanism under the moniker open-source urbanism because of how mobile devices and their applications allow "non-experts" to become authors of both how urban spaces are enacted and how public dialogues are shaped.[20] Open-source urbanism takes place in both physical and digital spaces and, as the Occupy movement demonstrated, often a simultaneous dialogue and overlapping between the two creates the participatory realm in which people actively engage their cities, neighborhoods, and physical public spaces through collecting and sharing data and ideas via digital methods. Massey and Snyder note that the Occupy movement existed virtually before it did physically:

> In the months leading up to the first occupation [...] Occupy established an online presence unmatched in the history of social action, leveraging multiple online spaces to stage protests and to generate a distinctive counter-public and alternative polity. [...] before the first protestors had set foot in Liberty Plaza, the Occupy movement was evolving toward a model of General Assembly that hybridized online and offline discourse. While street activists in New York were practicing consensus decision-making in public parks, online participants were responding to a poll Adbusters created using Facebook's 'question' function [...] Through this asynchronous online polling, Facebook supported a weak form of political discussion that prefigured the stronger and more interactive deliberations that filled Liberty Plaza.[21]

The Occupy movement created physical civic infrastructures (temporarily permanent) entirely generated by the participants. What arose across the United States was "complex, open-source, user-generated urban infrastructure, where creative participation, collaboration, generosity, and self-reliance are privileged over the more traditional urban imperatives of commerce and efficiency".[22] But can Occupy offer a method for bridging the gap between the ephemerality of some participatory urbanism and the desire for permanent change in the city? And can these bottom-up approaches ultimately situate everyday people as equal authors in the design of the built environment alongside architects, landscape architects,

ENDNOTES

1. Kim O'Connell, "Newest Urbanism," *Architect*, July 2013, www.architectmagazine.com/architects/newest-urbanism.aspx [accessed 11 July 2013].

2. Mike Lydon, et al, *Tactical Urbanism 2: Short-Term Action, Long-Term Change* was published online as a pdf by the Street Plans Collective, <http://issuu.com/streetplanscollaborative/docs/tactical_urbanism_vol_2_final> [accessed 15 February 2013].

3. A more formal version of this paper that also focuses on a discussion of rebuilding post-Katrina and a case study in Baltimore was recently published as: B.D. Wortham-Galvin, "An Anthropology of Urbanism: How People Make Places (and What Designers and Planners Might Learn From It)," *Footprint* 13, vol. 7/2 (Autumn 2013), 21-39.

4. Douglas Kelbaugh, "Toward an Integrated Paradigm: Further Thoughts on Three Urbanisms," *Places* 19.2 (2007), 13 & 15.

5. Ibid

6. Blaine Merker, "Taking place: Rebar's absurd tactics in generous urbanism," in *Insurgent Public Space. Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*, ed. Jeffrey Hou (New York: Routledge, 2010), 50.

7. An in depth discussion of both the notion of the public and of place can be found in: B.D. Wortham-Galvin and Isaac Williams, "The Stranger's Path: The Cultural Landscape of Urban Form," *Instant Cities*, the Center for the Study of Architecture in the Arab Region, American University of Sharjah, UAE (2008).

8. Kelbaugh (2007) and Harrison Fraker's "Where is the Urban Design Discourse?" *Places* 19.3, 61-63 are examples of such synoptic accounts.

9. Merker (Ibid), 51.

10. Jeffrey Hou, "(Not) your everyday public space," in *Insurgent Public Space. Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*, ed. Jeffrey Hou (New York: Routledge, 2010), 15-16.

11. Google defines contingent the following three ways: 1. Subject to chance. 2. Occurring or existing only if (certain other circumstances) are the case. 3. A group of people united by some common feature, forming part of a larger group. www.google.com][accessed 1 Nov 2013].

12. Nate Berg, "The Official Guide to Tactical Urbanism," *The Atlantic Cities Place Matters*, March 2, 2012, <www.theatlanticcities.com/neighborhoods/2012/03/guide-tactical-urbanism/1387/> [accessed 5 August 2013].

13. Lindsey M. Roberts, "Design Intervenes to Save Our Cities," *Architect* <http://www.architectmagazine.com/exhibitions/examples-of-city-saving-design-shown-in-aia-seattle-exhibition.aspx> [accessed 5 August 2013].

14. Kelli Anderson's ideas about "disruptive wonder" can be found in her TedTalk <www.ted.com/speakers/kelli_anderson.html> [accessed 29 January 2013]. For a discussion of the concept of "making the familiar strange" see B.D. Wortham-Galvin, "Making the Familiar Strange: Understanding Design Practice as Cultural Practice," in *The Urban Wisdom of Jane Jacobs*, ed. Sonia Hirt (New York: Routledge, 2012), 229-244.15.   A discussion of participatory urbanism as performance art in San Francisco can be found in Matthew Passmore, "Participatory Urbanism. Taking action by taking space," *Urbanist*, February 2010, <www.spur.org/publications/library/article/participatory_urbanism> [accessed 15 February 2013].

planners, and preservationist? What really happens when citizens take the shaping of the city into their own hands? And are these citizens just as guilty of leaving people out and behind?

Starting in fall 2011, the mythologies of whether or not the Occupy movement represented the 99% in its entirely gained traction. Two surveys performed that fall were widely reported in the press and pushed back on some of the myths (the former involving 1619 people responding online and the latter involving 198 people responding in person).[23] Both surveys determined that the Occupy Wall Street participants constituted a mix of ages, wealth, employment, and history of activism (meaning no one group dominated in these categories). The two categories that had clear majority constituencies were: 1. On the issue of political identification, 70% claimed to be politically independent; and, 2. 92% were highly educated (defined as having at least some college up through graduate degrees). Not reported in these surveys were gender, race/ethnicities, or place –based identifiers. The purpose here is not to parse the reality of the Occupy constituency, but to acknowledge that the Occupy leadership and "citizenry" had its own values systems that were physically manifest in their camps (having libraries, community gardens, and/or day-cares in a camp were value-laden choices). It is the recognition of value-bias in the implementation of city making processes that is key. Perhaps contingent urbanism is more transparent because its decisions are made out of doors and in view of all as manifest in the physical asserts they put forth, whereas top down processes opaquely imbed values in dense codes, regulations, and byzantine elisions between public and private ownership and occupation.

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL URBANISM

The physical deterioration of many of America's cities is not only due to unique circumstances fashioned by natural disasters, but also to an on-going series of systemic issues—poverty, gentrification, population decline, vacancy and abandonment, and of conflicts in cultural values.[24] And, while neighborhood revitalization usually focuses on physical improvements, it clearly has social impacts. Physical interventions do indeed transform the built environment; but they do not necessarily eliminate poverty, nor do they address the socio-economic disparities prevalent in many major (and minor) American cities and suburbs.

The politics of culture are just as important as the aesthetic considerations in the complex efforts to revitalize cities. As Roberta Gratz notes, "No one should want to protect the status quo of a deteriorated neighborhood. If all change is mislabelled as gentrification without distinctions, the problem of gentrification is not addressed, just ignored".[25] It is important to be aware that many physically deteriorated neighborhoods can, in fact, be vital as communities if they "possess viable social networks that function to meet the needs of their populations".[26] Is there a way to balance the micro and macro effects of revitalization? Is there a middle ground between whole cloth demographic change of the community and stopping the continued deterioration of blighted neighborhoods? How can cities address these issues to encourage the good subcultural networks without exacerbating the segregation of economic classes or discouraging private investment? Contingent urbanism has emerged in the gaps left by government institutions and their inability to address physical, fiscal, and socio-cultural inequities in contemporary cities.

North American municipalities have large tracts of land that are underutilized (primarily vacant or abandoned). Sites in the public domain could be activated by

hosting various groups to stage "urbanisms" and then use digital and traditional mechanism for feedback loops on uses and practices. Those privately held could be incentivized beyond current regulations that make lot parking the most profitable use to promote temporary and tactical physical installations that may catalyze, then, more permanent vitality. Contingent urbanism's ability to supplant the few with the many in both who makes the city and how it gets made might provide a guiding methodology as long as it is critically assessed: 1. To understand who are the agents and for whom are the actions; and, 2. When provocations become officially sanctioned are issues of public and private ownership and the right to inhabitation being lost in the translation to regulation. Contingent urbanism can promote an anthropologically rich city (a city of plural ritual and dwelling) when it transparently acknowledges who owns the land, who acts on it, whose values are being preferred, and how this correlates to the physical publicness and occupation of the city.

What contingent urbanism ultimately highlights is the disparity between professionalized discussions of place and those that derive from its inhabitants. Occupy Wall Street was too preoccupied with its agenda—which Kenneth Stahl argues persuasively was the occupation of place itself, not an ambiguously undefined socio-political or economic one—to worry about how Zuccotti Park would be writ large with stereotypes, good or bad.[27] If contingent urban groups achieve a "freshness of vision," as Edward Weston says, it is when they are not forced to fit into preconceived patterns. The Occupy movement did not reify their creation of an urban realm (or their digital discussions of that creation) into The Paradigm for the built environment; instead, the environments they made (and mapped or recorded) revealed the patterns of lived and built culture in their urbanisms.[28] And perhaps to the frustration of the professionalized built environment disciplines, what they produced, in the conscious participating and documentation of their everyday lives, is often more compelling than the over planned downtowns or the fictionalized "new" urbanisms being designed and built all over the United States in the context of local and global development pressures.

16. My reference for the use of the term agency and/or agent in this context is from Ana Paula Baltazar and Silke Kapp, "Against determination, beyond mediation," in *Agency: Working with Uncertain Architectures*, eds. Florian Kossak et al., (New York: Routledge, 2010), 131-140.

17. Lydon (n.d.), p. 15.

18. Baltazar and Kapp (Ibid), 135.

19. All information about the Crown Heights Participatory Urbanism project can be found on its website, <http://participatoryurbanism.blogspot.com/> [accessed 23 January 2013].

20. Jonathan Massey & Brett Snyder, "Occupying Wall Street: Places and Spaces of Political Action," *The Design Observer Group*, posted 17 September 2012, <www.places.designobserver.com/feature/occupy-wall-street-places-and-spaces-of-political-action/35938/> [accessed 20 February 2013].

21. Massey & Snyder (2012).

22. Ibid.

23. The first survey was published by Hector Cordero-Guzman, Ph.D, a sociology professor at the City University of New York and included 1619 online respondents. The second survey took place in person with 198 people present in Zuccotti Park (the site of Occupy Wall Street) conducted by Fox news analyst Douglas Schoen's polling outfit. Press coverage of these surveys can be found at the following websites [accessed 5 August 2013]: <http://gawker.com/5851376/the-demographics-of-occupy-wall-street>, <http://www.fastcompany.com/1789018/demographics-occupy-wall-street>, <http://theweek.com/article/index/220529/the-demographics-of-occupy-wall-street-by-the-numbers>,<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/29/occupy-wall-street-report_n_2574788.html>, <http://www.statisticbrain.com/occupy-wall-street-statistics-and-demographics/>, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/13/opinion/sunday/who-is-occupy-wall-street.html?_r=0>, <http://idealab.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/10/occupy-wall-street-demographic-survey-results-will-surprise-you.php>.

24. In its March 20, 2000 issue, *USA Today* published a list of American cities with the most abandoned buildings. Topping the list of the cities that provided data were: Philadelphia (27,000); Baltimore (15,000); Houston (8,000); Detroit (7,500); Kansas City (5,000); Indianapolis (3,400); San Antonio (3,000); Jacksonville (2,800); Louisville (2,200); Mobile (2,009); and Los Angeles (1,800).

25. Bruce London and J. John Palen, eds. *Gentrification, Displacement and Neighborhood Revitalization* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1984), 7.

26. Ibid, p. 10.

27. Kenneth Stahl, "How the Occupy Movement Changed Urban Government," *The Atlantic Cities*, Feb 6, 2012. www.theatlanticcities.com/politics/2012/02/how-occupy-movement-changed-urban-government/1130/ [accessed online 20 January 2013].

28. The term "enacted environment" is borrowed from James Rojas' work..