

Sooner Xpress Copy Request – Send to BIZZELL

Print date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019

ILLiad TN: 1076890



Journal Title: Cities of difference /

Volume:

Issue:

Month/Year: 1998

Pages: 1 - 25

Article Author:

Article Title: Introduction

Imprint:

ISSN: 1572303115

Notes:

Not on Shelf ☐

Not on Temp ☐

Not on New ☐

ILLiad TN: 1076890



Call #: HT 153 .C525 1998

Location: Bizzell Memorial
Library Stacks

UserCat: 200

Department: International & Area Studies

113473497 :

Emma Colven (colv0008)

University of Oklahoma **Sooner Xpress**

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Jane M. Jacobs
Ruth Fincher

In describing contemporary cities there are many realities and many daily lives to be accounted for. We inhabit different cities even from those inhabited by our most immediate neighbors. Commentators have long recognized the variety of experiences and processes that come to constitute urban life. Social differences are gathered together in cities at unique scales and levels of intensity. Roland Barthes (1981, p. 96), for example, described cities as the “place of our meeting with the other.” In a similar vein, Richard Sennett (1990, p. 123) suggests that urban dwellers are always “people in the presence of otherness.” From the beginnings of the modern industrialized city, commentators have been enthralled by this diversity: some rejoicing at the energy it injected into everyday life in cities; others blaming it for a loss of community—what they saw to be the modern condition of alienation. Similarly, city governance has vacillated between celebrating and enhancing such diversity, on the one hand, and regulating and repressing it, on the other. Whatever the response, difference is undoubtedly a sustained feature of urban spaces.

Recent developments in contemporary social theory have intensified interest in issues of identity and difference. This sensitivity responds, in part, to the convincing insights of those “others” who have known well the structuring of difference and the importance of identity politics.¹ These voices have challenged singular positions of authority and helped to open out a space in which difference might be theorized in new ways. Along with this enlivened attention to difference has come a new sensitivity to the processes by which identities are constituted and negotiated. These revisions have placed into question the frameworks by which we come to understand urban life and urban processes. “The city” as an object of analysis has been irredeem-

ably unsettled, and many of the more resilient ways urban processes are understood have been rendered problematic. What happens, for example, to the quest for a broadly applicable “theory of urbanization” when we are confronted with the postmodern critique of meta-narratives? What happens to our capacity to produce normative models of cities in this context of a new sensitivity to the politics of difference? What happens to studies of housing, suburbia, the inner city, ghettos, gentrification, social polarization, and urban social movements when framed not by a theory of “the city” but by theories of difference? This collection of essays shows how this recent attention to difference has productively contributed to the way contemporary geographers depict and analyze city spaces and city lives.

Taking difference seriously does not simply mean joyously indulging in urban diversity. Nor does it automatically cast one into a form of depoliticized relativism. The engagements with difference contained in this volume do not throw skyward notions of power, inequality, or politics. As Massey (1995, p. 283) notes, power relations contribute to the constitution of identities. Empowerment, oppression, and exclusion work through regimes of difference. The chapters to follow provide insights into the complex ways in which struggles over identity, resources, citizenry, and space are framed in and through differences that are variously constituted and contextually determined. Each chapter in its own way shows the complex entanglement between identity, power, and place. We can conceptualize this interlinking of power and identity not simply as *difference* but as a *located politics of difference*.

The complex processes that produce the arrangements of privilege and marginalization so evident in urban spaces come into sharp focus when conceptualized by way of a located politics of difference. Not least, reductive economic models for explaining the distribution of “haves” and “have nots” are productively complicated. The lens of difference does not ignore the way in which persistent power structures can unevenly shape urban lives. But it does highlight the ways in which such structures are, in turn, shaped by the contingent circumstances of specific people in specific settings. Emphasizing difference then does not simply mean charting new, more nuanced, uneven geographies of the city. It also means attending to the various ways that specificity—both social and spatial—can transform structures of power and privilege; the ways oppressed groups can, through a politics of identity and a politics of place, reclaim rights, resist, and subvert.

Attending to a politics of difference necessarily collapses the traditional divide between views of city life from cultural and political

economy perspectives. This is not simply to say that the lens of difference draws into focus what might once have been thought of as “culturally” defined urban groups such as ethnic or racial minorities. It is, rather, to acknowledge that processes of representation, signification, and performativity are fundamental components of the way identities are constituted and articulated. These processes of defining difference are in a mutually constitutive relationship with the uneven material conditions of everyday life. As Nancy Fraser (1995, p. 72) notes, “even the most material economic institutions have a constitutive, irreducible cultural dimension” and at the same time “even the most discursive cultural practices have a constitutive, irreducible political-economic dimension.” In this sense this book contributes to recasting the culture–economy dichotomy into a far more powerful cultural political economy of urban identities and places. For example, in many of the chapters to follow the representation of groups and urban places in public discourses are shown to be complexly entwined with the production and reproduction of the material imperatives of city lives—through urban labor markets and the restructuring of entitlements through the state. Similarly, many of the chapters deal with the way in which contemporary political struggles around rights and entitlements are often as not struggles that cohere around a politics of identity constituted through processes as much cultural as economic.

Many threads link contemporary urban geographies sensitive to difference with the varied urban geographies we have constructed in the past. Geography has a long tradition of attending to how certain social groups come to experience the city in ways different to others. Such concerns are contained within the varied urban geographies of “race,” class, gender, and, more recently, disability and sexuality. It is not our task in this introduction to trace the specific lineages of each of these areas of research. Where appropriate, the chapters that follow provide such accounts. But we can note that in recent years these more traditional geographies of social categories have undergone significant transformation. At the very least, the range of identified “groups” whose urban circumstances might be examined and theorized, and whose particular and diverse forms of marginalization or advancement might be publicized, has been extended. In this volume, for example, there is a consideration of life stages, physical disabilities, and religious convictions, as well as analyses of more familiar axes of difference such as gender, class, and race. It will also be clear from the chapters to follow that there is no predetermined or prescribed approach for contemporary urban geographies of difference. The papers in this collection, for example, draw upon varied

paradigms and methodologies. Some have a historical materialist starting point and emphasize how differently identified and resourced groups are incorporated within the structured material options of urban living. Others draw more clearly on a cultural perspective that reveals the moral and ideological frameworks underpinning the constitution of difference in urban spaces. All demonstrate clearly that geographies of a located politics of difference compel these once “incompatible” perspectives to come together in productive associations.

It is difficult to trace in any ordered way the trajectories of contemporary thought which have meant that difference is a central (and yet productively decentering) component of the ways society—including urban society—is now understood. We could point to post-structuralism, to feminism, to postcolonial criticism, to psychoanalytic theory, to queer theory, each of which has contributed in its own way to the opening up of the subject of difference. There is much cross-fertilization between these not-so-distinct bodies of thought that would further complicate any attempt to pin down origins. This introduction does not attempt to definitively trace the intellectual lineages of a located politics of difference. Others, like Ed Soja (1996), have already provided such road maps. Rather, we use this introductory chapter to sketch certain themes that are especially relevant to how a politics of difference restructures the way cities and urban processes are thought about. They are, of course, also themes taken up in far greater detail by the various authors who have contributed to this volume. We begin, below, in the section entitled “Identifying Difference,” with rehearsing the significant transformation from thinking about identity (and logically difference) as pregiven and fixed to something that is socially produced and multiply located. This is followed by a section entitled “(Dis)placing Difference,” which deals with the consequences of this way of thinking about identity for some of the current commentaries on difference in the city. The implications of a new emphasis on difference for questions of justice is examined in the section entitled “Just Difference.” Particular attention is given to the issues that arise when universal notions of justice come into contact with a politics of difference. Our final section, “Re-placing Difference,” suggests the necessity and significance of situating theories and narratives of difference in spatialized frameworks.

IDENTIFYING DIFFERENCE

When we talk of difference we are clearly invoking the idea that there are distinctions between people and groups. These distinctions may

be marked through gender, race, ethnicity, age, life course, sexuality, or any other referent. More likely, difference will be articulated through a combination of such defining characteristics. Urban studies have long noted differences among urban citizenry and the ways in which such distinctions are evident in city spaces. A usefully illustrative example of how difference has long been factored into accounts of the city is provided by the work of E. W. Burgess and his colleagues in the Chicago School of urban sociology. Of course, Burgess produced the now overexposed concentric zone model of urban growth, a model that was expected to stand as a template for "the city" conceived of as an "organism" with its own internal logic of growth and development. Within the framework of the concentric zone model, Burgess plotted what he saw to be the predictable spatial patterning of ethnic enclaves, racial ghettos, areas of prostitution, and "clean and bright" suburbs. The Chicago School's conceptualization of difference is useful as a point of comparison to demonstrate how ideas of social difference and urban spatiality have recently transformed. This model also helps illustrate the political implication that the identification and charting of difference may have.

In this early and somewhat crude urban model the encounter with "difference"—rudimentary as it is—contains many assumptions and prejudices. A number of these assumptions are quite at odds with the basic premises of contemporary thinking on identity and difference. Most notably, the social distinctions like "race" used in the model were accepted as pregiven and relatively uncomplicated categories that were simply there to be mapped. Others, like monogamous heterosexuality, were so naturalized that they were present only as the invisible norm against which the "deviant" sexuality of prostitution was positioned. Such conceptions of identity are at odds with current views that subjectivity (be it sexualized, gendered, racialized, or whatever) is socially constituted. Subjectivity is constituted by a wide range of discursive practices that label, name, and ascribe. These discourses are part of the means by which subjects come to be known and to know themselves. This is the idea of the interpellated (or "called") subject. From this perspective there is no natural or pregiven subject.

The Burgess model also assumed that in the case of certain groups it was appropriate that they be defined primarily, almost exclusively, by way of one single attribute—be it race, class, sexuality, or criminality. Again, this conceptualization of identity as reducible to one attribute is contrary to our current understanding of identity as multiply and variably positioned; that is, we are racialized, classed, *and* gendered (to select but three possible axes of difference). Furthermore, how these distinct attributes come into play in terms of life

chances is by no means given. Current thinking on identity means that describing, or (in the case of the Chicago sociologists) mapping, differences *as if* based around stable and pregiven categories of distinction is problematic. Critical studies of difference must instead chart the varied processes by which difference is constituted. This transformation in perspective is very clearly illustrated in this volume by Lawrence Knopp (Chapter 7), who (revisiting his earlier pathbreaking work on sexuality and cities) explains that geographers have now moved beyond "naive mappings of sexual spaces" (p. 149). In place of such uncritical geographies of (sexual) difference, Knopp proposes geographies of sexuality that attend to the interplay between urban spaces and the complex constitution of sexualized subjectivities.

Another important aspect of current critical perspectives on difference is the assumption that the processes that work to construct gendered, racialized or, say, classed identities are embedded in frameworks of power. Structures of difference are encoded with certain assumptions that variously apportion measures of legitimacy, civility, or authority to the socially constructed subject. Furthermore, through processes of regulation and repetition, these unevenly empowered differences are made to appear natural or, in the words of Judith Butler (1990, p. 33), to have the "appearance of substance." If we rethink the Burgess model of the city in these terms, then what it stands for is radically transformed. In the first place, we can begin to see how it was not an objective description of the city that *indifferently* attended to the social distinctions that occurred there. Rather, this model was one more articulation in the ongoing discursive constitution of those categories of distinction. Furthermore, the Burgess model provides us with an insight into the implications of those differences. This model of the city made specific assumptions about the social categories it mapped. In particular, a number of social groups (such as blacks and prostitutes) were designated as "problematic." The spatial concentration of such groups served as an indicator of the city organism being in a state of malfunction. These concentrations of negatively differentiated groups created what Burgess described as "disturbances" to the urban "metabolism" (Burgess, 1967, p. 52). These "problem" groups deviated from the white, heteronormative ideal embodied in the "clean and bright" outer suburbs. In this sense the Chicago sociologists actually produced an assimilationist model of the city. It was assumed that under the right conditions these "deviant" groups would conform to the characteristics embodied by the suburbs and then the city would become fully healthy. Burgess's map also carried with it the authority of being an academic, social scientific account of urban differences. This contributed to the way in which these constructs of

difference and deviancy were legitimized and naturalized. So it is not simply the idea of "the city" that is installed underneath the neat concentric zone of Burgess's model city but also a range of hierarchical structurings of social difference and moral ambitions to assimilate such differences.

It has been a sustained concern of contemporary critical studies of difference to undo the types of fixed categories, moral judgments and assimilationist goals that are so clearly illustrated by Burgess' model of the city. In place of unreflexive descriptions of difference, critical studies of difference concern themselves with the socially constituted subject and the means by which these subjectivities are variously centered and privileged or marginalized and disadvantaged. If one thinks about identity as discursively constituted, then one does away with the notion of a *pregiven*, essential identity. In its place we must assume that identity comes through the temporary fixing of the array of differences that constitute the embodied person. Judith Butler conceptualizes this process of fixing in terms of "performativity" or "naming as an identity-constituting performance." This is "a specific modality of power" that works through discourse as a means of establishing the parameters of identification by which the subject comes to be known (Butler, 1993, pp. 187–188). An example of this is the way in which, say, the category "woman" comes not from biology but from discursively constituting the sexed body in specific (feminine) ways. Brendan Gleeson, in Chapter 5 on disability, in this book, is particularly illustrative in these terms. Through a historical perspective, he is able to show that disability is something which is "made" from the impaired body under specific historical circumstances. That is, he points to the fact that the relationship between the physically impaired body and the intensely marginalized disabled body is not a necessary or given relationship, but historically contingent.

Gleeson's thinking about impairment and disability demonstrates that to claim that subjectivity is discursively constituted does not mean that it is confined to the sphere of ideas. Discourses are embedded in relational frameworks of power, in institutions, and in structures of governmentality. They have the ability not only to constitute subjectivity but also to demarcate the privileges and rights that embodied subjectivities might enjoy. In this sense, the marking of differences is contingent upon ongoing social processes and is complexly entwined with material conditions (Jones & Moss, 1995, p. 254, after Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). Such an observation is highly relevant to a consideration of cities and difference where the traditions of thinking about difference have often as not centered on issues of rights and access to resources. In the light of nonessentialist conceptions of difference

these traditional urban concerns do not disappear but they might need to be thought about and acted upon in new ways.

One of the challenges raised by the idea of the discursively constituted subject is that it suggests identity can be “reduced” to the effects of naming. This is an issue that has been central to recent debates within postcolonial theory, where considerable attention has been given to the ways in which the colonial self was constructed in reference to a colonized (racialized, primitivized, feminized) other. For example, postcolonial theorists might argue that difference in this conceptualization is cast as simply the “subject-effect” of colonial discourses (Williams & Chrisman, 1994, p. 16). But is our acceptance that subjectivity is discursively constituted necessarily limited to “effects”? Is identity so easily stitched into place? Do city dwellers simply succumb to the way society sees them? Kay Anderson, in Chapter 9 of this volume, suggests that urban dwellers are neither fully determined by (say) structures of racialization, class, colonialism, or bureaucracy nor fully outside these processes. They occupy what she calls, taking from Teresa de Lauretis (1987, p. 25), “in-between-spaces” in which it is possible to negotiate the categorizations by which they have come to be known. We might think of this as the open contingency of identity. Yet while it is important to admit such complex contingencies, it is also true that many political struggles (and even everyday transactions) are conducted by way of what we would call singularized identity designations—“woman,” “race,” “ethnicity,” and “gayness.” That is, there is an urban politics that forms around the very specific identity categories by which subjects have come to be unevenly placed in the sociospatial architecture of the city. Spivak (1990, p. 12) refers to this as a form of “operational” or strategic essentialism in which certain socially ascribed identities become provisional rallying points.

That such singularized political formations occur provisionally and often strategically is significant. The experience of feminism, for example, has shown that alliances that occur around single rallying points like gender have immense strength but also a certain vulnerability. Elspeth Probyn (1990, p. 176) states the problematic in these terms: “in creating our own centres and our own locals, we tend to forget that our centres displace others to the peripheries of our making.” Probyn is referring here to the limits of claims for political solidarity around a universalized notion of “woman” and “women’s oppression.” Such universalist claims set aside alternate vectors of oppression (based on, say, race, class, or sexuality) that mark out one woman’s experiences from another. Such singularized rallying points can produce their own exclusions and their own spheres of privilege. An example of this can also be seen when state bureaucracies sensi-

tized to difference become financial supporters of such identity-defined organizations. The "category workers" who are employed as representatives of, say, an ethnic group, disabled people, or women, may find their bureaucratic positioning difficult to reconcile with the diverse requirements of their identified communities (Pettman, 1992, pp. 102–103). So, to conceive of difference as constituted through a more fluid and nonessentialist performativity of identity at once dispenses with some of the more persistent problems associated with "identity politics" and poses new problems in terms of the pragmatics of politics and governmentality.

What such political dilemmas point to is the importance of recognizing the sheer multiplicity of differences that may cohere around any one person. Social distinctions are constituted in specific contexts through multiple and interpenetrating axes of difference, what Pringle and Watson (1992, p. 70) usefully refer to as a "chain of differences." At any one time we occupy more than one system of difference (Jones & Moss, 1995, p. 254). And at any one time we may be fixed into or strategically mobilize different aspects of the array of differences through which our embodied selves are known. How we are seen and how we present ourselves to others is, then, always provisional and contextual. As Geraldine Pratt puts it in this volume (Chapter 2), we are often "torn between identifications" and we regularly move "between identifications in different situations and places" (p. 26).

This, then, is a reformulation of identity around not only the notion of interlocking matrices of power relations (Ruddick, 1996, p. 133) but also the provisional and contingent performativity of subjectivity. As productive and necessary as these reformulations are, they do produce certain practical problems for the urban commentator. How does one speak (and write) about such multiply constituted and locationally contingent notions of difference? What are the pertinent dimensions along which different identities are expressed or represented? Should we view people as grouped by class, gender, sexuality, life stage, ethnicity, place, nation, or some combination thereof, and if so which combination and in which contexts? As Bordo (1990, p. 139) asks, "Just how many axes can one include and still preserve analytic focus or argument?" Many of the chapters to follow demonstrate well the intersection of axes of difference, even while they may, for whatever reason, emphasize one axis above others. Often the choice of which identity attribute to be emphasized is determined by the vector of differentiation that most tellingly contributes to that subject's marginalization or empowerment. Other times, the emphasis tends to be prespecified by theoretical questions or intellectual

lineages. A number of the contributors to this volume engage in useful reflections on their own efforts to adjust their earlier theoretical convictions in line with new theorizations of difference. For example, Geraldine Pratt (in Chapter 2) recasts her earlier work with Susan Hanson on gender and labor markets and extends these findings through thinking about the multiple differences that constitute located household labor relations. In a similar spirit, Kay Anderson (in Chapter 9) extends her original thinking about the construction of Chinatowns by questioning the reification of race within work influenced by the orientalist tradition and elaborating on the way Chinatowns are also implicated in labor markets where race, gender, and class interconnect. Liz Bondi (in Chapter 8) also revisits her ongoing project of reconfiguring gentrification as something more than a class process. She argues that gendering the gentrification process also necessitates attention to sexuality.

(DIS)PLACING DIFFERENCE

It is easy to critique the now outdated modes of mapping difference that are evident in the Chicago School of urban studies. But in what ways have the current modes of registering difference in contemporary cities incorporated the types of retheorizations we have just outlined? We might begin to answer this question by attending to some of the more dominant (and sometimes related) narratives that attempt, at their boldest, to explain the contemporary city or, more modestly, to simply speak to the specific conditions of contemporary urban life. For while the explanatory capacity of those old models of "the city" might no longer suffice, there is no lack of what might be thought of as blockbuster urban commentaries. For some commentators to speak of the present moment is, necessarily, to begin to speak of cities. The city, at least for some, has come to stand as the paradigmatic site of postmodernity: it is the place where, to paraphrase Ed Soja (1989), "it all comes together."

One feature of contemporary cities that has received considerable attention over the last decade is the phenomenon of social polarization. Social polarization is a term that has come into common currency as a way of explaining the specific social differentiations and inequities apparent in many First World cities. The term is specifically used to describe the trend in which an increasing disparity has been seen to emerge between an expanded and more diversely constituted "underclass" and more affluent groups. It is implied in the term social polarization that the "middle" has dropped away as a sig-

nificant grouping in the class arrangements of urban societies. As Lash and Urry (1994, p. 160) note: "middle income groups are becoming scarcer as income distribution increasingly assumes a bimodal pattern." Explanations of this heightened differentiation in contemporary urban societies draw primarily on recent economic restructurings—such as the shift from manufacturing to services—which, although globally driven, have distinct local effects. Most notably, social polarization is understood mainly in terms of changes in individual and household capacities, and argues a case for the diminishment or enhancement of these capacities in terms of the character of labor force participation (or, for that matter, nonparticipation). Not surprisingly, then, many of the studies that give empirical flesh to social polarization draw on statistical data sets that illuminate income and labor force participation (for a review and bibliography, see Gibson et al., 1996).

In the case of North American and European cities, these economic (class) disparities are often noted to have specific ethnic, racial, or gender characteristics. Lash and Urry (1994, p. 145), for example, note that "large numbers of immigrants flow" into the new urban underclass (see also Anderson, Chapter 9; Jacobs, Chapter 11; and Kofman, Chapter 12, this volume). Similarly, Saskia Sassen's depiction of the socially polarized "global city" has noted that in the case of New York "the poor are disproportionately black and Hispanic" and large numbers of this racialized poor are also within households headed by a single female parent (Sassen, 1991, p. 264). These accounts of social polarization in contemporary cities do offer a specific register of difference. They demonstrate how, in class terms especially, certain differences are actually being exacerbated in contemporary First World cities. They also indicate how class differences are complexly intertwined with race, ethnicity, and gender. Furthermore, there is considerable local variation in the effecting of global economic change, both in cities that are designated as "global" and in those that are not. As Kofman notes in Chapter 12, these global restructurings incorporate gendered and racialized peoples in different ways.

Complicating the class assumptions of social polarization debates is an important step in chronicling the multiple faces of differentiation within contemporary cities. It is an issue further developed in this volume by Katherine Gibson (Chapter 13), who notes that social polarization arguments approach "difference in a way that sees it as primarily economic . . . , as distinguishing groups that are relatively internally homogeneous and structurally defined by contemporary processes of capital accumulation" (p. 303). Gibson is implying that

strict economistic adjudications of difference (even those into which ethnicity or gender might "flow") are inadequate for understanding the complexities of the structuring and negotiation of difference in cities. As Kay Anderson (Chapter 9) suggests, this is as much a methodological as a theoretical issue, arising in part from the dominance of positivist frameworks for detecting difference. Mingione (1993, pp. 325–326) has suggested that social polarization studies may be well served by disconnecting from statistical databases and connecting with alternate methodologies that could better highlight the diverse processes by which difference is constituted.

What are the multiply articulated processes by which disadvantage is made and remade? As Gans (1993, p. 328) argues, it is necessary not only to understand that there is a new urban poor but also to understand how "the poor," in all their internal diversity, are "chosen for victimization, how and by whom." Addressing such questions takes us further than issues of economic advantage or disadvantage. On the one hand, it prompts the posing of optimistic questions about how urban dwellers negotiate their variable positionings in urban society and how they might chart strategic points of political commonality. But, on the other hand, it compels us to consider how disadvantage is made and remade by empowered institutions and the morally laden discursive fields by which specific subjectivities—like "blacks," or "single mothers," or "prostitutes"—come to be known. Several chapters in this volume contribute to the latter project. Fincher (Chapter 3) describes moral narratives that draw on life stage norms to render "youth" (of a particular racialized, gendered, and class-identified variety) in American inner cities a problematic designation, to be contrasted reprovably with a smugly successful, and adult, suburban norm. Robyn Dowling (Chapter 4) unsettles the contemporary predilection for accounting for diversity among suburbs by way of women's entry into the paid labor force. She argues that suburban lives are negotiated around moral codes of mothering and paid work participation that operate, often in association with diverse religious beliefs and practices, to construct complex between- and within-suburban differences. Lois M. Takahashi (Chapter 6) shows the importance of moral and religious norms in the ways leaders of certain Los Angeles immigrant groups deemed the homeless and those living with AIDS as "inside" or "outside" their communities.

A second and related narrative that circulates in relation to the contemporary city emphasizes the role that consumption now plays in urban transformation. Certainly the commentaries of David Harvey (1989) and Ed Soja (1989) on the conditions of postmodernity give grand testament to this new logic of urban space. The role of con-

sumption is evident in many aspects of the contemporary city: processes of gentrification, the expansion of shopping malls, the new emphasis on image making, and so on. Bondi (Chapter 8), Gibson (Chapter 13), and Jacobs (Chapter 11) each provide explicit critiques of the way difference is depicted in such accounts of the consumption-based (postmodern) city. Within this new cultural logic of urban development, image making and trading in images is paramount. Here difference is registered primarily in terms of how it is appropriated by—and transformed into a commodity within—reoriented processes of capital accumulation. As Gibson puts it, difference becomes something which is “good for business” (p. 309).

As a number of the authors in this volume note, such a scenario is politically debilitating. It assumes that capital has taken over, exhausted, every aspect of city life. Moreover, it is often anticipated that under these new regimes of appropriation political mobilization is thwarted. A politics of difference is transformed into the play of difference. But if a politics of difference were placed into closer contact with these narratives of consumption-led transformation, then it might become evident that the outcomes of these encounters was far from predictable. As Ed Soja's recent book *Thirdspace* (1996) hints, appropriation and political disablement are but two of the modalities that might be assumed. For example, Jacobs (Chapter 11) argues that “playing” with difference does not necessarily compromise urban political mobilizations and can in fact activate a most contested politics precisely around issues of signification and representation. This is a point also emphasized by Knopp in Chapter 7, where he considers the transformation of Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras from sites of performative resistance to national television events. Such “appropriations” are at the same time amplifications that carry with them gains as well as losses. Indeed, they may even generate a new politics based around what Knopp calls “managing success” (p. 164).

Reexamined through the lens of difference, globalization and social polarization can no longer be simply understood in terms of disembodied and undifferentiated corporate capitalists on some placeless stage, foisting their multinational solutions on powerless local jurisdictions. To challenge this economic meta-narrative does not, however, do away with issues of economic advantage and disadvantage in the negotiation of a politics of identity and rights. In many of the papers within this volume it is clear that the material resources of groups vis-à-vis others are still a vitally important consideration. This is a theme that resonates with broader debates within feminist and postcolonial writings. For example, Gayatri Spivak (1988) mounts a cogent critique of the desire within poststructuralist theory to incor-

porate difference by way of the subaltern. She argues that this is an example of the West instrumentally coming into contact with the subaltern in order to better theorize itself, yet notes that these same theorists are unwilling to accept the patently modernist fact that global capitalism has produced most uneven geographies of power and privilege. Indulging in difference is not then an option "enjoyed" in the same way by all (hooks, 1992). For example, Geltmaker (1992) has clearly outlined what we might think of as the uneven enjoyment of difference by way of gay activism for AIDS-related health services. He notes that this is an activism predicated on a class-specific acceptability of being gay that works to ensure that the services secured are primarily directed at those AIDS sufferers within the same economic class. Those with AIDS who are also materially disadvantaged and who might live in less tolerant communities that do not recognize their deservingness of support would never dare to so identify. Our point is to stress that registering difference has uneven outcomes: for some it marks a joyous inclusiveness; for some, a destabilizing contact with otherness; for some, a reminder of the unavoidable materiality of their marginalization.

The influence of material limits and opportunities on the success with which the interests of particular identity groups are acted out on the urban stage is clearly evident in many of the chapters that follow. For example, claims in relation to urban space that are structured around a specific identity politics (such as race, gender, sexuality, or class) are variously restrained or activated, depending on the material resources available. It is clear that economic advantage can assist in guaranteeing particular outcomes or successes for specifically identified groups (see, e.g., Knopp, Chapter 7, and Fincher, Chapter 3). But the relationship between identity-based claims and economic advantage is not always so neatly aligned. A number of contributors to this volume note the importance of "struggle" in the structuring of urban politics and the transformation of urban spaces into more homely places by under-resourced groups (see, e.g., Anderson, Chapter 9, and Nagar & Leitner, Chapter 10).

JUST DIFFERENCE

The reformulations of difference outlined above pose a specific challenge in terms of some of the more enduring political concerns of urban reformists. At stake here is where issues of equity might stand once cities are reconceptualized through the framework of radical difference. Can the political objective of equity be reconciled with

the notion of cities of difference? Does producing equity require that difference be obliterated in the name of justice? How can the just city coexist with cities of difference? We can once again turn to feminist theory as a guide here, for it has been within feminism that there has been explicit debate about equality and difference. Joan Scott (1990), for example, has argued against framing equity and difference as irreconcilable on the grounds that this binary is itself disabling in terms of feminist political objectives. She sees equality and difference as interdependent but not exclusive terms. As she so succinctly expresses it, "equality is not the elimination of difference, and difference does not preclude equality" (Scott, 1990, p. 136). Anne Phillips (1992, p. 25) further elaborates by considering the issues which arise from replacing the universal citizen as the subject of justice with differentiated persons and groups. For her the issue is "how far one would want to go; and in this case what balance one might hope to achieve between the ideals of the universal citizen and the reality of group differentiation."

Significant in this debate has been the work of Iris Marion Young, who has provided a more complex conceptualization of oppression. Her notion of the variable vectors of power and the oppressions they produce is explained in terms of "five faces of oppression" (Young, 1990, p. 39). Young's "plural explication of the concept of oppression" incorporates such explicit axes of oppression as racism, sexism, ageism, and homophobia but reformulates them into broader modalities of power, which she labels as exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence (1990, p. 42). In reconceptualizing oppression in this way Young is attempting to dismantle neat alignments between singularly identified oppressed groups and tyrannically cast oppressors (e.g., black/white; women/men; homosexuality/heteronormativity). Drawing on Foucauldian ideas of power, she argues that oppression is the consequence of complexly structured regimes of difference that are "systematically reproduced in major economic, political and cultural institutions" (Young, 1990, p. 41). This may even include the oppressive consequences of well-meaning practices like education, bureaucratic administration, medicine, and even some of the more inclusionary forms of governmentality. Young's project is explicitly directed at attempting to adjust older notions of justice based around equity for a universal citizen so they are more responsive to difference. Like Joan Scott, she mounts a sustained challenge to an "ideal of justice" that presumes the necessity of the "transcendence of group difference" (Young, 1990, p. 157; see also Fraser, 1995). This older, Enlightenment framework of justice is, she poses, assimilationist. In its place she proposes "an

egalitarian politics of difference" that attends to difference not by way of essentialist conceptions of those group distinctions but by way of difference defined "more fluidly and relationally" (Young, 1990, p. 157).

In reconceptualizing the relationship between justice and the politics of difference Young draws specifically on city life and on a well-established tradition of viewing public spaces in cities as potentially democratic (Ruddick, 1996, p. 134). For Young, cities are sites defined by "the being together of strangers," a concept that raises specific issues in terms of justice and difference (Young, 1990, p. 237; Gibson, Chapter 13, this volume). As Young (1990, p. 163) sees it, urbanization actually amplifies "particularistic affiliations" and reinforces "group solidarity and differentiation." In short, the city challenges the Rousseauist ideal of community, built as it is around the notion of copresent subjects that are "transparent" to each other and, because of this, enjoy certain levels of mutual understanding and sympathy. Young describes this idea of community as a dream that presumes a number of basic forms of social relations, such as face-to-face contact, which have long been absent from urban life. For Young, city life is not structured around known-ness and transparency but around social relations between "both seen and unseen strangers" (1990, p. 237), around casual encounters and the brushing together of opaque groups and individuals. It is within this social context that the uneven distributions of advantage and disadvantage, privilege and marginalization, are embedded.

The dilemma of seeing city life in this way, of course, is that it begs the question of how, in the jumble of identity politics that exists in city spaces, power between strategically identifying groups actually will be exercised. As Phillips (1992, p. 25) says, unless we interpret politics as an activity in which we act "outside of ourselves," consciously beyond our own positions, then there will be a "battle between vested interests which the larger groups will inevitably win." What must be avoided, as Neil Smith cogently argues, is an assumption of the "automatic equivalence of different oppressions," or a ranking of oppressions by appeal to histories of relative suffering (Smith, 1994). A close examination of "real cities," Pratt and Hanson (1994, p. 7) shows us, makes it very clear that

different groups and inequalities are structured relationally; a celebration of alterity (especially one premised on the denial that different groups can or even should understand each other) would seem to draw attention away from the relations of power

and domination that structure difference and the very real *connections* that exist between groups. (emphasis in original)

If city life is understood not as a community, but as a site structured around the actual, not imagined, "being together of strangers" joined through uneven power relations, then this has direct implications for the ways justice might be instituted in urban space. In particular it compels us to rethink a pragmatics of justice built around redistributive interventions aimed at delivering equity. It may well be that Henri Lefebvre's concept of the right to the city, as outlined by Eleanore Kofman (Chapter 12, this volume) can provide a guide to a reconfiguring of justice in cities of difference. She argues that new formulations of social citizenship should enshrine, as a right, respect for diversity and difference, for it is such an integral aspect of urban life, the use of city space, and the decisions that are made about that space.

Nancy Fraser (1995, p. 69) suggests that justice now needs to be built around both redistribution and recognition (of difference). She proposes an alternate framework for urban "remedies" that is structured around "affirmation" and "transformation." Affirmative remedies effect equity without doing away with the fundamental structures of difference around which inequity may have been built. This might include, say, multiculturalism or a gay rights politics that revalues and gives new legitimacy to previously marginalized groups. It is easy to see how in the contemporary polity of cities such redistributive strategies can cojoin with a politics of affirmation. Indeed, in those cities that retain some semblance of welfare governmentality, this is precisely the way in which justice is being restructured. But Fraser warns against some of the perverse and unseen outcomes of such recognitions of difference. These redistributive programs can create what she calls "stigmatized classes of vulnerable people" who are then resentfully perceived as being the beneficiaries of special compensatory measures.

There is presently plenty of evidence of resentment, expressed in complex ways and with diverse justifications, among distinct sectors of urban society. The problems posed for redistributive reforms in such urban contexts is specifically addressed in this volume in Chapter 5 by Gleeson and Chapter 6 by Takahashi. Lois M. Takahashi deals with local responses to the placement of service delivery points for AIDS sufferers and the homeless. Her paper reveals the deep antipathy that urban residents can express when human service provisions for "undesirable" groups move into in their neighborhood. Her chapter demonstrates clearly that the "trouble" surrounding human ser-

vices delivery in contemporary cities is not simply a matter of a misrecognition of the diverse axes of oppression that the client group may face. Rather, it is the way in which human services must negotiate an often antipathetic and defensive NIMBY ("not in my backyard") politics. Brendan Gleeson (Chapter 5) also points to the way in which aversions between "strangers" intersects with the processes of deinstitutionalization that have seen facilities for the disabled become the "unwanted neighbors" (p. 99) of normative homeowners. He notes that these localized expressions of antipathy are regularly shored up by centralized policies which assume that facilities for the disabled will impact negatively on property values. This, he argues, points not to cities of difference but to "cities of (in)difference" (p. 100).

It is certainly true that much of the recent restructuring of the welfare state evident in North America, Europe, and other First World regions is based precisely upon this type of misperception and the resentments it seems to generate. Once recognizably marginalized and disadvantaged groups are now seen to have "too much": too many special rights, too much government assistance, and so on. Neil Smith (1994, pp. 3-4), for example, suggests that the U.S. city of the 1990s is "increasingly the revanchist city in which the reassertion of rigid, conservative, legal, cultural and ideological statutes has been startling . . . [resulting] from a series of political and economic backlashes, backed by state power, against alternative visions and realities of social justice." And Robert Lake (1994, p. 601) has noted the reduction in size of the contemporary American public sphere and the simultaneous growth of mean-spiritedness, particularly at the local scale at which exclusionary modes of democracy prevail. This is an aspect of the policies toward single mothers in North American cities described by Ruth Fincher in Chapter 3 of this volume.

It is perhaps more necessary than ever before to think about how justice might be reconfigured through the radical transformations that attending to difference brings. Transformative remedies, as Nancy Fraser sees them, depend upon a radical fracturing of the generative frameworks of difference around which inequity has been built. This would entail deconstructing the binary notions of, say, white and black or hetero- and homosexuality. Fraser (1995, p. 83) sees this transformative politics not as a mechanism for dissolving difference entirely but as a way of opening out possibilities for sustaining "multiple, debinarized, fluid, ever-shifting differences." Or does David Harvey's (1996, p. 362) reformulated universality, one which is "construed in dialectical relations with particularity," provide a realistic and realizable political option? Harvey suggests that political futures must recognize that "some are more other than others" and that radical poli-

tics must work to draw different groups together into strategically formed alliances in order to ensure that justice prevails in relation to those who are so deeply marginalized. But is Harvey's political vision of "synthesis" (1996, p. 431) just as elusive as Fraser's radical fracturing?

The problematic posed by the located accounts of difference charted in the chapters to follow is that even as we may theorize such political possibilities, there are residual, nonprogressive structures of power and difference that are deeply embedded in city spaces and that resist such radical transformations. It is difficult to imagine how one might begin to reconcile a theorization of fractured and positional identities with an urban politics that is so routinely expressed by way of oppositional frameworks. It is difficult to imagine how a revised notion of justice might resurrect itself in contexts where difference plays a key role in the way marginalized or disenfranchised groups compete for the diminished resources of the welfare state. In part this is a task that involves attending to the diverse structures of urban politics, an issue of interest to a number of the contributors to this volume.

RE-PLACING DIFFERENCE

Theories of difference assume that contingency, or context, is significant. In the writings on difference this contingency is often conceptualized with recourse to spatialized metaphors, and particularly the notion first mobilized by Adrienne Rich (1986) as a "politics of location." Rich's term has been widely taken up by geographers concerned with rethinking identity politics and relational differences (see, e.g., Smith & Katz, 1993; Pile & Thrift, 1995; Rose, 1993, 1994). It has provided a way of moving from universalizing spatial visions toward geographies that are open to that which is cast as minor, marginal, or other. Elspeth Probyn (1990, p. 177) has considered the routine way in which this new openness to difference articulates itself as a "cry for the 'local.'" Probyn (1990, p. 186) concludes that it is fundamentally important in the project of a "politics of location" to look at "the construction of locale" and how it is implicated both in the reproduction of social difference and in the way our experiences of specific places are circumscribed by a politics of location. Many geographers have been engaged in just such a project for many years. They have been able to demonstrate that place and space are far more than "neutral backdrops or uncomplicated stages for people's lives," more than "containers within which social relations develop" (Pratt &

Hanson, 1994, p. 25). Instead, these geographies have shown how place and social processes are complexly intertwined.

One of the clearest statements of the relationship between "placement" in a locale and the construction of social identities and diversity was made by Pratt and Hanson (1994) in the opening article of the feminist geography journal *Gender, Place and Culture*. Based on their important study of women at work in Worcester, Massachusetts, Pratt and Hanson (1994, p. 6) found that contests over identity occurred in and through the spatial relations of places. Their focus on place worked against rigid and static conceptualizations of difference along lines like class, gender, and sexual alliance. In their view the use of geographical metaphors in feminist writing fails to explore fully the ways that complex configurations of identity emerge in place. Using a detailed empirical study of the social relations of workplaces and of the exhibited preferences of employers for certain "types" of worker in their firms, Pratt and Hanson were able to substantiate their point that community and identity are not accounted for solely "in movement, in the ability to disidentify, and dislodge privilege" (Pratt & Hanson, 1994, p. 25). Instead of this more mobile theorization of identity, their work suggests that there is a "stickiness to identity grounded in the fact that many women's lives are lived locally." This point returns us to the tension that exists between the radically fragmented notions of identity (which current theorizations of difference stress) and the less transformative and transforming lived realities. As Pratt and Hanson (1994, p. 25) note:

Many people simply do not move through the city in the way that [some] feminists suggest, at least not within certain spheres of their lives—especially in relation to labour and housing markets. . . . At the very least, this simple observation suggests that feminist theorists must work with a more complicated set of geographical constructs to conceptualise adequately subjectivity and community.

Many chapters in this book develop the point that people's relationships with places help construct their identities like their relationships within class, gender and ethnic groupings. Nagar and Leitner (Chapter 10) demonstrate that the appropriation of place and the control exercised over urban spaces by powerful groups is an important pivot in struggles that shape identities. Pratt (Chapter 2) continues her project of showing how "urban space orders grids of social difference" (p. 44), using an analysis of the lived realities of multicultural space in Vancouver, British Columbia. She indicates not

only the complexity of the relationships between identity and place but also the limits of those arguments that see city space as borderless and zoneless. Anderson (Chapter 9) claims that contests around identity and poverty actively transform urban space into place. Other contributors look at the significance of representations of city spaces, in the constitution of identities in public discourse (see Fincher, Chapter 3, Knopp, Chapter 7, and Bondi, Chapter 8).

Doreen Massey argues that a conceptualization of space through the lens of difference “inherently implies the existence in the lived world of a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces: cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another, or existing in relations of paradox or antagonism” (1994, p. 3). Places are open to the presence of social relations crafted at all spatial scales. In this vein, growing emphasis is being placed on the intersection of differently scaled processes in the construction of identity, with various geographers situating their sustained interest in the local in terms of its full range of broader and narrower spatial contexts. Smith (1993), for example, has noted the particular identities that seem to adhere to social processes at the scales of the body, home, local community, city, region, nation, and globe. Similarly, Ruddick (1996, p. 140) has demonstrated how an apparently “local” urban public square is also at the same time “situated in a liminal space of a global city” and may consequently play a “more pivotal international role in the production and dissemination of social identities [or] mythologies, than entire regions or nations in other parts of the world.” These geographers are suggesting that internationally broad social configurations are forged with reference to local places, that local spaces are not limited in their relationships to local identities.

Several chapters in this collection extend this emphasis in the geographical literature on the complexity of spatial scales that flow through “place”: the ways in which the local is always also a national or an international space, or the way in which “local” identities are always also constituted through nonlocal processes, or the way in which place-based identities are tied to the micropolitics of the home or the body. Pratt, for example, in Chapter 2 notes the diverse outcomes that arise from the presence of those from beyond Canadian borders in the multicultural spaces near to Vancouver’s gentrifying inner-city neighborhoods. Dowling (Chapter 4) registers a different spatial scale at work in the constitution of suburban space. She demonstrates how apparently “minor” codes around modes of mothering can spill out of the confines of the house and constitute the moral geographies of neighborhoods, establishing broader-scaled patterns of inclusion and exclusion. In a related fashion, Bondi (Chapter 8) demonstrates how

study of processes of neighborhood gentrification cannot be sealed off from study of the politics of the sexed body.

A number of the chapters extend this theme of the spatial complexity of cities by drawing our attention to the links between urban localities and geopolitical processes such as nation building, colonialism, and postcolonialism. Kofman's account in Chapter 12 of migrant labor in the "global" cities of Europe, for example, shows clearly that city spaces are also transnational spaces and that "urban" rights are complexly entwined with broader, nationally constituted issues of citizenship. In a different vein, Knopp (Chapter 7) traces the unlikely relationship between the articulation of gay identity in and through urban spaces to processes of nation building. Nagar and Leitner (Chapter 10) emphasize the way in which structures of power and difference constituted under colonialism continue to shape the everyday politics of urban space in a supposedly postcolonial city. Jacobs (Chapter 11) extends this intersection of urban space and geopolitics by arguing that many of the features associated with postmodern cities are unavoidably linked to struggles over how (post)colonial nations and their citizenry come to see themselves.

* * *

The essays collected in this book chart varied paths through the differences so apparent in city spaces. Each in their own way shows how a place-related focus on difference can reveal new complexities to be unraveled in matters considered the traditional substance of urban studies. The production and consumption of material life, long a preoccupation of critical urbanists in their work on built environments, labor markets, and capital movements, is unsettled in difference-directed geographies. Such concerns are not done away with, but they are productively complicated. And to these traditional preoccupations are added new urban geographies that not only document previously ignored urban lives but also reveal the complex intertwining of axes of difference. These new urban geographies attend to the variable and contextually constituted formation of difference and to the moral and material infrastructures around which such differences are built. This is a view of urban life that unavoidably fractures the idea of "the city." We invite you to make your own pathways and connections through these cities of difference.

1. We draw on such work later in this chapter, as do many of our contributors. We are thinking, as examples, of the general influence of feminist theory as well as the important contribution of subaltern theorists like Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha, the writings of women of color like bell hooks and the border writings of, say, Gloria Anzaldúa. A geographical overview of these and many other such theorists has been provided by Ed Soja in his book *Thirdspace* (1996).

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (1981). Semiology and the urban. In M. Gottdiener & A. P. Lagopoulos (Eds.), *The city and the sign: An introduction to urban semiotics* (pp. 87–98). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bordo, S. (1990). Feminism, postmodernism, and gender-scepticism. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 133–156). London and New York: Routledge.
- Burgess, E. W. (1967). The growth of the city: An introduction to a research project. In R. E. Park & E. W. Burgess (Eds.), *The city* (pp. 47–62). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1925)
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. London and New York: Routledge.
- De Lauretis, T. (1987). *Technologies of gender: Essays, films and fiction*. London: Macmillan.
- Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a “post-socialist” age. *New Left Review*, 212, 68–93.
- Gans, H. (1993). From underclass to undercaste: Some observations about the future of the postindustrial economy and its major victims. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 17(3), 327–335.
- Geltmaker, T. (1992). The queer nation acts up: Health care, politics and sexual diversity in the County of Angels. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 10, 609–650.
- Gibson, K., Huxley, M., Cameron, J., Costello, L., Fincher, R., Jacobs, J., Jamieson, N., Johnson, L., & Pulvirenti, M. (1996). *Restructuring difference: Social polarisation and the city*. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Working Paper 6.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- hooks, b. (1992). Representing whiteness in the black imagination. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 338–346). London and New York: Routledge.
- Jones, J. P., & Moss, P. (1995). Democracy, identity, space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 13, 253–257.

- Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993). Introduction, part 2: The place of politics. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity* (pp. 22–40). London and New York: Routledge.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Lake, R. (1994). Democracy and the transformation of the public sphere. *Urban Geography*, 15(7), 601–602.
- Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space*. London: Sage.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Massey, D. (1995). Thinking radical democracy spatially. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 13, 283–288.
- Mingione, E. (1993). The new urban poverty and the underclass: Introduction. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 17(3), 324–326.
- Pettman, J. (1992). *Living in the margins: Racism, sexism and feminism in Australia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Phillips, A. (1992). Universal pretensions in political thought. In M. Barrett & A. Phillips (Eds.), *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates* (pp. 10–30). London: Polity Press.
- Pile, S., & Thrift, N. (Eds.). (1995). *Mapping the subject: Geographies of cultural transformation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pratt, G., & Hanson, S. (1994). Geography and the construction of difference. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1(1), 5–29.
- Pringle, R., & Watson, S. (1992). “Women’s interests” and the post-structuralist state. In M. Barrett & A. Phillips (Eds.), *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates* (pp. 53–73). London: Polity Press.
- Probyn, E. (1990). Travels in the postmodern: Making sense of the local. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 176–189). London and New York: Routledge.
- Rich, A. (1986). Notes towards a politics of location. *Blood, bread and poetry* (pp. 210–231). New York: Norton.
- Rose, G. (1993). *Feminism and geography: The limits of geographical knowledge*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Rose, G. (1994). The cultural politics of place: Local representation and the oppositional discourse in two films. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 19(1), 46–60.
- Ruddick, S. (1996). Constructing difference in public spaces: Race, class and gender as interlocking systems. *Urban Geography*, 17(2), 132–151.
- Sassen, S. (1991). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, J. (1990). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference; or the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. In M. Hirsch & E. Fox Keller (Eds.), *Conflicts of feminism* (pp. 134–146). New York and London: Routledge.
- Sennett, R. (1990). *The conscience of the eye: The design and social life of cities*. New York: Knopf.

- Smith, N. (1993). Homeless/global: Scaling places. In J. Bird et al. (Eds.), *Mapping the futures: Local cultures, global change* (pp. 87–119). London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, N. (1994, March). *Social justice, gentrification and the revanchist city*. Paper presented at the Conference on Social Justice and the City, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
- Smith, N., & Katz, C. (1993). Grounding metaphor: Towards a spatialized politics. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity* (pp. 67–83). London and New York: Routledge.
- Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in social critical theory*. London: Verso.
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Williams, P., & Chrisman, L. (Eds.). (1994). *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory: A reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.