© Mary Corbin Sies. Not for quotation without permission.

"Regenerating Scholarship on Race and the Built Environment"[1]

Mary Corbin Sies
Department of American Studies,
The University of Maryland, College Park

It is heartening to see a session on "Reconsidering Race in the Built Environment" scheduled first thing in the morning, so that our presentations and the ensuing discussions might have the opportunity to resound and resonate throughout our time together. Despite Dianne Harris's contention that race has hardly figured in landscape and architectural histories,[2] one can discern in these disparate papers that scholars have traveled some distance in studying the complex ways race and ethnicity interact with the built environments of the United States. I applaud the focus of these papers, their interdisciplinary reach, and the intellectually profitable ways that they signify off of each other. This is a session in which the proverbial whole is greater than the sum of the parts. I shall try to build on this knowledge by offering seven points or perspectives I've found useful for thinking through the complexities of how race and built environments can constitute one another in different ways over time, triangulating between the papers as I go.

Meditation on marginality

I begin with a brief meditation on the meanings of marginality. Asking, as the session organizers did, how an "historian's understanding of race and ethnicity is deepened through linkages to the built environment," or how our understandings of the built environment are "complicated thru attention to race," allows for the possibility that these issues *could* be marginal to one another and to the historian's or architectural historian's scholarly problematics.[3]   The remarks that follow are premised upon the bolder assertion that in North America, at least, race and ethnicity are *necessary* considerations for understanding built environments—they, with other factors, help to constitute these cultural forms.

This is a point all three authors agree on, albeit in complementary ways. Dianne Harris, citing Michael Eric Dyson, argues that race is the "suppressed premise of so many syllogisms of American democracy. Race is part and parcel of the very fabric of the American intellectual project."[4] Wendell Pritchett demonstrates how race gets embedded into the most basic assumptions about property and public policy concerning property. Those assumptions, he states, "become part of the infrastructure of an America that … maintain[s] high indices of racial segregation."[5]   Jeff Melnick, in a clever paradigm-confounding argument, places the purportedly marginal culture of a marginal place inhabited by persons some sociologists have deemed the most marginal denizens of the city smack in the center of one of the major artistic movements of the 20th century.

Marginal can be a useful term, reminding us, on the one hand, that racial-ethnic minorities experience tremendous constraints in access to some kinds of power and resources. For some people, on the other hand, the margins provide an important site of differential knowledge and strength from which to engage in political activity to define and achieve their own interests. Can we accurately label the experiences of racial-ethnic populations marginal to understanding the built environments of North America? Is race marginal to imagined, built, or lived space? To these questions the panel members properly posit a resounding "no".

Nervous landscapes

Having insisted on the centrality of race to the formation of North American built environments, we now have to address the more difficult questions of how we theorize and study these relationships. Simply writing "the works of blacks, Latino/as, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and so on into the existing canon" is not enough, as Dianne Harris points out. We need to rethink architectural and landscape history from "an entirely new theoretical perspective."[6]

On this challenging issue our authors model a range of approaches. Harris crafts her framework from race theory and especially whiteness studies. Drawing from David Roediger's critical whiteness scholarship and Michel Laguerre's theories of minoritized space, she analyzes how ordinary post-World War II houses and gardens "coached immigrants … in the assimilation and whitening process," and served as ciphers for belonging to white middle class society.[7] She suggests how space and the language realtors and policy-makers used to describe space shaped the notion of minority, and the spatial parameters of segregation. In the real estate industry, blackness was associated with declining property values, deteriorating neighborhoods, and other negative consequences.[8]

Wendell Pritchett is also interested in the ways racial beliefs influenced the structure of the housing market, especially how "racial discrimination is embedded in seemingly neutral doctrines, such as property rights." He analyzes how the idea that blacks depress property values got coded into public policy during the New Deal era and in private housing guidelines, such as the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) code. He establishes, quoting Richard Ford, that "public policy and private actors operate together to create and promote racially identified space and the racial segregation that accompanies it."[9] But unlike Harris, who concentrates entirely on excavating the ideologies of white privilege, Pritchett also shows us how scholars and African American community members contested these public and private theories and assumptions. They promoted alternative theories—citing the writings of Gunner Myrdal and the contact theory of race relations—as well as empirical research, such as economist Robert Weaver's investigations questioning the impact of black occupancy on property values.[10]

In contrast to the other two papers, Jeff Melnick provides what I'll call, following Leonie Sandercock's terminology, an entirely insurgent history of how the housing projects of northern cities "have been a crucial site of youth subculture development, community-building, and artistic innovation."[11] At the heart of his argument is an analysis of how the projects' environment—with its massive concentration of unsupervised black youth in an uncongenial physical space—fostered the vocal arts of African American popular music and how, in turn, project youth created new culture and a new sonic palette out of the social and material circumstances of their surroundings. This research is insurgent because Melnick re-centers our understanding of the projects on cultural productivity rather than social and racial pathology. He theorizes culture emanating from local knowledge and experience: doo wop and hip hop artists write back and sing back to create their own local identities and more.

Both Harris and Pritchett excavate the ideologies of whiteness designed into spaces that surround us, in landscapes and public policies that appear to be natural and neutral but never are. Diane Harris invokes the "hidden in plain sight" metaphor to express this point. White privilege and built form hold invisible ideologies that are "more than usually complicit in the manufacture of societal norms."[12] But the hidden in plain sight metaphor can signify in more than one dimension. People resist systems of domination in ways both visible and invisible, through a range of covert and overt actions, and in ways that—as Melnick well knows—scholars can fail to recognize or even see.[13] Every group, even the privileged white upper-middle class suburbanites I've studied so closely, transgresses model housing and living prescriptions in significant ways.[14]

What we need, then, is an approach to scholarship on race and the built environment that acknowledges powerful entrenched racialized ideologies but captures as well the range of responses to them that different people craft at the level of tactics or strategies. I favor Australian archaeologist Denis Byrne's concept of nervous landscapes: a perspective that encompasses how a dominant culture spatially controls a population's presence in and movement through a landscape but also looks at the full range of methods a minority group may use to subvert that system of spatial control. That contestation makes the built environment tense, nervous—what Byrne calls "a nervous system of racialized space." A nervous landscape is always on some level a landscape where hegemonic ideologies and containment have failed due to the interactions between different spatial regimes, modes of community building, and imaginings.[15] To understand how specific cultural landscapes get made, scholars must look for and listen to the tensions that underlie its logic and its multiple uses and interpretations.[16]

Place in motion: where geopolitics and local identities meet

Nervous landscapes do not occur in a vacuum, obviously. They are places where cultural flows and political/economic currents intersect. Thus understanding relationships between race and the built environment requires analyzing the larger theatres within which houses and gardens, housing projects, neighborhoods, and real estate theories and practices perform. Two sets of ideas seem especially useful for thinking about these local to global interconnections. The first is recognizing that ordinary Americans' interactions with urban and suburban space constitute a local politics. People respond to and use their global economic and geopolitical circumstances in political behavior that may manifest at extremely local scales: in the family, the household, women's organizations, building practices, artistic expression, consumption practices, and neighborhood social actions. The second, following the work of British geographer Timothy Creswell, involves the simple insight that place "provides the unstable stage for performance," where these flows and movements interact. Places, Creswell argues, are always becoming—they get made and remade every day.[17]

Do our authors understand the scale of inquiry necessary to figure out how racialized environments are made, unmade, and remade within their macro environments of industrial or global capitalism? I think they do. Jeff Melnick explicitly connects the "extreme local to the extreme global" when he indicates how several geopolitical and economic currents, such as the influx of new immigrants from the islands that "Caribbeanized" New York shaped the extreme local where "hip hop artists have cultivated meaningful rearticulations of their place in the world."[18] Dianne Harris shows how ideologies of whiteness flow "from a language of political pragmatism and capitalism that disguises the racism" and embedded privilege inscribed into the built environments of U.S. cities. Housing, she argues, is the appropriate scale for the study of these connections because "discriminatory practices radiate from the central question of the location of the residence." Her analysis of houses and gardens focuses on how these built forms serve as material frameworks for the construction and reinforcement of ideas about exclusion, belonging, and identity, demonstrating how the ideological and the national permeate the domestic scale.[19] Wendell Pritchett's case studies of Levittown and Concord Park, PA are illuminating on these issues as well; they show a more complex situation. In both landscapes different combinations of local and national racial beliefs troubled the structure of the housing market, creating disparate nervous landscapes at the scale of the neighborhood.[20]

Perhaps Melnick, more than Harris or Pritchett, shows place—the "PJ's" (housing projects)—as what Cresswell would term the "raw material for the creative production of identity."[21] Examining what people do with what they have is one strategy for thinking about these global to local interconnections.[22] Dianne Harris's suggestion, following Laguerre, that we undertake a critical cartography of social practices is worth experimenting with as well, so long as it allows for the mapping of multi-vocal experiences.[23] Attending to these fluid performances that enforce, disseminate, or contest the global or national in local places enables scholars to perceive nervous landscapes in most of their complexity.

Intersectional Theory

An important perspective for understanding both the large-scale historically constructed systems of power and the small-p politics of individuals, families, households, or neighborhoods is provided by the concept of intersectionality. Intersectionality is a term developed primarily by black feminists. It is a tool for analyzing the ways dimensions of difference—e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, age—can form interlocking inequalities and must, therefore, be simultaneously considered if we are to understand accurately how people shape their environments and negotiate their everyday lives within the contexts of ideological, political, and economic systems of power.[24]

All of our authors consider multiple dimensions of difference in their research. Although Dianne Harris does not directly frame any of her key questions intersectionally, she understands that "race, class, and gender can rarely be treated separately," since class and gender constructions are both “highly racialized.”[25] In evaluating the research conclusions and policy positions of Robert Weaver, Wendell Pritchett observes that although Weaver opposed housing segregation by race, he did not question segregation by class. Indeed, Weaver championed “occupancy standards,” such as minimum housing costs and an agreement not to subdivide houses, as an alternative to racially restrictive covenants.[26] Jeff Melnick has at least three identity markers in play throughout his analysis of artistic production in the PJ’s—race, ethnicity, and age—but one might ask, given the range of music and artists, where gender and sexuality factor into these complex trajectories of artistic expression.

Intersectional theory and method is tricky to apply sometimes, but the scholarship is well developed within women’s and black studies. A good starting point is the work of Harvard’s Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham or the scholarship being generated at the University of Maryland by Bonnie Thornton Dill, Patricia Hill Collins, or Elsa Barkley Brown.[27] Many of us attending this conference, I suspect, might profit from thinking with the concept directly (as Dianne Harris already is), despite its absence from the canonical toolkits of architectural, landscape, or urban history.

Reading More Widely

This brings me to my next perspective. If we are serious about understanding how race, ethnicity, and other dimensions of difference interact with space and the built environment, then we must read more widely--read as if we are in ethnic studies departments. Dianne Harris, clearly an advocate of wider reading, makes a telling observation at the beginning of her paper. She contends that “architectural and landscape history have been white disciplines in which the operations of study—and the questions they leave unasked—have frequently rendered the practices of racism, privilege, and exclusion opaque, or reinforced their invisibility.”[28]

I would like to extend her trenchant critique with two points. The first is that although white mainstream architectural and landscape historians—and the journals that support their work—have not distinguished themselves in producing scholarship that engages race and ethnicity as critical categories of analysis, other scholars have. Just to give one example, African American scholars, many of them based at historically black colleges and universities, have sponsored a substantial and venerable body of research on race and housing or race and urban studies. One could begin by pointing to W.E.B. Dubois’s *The Philadelphia Negro: a Social Survey* and come forward in time, but we needn’t go outside of this session, since Wendell Pritchett featured the research of Robert Weaver, a black intellectual who studied race and the built environment directly in the context of housing at mid-century.[29] As Pritchett’s essay demonstrates, the work of Weaver and other seminal scholars constitutes an indispensable set of primary sources that any historian studying race and the 20th century built environments of African Americans must consult. People have been writing about race and space for years; “we” (read white scholars) just don’t read, cite, or sometimes even know about their research.[30]

My second point is that a talented set of scholars, including many scholars of color, have produced or are producing valuable research on race, ethnicity, and space, but they may not identify themselves as architectural, landscape, or even urban historians. Jeff Melnick is, no doubt, familiar with historian Robin D.G. Kelley's *Yo' Mama's Dysfunktional!*, which begins with a kindred argument about the character of African American youth culture emanating from the projects.[31] His work joins that of a multi-disciplinary range of scholars, many writing from insider perspectives, examining the efforts of poor and racial-ethnic groups and individuals to deconstruct racism and shape space in their own interests on a daily basis.[32] I would importune us to expand our reading, read more interdisciplinarily, teach more interdisciplinarily, and consult the ethnic and cultural studies literatures. There is wonderful, lively, rich scholarship out there, even though much of it will never get picked up in the *Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals*.

Representations versus material manifestations of difference.

One of the ways in which the papers for this session match up well with cutting edge cultural studies scholarship on race and space is in their combined ability to study both representations of race and ethnicity and the ways those markers of difference manifest materially. All three authors offer intriguing case studies of how representations carry powerful messages of racism and white privilege. In an extended analysis of the 1992 film *Candyman*, which is set in Chicago's Cabrini-Green, Jeff Melnick depicts the film's pernicious imagery of public housing as post-apocalyptic terrain "organized around terror and waste." The underlying message, however, is that it is the massive concentration of black people that has made the environment of the projects untenable. Cabrini-Green, as this film would have it, is "too permeated by blackness to provide a comfortable environment for white people."[33]

Wendell Pritchett devotes the first part of his paper to uncovering the spurious racist theories that have linked racial-ethnic households to plummeting residential property values and, subsequently, to both private and public policies toward the built environment.[34] His work intersects nicely with Dianne Harris's effort to demonstrate how whiteness is embedded in an environment that excludes and, in so doing, creates a spatial notion of minority that "implies positioning, relations, hierarchy, mobility, displacement, difference, and segregation."[35] Harris goes on to analyze how media representations of postwar houses and gardens "reinforced norms of middle-majority and white dwelling." The language of the shelter magazine literature and real estate ads depicting how good Americans ought to live coded the legitimacy of white privilege, by offering, in essence, a pedagogy of assimilation, identity formation, and conformity. House and garden in these representations, she argues, appeared "as the material dimension through which race and class identity and difference [were] assumed and played out."[36]

Harris insists that we identify and understand how these representations and the physical contours of domestic space "instantiate white identities and notions of belonging or privilege."[37] Culture, in this sense—in the form of houses and gardens—takes the shape of a concrete historical process and representation is a social act that always operates in someone's interest. "Here the capitalist understanding of reality saturates the common sense and daily activities of all classes," as Richard Ohmann has argued in *Selling*

Culture.[38] Unmasking representation as ideology, then, provides opportunity for political intervention, for rethinking or reform.

Such strongly stated cultural hegemony arguments, however, are best troubled, no matter how persuasive they seem. Both Pritchett and Melnick problematize the representations they analyze by considering the material conditions that exist in integrated neighborhoods or housing projects, aside from their representations. Pritchett, for example, shows scholars and policy-makers contesting the theory that racial segregation was necessary to protect property values. He does so by pointing out the counter-theories promoted at mid-century, empirical research disputing the impact of black occupancy on property values, organizations such as the National Committee Against Discrimination founded to combat these popular representations, and case studies that give the lie to at least key components of the association between racial identity and property values.

Melnick critiques the housing project as hellhole imagery even more aggressively, beginning with the recovery of a more textured social and architectural history of Cabrini-Green. To the popular narrative that blames project failure on African American concentration, he counters that it was exactly the massive concentration of black experiential energy that gave rise to the "major artistic movement of the 20th century" that included doo wop, hiphop, public visual arts, dance, and fashion. This phenomenal burst of cultural creativity cannot be contained as a narrative of triumph over adversity: groups of young people "made this music…*because* they lived together in the projects."[39] In places like the Bronx's Patterson Houses, Chicago's Altgeld Gardens or, more recently, Queensbridge or the Bronx River Houses, the projects were instrumental in helping youths to form the alternative local identities that generated such tremendous artistic activity.

Divorcing representations from the material circumstances they purport to describe, then, and examining both phenomena critically offers a more useful approach to understanding how power and cultural hegemony work in a modern urban setting. Exposing the power embedded in racist and white supremacist ideologies is a valuable scholarly exercise, but so is acknowledging the limits of hegemony. How do we know that actual gardens did the cultural work that their racialized representations directed, and acting upon whom? What are the processes by which a household's ethnic identity got occluded or maintained? Or, as Wendell Pritchett frames the more general question, how do "conceptions of race infuse understandings of home and neighborhood?"[40] What if, as John Archer's recent scholarship has suggested, our metropolitan mosaic consists of planes of opportunity in which residents advance and negotiate their interests and aspirations?[41] A lot is at stake in how we frame our research on representations. If generations of sociologists can render invisible such a profound artistic vernacular emanating from the projects, then how much more carefully and diligently must we work to credit citizens who craft a grassroots political response to oppressive conditions by acting "in the extreme local" to shape space?[42]

Working for social justice

How we ask and how we study these questions have important social justice implications. All of our authors delineate those stakes in their papers. Dianne Harris answers the question of why study space to understand racism by noting that "the primary terms of racism—segregation, seclusion, marginalization, incarceration—are all spatial phenomena." One must "understand the way power operates in and through spaces of the built environment if that power is to be reapportioned or dismantled."[43] Joining Harris in researching toward a more just society is Wendell Pritchett. Both emphasize one of the premises of critical race studies—that systems of domination that work against minorities are invisible.[44] Pritchett's scholarship makes the property value assumption visible, and uncovers how this particular racial belief has influenced the structure of the housing market, racial segregation practices, and consumers' basic conceptions about what a suburban house should be.[45] Just as important, he restores to history the mid-century efforts of scholars, policy makers, and developers to discredit any association between racial minorities and plummeting property values, suggesting, then and now, some means for establishing more equitable spatial theories and practices.

By re-orienting scholarship about housing projects toward the spectacular indigenous cultural productivity centered there, Jeff Melnick undercuts a longstanding narrative of scholarly distortion that has reduced these urban landscapes to depictions of the most debased social pathology.[46] Situating the culture of public housing at the center of American popular music restores some measure of agency and human dignity to the racial-ethnic populations that live there as they rearticulate the built environment and their place in it.[47] In addition, Melnick models an approach to studying race and the built environment akin to what American Studies scholar George Lipsitz has called "listening to learn and learning to listen."[48] To understand the positive culture of this urban landscape, Melnick argues, one must "listen to the human voices."[49] This insistence on respecting and understanding the ways that marginalized or denigrated groups experience place and construct knowledge constitutes one of the four "tools for social justice" that sociologist Bonnie Thornton Dill recently set out in her call for university scholars to direct their research toward creating a more just and inclusive society. The other three are social critique, representation and inclusion of difference, and embracing different styles and forms of communication.[50] These tools are on abundant display in the scholarship presented in this session and provide an exciting standpoint from which we might work toward regenerating scholarship on race and the built environment.

---

[1] I would like to acknowledge warmly a wonderful dinner conversation with Michelle Scott, Dept. of History, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and Angel David Nieves, Program in Historic Preservation, University of Maryland, which helped me think through the ideas in this paper.

[2] Dianne Harris, "Little White Houses: Critical Race Theory and the Interpretation of Ordinary Dwellings in the United States, 1945-1960," (paper presented at the conference "Reconceptualizing the History of the Built Environment in North America," Charles Warren Center, Cambridge, MA, April 2005), 1.

[3] Lizabeth Cohen, Margaret Crawford, and Arthur Patton-Hock to Mary Corbin Sies, 17 August 2004.

[4] Michael Eric Dyson, quoted in S.I. Dobrin, "Race and the Public Intellectual: A Conversation with Michael Eric Dyson," *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 17, no. 2 (1977), 170-171, cited in Harris, 5.

---

[5] Wendell E. Pritchett, “From Theory to Practice: Race, Property Values and Suburban America in the Post-War Years,” ,” (paper presented at the conference “Reconceptualizing the History of the Built Environment in North America,” Charles Warren Center, Cambridge, MA, April 2005), 23.

[6] Harris, 7.

[7] Harris, 2, 6, 11, 12. See David Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991) and Michel Laguerre, *Minoritized Space: An Inquiry into the Spatial Order of Things* (Berkeley: Institute for Governmental Studies Press and the Institute of Urban and Regional Development, 1999), both cited in Harris.

[8] Harris, 6, 12.

[9] Pritchett, 22, 2-3. Richard Ford, “The Boundaries of Race: Political Geography in Legal Analysis,” *Harvard Law Review* 107 (June 1994), 1845, cited in Pritchett, 23.

[10] Pritchett, 5-7.

[11] Jeff Melnick, “Project Culture: The Popular Arts of Public Housing,” (paper presented at the conference “Reconceptualizing the History of the Built Environment in North America,” Charles Warren Center, Cambridge, MA, April 2005), 3. See Leonie Sandercock, “Framing Insurgent Historiographies for Planning,” in *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, ed. Leonie Sandercock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998): 1-33.

[12] Harris, 2.

[13] See, for example, Jacqueline L. Tobin and Raymond G. Dobard, *Hidden in Plain View: A Secret Story of Quilts and the Underground Railroad* (New York: Anchorbooks, 1999) and Robin D. G. Kelley, “’We Are Not What We Seem’: Rethinking Black Working Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South,” *Journal of American History* 80, no. 1 (1993): 75-112.

[14] Mary Corbin Sies, “North American Suburbs, 1880-1950: Cultural and Social Reconsiderations,” *Journal of Urban History* 27, no. 3 (March 2001): 313-346.

[15] Denis Byrne, “Nervous Landscapes: Race and space in Australia,” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3, no. 2 (2003): 169-193; quotation from 170.

[16] George Lipsitz, “Listening to Learn and Learning to Listen: Popular Culture, Cultural Theory, and American Studies,” *American Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (Dec. 1990): 615-636.

[17] Tim Creswell, “Introduction: Theorizing Place,” in *Mobilizing Place, Placing Mobility: The Politics of Representation in a Globalized World*, ed. Ginette Verstraete and Tim Cresswell (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), 11-31, quotation from 25.

[18] Melnick, 28-31, quotations from 28, 30, 17. The phrase “extreme local” was coined by Murray Forman, *The ‘Hood Comes First: Race, Space, and Place in Rap and Hip-Hop*. (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2002), 206, cited in Melnick, 17.

[19] Harris, 3, 6, 2.

[20] Pritchett, 12-19.

[21] Cresswell, 25.

[22] The phrase is de Certeau’s; see Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

[23] Laguerre, 5, quoted in Harris, 7.

[24] See Dill Bonnie Thornton Dill and Saundra Murray Nettles, “What do we mean by Intersections?” *Connections* (2001); www.crge.umd.edu (accessed 7.1.05); Lynn Weber, *Understanding Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality: A Conceptual Framework* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001).

[25] Harris, 9.

[26] Pritchett, 7-8.

[27] Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, “African American Women’s History and the Metalanguage of Race,” *Signs* 17 (1992): 251-274; Bonnie Thornton Dill and Maxine Baca Zinn, “Theorizing Difference From Multiracial Feminism,” in *Through the Prism of Difference: Readings on Race and Gender*, ed. Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, Michael A. Messner, and Maxine Baca Zinn (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1997), 23-29; Patricia Hill Collins, *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998); Elsa Barkley Brown, "Negotiating and Transforming the Public Sphere: African American Political Life in the Transition from Slavery to Freedom," *Public Culture* 7 (1994): 107-146.

[28] Harris, 5.

[29] Pritchett, 6-10; W. E. B. Dubois, *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Survey* (Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson Organization Ltd., 1973).

---

[30] Dianne Harris has compiled a bibliography on “Race and Space,” in *Towards a Bibliography of Critical Whiteness Studies*, ed. Tim Engle (Urbana, IL: Center on Democracy in a Multiracial Society, 2004).

[31] Robin D. G. Kelley, *Yo’ Mama’s Disfunktional!: Fighting the Culture Wars in Urban America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997).

[32] See, for example, Stephen Gregory, *Black Corona: Race and the Politics of Place in an Urban Community* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); Clyde Woods, *Development Arrested: The Blues and Plantation Power in the Mississippi Delta* (New York: Verso, 1998); Elsa Barkley Brown and Gregg Kimball, “Mapping the Terrain of Black Richmond,” *Journal of Urban History* 21, no. 3 (Mar. 1995): 296-346; Andrew Wiese, *Places of Their Own: African American Suburbanization in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Joanne M. Braxton, “Symbolic Geographies and Psychic Landscapes: Decoding the Hegemonic Discourse of Urban Renewal in the Case for Billy Weems v. the City of College Park, Maryland,” in *Keep Your Head to the Sky*, ed. Grey Gundaker (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998), 177-192; Angel David Nieves, “’We Gave Our Hearts and Lives To It’: African American Women Reformers, Industrial Education, and the Monuments of Nation Building in the Post-Reconstruction South, 1877-1938,” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 2002); M. Jeff Hardwick, “Homesteads and Bungalows: African American Architecture in Langston, Oklahoma,” in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture: Shaping Communities* VI, eds., Carter L. Hudgins and Elizabeth Collins Cromley (Knoxville, TN: University of Texas Press, 1997), 21-32; Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995); Gail Lee Dubrow with Donna Graves, *Sento at Sixth and Main: Preserving Landmarks of Japanese American Heritage* (Seattle: Seattle Arts Commission, 2002); Lynn Horiuchi, “Dislocations and Relocations: The Built Environments of Japanese American Internment,” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2005); Karla Slocum, "Discourses and Counter Discourses on Globalization and the St. Lucian Banana Industry," in *Banana Wars: Power, Production, and History*, eds. Steve Striffler and Mark Moberg (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003), pp.306-357; Michelle Scott, "The Realm of a Blues Empress: Blues Culture and Bessie Smith in Black Chattanooga, Tennessee, 1880-1923" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 2002); Farah Jasmine Griffin, *‘Who Set You Flowin?: The African American Migration Narrative* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[33] Melnick, 6, 12, 7.

[34] Pritchett, 2-4.

[35] Laguerre, 8, cited in Harris, 6.

[36] Harris, 15, 12-14, 14.

[37] Harris, 15.

[38] Richard Ohmann, *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Verso, 1996), 45.

[39] Melnick, 3, 13-14, 16.

[40] Pritchett, 23.

[41] John Archer, *Architecture and Suburbia: From English Villa to American Dream House, 1690-2000* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 357.

[42] Melnick, 28.

[43] Harris, 6.

[44] Harris, 6, 2; Pritchett, 22-23.

[45] Pritchett, 21.

[46] Melnick, 3-5. See also, Kelley, *Yo’ Mama’s Disfunktional*, chapter 1.

[47] Melnick, 17.

[48] Lipsitz, “Listening to Learn.”

[49] Melnick, 19.

[50] Bonnie Thornton Dill, “Creating the Democratic University: Bridging the Gap Between Communities,” www.crge.umd.edu/research/randsdaykeynote.htm, (accessed 7.1.2005), pp. 4-5.