Chapter One

Race, Culture, and the City: An Introduction

Introduction: Pedagogy and Urban Space

Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy of Place for Black Urban Struggle argues for the necessity of developing a pedagogy of black urban resistance, which I define in relation to a "pedagogy of place." Though the relationship of "place" to pedagogy has largely been ignored in the study of education, the limited work that has been done has been greatly influenced by the spatial concepts of contemporary critical social theory including critical postmodernism, post-colonialism, feminist cultural studies, and black cultural studies. In Postmodern Geographies Edward W. Soja points out that geography plays a role in the making of history. He states: "A distinctively postmodern and critical human geography is taking shape, brashly reasserting the interpretive significance of space in the historically privileged confines of contemporary critical thought" (1990:11). Michael
Keith and Steve Pile in *Place and the Politics of Identity* similarly argue that critical social theory has drawn on “spatial metaphors,” such as position, location, situation, mapping, geometrics of domination, centre-margin, open-closed, inside-outside, global-local; liminal space, third space, not-space, impossible space; the city” (1994:1). Both Soja and Keith and Pile assert that space has both a material and an interpretive quality, which Soja describes as “actually lived and socially created spatiality, concrete and abstract at the same time, the habitus of social practices” (1990:18).

This spatialization of contemporary critical social theory has influenced the way critical pedagogists think about pedagogy. However, I would qualify this by saying that Paulo Freire’s earlier work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* predates this influence. Freire is aware that all pedagogies are situated in place, in the spatially configured lived and interpretive experiences of the learner. In talking about a pedagogy that addresses the particular situation of the oppressed Freire writes:

> Men [and women], as beings “in a situation,” find themselves rooted in temporal-spatial conditions which mark them and which they also mark. They will tend to reflect on their own “situationality” to the extent that they are challenged by it to act upon it. Men and [women] are because they are in a situation. And they will be more the more they not only critically reflect upon their existence but critically act upon it. (1970:100)

This aspect of Freire has been taken up and expanded on by Henry Giroux (1992; 1993; 1994), Peter McLaren (1993a; 1993b; 1993c; 1993d; 1994), and other critical pedagogists who argue that for the marginalized and oppressed to critically reflect and act upon their existence pedagogy must be informed by a “politics of location.” When pedagogy is defined in relation to “locationality” “at question is the issue of who speaks, under what conditions, for whom, and how knowledge is constructed and translated within and
between different communities located within asymmetrical relations of power” (Giroux, 1992:2).

Although Freire and other critical pedagogists do not specifically focus on the city, their insights into how a “politics of location” or a “politics of place” can inform pedagogy is important for understanding the link between pedagogy and the production of urban meaning. Race, Culture, and the City asserts that pedagogy must be linked to how individuals and collectivities make and take up culture in the production of public spaces in the city, with particular emphasis on how they use and assign meaning to public spaces within unequal relations of power in an effort to “make place.” A critical pedagogy of urban place and struggle therefore must take up how the manufacturing of urban meanings structures our perceptions about different living spaces and the political and ethical consequences of those meanings on both the spaces and the people that live in them.

The Social Construction of the City

The basic premise of Race, Culture, and City is that cultural images and historical images have as much influence on the spatial form of the city as do economics (Castells, 1979; Saunder, 1981; Langer, 1986). Manuel Castells states: “Because society is structured around conflicting positions which define alternative values and interests, so the production of space and cities will be, too” (1983:xvi). Similarly, Folch-Serra points out that “human agents wield agency through language [and that] this agency creates landscapes through metaphors...whose outcome is the building of roads, towns, and cultures. Landscapes can be regarded as places where social, historical, and geographical conditions allow different voices to express themselves” (1990:255). Cityscapes are therefore constitutive of many different voices and living spaces that have relations between them. Foucault calls these heterogeneous and rela-
tional spaces “heterotopias,” denoting that they are capable of being “juxtaposed to one another, set off against one another as a sort of configuration” [Soja, 1990:19-20]. His concept of a heterotopia is useful for understanding how some spaces get portrayed as “normal” and “ordered” at the expense of constructing others as “abnormal” and “disordered” [Soja, 1990:17].

In the context of American cities the category of “race” is used metaphorically as a way to juxtapose the different “social spaces” that make up the urban landscape, describing some as “normal” and “ordered” and others as not. Malcolm Cross and Michael Keith remark that “[r]ace is a privileged metaphor through which the confused text of the city is rendered comprehensible” (1993:9). They argue that “our way of seeing cities and thinking about cities this sense of urbanism is deeply racialized (1993:9). It is in this “racialized urbanism” that blackness is the urban Other, the disordered and the dangerous. This portrayal of blackness in urban mythology is central to the social construction of the city as a representation of the id and the superego, a “juxtaposition of primitive urge and civilizing consciousness” [Wilson cited in Cross and Keith, 1993:9]. In this urban mythology black and white represent the id and superego respectively. It has been this urban mythology that has identified blacks with disorder and danger in the city. Gerald Suttles accepts this mythology while arguing that it provides the city with “cognitive maps” to “regulate spatial movement and locational possibilities” (1972:23). Suttles believes that “cognitive maps” are necessary for white “ethnic” neighborhoods to defend themselves from their enemies—the urban Other. Their enemies, in Suttles’ words, are “people who fall short of existing standards that attest to their trustworthiness and self-restraint. Typically, these are poor people from a low-status minority group” (1968:5). It is from this vantage point that Suttles defines what he means by cognitive maps:

Cognitive maps provide a set of social categories for differentiating between those people with whom one
can or cannot safely associate and for defining the concrete groupings within which certain levels of social contact and cohesion obtain. These cognitive maps, then, are a creative imposition on the city and useful because they provide a final solution to decision making where there are often no other clear cutoff points for determining how far social contacts should go. [1972:22]

The white supremacist thinking and attitudes that undergird urban mythologies about blacks have resulted in their spatial regulation and control in cities. Put another way, contemporary urban forms are the spatial expression of racialized values or what some have referred to as the “urban realization of the ideology of apartheid” [Cross and Keith, 1993:11]. Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton in American Apartheid argue that the continued high levels of residential segregation experienced by blacks in American cities is an example of this ideology actualized in urban form. Racial prejudice and discriminatory real estate practices designed to insulate whites from blacks have been the cause of black residential segregation (Massey and Denton, 1993). Their study shows that post-world-war racial prejudice and discrimination in the housing market by whites established today’s persistent patterns of black residential segregation. The principle of racial exclusion was practiced through restrictive covenants and deeds employed by neighborhood “improvement” associations and social pressure applied to realtors, property owners, and public officials [Massey and Denton, 1993:58].

Massey and Denton add that until 1950 federally sponsored mortgage programs also reinforced racial exclusion in that FHA and VA mortgages went to white middle-class suburbs, while very few were awarded to black neighborhoods in the inner city. The rationale given for this practice was that increased black population would drive down property values therefore increasing the risk involved in backing the loans. Furthermore, Massey and Denton argued
that the FHA "recommended the use and application of racially restrictive covenants as a means of ensuring the security of neighborhoods and did not change this recommendation until 1950" (1993:54). Subsequently, the racially discriminatory practices of federally sponsored mortgage programs resulted in high levels of black residential segregation, as well as encouraged private lending institutions to not make loans to black inner-city neighborhoods. The consequence of disinvestment in black central-city neighborhoods at the expense of middle-class white suburbs were "steep declines in property values and a pattern of disrepair, deterioration, vacancy, and abandonment" (Massey and Denton, 1993:55).

Fearful that this decline would spill over into adjacent white communities, harming white business districts and elite institutions, local white urban elites during the 1950s and 1960s through downtown redevelopment "manipulated housing and urban renewal legislation to carry out widespread slum clearance (Massey and Denton, 1993:55-56). Slum clearance as defined and practiced by the local white urban elites meant the tearing down of black neighborhoods adjacent to white areas and converting them to other uses, the intended goal being to block the expansion of the "ghetto." According to Massey and Denton, those displaced because of urban renewal were either permanently dislocated into other crowded "ghetto neighborhoods" or relocated to high-density tower public housing projects, built for the specific purpose of warehousing poor blacks:

By 1970, after two decades of urban renewal, public housing projects in most large cities had become black reservations, highly segregated from the rest of society and characterized by extreme social isolation. The replacement of low-density slums with high-density towers of poor families also reduced the class diversity of the ghetto and brought about a geographic concentration of poverty that was previously unimaginable. This new segregation of blacks—in
economic as well as social terms—was the direct result of an unprecedented collaboration between local and national government. (1994:57)

What Massey and Denton’s comment suggests is that black urban poverty is the outcome of black residential segregation and is therefore responsible for the emergence of the “urban underclass.” However, they mistakenly point to how the residential segregation of blacks has resulted in their marginalization and isolation from white mainstream culture and values and that this has contributed to the lack of “black socioeconomic advancement and income growth” (1993:163). They point to how “the depth of isolation in the ghetto is evident in black speech patterns” and say that because of this “ghetto residents have come to speak a language that is increasingly remote from that spoken by American whites” (1993:162).

The persistence of “black speech patterns” because of the sociocultural isolation imposed on blacks by residential segregation is believed by Massey and Denton to be the reason for low educational achievement and the lack of employment opportunities. Also mentioned is that “black speech patterns” reflect the supposed values that underlie forms of black cultural identity that arise from residential segregation and that these values are “defined in opposition to the basic ideals and values of American society” (1993:167). It is argued that “black identity” and “black street culture” are at variance with mainstream white cultural values such as self-reliance, hard work, sobriety, and sacrifice and that this has led to the “legitimat[ing] of certain behaviors prevalent with the black community that would otherwise be held in contempt by white society” (1993:167). Referring to “black street culture,” Massey and Denton argue that black residential segregation has resulted in an “autonomous cultural system” (1993:172). They claim that it is a cultural system that devalues work, marriage, and family formation but promotes male joblessness, teenage motherhood, single parenthood, alcoholism, drug
abuse, crime, violence, and school failure (1993:162-78). According Massey and Denton, it is "black street culture" perpetuated by black residential segregation that has produced America's huge black "urban underclass." Their solution is a dismantling of the "ghetto" (1993:236).

What is interesting, Massey and Denton do not consider geographical areas concentrated with whites as "racially" hypersegregated. Seldom do they identify the so-called broader society or white society or American society in terms of a "racially" defined geographical space, and when they do it is rarely mentioned as "white residential segregation." In addition, they unquestioningly attribute differences between black and white "ghettos" (I use the term ghetto to denote white middle-class neighborhoods as well since they are segregated), between the value placed on self-reliance, hard work, sobriety, and sacrifice, and the belief that these principles will bring monetary reward and economic advancement, to race and culture rather than to mainstream white privilege and domination. Massey and Denton, through their ideological construction of residential segregation, racialize the residential spaces of blacks but not whites. What they have done is to transpose racial identity, or stereotypical black images of disruptive behavior, attitudes, and values, on to residential location. Susan Smith defines this maneuver by whites as the "racialization of residential space" through the imagery of racial segregation:

When referring to the racialization of residential space, I mean the process by which residential location is taken as an index of the attitudes, values, behavioral inclinations and social norms of the kinds of people who are assumed to live in particular "black" or "white," inner city or suburban, neighborhoods. Once the "black inner city" is isolated in this way, the image of racial segregation is mustered as spurious evidence of the supposedly natural origins of social ["racial"] differentiation. (1993:133)
It is the imagery of racial segregation, the transposing of white supremacist representations of black identity on to residential space, that has reinforced the notion that the problems experienced by black people are sharply bounded in space (Smith, 1993:134). Smith states, "The social construction of racial segregation portrays urban deprivation as a moral problem, deflecting attention away from the power structures creating and sustaining the inequalities dividing black and white [Americans]" (1993:136). The bounding of the problems experienced by blacks in space, Smith observes, means that the political and economic contradictions of black subjugation and white domination and privilege get defined as technical and administrative problems, as policy recommendations that support racial desegregation and the dismantling of black urban settlements.

*The Social Construction of Black Urban Struggle*

The inner city communities combat the segregated space of ethnic fragmentation, cultural strangeness, and economic overexploitation of the new post-industrial city with the defense of their identity, the preservation of their culture, the search for their roots, and the marking out of their newly acquired territory. Sometimes, also, they display their rage, and attempt to devastate the institutions that they believe devastate their daily lives. (Castells, 1983:317)

With Castells’ comment in mind, one way to begin to understand the social construction of black urban struggles is by looking at how black urban communities resist white supremacists’ urban meanings and urban forms by constructing alternative images and representations of place. By doing so, urban blacks construct self-definitions; their making of place is tied to the construction of their identity as blacks. Related to this is the assumption that for poor
and working-class black urban communities the making of place has been significant in forging a politics of struggle or resistance. Referring to the black urban revolts of the 1960s, Manuel Castells in *The City and the Grassroots* notes that “the ghetto territory became a significant space for the black community as the material basis of social organization, cultural identity and political power” (1983:49-54). Castells argues that the relationship between black geographical concentration and the urban revolts was “analogous with the concentration of industrial workers in large factories being indispensable to the formation of the labor movement” (1983:54). In agreement with Castells, Cynthia Hamilton argues that the massive black migration from the rural South to southern and northern cities, consequently resulting in the geographical concentration of blacks, not only was the basis for strong black urban communities that evolved and flourished through the world wars, it may have been the spark for the civil rights movement:

Many say this new demographic arrangement may have been a spark for the civil rights movement. It is clear that the spatial configuration of that period was an asset to political organizing and protest. Greater concentration of the population strengthened community bonds and institutions and even provided the basis for electoral strength after the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (1991:29)

It is within this context that place making is tied to the idea that places are significant because we assign meaning to them in relation to our specific projects. I will argue that this concept is linked with self-definition or identity formation. However, I might add that projects are shaped by experiences in everyday life, so that within black urban communities place making and therefore the production of public spaces is linked with day-to-day survival. But it is within the realm of day-to-day life, of daily survival, that black urban communities create “public spaces” that allow
them to develop self-definitions or identities that are linked to a consciousness and politics of resistance. A. Sivanandanan in *Communities of Resistance: Writings on Black Struggles for Socialism* suggests this relationship among daily survival, consciousness, and black urban resistance when he writes,

> By their very location, the underclass are the most difficult to organize in the old sense of organization. They do not submit to the type of trade union regiments which operates for the straight "official" workforce. . . . They come together over everyday cases of hardship to help each other's families, setting up informal community centres. . . . Relegated to a concrete ghetto and deprived of basic amenities and services, jobless for the most part and left open to crime, the inhabitants came together to create a life for themselves. They set up a nursery, provided meals and a meeting place for pensioners, established a recreation centre for youth and build up in the process, a political culture [of resistance]. These are not great big things they do, but they are the sort of organic communities of resistance that, in a sense, were prefigured in the black struggles of the 1960s and 1970s and the insurrections of 1981 and 1985. (1990:52)

Although Sivanandanan's comments mainly address contemporary black urban struggles in Britain, he provides insight into black urban struggles in the United States, particularly as they relate to the particular form of political organizing by poor and working-class black urban communities. Of significance is the way in which the political organizing of these communities is linked to developing day-to-day strategies and networks of survival and self-reliance. Though Carol Stack in *All of Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community* does not focus like Sivanandanan on how strategies and networks of self-reliance become the basis for political organizing, she does draw
attention to how these strategies and networks are the basis for daily survival for black urban communities in the United States. In addition, she argues that unlike the mainstream white free-market values of individualism, competitiveness, and materialism, the value system that undergirds the survival networks of poor and working-class black urban communities is based on what she calls an “ethic of cooperation.” Stack observes, “They share with one another because of the urgency of their needs. Alliances between individuals are created around the clock as kin and friends exchange and give and oblige one another” (1974:32). The point is that through networks and strategies of survival black urban communities develop bonds of trust, friendship, and solidarity.

However, Stack’s discussion assumes that “black solidarity” is based on some utilitarian logic, which presumes that relationships between blacks are entered into on the basis of economic self-interest. If this is the case, if survival strategies and networks are simply guided by a utilitarian logic, why do blacks choose to participate in these networks with blacks and not with whites. The question then is to what extent does black culture play a role in the formation of black solidarity? As St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton remind us in their classic Black Metropolis, unlike the “gilded sections of the black neighborhood in Chicago, lower-class sections “had a warm and familiar ghetto subculture that flourished through ribs, shrimp, chicken, juke box, soul and swagger.” What Drake and Cayton’s observations tell us is that the bonds of trust, friendship, and solidarity that are constitutive of black survival networks are shaped by black culture. This means that to understand black solidarity we must analyze the category of black culture.

One way to analyze black culture is to interpret it as a social movement; this makes more explicit the intersection between culture, political action, and organization. The term social movement is distinguished from those social and political collectivities that are based on the political
economy of the workplace, such as the labor movement. Put another way, social movements "are located outside the immediate process of production, and consequently require the reappropriation of space, time and of relationships between individuals in their day to day lives" (Gilroy, 1992:224). It is outside the workplace, the capital-labor contradiction, that social movements transform economic and extra-economic modes of subordination (Gilroy, 1992). For example, in post-industrial Capitalist society urban blacks constitute a surplus population, an expendable population that is no longer useful to Capitalist economic production. Mass urban black unemployment and underemployment, due to white racism and the automation and cybernation of the workplace, suggests that the "factory" is not the major site from which urban blacks develop black consciousness and solidarity. The black power movement of the 1970s recognized this by suggesting that the geographical space of the city was essential for the emergence of "black power consciousness" (Allen, 1967; Boggs, 1970; Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967; Bush, 1984; Marable, 1991).

It is in the "spaces of the ghetto" then that black consciousness and solidarity are mostly formed. Alberto Melucci argues that one of the characteristics of contemporary social movements is their alternative public spaces, which he describes as "submerged networks." According to Melucci, these networks are where actors of social movements invest "in the experimentation and practice of new cultural models, forms of relationships and alternative perceptions of the world" (1989:60). In this way, the organizational form of a social movement is itself the message, a symbolic challenge to the dominant codes" (Melucci, 1989:60). This means, then, that the organizational forms of social movements are in Melucci's words "self-referential"; they "are not just instrumental for their goals, they are a goal in themselves" (1989:60). In a sense, black settlement space is the location from which urban blacks construct alternative experiences of time, space, and interpersonal relationships or community, an alternative culture
to that of white supremacist Capitalist patriarchy.

I do not wish to imply that black settlement spaces or "black ghettos" are self-contained and therefore isolated from the processes of post-industrial capitalism. Instead, my argument is that the particular "mode of production" of post-industrial capitalism has had much influence on the production of black culture within the spaces of the inner city. This is because one of the distinguishing features of post-industrial Capitalist society is the dominance of electronic-information technologies; in other words, "information has become the core resource" (Melucci, 1989:185). Acknowledging this, Melucci presents the implication of this for human consciousness and subjectivity in what he calls "complex societies":

Our access to reality is facilitated and shaped by the conscious production and control of information. "Forms" or images produced through perception and cognition increasingly organize our relationship to the material and communicative environment in which we live. The transformation of natural resources into commodities has come to depend on the production and control of these cognitive and communicative "forms." Power based upon material production is therefore no longer central. (1989:185)

In Chapter 2 of *Race, Culture, and the City*, I will elaborate on the consequences of this for contemporary black consciousness and subjectivity. In post-industrial capitalism the "mode of production," cultural/symbolic production, has become more dominant within the economic/material productive sphere. Alain Tourine points out that this has resulted "in the production of symbolic goods that modify values, needs, representations, more so than "the production of material goods or even of services" (1988:104). Industrial society, Tourine observes, "had transformed the means of production; post-industrial society changes the ends of production, that is culture" (1988:104). These
changes have meant that the terrain for constructing political action is now qualitatively different than the era of industrial capitalism. That is to say, political action has moved from the instrumental objectives of corporatist class politics, the winning of political power, toward "control of a field of autonomy or independence vis à vis the system and the immediate satisfaction of collective desires" (Gilroy, 1987:226). The models of management, production, organization, distribution, and consumption of state bureaucracies and capitalist corporations, models that control and regulate "areas of self-definition, emotional relationships, sexuality and biological needs" (Melucci, 1989:46), are challenged by the identity politics of social movements. Therefore, in post-industrial Capitalist society the focus of social movements is on social identity. Melucci further elaborates this point by suggesting that the identity politics of social movements are focused on mobilizing and controlling their own action:

There are aspects of the action through which actors signal and expose problems that concern the means of production and distribution of resources of meaning. The actors mobilize to regain control of their own action. They try to reclaim the right to define themselves against the criteria of identification determined by an anonymous power and system of regulation that penetrates the area of "internal nature." (1989:189)

This category of social movement, although inseparable, is analytically distinguishable from collective mobilization. More specifically, mobilizations such as strikes, civil disobedience, marches, and rebellions are visible events or outcomes of action, and to focus simply at the level of mobilization is to ignore how action is itself produced. As briefly mentioned above, social movements are principally organized around the production of meaning, desire, affect, corporeality, and identity. Related to this point is that "the black social movement was the first to expand the concerns
of politics to the social, to the terrain of everyday life" [Omi and Winant, 1987]. Others have made a similar point by arguing that "the politics of identity can learn much from a closer engagement with the experiences of racialized minorities" (Cross and Keith 1993:22). Malcolm Cross and Michael Keith have noted, "The recently discovered post-modern condition of marginality and fragmentation, positively signified, has been lived and worked through for the last 40 years, and more by racialized minorities in post-metropolitan economies" (1993:22). And in terms of cultural theory, they argue that Frantz Fanon's psychoanalytic work was a key reference point for British and American blacks in addressing "the inextricable interplay of social context of oppression and resistance in the internalization of complex identities in the formation of self [Cross and Keith, 1993:23].

Another concern of Chapter 2 is the impact of a consumer-oriented capitalism on black identity politics. This is of particular concern in that consumer capitalism is informed by mainstream white culture's exotic interest in black culture. The commodification of black culture, in a society dominated by the white racist imagination, has transformed it from an outwardly oriented culture of joy—that fosters kindness, love, caring, service, solidarity, and the struggle for justice—to an inwardly oriented culture of pleasure that promotes the market values of individualism, materialism, and competitiveness [Dent, 1992:1]. One of the questions addressed in Chapter 2 is related to the effects of consumer-oriented capitalism on black self-definition since it is informed by white supremacist culture. Second, how have the effects of internalized racism, the result of the dominance of white supremacist ideology, combined with a consumer-oriented Capitalist value system of competitiveness, materialism, and individualism affected black solidarity in the city?

Johnathan Kozol in Savage Inequalities argues that there is a correspondence between the rise of black inner-city crime and the intentional aggressive promotion through
advertisement of “black” consumerism by U.S. corporations. Kozol states: “The manufacturing of desire for commodities that children of low income can’t afford pushes them to underground economies and crime to find the money to appease the longings we have often fostered” (1991:191). Others show how the white supremacist ideology that signifies consumer culture, that makes blackness and black culture a metaphor for pleasure and desire, is damaging to the black psyche and encourages destructive forms of behavior, such as black-on-black violence and covert suicide through drugs (hooks and West, 1991; hooks, 1993; Marable, 1992a; West, 1991b, Kozol, 1992; Nightingale, 1994). These questions and issues are of import given Mclucci’s insights regarding the relationship of culture to the production of action in post-industrial Capitalist society. He states that

in the current period, society’s capacity to intervene in the production of meaning extends to those areas which previously escaped control and regulation: areas of self-definition, emotional relationships, sexuality and biological needs. In contemporary society we find an emerging awareness of the capacity to act upon action itself—to intervene in our motivational and biological structures. The social potential for action becomes itself the object of action (1989:33).

In addition to addressing the destructiveness of mainstream white consumer culture on black culture and black identity, Chapter 2 will also examine the contradictory way in which black cultural workers have resisted white racist images and representations of the “black body” by taking up what Peter McLaren calls a “politics of the flesh.” As Paul Gilroy states: “Blacks who live in the castle of their skin and have struggled to escape the biologization of their socially and politically constructed subordination are already sensitive to this issue. The attempt to articulate blackness as an historical rather than as a natural category confronts it directly” (1992:226). Black cultural workers
have confronted this biologization directly or have reappropriated it to fashion a culture of resistance (for example, Afrocentrism). Consequently, reinforcing white supremacy and black self-contempt—in the form of black male misogyny or black middle-class hatred of lower-class blacks—will be discussed.

Chapter 3 of Race, Culture, and the City examines how the consumer culture of the white middle-class produces a spatial arrangement in cities that transforms the public spaces of “black ghetto” described by bell hooks as “homes” into private spaces or “pleasure spaces” for white middle-class consumption. As Neil Smith has suggested, “We are witnessing the construction of an urban rather than a suburban dream” (1987:152). In post-industrial Capitalist society, the dominance of electronic information technologies has made the cultural and symbolic a core resource in the production of consumer goods. However, this has been accompanied by disindustrialization, the making of an expendable surplus population, a new spatial reconfiguration of the city. Comparing south central Los Angeles to the “bantustans” in South Africa, Cynthia Hamilton in “Apartheid in an American City” clearly describes how the “urban dream” of the post-industrial Capitalist city is removing the material or territorial basis of the black and Latino public sphere:

Much like the bulldozing of black encampments on the fringe of Johannesburg or Durban, it can be argued, South Central, Los Angles is inevitably slated by the historical process to be replaced without a trace: cleared land ready for development for a more prosperous—and probably whiter—class of people. For the large, unspoken malady affecting South Central stems from the idea that the land is valuable and the present tenants are not. This “bantustan,” like its counterparts in South Africa, serves now only as a holding space for blacks and browns no longer of use to the larger economy.
Kristin Kiptiuch refers to the process Hamilton describes in south central Los Angeles as “third worldizing at home.” This concept metaphor she argues “names the effect of a process of exploitative incorporation and hegemonic domination—and its fierce contestation by subjugated peoples” (1991:88). The “third world,” Kiptiuch believes, “can no longer be geographically mapped off as a space separate from a seigneurial “first world.” Describing the nation’s major urban centers, she writes, “The shift towards desperation is apparent in the growing disparities between the dominant white population and the ‘minority’ population of the inner cities, and in growing similarities between the latter and people in countries conventionally associated with the ‘third world’” [1991:89].

If within black inner-city communities networks of survival and self-relience produce public spaces, the converting of those spaces into private spaces of middle class consumption interrupts their continuation. Alexander Kluge (1991) refers to public spaces that are appropriated for private use as “pseudo-public spaces,” those spaces that are privately owned and determined by the private motive, making them bourgeois public spaces. He argues that the bourgeois public space represses debate, because it draws a false demarcation between the private and the public. This means that profit making is protected from public accountability because it is believed to be within the private domain, even though “it depends on conditions that are publicly provided.” The conclusion is that the “bourgeois public space developed as a way for private interest to control “public activity.” One major implication being that the private use of black public spaces represents an attempt to control the political dialogue about how the ghetto territory should be used and defined.

In Chapter 3, I will explore how this political dialogue about the use of public space in terms of privatization is framed in ways that glorify Capitalist free market-ideology, and its belief that wealth is the result of individual hard work, and poverty is the result of laziness. Within a racial-
ized society such as the United States, the subtext of this glorification is based on white supremacist assumptions about black people. This means that with regard to the logic of white supremacy black people are not materially better off than whites because their “black” bodies are assumed to lack self-regulation, self-discipline. Black culture is believed to be responsible for this behavior. Frantz Fanon called this form of racism “cultural racism” and said that it is a strategic maneuver by whites to fix black culture to their nature, to the bodies of blacks.

The implication of naturalizing or essentializing black culture is that black public spaces are seen as pathological and in need of control (Goldberg, 1994). In the context of Capitalist free-market ideology black “pathologies” are seen as the reason for black public spaces not being wealth generating, but wasteful and dependent upon public welfare. Within a white supremacist culture, such as in the United States, the concepts ‘private’ and ‘public’ now act as racialized metaphors; the private is equated with being “good” and “white,” and the public with being “bad” and “black.” Therefore, the rationale used to convert black public spaces into private spaces of middle-class consumption is based in part on this view. Nonetheless, the relation of free-market ideology to the cultural politics of race and racism, particularly as it relates to the privatizing of black public spaces, must also be understood in terms of the production of urban meanings. Chapter 3 therefore will examine the relationship between the cultural politics of race and racism and the production of urban meanings (Gilroy, 1991; Jefferies, 1993; Carby, 1993; Goldberg, 1994).

Predating the formation of large-scale black settlements in the city, the urban area was described as a jungle, where bestial, predatory values dominated. With the emergence of large black urban ghettos, the notion of the “city as a jungle” began to operate as a racist metaphor to describe inner-city blacks (Gilroy, 1991:228). Paul Gilroy notes: “It has contributed significantly to contemporary definitions of ‘race,’ particularly those which highlight the supposed primitivism