

# Urban Affairs Review

<http://uar.sagepub.com/>

---

## **HOPE VI, Colonization, and the Production of Difference**

James Curtis Fraser, Ashley Brown Burns, Joshua Theodore Bazuin and Deirdre  
Aine Oakley

*Urban Affairs Review* published online 23 November 2012

DOI: 10.1177/1078087412465582

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://uar.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/11/27/1078087412465582>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



The Urban Politics Section, American Political Science Association

**Additional services and information for *Urban Affairs Review* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://uar.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Nov 27, 2012

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Nov 23, 2012

[What is This?](#)

---

# HOPE VI, Colonization, and the Production of Difference

Urban Affairs Review  
XX(X) 1–32  
© The Author(s) 2012  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1078087412465582  
<http://uar.sagepub.com>



**James Curtis Fraser<sup>1</sup>, Ashley Brown Burns<sup>2</sup>,  
Joshua Theodore Bazuin<sup>1</sup>, and  
Deirdre Áine Oakley<sup>3</sup>**

## Abstract

Between 1993 and 2010, the Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPEVI) Program sought to transform public housing by demolishing large spatially concentrated developments and replacing them with mixed-income housing. Drawing on postcolonial geographical thought, this article interrogates HOPE VI as a colonial project. Through the displacement of public housing residents, the razing of the development in which they lived, and the rebuilding of mixed-income housing, including new public housing units, HOPE VI projects seek to revitalize neighborhoods by attracting higher-income homeowners to relocate in these areas. Proponents of HOPE VI and other mixed-income housing strategies contend that socioeconomic mixing will provide a range of benefits for low-income residents in these environments. Yet, there is a growing body of research suggesting that income mixing itself can be a problem for public housing residents because the neighborhood social relations operate to marginalize them. Using a case study conducted in a midsized southern city, we build on this prior work by examining the sociospatial narratives that neighbors surrounding the HOPE VI site use to identify themselves. The article focuses on how new homeowners, residing

---

<sup>1</sup>Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA

<sup>2</sup>Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

<sup>3</sup>Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

## Corresponding Author:

James Curtis Fraser, Vanderbilt University, Peabody #90, 230 Magnolia Circle, Nashville, TN 37203, USA

Email: [pavement@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:pavement@vanderbilt.edu)

in a self-contained development right across the street from a HOPEVI site, construct themselves as a community by situating public housing residents as their *other*. We conclude that these sociospatial distinctions are integral to the broader, state-led effort to colonize and transform this low-income neighborhood situated next to the downtown business district.

### **Keywords**

public housing, postcolonial theory, mixed-income neighborhoods

### **Introduction**

This article reports on the narratives that market-rate homeowners use to make sense of living in a mixed-income neighborhood with a Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) public housing development. The HOPE VI Program is a federal policy begun in 1992 in an effort to redevelop project-based public housing communities into improved mixed-income housing developments using a public-private partnership model. Such efforts have entailed forced relocation of the existing public housing residents, demolition of many conventional projects, and rebuilding schemes that intentionally limit the number of units affordable to former public housing residents. Although the promotion of the mixed-income aspect of HOPE VI varies slightly in content, intent, and design, they inevitably come back to a stylized vision of helping the poor by having them live in proximity to moderate- to middle-income households. Although the theoretical antecedents are more nuanced, this conceptual model is based upon the neighborhood effects perspective, which posits that the disadvantaging effects of individual-level poverty are exacerbated when living in highly concentrated areas of poverty, cut off from institutional resources (e.g., Goetz 2003; Jargowsky 1997; Sampson 1999; Venkatesh 2000; Wilson 1987).

This conceptual model lends itself to investigating whether having lower-income and higher-income residents living in proximity generates positive outcomes for those experiencing poverty (e.g., employment and wealth). Researchers have identified the routes through which this social mixing might achieve such outcomes, and social networking figures prominently among them (Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007). Yet, empirical studies to date suggest that these proposed routes for increasing life opportunities for low-income residents have proven to be illusive, and it is unclear how these residents benefit from the political and economic resources that higher-income households may bring to an area (Fraser and Nelson 2008; see Levy,

McDade, and Dumlao 2010 for an excellent review).<sup>1</sup> Parallel to these findings, case studies focusing on the everyday realities of residents living in HOPE VI developments find that there are multiple obstacles to building cross-class ties and social networks based upon a sense of community (Chaskin and Joseph 2010, 2011; Goetz 2003, 2011; Graves 2011; Sedlak 2009). These empirical findings are not surprising given that HOPE VI, as a federal policy, and actual HOPE VI developments, tend to neglect any specification on why or how cross-class alliances would emerge. In fact, it is this aspect of HOPE VI that reveals the possibility that the call for mixed-income housing may actually be a state-led effort to colonize former public housing residents to prepare neighborhoods for market reinvestment. Although some initiatives may not be successful at promoting neighborhood revitalization, it is a stated goal of the program. One need only look toward Chicago and Atlanta to see examples of rapid gentrification around areas that were considered no-go zones during the 1980s (Pattillo 2008). Even in smaller cities, mixed-income development has led to clear instances of dramatic shifts in housing market value increases (Fraser et al. 2003).

One area of inquiry on HOPE VI mixed-income housing that has been conspicuously missing from the literature is how residents in these developments fit into the social relations that constitute the broader neighborhood environments in which they are embedded. Prior work suggests that developing positive, communal relationships between subsidized and market-rate resident in HOPE VI developments is far from being a straightforward result of living in propinquity, and oftentimes intergroup relations range in tenor between superficial acknowledgment and benign neglect to suspicion, resentment, and outright hostility (Chaskin, Joseph, and Voelker 2011; Chaskin, Khare, and Joseph 2012).

These studies prompt us to reevaluate the theoretical framing of mixed-income housing development and bracket off the typical starting point for many studies: neighborhood effects and poverty amelioration. Instead, we take as our starting point the premise that HOPE VI and other comparable government programs that are rolled out in the name of mixed-income development cannot be afforded the luxury of unconsciously being taken as strategies to ameliorate poverty. An analysis of relations between subsidized HOPE VI residents and their neighbors may be more usefully thought about as *colonial* because mixed-income development inherently operates in the context of preexisting sociocultural meanings that tend toward hierarchically organizing people by class and housing status (Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin 2012). Although the actual policy goals of building similar housing types for both lower- and higher-income people may be designed to conceal these

differences, it is naïve to suggest that people are not aware of where the homeowners reside and which units house subsidized renters (see M. L. Joseph 2008). Even if this were to be the case, people who do not live in HOPE VI developments can surely identify these developments.

This ability to identify public housing takes on additional significance because a central component of HOPE VI is geared toward drawing higher-income people to lower-income neighborhoods to stabilize these places. Stability, in this instance, is a signifier that accumulates meaning through its articulation with capital. Higher-income homeowners are celebrated as the norm to which subsidized former public housing residents are told to aspire. Thus, mixed-income neighborhoods that spawn from HOPE VI need to account for their difference generating tendencies, and the disciplinary effects that community can have on those who are marginalized as a potential barrier to “the release of urban land for capital accumulation” (Doshi 2012, p. 3).

To date, the majority of literature on mixed-income development conceives it as providing social and economic goods for low-income people or causing physical displacement of public housing residents. In a recently edited volume, *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth* (Bridge, Butler, and Lees 2012), the central questions about mixed-income housing initiatives revolve around the contention that mixed-income policies may be less about helping the poor and more about neighborhood revitalization. Although gentrification occurs around some HOPE VI developments, in many cases this is a protracted, and oftentimes unsuccessful, process (DeFilippis, Fraser, and Bazuin 2012). Either way, the ways in which culture underwrites power to initiate community processes whose potential outcomes include the marginalization and eviction of the poor from a neighborhood are largely left unanswered.

Situating HOPE VI as a state-led colonization effort provides a theoretical scaffolding to examine the types of subjectivities and social relationships that are produced in the context of socioeconomic mixing, and a framework to understand how HOPE VI, mixed-income housing initiatives enable some groups to exercise power to claim rights to place while precluding others from doing so.<sup>2</sup> When higher-income homeowners relocate to neighborhoods that once had traditional public housing, how do they discursively construct their HOPE VI, former public housing neighbors? What interpretive repertoires do these homeowners use to construct themselves as a community, and how inclusive is it of those who possess a lower socioeconomic status? The remainder of this article proceeds with a brief review of literature on the social relations between different income groups and further explication of our theoretical orientation through an analysis of homeowner narratives on living alongside public housing residents.

## Community and the Production of Difference

There are a growing number of studies that examine the realities of low-income residents returning to redeveloped HOPE VI sites (Chaskin and Joseph 2010, 2011; Kleit and Carnegie 2011; Levy, McDade, and Dumlao 2010). A common starting point for these examinations has been to ask, “Do mixed-income environments engender meaningful resident engagement across income lines, and, if so, does this social interaction affect positive changes in the lives of low-income residents?” These studies report that the frequency of social relations among HOPE VI residents that cross-class lines tends to be low (see, for example, Fraser and Nelson 2008; Joseph 2008; Kleit 2005; Kleit and Carnegie 2011; Tach 2009).

Multiple case studies find that residents tend to interact with their neighbors based upon perceived characteristics in common (see Levy, McDade, and Dumlao 2010), and that, in some cases, “management encouraged social distance between market-rate and subsidized neighbors” (Graves 2011, p. 127). Indeed, subsidized renters in mixed-income developments are often the objects of intensified surveillance and discipline, in part because site management is charged with drawing middle-income residents into these developments to capture enough ground rent to offset the costs associated with a devolved public housing program (Kipfer and Petrunia 2009). Enhanced social control emerges in these contexts, even when there is little social interaction between residents of dissimilar backgrounds or classed lines. In many cases, disputes around whether residents should have the right to occupy public space are raced, gendered, and classed. For example, studies find that market-rate residents tend to identify young, African-American men as a threat simply because they are exerting a right to convene and converse in public space (Chaskin, Joseph, and Voelker 2011; Joseph 2008; Sedlak 2009).

In many ways, this should not be surprising because society at large has a long history of making such identity categories the foundation for direct and indirect discrimination (O’Connor 2001; Vale 2007). The regulation of belonging is distinct among differing groups. DeFilippis and Fraser (2010, p. 144) noted, “For mixing to have a role in making our cities more just, the people being mixed need to be in proximity on their own terms and those terms need some level of equivalence or comparability.” Yet, as numerous studies have demonstrated, this is simply not the case for the HOPE VI program (*ibid.*). Thus, there is broad consensus among those who have studied social networks in HOPE VI developments that improving the life opportunities of low-income residents cannot hinge upon social mixing

(Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Graves 2011). Yet, even if social contact and social networks appear to be nonexistent between socioeconomic groups, this cannot be read as these groups having nothing to do with each other. Davidson (2010, p. 526) noted, “The absence of social mixing cannot be viewed as a policy failure; rather, it demands an understanding which posits how social class continues to operate and be structured in the neighborhood context.”

This task of accounting for the underlying dynamics that shape social relations between neighborhood residents must be firmly grounded upon an understanding of the production of space and culture to make sense of the extant empirical findings of studies on mixed-income housing development. It is from this point of departure that we draw again upon postcolonial thought. In *Modernity at Large*, Appadurai (1996, p. 184) wrote,

The production of neighborhood is inherently an exercise of power over some sort of hostile or recalcitrant environment, which may take the form of another neighborhood . . . Insofar as neighborhoods are imagined, produced, and maintained against some sort of ground (social, material, environmental), they also require and produce contexts against which their own intelligibility takes place.

Whether the focus of inquiry is on empire building or claiming a neighborhood through colonization, the production of alterity is an achievement that is (re)produced through the embodied sociospatial practices that create and maintain boundaries and categories (Appadurai 1996; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Said 1979). It is through these acts of spacing and ordering that people come to understand themselves as belonging to a community by constructing those people and places that are imagined to be different.

HOPE VI provides a useful vehicle to think through the ways in which these processes unfold. In 1989, the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing was formed to conduct a census of housing deemed to be unfit for human habitation, and in many ways parallels the census of blighted urban structures during the urban renewal era of the mid-twentieth century in the United States. In both cases, the enumeration of blight and distress was arguably made possible by “the narrative of spectacular failure and dysfunction” of places and inhabitants who were defined as locked into a hypersegregated culture of concentrated poverty (Goetz 2011, p. 4). The hegemony of such pathologizing discourse on public housing enables certain political projects to emerge in response. Gregory (2004, p. 8) contended,

[C]olonialism is not best understood primarily as a political or economic relationship that is legitimized through ideologies of racism or progress. Rather, colonialism has always, equally importantly and deeply, been a cultural process; its discoveries and trespasses are imagined and energized through signs, metaphors and narratives; even what would seem its purest moments of profit and violence have been mediated and enframed by structures of meaning.

In the case of HOPE VI, the power of the state to define public housing developments as locales that transgress societal values—while overlooking the community and support structures that people had knit together in the context of deep disadvantage—not only reinforces negative imagery attached to being a public housing resident but also makes colonization projects legible (DeFilippis and Fraser 2010; for excellent review, see Goetz 2012a).

HOPE VI initiatives are interventions that aim to *reterritorialize* neighborhoods through a complex of regulations that determine the type of public housing resident who will be granted entry in to the redeveloped, mixed-income setting. Alternatively, those people who have the socioeconomic means to become homeowners are enticed—many times through deep homeownership subsidies—to live beside the deserving poor, and attracting the middle class into HOPE VI neighborhoods has received a great deal of attention as these residents are conceived as part of what will maintain neighborhood stability (Brophy and Smith 1997). Inherent in the HOPE VI program—and more generally in mixed-income redevelopment initiatives—there is an expectation that social mixing will produce an environment that regulates low income and public housing residents by hailing them to enter into a new moral community (drawing on Rose 1996).

That being said, there is a gap in our knowledge of HOPE VI in the sense of teasing out the ways in which different members of these mixed-income settings come to understand themselves in relation to people they define as others. More affluent residents of these developments often see their rights as superseding those of their neighbors who are lower income (Duke 2009). In part, this is reinforced by site managers and public housing authorities who remind subsidized renters that they occupy a liminal status in these communities and need to be working to move up and out of the development into private-sector housing (Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin 2012). Yet, focusing solely on the immediate interactions between actors whose lives intersect in place without attending to the broader urban politics that organize colonial territorial relations misses the point that HOPE VI is founded upon the

marginalization and eviction of those of who experience persistent poverty under the banner of neighborhood transformation.

Recolonization is meant to turn a segregated public housing site into a “normal,” “successful,” neighborhood . . . social mixing, now operates as code words to incorporate and submerge racialized public housing tenants under a cohesive form of normalcy defined by private property and the (middle-class and typically white) sensibilities of the “new” normal. (Kipfer and Petrunia 2009, p. 121)

Conceptualized as such, prior HOPE VI studies reporting homeowner suspicion of young, African-American males visibly occupying public space, then, is made legible as those who have been cast off—the abject—returning in material form. Although HOPE VI initiatives effectively raze old structures and (dis)place former residents, it is also true that the rebirth of contemporary (HOPE VI) “public” housing developments relies on the specter of this very past as its midwife.

This *other* place—inhabited by those who “have either refused the bonds of civility and self-responsibility or aspire to them but have not been given the skills, capacities, and means” (Rose 1996, p. 347)—draws on the persistent purchase of classed and raced cultural signifiers evoking images of the slum, hood, ghetto, or project. This provides a powerful context within which socioeconomic mixing, relationship building, and the forging of community occur but it is not the only one. However, HOPE VI experiments that unfold in particular places need to be understood in their singularity. We turn next to an examination of the narratives of incoming neighborhood homeowners who, in Euclidean terms, live across the street from HOPE VI, public housing residents.

## Study Setting

This case study examines a small community of homes owned by low-to-moderate income families called, for the purposes of this article, “New Village.” New Village was constructed across the street from Murphy Manor, a small HOPE VI development. The development of New Village entailed the demolition of older homes adjacent to Murphy Manor as part of a city-wide neighborhood revitalization and affordable homeownership program. New Village is formally separate from Murphy Manor and was not constructed as a homeownership component of the HOPE VI redevelopment,

though both were occupied in 2008. Murphy Manor has 83 units: 55% Section 9 (public housing), 34% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), and 11% market rate. New Village includes 36 homes and condominiums that are targeted to low-to-moderate income first-time homeowner through mortgage and down-payment subsidies.

This study focuses on New Village residents' perceptions of their neighborhood and, more precisely, how they view the residents of Murphy Manor. Although New Village is not part of the Murphy Manor HOPE VI redevelopment, it was intended to be an integral aspect of the city's overall mixed-income plan to combat poverty concentration through collocation of homeowners and renters.

## Data and Method

The data used in this article are part of a larger project to investigate the reconstruction of community after HOPE VI revitalization. This project includes in-depth interviews with approximately 40 households living in Murphy Manor and New Village as well as interviews with a collection of stakeholders and service providers connected to the revitalization efforts. These interviews were conducted from August 2010 until August 2011. This analysis draws on the subset of interviews with the New Village residents.

Initial contact for recruiting respondents was made through a homeowner at a private gathering New Village. At this time, we were provided with a partial listing of the home and condo residents in the 36-unit development (three homes remained uninhabited). Each household was contacted by phone over several weeks. We conducted 28 semistructured and open-ended interview sessions with 15 New Village homeowners, comprising 45% of all home and condominium owners in the development. Most were interviewed twice; however, there were two for which we only completed one interview session. Interviews addressed a flexible but preset list of topics, including positive and negative aspects of buying in New Village, their resident experience, and community relations as well as any additional topics rose by respondents. Each interview lasted between 55 and 120 minutes. The respondents were primarily African-American like the residents of Murphy Manor. Although New Villagers certainly did not have the low-income levels of many former public housing residents, they fell within 60% to 80% of the area medium income. The interviews with the New Village residents were transcribed and analyzed for common themes concerning how these residents identify themselves in comparison with the Murphy Manor residents.

## Findings

Despite the many demographic similarities between themselves and the residents of Murphy Manor—and perhaps because of them—New Villagers construct themselves as different from Murphy Manor residents in a variety of ways. Yet, this is not a simple case of homeowners identifying public housing residents as less deserving of being in the neighborhood. Some New Villagers offer what might appear to be sympathetic accounts of the difficulties of living in *the projects*, but even in these cases, virtually all of these discourses are accompanied by statements that define Murphy Manor residents as not knowing how to live properly, or, more specifically, to conduct their lives like New Villagers. Furthermore, many of our respondents presented profoundly negative statements about having these public housing residents as part of the community. This is expressed most generally in variations on the theme of having a *project mentality* that resides internally in Murphy Manor residents, and relies on a conception of space that folds distance into difference rendering Murphy Manor as having an internally generated culture that is experienced by the homeowners as foreign and less developed. This renders public housing residents as the *other* within which the specter of the project gestates. This is a past that is required for the continued colonization of the neighborhood to appear morally right. Furthermore, as we will demonstrate, New Villager's narratives are replete with accounts of being flanked by state officials and agencies that are described as being very responsive to homeowner requests for intensive surveillance and policing of Murphy Manor.

Although it would be easy to pick excerpts from our interviews that depict an internally consistent depiction of New Villagers denigration of Murphy Manor residents, the situation is far more complex because some New Villagers have experienced living in subsidized government rentals. Therefore, we complicate our own narrative of New Villagers to draw out themes of desire to expel or embrace public housing residents. This, on the part of New Villagers, ranges from calls to reform Murphy Manor residents oftentimes through state intervention to wanting the public housing residents evicted from the neighborhood. Furthermore, there are residents of New Village who largely speak about their homeowner neighbors as being the ones who hold such orientations toward public housing residents and describe New Villagers as a fractured community. These more sympathetic respondents identify with Murphy manor residents, which points toward openings to see a different set of relationships emerging in the neighborhood where those in poverty are accepted as having something positive to contribute to the neighborhood.

## *The People Across the Street: Otherness Conceptualized*

Jonathon: I really think it's a us versus them. I can't describe it any other way.

Sheila: I feel like we divided, but technically, we are still neighbors.

Many New Village homeowners construct their identities through a constant process of contrasting their traits with constructed images of "low-income" renter residents of Murphy Manor to authenticate conceptualizations of who they are not. Dominique provides insight into how she believes her neighbors largely think:

I notice some of my neighbors attitudes are kinda like, oh they are low income, and they turn their nose up and expect the worse out of the people across the street. That's how they see them, the people across the street.

Many of our respondents maintain that some variation of the "people across the street" sentiment is operative in New Village and that it is used to highlight difference rendering public housing residents as chaotic and uncivilized *others*.

Although there are respondents in our sample that hold such sentiment, the more pernicious aspects of this perspective emerge when it is used as a foundation for producing community among some New Villagers. Marion, who does not even have a direct view of Murphy Manor, not only appears to take as fact what her New Village neighbors share with her but also claims that these types of narratives are often repeated when New Village neighbors convene.

They see it. They hear the partying that goes on at 2:00 a.m. in the morning outside. They see the people on the roof of the building. They see the clothes hanging off the sides. They see the drug activity, the gang-related activity. Those kind of things . . . A lot of times I am not aware that some of those things go on, but they make for great stories when we get together in the HOA [New Village homeowner's association] because everyone kinda raves about it.

*Othering* is a process of defining an "us" or community through the construction of a constitutive exterior that is positioned as inferior. This process relies on the production and dissemination of cultural stereotypes that render a group as transgressing some moral imperative or not being

civilized (drawing on Said 1979, 1994). How can Marion's statement about her neighbors convening the homeowner's association (HOA) meetings and repetitively sharing similar stories about public housing residents be interpreted? This is something of a cultural mapping wherein certain material practices, real or imagined, are encoded as signs that identify a place and a people. One only needs to refer to "clothes hanging off the side" or "people on the roof" as signifier of those people with the *project mentality*.

The creation of the *other* is a constitutive moment of the colonization process that legitimates certain lines of action toward groups of people who are violent. Andre states,

This past summer, we had incidents, twelve and one o'clock, kids walking the streets by themselves, this just recently. All night, kids is up in that neighborhood across the street. Now if they was, to me, if they was under some type of curfew where they had to be in at a certain time that would cut a lot of that riff raff out. Demolishing of the neighborhood. Crime would be a lot lower. Its funny cause, you just can't get that mentality outta some people. I just, no matter what you do. No matter. How you try to restructure they lives. You try to give them something better.

Andre continues that the incidents to which he is referring are children throwing trash on the ground in front of his house and occasionally hanging on trees. Moreover, he attributes this behavior to "parents being strung out on drugs" and that the kids are "gon have this type of mentality." It is a remarkable way of posing an argument for the demolition of Murphy Manor altogether, but one that has precedent in HOPE VI itself as Goetz (2012a, p. 331) reminded us that the program demolished or converted over 225,000 units of public housing in cities across the United States so that "modernism could make way for new urbanism."

Andre's narrative also evokes images of a primitive people incapable of being anything else. He describes New Villagers as "an oasis in the middle of the desert dealing with the past." In his estimation, the residents of Murphy Manor do not belong but rather present themselves as a threat to progress that an advanced community will usher into the neighborhood. Although there are numerous dimensions upon which this idea of difference is drawn and how New Villagers view themselves, we focus particular attention on how HOPE VI is a spatial intervention that articulates with capitalist subjectivities in both the social reproductive and productive realms. The subject positions are

made important in the narratives of New Villagers as they distinguish themselves (in the social reproductive realm) as homeowners versus Murphy Manor residents who are renting from the state, and (in the productive realm) as working in the formal economy versus Murphy Manor residents who are described as being on public aid.

### *Producing Difference Through Home and Work*

It is worth noting that homeownership has a long history of being promoted by the real estate industry as a marker of full citizenship. In the 1930s, the National Association of Real Estate Brokers (NAREB) promoted homeownership as a signifier of “American exceptionalism” and public housing as a “dangerous socialist experiment” (Parson 2005, p. 17). Whereas White Americans were increasingly afforded opportunities to obtain homeownership status, institutionalized racism in the housing industry, government, and broader society relegated large minority populations to renting (Fox-Gotham 2002). During the 1950s, NAREB mounted a relentless campaign against public housing by maintaining that homeownership was the hallmark of American individualism. Since then homeownership continues to be held in high esteem, while traditional public housing is generally viewed as a massive failure (Goetz 2012b), and public housing residents are suspected of transgressing deeply held societal values. HOPE VI seeks to overcome this stigma largely through new urbanism design and screening out those who are not employed or are identified to be some type of risk to the new development.

Evidently, many New Villagers do not seem convinced that the public housing is much different than it was before, although some of them are more sympathetic. Dominique, a young African-American resident who takes care of her own daughter and a nephew, provides a poignant narrative of how her fellow homeowners engage in sociospatial identity work to distance themselves both from the public housing residents across the street and from where they came. She perceives that these gestures toward being part of a different community are a protective response:

When I moved here, there was nothing across the street but a field. Neighbors complained once they heard about construction of low-income housing across the street. They were really not happy. A lot of time, I think people feel that it brings their property values down, but mine has remained level even though the housing market crashed. They complain about Murphy Manor in the [HOA] meetings. I think

that a lot of the people here are first-time homebuyers, so of course, they are proud and want to protect their investment. Which is understandable. To protect that investment, in a lot of their minds, they may feel the people across the street won't care as much. I think that may be part of the problem, they see them as a problem. Think that income-based housing, a lot of people have less education, they think that could lead to more negative factors that aren't necessarily there.

There is a fear-based narrative alive among homeowners that, because the people across the street are renters, they will not have the same pride and will not care for their homes, and the neighborhood will decline as a result, therefore harming the homeowners who have invested in their homes. Because the renters receive government housing assistance they are automatically suspected of being a potential threat to Village homeowners. Another respondent from New Village reports that "whenever you have renters you're gonna have problems."

Katrina, like many of our New Village interviewees, suggests that "it's not just that they are renting. It's just a difference you can see." This leads back into the connection between public housing and *those people* who live in public housing. This narrative also highlights the ways in which housing status is perceived by many New Village residents to be linked to people's employment status. This forms another axis on which difference is constructed resulting in the further marginalization of Murphy Manor residents.

Some New Village residents mention their occupations in conversations about their experiences living in the revitalized, transitioning area; they include a bondswoman, a medical center employee, city worker, community activist, a sales manager, a retail worker, and a legal worker. While the adjacent Murphy Manor residents are required to work if they are able-bodied (not a senior citizen, not disabled), New Village homeowners construct their identities through a constant process of contrasting their status as workers with incomes with that imagined of the *low-income renter*—often assumed to be on public assistance. Gary, for example, says that the socioeconomic differences between New Village and Murphy Manor residents are a barrier for sustained interactions between the two groups:

I really don't know any of those people over there . . . I wave [at them]. But I don't interact with those folks. I think it's deeper, I really think it runs socioeconomic barriers.

Sheila roots these differences very explicitly in education and work, highlighting the importance of getting Murphy Manor residents to pursue more education so they can work and thereby escape the traps of violence and public housing:

If they understood the importance of education, high school education is free. [If] they went to school it would broaden their mind from crime, violence, and what they are used to. That's why we fight so hard for them [rental management company] to screen the residents more . . . just do different. It starts with the importance of education and staying in school. High school education is free. The importance of working . . . being productive members of society. We shouldn't want to feel different or better than anybody, but that's unfortunately how it is.

Sheila says that she does not want to feel different or better than the Murphy residents, but because of their lack of education and the low priority she perceives that they give to work and being "productive members of society," she does indeed deem them suspicious. In part, her storyline of people pulling themselves up by their bootstraps by way of education and self-discipline reflects her own narrative, whereby getting an education and then a decent paying job enabled her to buy a home in New Village, even though the home is ultimately subsidized by government partnerships.

Several interviewees provide some variation of a culture of poverty theory to explain the conditions and type of persons they perceive to live in public housing, frequently saying that they believe that people's attitudes and lifestyles essentially trap them in places like the old and new Murphy Manor. Curtis says it this way,

People in that type of environment in and out anyway. I mean, it's like people who live in the projects all they life or been around people in the projects all they life. They a have a mentality. It's a bad mentality they have, and half the people, they don't work, or on fixed income, SSI, welfare. They just got a mentality and that's all they know.

Curtis employs multiple stereotypes of public housing residents where public housing is a revolving door from which people cannot escape because they are dependent on government handouts and because, as children, they are acculturated into lifestyles of crime, violence, drug use, and dependency due to their surroundings; though, his position as manager of a local retail

store presumably puts him in regular contact with residents from all over the neighborhood. He is, ultimately, pessimistic about any possibility of change. Sheila, however, is somewhat more optimistic, expecting that government-provided training could teach people to be more caring:

Our community [sustainability] depends on what happens across the street. Their minds are pretty much set living at the low price. They not gonna change. I would just want them to be more caring. They [government] should train the people in what to do when they come back and how they should live and be more caring. Set guidelines in place, like us. We pay dues.

Her last comment, that New Villagers pay dues, reflects an understanding of citizenship constituted by both rights and responsibilities. In her estimation, New Villagers pay their dues and fulfill their responsibilities through education, the homeownership course, becoming homeowners, and working for the betterment of themselves, their families, and their neighborhood. Residents of Murphy, however, do not meet those responsibilities and, as such, cannot fully access their rights, such as better housing of the type that the Villagers occupy.

New Villager practices of narrative *othering* are more than positioning differences and constituting sociospatial identification. This discursive mapping of Murphy Manor and its people is a constitutive moment in building community in New Village. The depictions of public housing residents as chaotic, rebellious, and unruly are accompanied by discourses of intervention. Given that people in Murphy Manor are constituted as an actual or potential threat, and negligent stewards of their part of the neighborhood, New Villagers—with the support of the City and the public housing authority—enact spatial practices to exact control over public housing residents. Although these interventions in place making range from enhanced surveillance and policing to holding neighborhood events, many New Villagers and their HOA want to wrest the locality from those encoded as primitive, uncivilized, and undeserving.

### *Community Processes in a Colonial Space*

The production of a neighborhood is inherently colonizing, in the sense that it involves the assertion of socially (often ritually) organized power over places and settings that are viewed as potentially chaotic or rebellious. (Appadurai 1996, pp. 183-84)

Samantha: We got Neighborhood Watch. People watching. They see you. Nothing would happen to you here.

Jonathon: Whenever I hear gunshots, even if it's just every other month, I just call in to 911. That's how they plot; it's a double-edged sword. It means we run up our reports on the crime map. But, we get increased coverage. That's the biggest crime deterrent.

One of the most important ways in which New Villagers mobilize their conceptions of difference from Murphy Manor residents is with regard to policing and crime. New Villagers frequently mention a strong police presence and monitoring of public activities in the community. Homeowners express concerns over violence, deviant behavior, idle youth, and crime. Some homeowners actively participate in local government, directing their connection to city resources, especially policing, to Murphy Manor. Other Villagers encourage formal and informal crime deterrence through Neighborhood Watch efforts and hyperawareness of "bad" behaviors and activity.

The most important priority of the New Village residents active in the development's HOA is ensuring a safer neighborhood through surveillance and police presence. In multiple interviews, Villagers worried about crime and praised the heavy police presence in the wider neighborhood. This priority seems to feed into feelings of safety while at the same time perpetuates somewhat unfounded perceptions of a vague, persistent threat. Villagers frequently portray the Manor as the source of crime and disturbance. Others highlight the safety that accompanies increased police presence. For example, even though Dominique says she has never felt threatened while in her community, she admits, "It's really good. [The police] are just out there. They are patrolling. They're usually, you know, around. It makes it safer."

Many of the Villagers' complaints about crime are actually mere suspicions of criminal conduct across the street or reports that the Murphy Manors' residents are too visible in the wider neighborhood. Roslyn's views on the disturbances emanating from the Manor are shared by a number of neighbors. She says,

Basically, I see a lot of the same things happening over there, as in other public housing. I see a lot of sitting out. I see boyfriends moved in. Um, the crime rate right now hasn't, is not that bad yet, so, that's 'cause it's relatively new. I see children, unsupervised children, all over the neighborhood. Um, I think you know, right now, I think, basically, it's too early to tell.

Roslyn believes that because she sees behavioral patterns emerging at Murphy similar to patterns observed at other public housing complexes, the social order at Murphy will deteriorate over time and cause an increase in crime for the whole neighborhood, New Village included. Several other New Villagers echo her particular preoccupation with unsupervised children. As noted earlier, some residents advocate strongly for a curfew for children, to prevent “riff raff” from disturbing the peace of the neighborhood. While no one interviewed made claims of any serious criminal behavior by children or youth, some New Villagers advocate restricting the Murphy children’s mobility. Furthermore, although many homeowners mention crime as a central concern, they are often unable to point to specific criminal activity occurring in the wider neighborhood. Rather, they seem to worry about the possibility of crime emanating from the public housing residents across the street.

At least some Village residents question whether this focus on Murphy as a source of potential criminal activity is fair. Jonathon, objecting to the perpetuation of these stereotypes by his Villager neighbors, notes that he has no personal knowledge of criminal incidents or the epidemic of crime some residents seem to report. He equates any potential crime in New Village and Murphy to the crime any rental community would experience.

Because it’s like, those people are renting; any time you have renters, no matter what their income is, you could have a bunch of college students, a posh apartment community, there is gonna be the same issues of crime, loitering, children around. No matter where you live in the City, there may be crime two blocks from you—your car may be broken into, there may be petty vandalism or theft. And, so what makes us think we are gonna be any different? You can go to those University apartments and they have the same issues of break-ins, or loitering, etc. For some reason, New Village[rs] thinks we’re different . . . You don’t hear about random shooting, you don’t hear about innocent people getting hurt in our neighborhood.

Jonathon also grounds his view in personal experience with the lack of crime in New Village:

I’ve left my computer on the porch overnight, left my door unlocked all day accidentally and come back, no one’s been in my house. For nothing to happen in three years, it’s a sign there can’t be an epidemic. I mean someone’s car radio got stolen, but that happened to me in a posh apartment complex. Other than loitering, I’ve never seen anyone do anything bad over there.

Dominique identifies similar trends: “My neighbors think people across the street are gonna run it down or write graffiti all over it and tear it up.” Jonathan actively links his neighbors’ discursive construction of the public housing resident other with the HOA’s preoccupation with crime: “Murphy is ‘them.’ They are the problem. They are the bad people. It’s flawed, but that’s the image people have.” Several residents noted the antipathy of their neighbors toward Murphy Manor despite the presence of a homeless shelter nearby; they believed that the homeless people were a more likely source of crime and disorder than the public housing residents.

Yet, many of the homeowners tend to muddle criminal and social activities and behaviors. Reality and perceptions collide. Several homeowners echo, “There is drama across the street.” There are few examples presented of this “drama” actually occurring. For example, Sheila, in a somewhat vague manner, offered, “Some incidents are all the time. Two, three times a week.” However, the personal narratives fail to strengthen or fully support this claim. Dominique’s statement best summarizes this,

They tend to spend more time outside, we may sit on our porch, but there is a lot more activity in general in Murphy. You may hear a big argument; there is really never drama here in New Village.

This excerpt from an interview with Natasha and her mother depicts the heightened surveillance by some New Villagers aimed at Murphy Manor:

Natasha: I mean [her neighbors in New Village] constantly watching you know [she laughs].

Interviewer: You get that feeling?

Natasha: Yea.

Interviewer: What gives you that feeling?

Natasha: Cause you see them. You see them peeping out the window and you’re like “what the hell is going on with these people?”

Natasha’s mom: We have a Neighborhood Watch.

Natasha: Yes, it’s a watch but I mean, my goodness, they watching all the time.

Natasha’s mom: Yea.

Murphy residents are simply very visible to Village residents. Suspicion then emanates from the visibility and proximity, buoyed by Murphy’s (and other public housing complexes’) past history as a site of neighborhood destabilizing crime.

Regardless of the fairness of the Villagers' preoccupation with Murphy as the source of neighborhood disturbances and crime, this image of the HOPE VI complex has consequences. New Village residents who are active with the HOA work toward increased neighborhood policing and regulation of Murphy Manor. Gary described the work of the city and police to provide more resources to the neighborhood, at the behest of the Village HOA:

We are well aware that the City, on the police side, dedicated resources to this area. New Village is dead set in the center. For a whole year, they offered overtime to the police officers, they allowed them more flexibility, such as dressing in plain clothes. It wasn't just New, it was also some of the surrounding areas. Crime has decreased, absolutely, but would I feel safe walking at 10:00 p.m. at night around the corner? Nope. We are still aware that there still is criminal activity occurring. Oftentimes, it's very out in the open. Very in your face.

Gary was unable to recall any personal experience or accounts of criminal activity, but he supports the initiative. In another interview, Dominique recounts how she wants the police activity, though she too has never personally felt unsafe:

There's a lot of police activity there, in that area. Wanted, definitely, I believe, wanted. Although, I've never felt threatened or that it was a dangerous neighborhood or area. For me, it makes me feel like they care what's going on around here; they are trying to make sure our neighborhood safe, they are trying to deter crime.

In addition to a visible police presence, there are other programs that New Village residents support as means of limiting the Murphy residents' opportunities to engage in criminal behavior. To combat the oft-cited problem of unsupervised children, the police offer a community summer program at the neighborhood school. Samantha said it would be good to "take the kids down to the jail to see it," which she sees as a means by which to deter possible criminal activity. Villagers, motivated by a desire to protect their investments and reinforced by their construction of Murphy Manor residents as deviant others, become hypervigilant of their neighbors and advocate a strong police presence in their neighborhood. Much of the work of the Village HOA is liaising with police and other resources to control crime.

The HOA works not only with the police to prevent crime but also with the housing authority to monitor the residents of Murphy Manor. Gary describes a meeting the HOA had with representatives from the housing authority:

I think that [long pause], There's, well, I am just trying to think of a good example . . . We [HOA] just had a recent meeting with the Housing Authority, the president, his staff; the Murphy management company . . . there were issues. Let's back up—several months ago, there were issues where a young man came from across the street and stole a bike from a child living on our street. I wasn't there, I am recounting the story. It sparked a lot of hard feelings, animosity.

The work of the HOA extends beyond trying to convince the housing authority to hire more security to crack down on disturbances at Murphy. Sheila outlines the chain of command the HOA uses when confronting a perceived problem:

We met with the property manager, the Housing Authority, the Mayor, the City Manager, the property development manager, we've met with everybody about Murphy—I've initiated some of them . . . In the past two years since Murphy has been there.

When asked about attendance at meetings, Sheila admits that Murphy residents are not invited to participate in most of them. Samantha states that the HOA pressures the Murphy management organization to

make sure they screen the people that come in there. Make sure the people are qualified to come in there. Do some testing. Do some background checks. So they won't get bad people over there.

The Village homeowners therefore employ surveillance strategies and police their Murphy Manor neighbors. They put pressure on the police to step up patrols and increase their visibility. They urge the housing authority and management company to do better screening of prospective residents to keep out potential troublemakers. More seriously, the Murphy residents are excluded from discussions about neighborhood problems, in part because they are seen as the problem. The production of difference between New Village and Murphy Manor not only actively disadvantages the Murphy residents through increased surveillance and discipline but it also affects the ways in which Villagers attempt to interact with the public housing residents.

The consequences of Villagers' construction of Murphy residents as threatening, impoverished, morally suspect others extend beyond work with the police and housing authority. Consider several Villagers' description of events they organize for the neighborhood. Gary says,

We hold some community events in our neighborhood. Two years ago, we started a Halloween event. We actually do it out on the street, so that way we are not hiding behind our doors. If you don't want to participate, if you don't feel comfortable doing that, you can at least donate candy and we'll stand there and give it out. We open it up to the entire community. We go over to Murphy Manor and hand out flyers. For me, it's important we did that, it shows people, you are welcome here.

The description sounds like an opportunity for the neighborhood to get together around Halloween. Gary's characterization suggests that it is an intentional effort by New Villagers to make themselves visible in the wider neighborhood and to suggest that they welcome interactions with their Murphy neighbors. Jonathon, however, has a very different understanding of the same event:

Another thing that's interesting: It's like we don't want, we don't like the other people in the neighborhood, but we throw events for their children. So, like for Halloween, we put candy at the beginning of the street so they won't come into our neighborhood [to trick or treat].

While Gary sees the positioning of the candy as a means to get faces out on the street to meet neighbors, Jonathon sees it as a means of limiting the Murphy children's access to New Village.

Sheila and Curtis also describe the Halloween event, as well as a Back-to-School fair, noting that they are attempts by New Village to reach out to Murphy Manor:

Sheila: We try to establish relations with them by having Halloween party, our annual Back-to-School party. So, we have reached out to them plenty of times in the past.

Curtis: Invite them over for our annual cookouts. It's something we do. We send out flyers. It's fun. We enjoy it.

Sheila: Mostly, [Murphy Homes] people send they kids. We rather have the parents with the kids instead of the kids being by themselves.

She notes that there is little buy-in from the adults at Murphy Manor, who send their children rather than attending themselves, further emphasizing the differences in how the two communities value education. Sheila elaborates by saying that there is a genuine inclination to organize large, public events

that include Murphy. But her description of engagement with Murphy Homes still conveys an “us versus them” mentality:

We, and the Housing Authority, have tried to develop programs for the kids and resource centers to show, you know, give them another outlook. It’s not working. They are not taking advantage of them. Its more kids over there, God, I would say, there may be triple the amount over there. We don’t have many kids over here. I say this because the kids are our future. It starts—they mimic what they see. If all they see is a life of crime and violence then . . . you know . . . [Trails off]. Nobody is ever too old to be saved. We need to target their environment in the homes.

Notably, Murphy Manor residents themselves are never described as being involved in the organization of these events. Rather, the Villagers contact the housing authority when they want to organize joint events, and then they wonder why Murphy Homes’ adults do not show up. Sheila’s description of some events is paternalistic, emphasizing the charitable aspects of New Village’s outreach efforts and their attempts to change attitudes and save the children and adults at Murphy Manor.

New Villagers encode their various outreach initiatives as well-meaning, charitable efforts to engage a needy population living in public housing. However, they rarely express awareness of the ways in which treating Murphy Manor residents as charity cases rather than coresidents in a neighborhood and potential partners in tackling neighborhood could be problematic. Indeed, the depth of the differences that Villagers describe between themselves and their neighbors at Murphy may have become such a deep gulf that the Villagers are unable to recognize the ability of their neighbors to make meaningful contributions to better the community for all residents.

### *Complicating Colonization*

The story of state-led colonization and the subjectivities it produces is complex. New Village is a mixed race, moderately middle-income development. The majority of the residents are African-American. The former public housing residents in Murphy Manor are virtually all African-American. Carla who has lived in public housing prior states,

I don’t want to separate myself from anybody because I am thankful you know for who I am and who I have become. And, you know, just

thankful that I had the, God gave me the, you know, the brain to want to live different, to do different. And my son, you know I tell him all the time that “you, you are fortunate and you’re blessed.” You know, and I let he sees the things that go on. I am really glad that I did move here because he gets to see, you know, really how [pause] the [pause] upper class [her New Village neighbors] consider themselves. I don’t even like to say that to him because I don’t want him to feel like a minority, even though it is reality. But you know, I just, um, want him to see, you know the difference in how the upper class [her New Village neighbors] try to keep us at each other and killing off each other. And [be] against each other because they know that it would destroy, you know, what they consider a minority. Before anything is gonna get better what we are gonna have focus on is helping each other and not feel that we are divided. I don’t want to feel like I am divided.

Interviewer: You know anyone in Murphy Manor?

Carla: No one does.

Excerpts from an interview with Derwin also speak to the psychology of colonialism:

Derwin: I think we have created an us and them mentality with our wrought iron gate, with our beautiful sign, with our fencing, with our I think the homeowner’s association was an idea to become a gated community with only key code access. And, so it’s annoying too because that’s not how we stabilize a neighborhood by having an enclave that is for, you know, special people, and we want the rest of the people out. Cause I think psychologically people steal from people who are different from them. So we’re telling them “you don’t belong here.”

Interviewer: And they were there first, some of them.

Derwin: Exactly. And it just sets us apart.

Derwin continues by saying that he does not want to have anything to do with the HOA “summoning the Murphy Manor apartment director” or the housing authority, or the Mayor’s office to discipline the public housing residents across the street. In both Carla’s and Derwin’s narratives, there is a palpable concern not only with the direction that the neighborhood is moving in terms of social relations but also with the damage done through colonization of people’s home spaces, the building of a fortress enclave, the attendant

acts of *othering*, and the psychological violence of abjection. The creation of sociospatial identities that marginalize public housing residents as socially inferior requires a frame to make such narrative acts legible. Here, we see that HOPE VI and the production of the new neighborhood are intimately tied to the retelling of a past that is not only coming back (again) as a context to legitimate New Villager's acts of exclusion and hostility but also as a wound that some African-American homeowners only know to well. Jonathan claims, "It's frustrating to me, 85% of us are Black. We know what it means to struggle. I would say 90% of these people who live in New Village are low income." A separate interview with Dominique speaks to the closeness of this past for many New Villagers and provides a lens through which the abjection of public housing residents might be understood (drawing on Kristeva's 1982 concept of abjection):

Most people don't know about the special programs used to buy these homes. Some people, once they have something they forget when they didn't, and look down their nose at people who don't have what they had even though they used to be in that position; they want to get as far away from where they came from as they can.

She identifies a trend at New Village in which the new homeowners look down on Murphy Manor residents for living in public housing while concealing or forgetting that they themselves are beneficiaries of government aid. Living in proximity may cause enhanced awareness of class differences (Arthurson 2007). This plays out in a variety of ways as studies of neighborhood change and gentrification demonstrate (for an overview, see Lees, Slater, and Wylie 2007). At the same time, it may provide a sense of a past coming back upon people who were once there. A painful past presents itself vividly in the *people across the street*.

## Discussion

The production of neighborhood change through HOPE VI initiatives involves the use of organized power to transform space and the social relations that constitute it. Central to this program is the notion of rebuilding "working communities" by requiring residents to articulate with capital and become employed. This rebuilding also includes the establishment of community processes to serve a variety of purposes, including the management of neighborhood affairs, networking with one another to expand opportunities, working alongside the state to create and enforce norms of behavior,

and to effectively lobby for needed resources (typically from the state and nonprofit sectors).

Although studies have been conducted to detect the quantity and quality of social relations within HOPE VI developments themselves, this study has examined how homeowners surrounding a HOPE VI development engage in forming and enacting community processes alongside, with, and sometimes against their HOPE VI neighbors. New Villagers constitute themselves as a community (e.g., HOA) that claims rights to the city—the right to inhabit and produce space—through their articulation with the state-led project of revitalizing a lower-income neighborhood, as well as with the formal economy. M. Joseph (2002, p. 28) suggested that to access full citizenship rights, “one inscribes oneself into the machinery that turns the raw material of community into subjects of nation-state and capital.” New Villager’s access to the housing agency, police, and mayor’s office is an effect of this relation between community, state, and capital, whereas the public housing residents are portrayed by New Villagers as not being a legitimate community, rather they are the incalcitrant *other* from whom the neighborhood must be wrested. It is not a matter of whether there is criminal behavior on the part of Murphy Manor residents. It is their very presence that signifies a crisis of capitalism. Moreover, New Villagers as a community supplement capital by playing their role in regulating the behavior of those who are discursively constructed as the embodiment of deprivation. Community is governmental as it is a technology deployed to transform neighborhood space (drawing on Rose 1996).

It may seem that many of the conceptualizations of Murphy Manor residents are unfair and simply wrong—a point recognized by at least some residents. Moreover, several homeowners recognize that New Villagers have more in common with the Murphy Manor residents than their collective discursive construction of Murphy residents confirms. Take, for example, Sheila, who in an offhand comment contradicts some of her previous statements:

We have actual statistics from meetings about these people’s education and situations. We have some people here [New Village] that don’t have the education or the finances. There is no difference. If they took the statistics here, they may find the same [as Murphy Manor].

Yet, while there were certainly points at which New Villagers provided supportive statements about the ways in which their HOPE VI neighbors were similar to them, there were many more instances in which they constructed themselves as different. Taken together, all the dimensions of

difference articulated in our narrative analysis present a clear pattern. New Villagers define Murphy Manor renters as willfully choosing to be unemployed and dependent on the government. This is despite the fact that Murphy Manor has a work requirement for able-bodied residents. Such difference production is further explicated by the Villagers' perceptions of the Murphy Manor residents as uneducated by choice and in need of discipline. As unable or unwilling to be entrepreneurial, Murphy Manor residents are defined by New Villagers as adhering to a culture of poverty.

According to New Villagers, this culture leads to sporadic criminal behavior although they also supply little evidence of actual crime. But the New Villagers, as homeowners (not renters), view themselves as good citizens. They build community around protecting *their* neighborhood from the potentially chaotic and menacing behavior of Murphy Manor residents. This, in turn, leads to mobilization efforts to increase surveillance of Murphy Manor through Neighborhood Watches and increased police presence.

To this end, the New Village HOA defines the contours of the problem to be addressed and then initiates a range of strategies to neutralize and "civilize" the people across the street, all of which is done without input from or involvement with the Murphy Manor residents. These efforts include reaching out not only to the police but also to the city and officials at the housing authority as well. At the same time, the perceptions New Villagers have of the Murphy Manor residents are largely based on preconceived stereotypes rather than actual interaction. These findings confirm the connection between the production of HOPE VI neighborhoods and colonization. To be sure, the push among the New Villagers for more police presence suggests a key element of internal colonization: containment.

If HOPE VI development is simply about the provision of better quality housing for those who reside in that place, then the massive displacement of public housing residents would not be necessary. However, these efforts are very much about creating another type of neighborhood, one that is safe for external investment and real estate development. This production of locality is an achievement that exceeds the materiality of place in that the production of the new neighborhood occurs through the imagined geographies that people like the New Villagers produce. Spatial narratives provide the context—in the form of an (*other*) neighborhood—that makes HOPE VI an understandable intervention. But such an understanding is based, in part, on the institutionalized narratives of failure and dysfunction of public housing (Goetz 2012b).

When New Villagers deploy this cultural context as part of their construction of local knowledge to make their current neighbors in public housing

legible, it produced anxiety and a sense that the past is not the past at all. New Villagers attenuate this anxiety through material and symbolic acts that make their neighborhood understandable to broader society. Reports on HOPE VI that merely enumerate the number of fence posts erected by New Villagers or the lack of social networking between public housing residents and their neighbors obscure the extra-neighborhood contexts that give these performative purchase.

The contexts New Villagers use to build community obviously affect the social relations that play out in the redeveloped neighborhood, and produce contexts with which other neighborhoods may come to make themselves knowable. But the ways that they come to know who they are in a mixed-income setting are shaped by available cultural understandings that circulate throughout this current historical moment. HOPE VI has not only provided the economic means to colonize neighborhoods with high concentrations of those living in poverty but it is also colonial in that it draws on the myth of American self-sufficiency to discipline those living in poverty. The abject, those living across the street, are as distant as those across the globe.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Notes**

1. Notwithstanding the ethics of displacing thousands of residents from their homes to which under 10% return, there is little evidence that the program generates any increases in income for participating residents (Popkin, Levy, and Buron 2009).
2. Drawing on Lefebvre's (1996) notion of rights to the city, these refer not only to the right to inhabit a space but also to participate in the production of the city (see also Duke 2009; Young 1999).

### **References**

- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Arthurson, K. 2007. Social mix and social interaction: Do residents living in different housing tenures mix? Paper presented at ENHR Conference on Sustainable Urban Areas, at Rotterdam, Netherlands.

- Bridge, G., T. Butler, and L. Lees. 2012. *Mixed communities: Gentrification by stealth*. Chicago: Policy Press.
- Brophy, P. C., and R. N. Smith. 1997. Mixed-income housing: Factors for success. *Cityscape* 3 (2): 3-31.
- Chaskin, R. J., A. Khare, and M. Joseph. 2012. Participation, deliberation, and decision making: The dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in mixed-income developments. *Urban Affairs Review*. doi: 10.1177/1078087412450151
- Chaskin, R. J., and M. L. Joseph. 2010. Building "community" in mixed-income developments. *Urban Affairs Review* 45 (3): 299-335.
- Chaskin, R. J., and M. L. Joseph. 2011. Social interaction in mixed income developments: Relational expectations and emerging reality. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 33 (2): 209-37.
- Chaskin, R. J., M. L. Joseph, and S. Voelker. 2011. *Whose space? Whose rules? Social challenges in mixed-income developments*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago School of Social Service Administration.
- Davidson, M. 2010. Love thy neighbour? Social mixing in London's gentrification frontiers. *Environment and Planning A* 42 (3): 524-44.
- DeFilippis, J., J. Fraser, and J. T. Bazuin. 2012. HOPE VI: Calling for modesty in its claims. In *Mixed communities: Gentrification by stealth?* edited by G. Bridge, T. Butler, and L. Lees, 209-229. Bristol: Policy Press.
- DeFilippis, J., and J. Fraser. 2010. Why do we want mixed-income housing and neighborhoods? In *Critical urban studies: New directions*, edited by J. S. Davies, D. L. Imbroscio, and C. N. Stone, 135-48. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Doshi, S. 2012. The politics of the evicted: Redevelopment, subjectivity, and difference in Mumbai's slum frontier. *Antipode*. doi:1-.1111/j.1467.8330.2012.01023.x. First published online.
- Duke, J. 2009. Mixed income housing policy and public housing residents "right to the city." *Critical Social Policy* 29 (1): 100-120.
- Fox-Gotham, K. 2002. *Race, real estate, and uneven development: The Kansas City experience, 1900-2000*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Fraser, J., and M. H. Nelson. 2008. Can mixed income housing ameliorate concentrated poverty? The significance of a geographically informed sense of community. *Geography Compass* 2 (6): 2127-44.
- Fraser, J. C., J. Lepofsky, E. L. Kick, and J. P. Williams. 2003. The construction of the local and the limits of contemporary community building in the United States. *Urban Affairs Review* 38 (3): 417-445.
- Fraser, J. C., D. Oakley, and J. T. Bazuin, 2012. Public ownership and private profit in housing. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 5 (3): 397-412.
- Goetz, E. 2003. *Clearing the way: Deconcentrating the urban poor*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

- Goetz, E. 2011. Gentrification in Black and White: The racial impact of public housing demolition in American cities. *Urban Studies* 48 (8): 1581-604.
- Goetz, E. 2012a. Obsolescence and the transformation of public housing communities in the U.S. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 12 (3): 331-45.
- Goetz, E. 2012b. The audacity of HOPE VI: Discourse and the dismantling of public housing. *Cities*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2012.07.008> (accessed October 22, 2012).
- Graves, E. M. 2011. Mixed outcome developments. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 77 (2): 143-53.
- Gregory, D. 2004. *The colonial present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gupta, A., and J. Ferguson. 1997. Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. In *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology*, edited by A. Gupta and J. Ferguson, 33-50. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Jargowsky, P. A. 1997. *Poverty and place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Joseph, M. 2002. *Against the romance of community*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Joseph, M. L. 2008. Early resident experiences at a new mixed income development in Chicago. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30 (3): 229-57.
- Joseph, M. L., R. J. Chaskin, and H. S. Webber. 2007. The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development. *Urban Affairs Review* 42 (3): 369-409.
- Kipfer, S., and J. Petrunia. 2009. "Recolonization" and public housing: A Toronto case study. *Studies in Political Economy* 83:111-39.
- Kleit, R. G. 2005. HOPE VI new communities: Neighborhood relationships in mixed-income housing. *Environment and Planning A* 37 (8): 1413-41.
- Kleit, R. G., and N. B. Carnegie. 2011. Integrated or isolated? The impact of public housing redevelopment on social network homophily. *Social Networks* 33 (2): 152-65.
- Kristeva, J. 1982. *Powers of horror: An essay on abjection*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Lees, L., T. Slater, and E. Wyly. 2007. *Gentrification*. New York: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, H. 1996. *Writings on cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Levy, D. K., Z. McDade, and K. Dumlao. 2010. *Effects from living in mixed-income communities for low-income families*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- O'Connor, A. 2001. *Poverty knowledge: Social science, social policy, and the poor in twentieth-century US history*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Parson, D. 2005. *Making a better world: Public housing, the red scare, and the direction of modern Los Angeles*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

- Pattillo, M. 2008. *Black on the block: The politics and class in the city*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Popkin, S., D. Levy, and L. Buron. 2009. Has HOPE VI transformed residents' lives? New evidence from the HOPE VI panel study. *Housing Studies* 24 (4): 477-502.
- Rose, N. 1996. The death of the social: Re-figuring the territory of government. *Economy and Society* 25 (3): 327-56.
- Said, E. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. 1994. *Cultural imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sampson, R. J. 1999. What "community" supplies. In *Urban problems and community development*, edited by R. F. Ferguson and W. T. Dickens, 241-92. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Sedlak, W. C. 2009. "Getting to know your neighbor": The efficacy of social networks in mixed-income housing. Philadelphia: Temple Univ.
- Tach, L. M. 2009. More than bricks and mortar: Neighborhood frames, social processes, and the mixed income redevelopment of a public housing project. *City & Community* 8 (3): 269-99.
- Vale, L. J. 2007. *From the puritans to the projects: Public housing and public neighbors*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Venkatesh, S. A. 2000. *American project: The rise and fall of a modern ghetto*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Wilson, W. J. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Young, I. M. 1999. Residential segregation and differentiated citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 3 (2): 237-252.

## Bios

**James Curtis Fraser** is an associate professor in the Department of Human and Organizational Development in Peabody College at Vanderbilt University, and a member of the graduate faculty at Duke University. Among other topics, he has explored the theoretical underpinnings of mixed-income housing development and the actually existing effects upon different populations, including public housing residents and low-income residents in urban neighborhoods. He has also published widely on urban redevelopment policies giving particular attention to their spatial politics. Recent publications include "Public Ownership and Private Profit in Housing," with Deirdre Oakley and Joshua Bazuin in the *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*; "HOPE VI: Calling for Modesty in Its Claims," with James DeFilippis and Joshua Bazuin in Gary Bridge, Tim Butler, and Loretta Lees (eds.) in *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth*; and "Hybrid Forms of Civic Participation in Neighborhood Redevelopment," with Csilla Weninger in *Deliberations*

*in Community Development: Balancing on the Edge*, J. Peter Rothe, Linda J. Carroll, and Dejan Ozegovic (eds.).

**Ashley Brown Burns** is a Ph.D. candidate at the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University, where she earned her M.A. in public policy and the graduate certificate in African and African-American studies. She received her B.A. in political economy from Williams College. She is presently a Derrick K. Gondwe fellow in Africana studies and public policy at Gettysburg College. Her current research areas address social policy, American politics, and racial disparity.

**Joshua Theodore Bazuin** is a postdoctoral fellow at Vanderbilt's Institute for Energy and the Environment. He has been involved in several research projects regarding aspects of public housing in Nashville. In addition to his work on housing, he is active internationally around issues of postconflict transitions and community development, particularly around questions regarding poverty and the environment dimensions of development.

**Deirdre Áine Oakley** is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at Georgia State University. Her research focuses primarily on how social disadvantages, often created or reinforced by urban policy choices, are compounded by geographic space. Since 2008, she has been collaborating with Dr. Lesley Reid and Dr. Erin Ruel on two complementary National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF)—funded projects examining the impact of public housing elimination in Atlanta.