URBAN POLITICS

A Reader

Stephen J. McGovern
Editor

Chapter 1

Cities in a Global Era

Introduction

In a book about power and politics in American cities, it is appropriate to ask at the very outset whether cities are relevant in an age of globalization. And even if cities do fulfill a significant function in the transnational flow of capital, labor, and goods, how important is political decision making at the local level? When key actors in the global economy sometimes seem to operate above nation-states in an autonomous and even unaccountable manner, do ordinary citizens living and working in cities have much influence over the big issues that shape their lives? Put simply, does urban politics still matter?

While sweeping societal change would at first blush seem to undermine the place of cities as economic and political entities in the global era, many scholars have contended just the opposite. Saskia Sassen notes the paradox that notwithstanding the worldwide dispersal of economic activities, there has been a simultaneous concentration of economic activities in cities, which have become strategic nodes in the implementation and maintenance of the global economy. In her view, cities are the spatial hub of leading economic sectors such as finance and specialized services for firms. Moreover, they continue to be the primary site of production processes, organizational arrangements, and physical infrastructures. Sassen claims that it is no coincidence that with the rapid growth of the globalized knowledge economy based on information, technology, and innovation, we have seen the marked expansion of cities throughout the world.[1]

However, urbanists agree that globalization has had varying impacts on American cities. In **Reading 1-1**, Richard C. Longworth provides a typology of cities based on their capacity to connect to the global economy. At the top of the hierarchy are the so-called global cities, such as New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, which are major centers of business and finance, technology, culture, and power and thus are directly linked to global networks trading in capital, information, and expertise. A second tier of cities is somewhat less tied to the world economy, but places like Indianapolis, Denver, and Portland continue to serve as thriving regional centers. All these cities lure newcomers searching for good jobs and economic opportunity. A third tier consists of former industrial dynamos such as Detroit and Akron that lack both strong links to the global economy and regional stature; their future prospects are uncertain at best.[2]

Other commentators believe that changes in society threaten the long-term vitality of all but the most prosperous cities. They point to the revolution in digital communications and how it has transformed how we think about space, community, and urban life. The Internet makes it possible for individuals, groups, and firms to conduct their affairs from virtually anywhere, rendering the age-old need for people to cluster together in urban places much less compelling.[3] But perceptive observers such as Joel Kotkin contend that the digital era may actually be a boon for cities. He argues that while individuals and businesses are increasingly able to settle wherever they wish, their locational decisions hinge more than ever on the particular amenities of any given area. Ironically, "the more technology frees us from the tyranny of place and past affiliation, the greater the need for individual places to make themselves more attractive." As city leaders endeavor to enhance their appeal to mobile citizens and firms, at least some urban places (and Kotkin refers to a wide variety of such places, not just large cities) can be expected to grow and thrive.[4]

Indeed, some cities in the United States are now growing and flourishing—for the first time in many decades. After nearly a century of declining populations, a trend that seriously undermined the economic, social, and cultural condition of urban America, demographers report that the populations of many cities have stabilized while some have experienced a small but significant increase.[5] The recent influx of middle-class people with resources and skills, including young college graduates, empty nesters, and immigrants, has revitalized neighborhoods and boosted the overall prospects of cities. At the same time, African Americans and immigrants have been moving at higher rates to the suburbs. Alan Ehrenhalt calls these recent demographic shifts "The Great Inversion," and he considers their implications in **Reading 1-2**.

Why have many American cities undergone a resurgence after several decades of decline? One explanation is that some cities have benefited by offering an attractive urban lifestyle. Richard Florida has influenced numerous city planners by emphasizing the practical advantages of implementing policies designed to nurture a lively social environment and a culture that promotes diversity, tolerance, and cosmopolitanism. Such a milieu, Florida maintains, entices a "creative class" of well-educated and highly skilled individuals whose collective presence within urban neighborhoods and business districts serves as an incubator of ideas, innovation, and productivity.[6] Cities that have cultivated such environments—Boston, Seattle, and Austin, Texas, to name just a few—have witnessed healthy population spikes and vigorous economic growth.[7]

However, it would be highly misleading to proclaim any kind of broad-based urban renaissance throughout the United States. First, many cities have not experienced a revival. Some cities have been unable to connect to the global economy or develop robust sociocultural spheres that might attract middle-class newcomers. Such places continue to suffer desperate levels of unemployment and poverty.[8] Second, even among those cities with noticeable gains, the fruits of growth have been uneven. While some sectors of the population have prospered, others have been left behind. Inequality has become one of the defining characteristics of American cities, as elaborated by Alan Mallach in **Reading 1-3**.[9]

What is to be done? Cities continue to be the focal point of many of the nation's most intractable problems. Along with the deepening chasm between the affluent and the poor, urbanites confront racial and ethnic tensions; underfunded and underperforming public schools; a dearth of decent, affordable housing; and the stubborn persistence of gangs, drugs, and violent streets. Responding effectively to such issues is the challenge of urban governance. But are the problems too immense for cities to make real headway, especially in the global era? Or are cities uniquely positioned to make significant contributions? After all, citizens are closest to government at the local level and thus have the best opportunity to get directly involved in the political process and shape public policy. The potential for democratic engagement is arguably greatest within the nation's towns and cities. But what factors work against an energetic and active citizenry? And even assuming an engaged public, what forces limit the capacity of city governments to act productively?

This book explores these fundamental issues of urban politics. A core assumption is that much can be learned from the past, and so we begin our analysis by examining how cities were governed at the birth of the United States and then proceed chronologically. In the process, we will discover how cities have evolved over time and how citizens and their leaders have utilized political power to try and improve their societies. Many approaches to urban governance have been employed with varying degrees of success. For our purposes, the "visions of politics" that have emerged at different times and places provide valuable lessons for the contemporary period. By the end of this narrative, we hope that you will have developed the knowledge and skills to judge for yourself how cities today might go about pursuing a brighter future.

Notes

1. Saskia Sassen, *Cities in a World Economy*, 4th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2012); Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).

2. For another ranking of global cities, see "Global Cities, Present and Future: 2014 Global Cities Index and Emerging Cities Outlook." A.T. Kearney. www.atkearney.com/research-studies/global-cities-index (Accessed February 28, 2015).
3. Refer to William Mitchell, *City of Bits: Space, Place, and the Infobahn* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997).
4. Joel Kotkin, *The New Geography: How the Digital Revolution Is Reshaping the American Landscape* (New York: Random House, 2000); see also Edward Glaeser, *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier* (New York: Penguin Press, 2011).
5. William H. Frey, "Will This Be the Decade of Big City Growth?" www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/05/23, May 23, 2014 (Accessed February 28, 2015).
6. Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2002); see also Jane Jacobs, *The Economy of Cities* (New York: Random House, 1969). For a critique of Florida, see Jamie Peck, "Struggling with the Creative Class," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Affairs*, 29 (4), 2005.
7. In explaining the appeal of some reviving cities to the creative class, other urbanists emphasize not so much the recent policy initiatives influenced by Richard Florida but the long-term evolution of economic development and growth management strategies that shaped a city's cultural economy. Carl Grodach, "Before and After the Creative City: The Politics of Cultural Policy in Austin, Texas," *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 34 (1), 2012. Another study, in an even sharper departure from Florida, points to high levels of social capital to account for the rising fortunes of a rustbelt city. Meghan Ashlin Rich, "'From Coal to Cool': The Creative Class, Social Capital, and the Revitalization of Scranton," *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 35 (3), 2013.
8. Refer to Charlie LeDuff, *Detroit: An American Autopsy* (New York: Penguin Press, 2013); Sandra L. Barnes, *The Cost of Being Poor: A Comparative Study of Life in Poor Urban Neighborhoods in Gary, Indiana* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).
9. See also Rowland Atkinson and Gary Bridge, eds., *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

1-1 "Urban America: U.S. Cities in the Global Era"*

Richard C. Longworth

Journal of International Affairs

"Put the city up; tear the city down; put it up again; let us find a city."

Carl Sandburg[1]

This much we know for sure: cities are the future. Much was made of the recent demographic tipping point, when, for the first time in history, the population of cities and their suburbs accounted for more than half of humanity.[2] Cities are big and getting bigger. In the twenty-first century, cities are and will continue to be where the action is, where business is done, where ideas and innovations spring up, where arts and sciences proliferate. For better or worse, our future is urban.

How exactly our urban future will take shape remains an open question. Clearly not all cities will grow equally. Which cities will grow, which will shrink and why? Will urban patterns in the United States resemble those in Europe or, for that matter, in Asia and Africa? Will most cities remain, as they have been in the past, centers of a limited geographic area, dependent on their physical environment? Or will globalization create a new class of cities, a sort of global Hanseatic League, increasingly divorced from surrounding hinterlands that may wither without them?[3]

What may be evolving is an urban-rural divide between wealthy cities participating in a new global hierarchy and the impoverished others, mired in the lowlands of a supposedly flat world. If cities aspire to global preeminence, they will need to provide the services and amenities for global citizens who, increasingly, can live anywhere.[4] But how will cities pay for these services and amenities? This may be the biggest question of all.

These questions apply to all cities, from London to Lagos to Los Angeles to Lahore. However, globalization affects each in different ways and will assign each of them different roles, just as the industrial era in the United States assigned different roles to Boston, Pittsburgh and Omaha, all of which developed in the same era but evolved differently. Chongqing—booming, thrusting, raw, ambitious—calls itself the Chicago of China.[5] But the Chicago it resembles is the lusty industrial Chicago of the late nineteenth century, not the relatively sedate business center of the early twenty-first century, which has ceded industrial prominence to the Chongqings of the world to establish a new postindustrial niche in the global economy.[6]

One urban size does not fit all, and any attempt to squeeze New York and Nairobi into one grand theory is flawed from the start. Let us focus then on the futures of American cities, a more modest task made easier by the fact that their futures are beginning to be revealed.

Early U.S. Cities and Their Economic Roots

Almost all American cities, like cities throughout history, developed to serve some economic purpose. Invariably, that purpose was place-bound. A port, a mine, or a river provided the *raison d'être* for many cities.[7] Steel mills took root near raw materials. Auto plants grew up near steel mills. Stockyards depended on fields of grain to feed livestock and on railroads to

Source: Richard C. Longworth, "Urban America: U.S. Cities in the Global Era" from *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 65, no. 2, Spring/Summer 2012, pp. 97–103, 104–110. Reprinted with permission from the School of International Affairs, Columbia University.

*Some text and accompanying endnotes have been omitted. Please consult the original source.

ship them. Oil cities relied on nearby oil fields while trading posts lay astride trade routes. The economic needs that created cities in turn created jobs, and where industries were robust, the workers stayed to build places to live. In some cases these settlements produced small towns comprised of just a few houses, stores, a school and a church, all serving local farmers or miners. In other cases, these economic epicenters spawned great cities—civilizations that grew to a million people or more—with museums, symphonies and universities, all dependent on that original economic *raison d'être;* the port, the steel industry or the auto plants.[8]

Thus grew Chicago, New Orleans, Detroit, Miami, Houston, San Francisco and Boston.[9] Not all great cities grew near water—Atlanta and Denver are landlocked—but most lie near oceans, rivers or the Great Lakes, because trade goods traveled by water, not by rail or air. For all of these major urban centers, a place-based economic role brought them into being and defined their identities.[10]

But in economics, nothing lasts forever. Trade routes shift. The raw materials necessary for mighty industries become scarce or expensive and the labor necessary to run those industries becomes cheaper elsewhere. Cities that rely on location for their livelihoods may discover over time that the fonts of their economies have vanished. When economic opportunities arise elsewhere, how can these cities sustain themselves? This is the question facing many American cities today. Born and reared in the industrial era, they find themselves cast adrift in today's global era, forced to reinvent themselves or wither.

Still, if the global future is urban, the United States is already there. While half the world's population now lives in cities, no less than 82 percent of Americans live in metro areas, generating about 86 percent of the nation's jobs and nearly 90 percent of its gross domestic product.[11]

While geography may not be irrelevant in the information era, it is certainly less important. Increasingly, modern global cities exist in the context of global networks overseeing vast supply chains, far-flung human resources and borderless capital flows. The old assets—iron, coal, water, oil—no longer justify their existence. The future of these cities depends on their ability to attract creative talent and wokers [*sic*] capable of succeeding in a twenty-first century knowledge economy.[12]

Globalization Reshapes Urbanization

The international economy has been with us for centuries, since before Marco Polo made his trade mission to Cathay and before the Lombard banks began financing Europe in the Middle Ages.[13] This economy ultimately helped shape America. Later, the industrial era marked the ascendance of many U.S. cities. In the postindustrial period, going back about forty years, American cities were transformed, some declining and others gaining strength. We have seen the culmination of this process in the exodus of heavy industry from the Rust Belt to the Sun Belt, with population booms in once-remote cities like Phoenix and Las Vegas and with the new eminence of intellectual centers like Raleigh-Durham, Austin and Seattle.[14]

However, the modern wave of globalization is even more recent. It began with the rise of post-Mao China in the 1980s but flowered after the collapse of Soviet communism in 1989. Around this time, India and Brazil emerged from decades of self-imposed isolation and dirigisme.[15] Suddenly, 1.5 billion workers in developed countries found themselves competing with 2 billion new workers entering the global economy. Since these workers came from relatively poor countries, they did not bring much new money with them, which meant more than twice as many workers were competing for roughly the same amount of money. This had the effect of devaluing labor, which explains the availability of cheap goods in American stores, the offshoring of much of American industry and the decline in American wages. At the same time, new inventions like the Internet made it easy to tie the previously distinct first, second and third worlds into one big economy.[16]

All of a sudden, Chicago and Detroit no longer competed with Atlanta or Birmingham. American cities found themselves competing instead with Shenzhen or Jakarta. Whole industries relocated and, in time, services began to follow. Still in its infancy, this new wave of globalization proved as raw as the industrial era was twenty years after James Watt first improved the steam engine.[17]

Quickly, the service economy gave way to the knowledge economy, with its emphasis on innovation, information, technology and speed. With luck, the refinement of the globalized economy in the coming decades will produce the widely shared economic decency that eventually flowed from the industrial era. But human capital is not what it once was, and the rewards of the knowledge economy are unlikely to be distributed in the same manner they were when industry reigned. Some cities will win and others will lose. This may sound too competitive—too much of a zero-sum game—but the rapid decline of many American cities shows that this is a reality, and there are few indications suggesting the future holds otherwise.[18] Throughout history, cities have flourished or faded according to their ability to cope with new challenges and reinvent themselves. The great cities—London, Paris, Mumbai, Beijing, Cairo—have reinvented themselves many times. Other once-great cities, like Ur and Nineveh, are now no more than ruins, or have declined into backwaters like Venice and Bruges. We can see the same process happening in many U.S. cities today.

New Urban Power Structures

American cities, now and in the future, can be sorted into three categories: global cities, regional capitals and the rest. Global cities are the handful of metropolises that are intimately linked to and help guide the global economy. Regional capitals are healthy cities, magnets for their immediate heartlands, but are weakly linked to the global economy. The rest are mostly the losers, neither healthy nor global, caught in a downward spiral that may be terminal.

Global cities are the true metropolises of a globalizing world. A 2010 listing of the mightiest global cities compiled by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs and A.T. Kearney describes global cities this way:

> These are the ports of the global age, the places that both run the global economy and influence its direction. The cities where decisions are made, where the world's movers and shakers come to exchange the latest news and information. . . . They are where you go to do business, yes, but also to see the greatest art, hear the greatest orchestras, learn the latest styles, eat the best food and study in the finest universities. They have global corporations—this goes without saying. But they also have think tanks, jazz bars and broadband. In a word, they have clout. . . . To be a global city, then, is to belong to the urban elite. Global cities are not always the most beautiful or the most pleasant. Almost by definition, they are busy, crowded, noisy, even frantic. But they are crowded with those who are creating the future, noisy with the clash of deals and ideas, frantic in the race to stay ahead. They have money and power. They know where the world is going because they're already there.[19]

Ranking global cities has become something of an intellectual party game. For the 2010 study, A. T. Kearney and the Chicago Council scored cities using various metrics within five categories: business activity, human capital, information exchange, cultural experience and political engagement.[20] Arbitrary criteria, perhaps, but the results tallied with other similar rankings. New York, always America's most international city, is the leading global city, followed by London, Tokyo and Paris, bunched at the top in a class by themselves.[21]

Of the sixty-five global cities listed, eight other American cities made the cut. Chicago ranked sixth and Los Angeles seventh, in the company of Singapore, Sydney, Seoul and Hong Kong. San Francisco ranked twelfth, the smallest city to rank so highly, followed by Washington, a one-industry town that made the list only because that industry is the world's most powerful government. Boston was nineteenth, Miami thirty-fourth, Houston thirty-eighth and Atlanta fortieth.[22] If the list were longer, Minneapolis, Dallas, Denver and Seattle might also have been included.

The United States led the global rankings with nine cities on the list, while China had six. These nine, already off and running in the global race, are poised to remain global cities in the coming years, though their rankings may slip as they are surpassed by rising Asian cities. All of these global U.S. cities face three crucial questions: What do they have to do to stay competitive, and how will they pay for it? How do they identify—are they regional capitals, American cities, or global cities? Does the mere fact of having gone global give them more in common with cities around the world than with their national neighbors?

Regional capitals are second-rank cities, often prosperous, cultured and pleasant, but more plugged into their immediate surroundings than the wider world. This list includes Indianapolis, Columbus, Little Rock, Oklahoma City, Salt Lake City, Richmond, Kansas City and Portland, among others. These cities are often state capitals, dominating their states and drawing in much of its talent and money, but not much else.[23]

Then there are the rest—winners of the industrial era who are losers in the global era. Many have tried desperately to hold onto the industry that made them rich, but have failed. This failure is evident in their drastically reduced populations, high dropout and poverty rates, depressed housing prices and a "brain drain" that is depleting their intellectual capital. These cities are disproportionately in the Rust Belt—the large manufacturing cities of old—including Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Rochester, Syracuse, Buffalo and Dayton, as well as Birmingham and New Orleans in the South.[24]

Whether these cities have a future remains an open question. One school of thought argues that when a city has lost more than half its population, it has tipped into inevitable decline.[25] All of the cities mentioned in the previous paragraph stood tall in the industrial age, and to this day they boast the trappings of great civilizations—renowned orchestras in Cleveland and Detroit, professional sports teams in Buffalo and Cincinnati, respected universities in St. Louis and Rochester. These assets stir the civic breast but do not contribute to the economic viability of a city.

It is hard to see what some of the old Rust Belt cities, especially Detroit, can do to reverse their downward fortunes. Most continue to bleed residents: Detroit lost no less than 25 percent of its population in the first decade of this century and Cleveland's population fell by 17 percent.[26] Cities in the knowledge economy need educated and skilled workers; Detroit, Cleveland and the like attract mostly the poor, uneducated and unskilled, guaranteeing that these cities will remain poor, uneducated and unskilled.

However, no matter how decrepit at their cores, these cities are still surrounded by decent suburban areas, though poverty is beginning to overwhelm some inner-ring suburbs.[27] But can a large urban region thrive without a solid core? The answer may be no. The Detroit and Cleveland metro areas, along with Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Dayton and Flint, were among the only cities in the country to shrink in the last census.[28]

Size counts, incidentally, but it is not decisive. If population were all that mattered for global-city status, noisome megacities like Lagos, Mexico City and Kolkata would rank at the top instead of at the bottom. The same holds true in America. Until the housing bubble burst, Phoenix and Las Vegas were two of America's fastest growing cities. But neither had the attributes—human capital, business connections, culture, political clout, great universities—that make a global city.[29] . . .

Global versus Regional Cities

Global cities, which have the size and complexity to be great metropolises of the global economy, are at the center of the American urban future. Some people deny that global cities exist, just as they deny that there is any more to globalization than an intensification of the trade practices of old.[35] But the latest wave of globalization has ushered in a new economy based on cutting-edge technology and a reordering of the very nature of work. It has reversed trade routes, restructured patterns of production worldwide and employed billions of people who, two decades ago, played no role at all in the world economy.

Global cities are the command points of this new economy. Globalization has scattered not only manufacturing but many functions, like sales and research, across the global landscape, and global cities serve as the headquarters for the coordination of these activities. As University of Pennsylvania urbanologist Witold Rybczynski has said, paraphrasing Columbia University sociologist Saskia Sassen: "Global cities . . . are a select group of cities that play key roles in the world economy, particularly as regards the cross-border flow of capital and goods."[36] They are the focal points not only of industries and businesses, but of the many global experts—lawyers, accountants, consultants and the like—who serve them.

The way in which the reins of the global economy have been gathered in the hands of global cities is unexpected. Not so long ago, we thought that digital communications would enable us to escape the crush and noise of cities by taking our computers and our business to the mountains or lakes, where we could keep in touch with the world while enjoying the scenery and breathing fresh air. It has not worked out that way. As Sassen points out, global citizens need not only general information, available through their computers, but the latest information, the news of the next new thing—the sort of information that is only available face-to-face. Modern businesses need to move quickly and to have access to many strands of expertise all at once, in the same room, if possible. Despite the explosion in new communication technologies, business air travel between global cities has boomed, because global citizens have to go to these cities just to stay in the loop. As Sassen writes, global cities "have become home to complexes of producer services."[37]

But this does not tell us which cities will continue to lead. Given the rankings by A.T. Kearney and others, New York, London, Paris, Hong Kong, Tokyo and perhaps Shanghai will remain preeminent. Beyond that, we can only look at present trends. As Rybczynski says, again citing Sassen, global cities "have become global centers for finance, servicing, and management, and . . . the network that binds them together is a trans-national one. In a sense the global cities could be said to form a sort of loose medieval league, but on a global scale."

It is the great survivors like New York that are pacing the new global economy. In the process, they are becoming something new, as Rybczynski says; not autonomous city-states, like the Hanseatic ports, but not strictly national either. They belong to nations and live under their laws and regulations. But at the same time, they are part of a global network that "appears to be supra-national, unaccountable to national control, and strikingly autonomous."

"Global cities," says Rybczynski, "are something less than city-states, but something more than prime cities."[38] Until now, great American cities, apart from New York, have been regional centers. Boston defined New England. Atlanta characterized the South, Chicago the Midwest, and Los Angeles was the epitome of California. Now, increasingly, these cities are global city-states, in the hermaphroditic sense described by Rybczynski. They are the centers of regional markets and still sell to those markets. But as the industry and farming that once supported towns and smaller regional cities shrivel, money, power and talent flow to the cities.[39] Regional capitals often rely on their states for sustenance. Many lie at crossroads served by interstate highways, making them easily reachable from the rest of the state, and most identify with their states and major institutions in a way that global cities like New York or Chicago do not.

This would seem to give these cities a secure future as the hubs of their respective states, attendant to global trends but not dependent on them. But this is not the sinecure it seems to be. Both American states and their governments are facing an uncertain future, and any city that depends on their state may be in for a rough ride. Across the country, rural areas are emptying out. Nonurban economies are generally losing ground to urban economies.[40] Young people are moving to these regional capitals, putting pressure on public services. At the same time, state governments are falling deeper into debt, eroding their ability to pay for these services. Moreover, many state governments are still dominated by rural interests who are reluctant to spend tax money on urban needs, especially given rural difficulties.[41]

As state governments become increasingly unviable, it would make sense for regional capitals to join forces and leverage their strengths, as is taking place now with the Southern Growth Policies Board.[42] Perhaps these cities will be subsumed into a larger region, a networked "megalopolis."[43] Other candidates for regional networks might include the so-called BosWash corridor, the industrial belt stretching from Milwaukee through Chicago to Pittsburgh, the Piedmont region from Charlotte to Atlanta or the Interstate 35 corridor from San Antonio to Kansas City. But so far, these "megapolitan" regions—a term coined by Robert E. Lang and Dawn Dhavale to describe "integrated networks of metro and micropolitan areas"—owe more to geographers' whimsies than to any economic or political reality.[44]

William Cronon's magisterial book, *Nature's Metropolis*, describes the century-long process in which the Midwest created Chicago by sending it the produce and raw materials that fueled the city's industries and markets, while Chicago in turn created the Midwest by stoking the demand for these goods.[45] Without Chicago, there would be no Midwest, and vice versa. The symbiosis that once characterized such relationships has ended.

At the same time, cities remain tied to their states both legally and financially. Tax money flows from cities to state governments and comes back as financing for urban services. State governments retain much control over city financing, taxation, infrastructure, zoning and schools. But state deficits are forcing cities to seek new ways to finance themselves, making them less beholden to their states, even indifferent to them.[46]

Will cities break away from their states and regions? Not entirely. The federal structure dictates that some ties remain. But states will become less able to meet the needs of their biggest economic engines, and cities with global ties will look elsewhere for sustenance. In addition to the wealth that comes from global partnerships, cities are already seeking new local revenue sources in user fees or through the privatization of public services. But can they find enough, in increased fees or taxes, to pay for the services and amenities that they will need to remain global cities?

Global cities will always attract some businesses and people who can afford to live anywhere. But can these cities, still home to the working and middle-class populations from the industrial era, raise costs without pricing out all but the rich? We already see this happening in cities like New York and Chicago, where wealthy citizens of all nationalities are moving back into the city centers, colonizing neighborhoods once left to the poor and forcing the poor farther out.[47]

What then can we predict about the futures of individual American cities? Which cities will become global and which will not? New York is and will continue to be the quintessential global city. Twice assaulted in the past decade, first by al Qaeda and then by the mortgage meltdown, it has emerged strong and has not been chastened. It remains the true capital of America, its intellectual center, its newsroom, its atelier, its tastemaker. It even wants to be its scientific center.[48] This goal may or may not be realized, but it reveals the sheer ambition of the city.

Most global cities like New York have diversified economies; if one sector dips, other sectors pick up the slack. This raises the question of whether one-industry cities may have put too many eggs in one economic basket. In Europe, the unraveling of the European Union and the devaluation of the euro could foil the global ambitions of Frankfurt and Brussels.[49] Houston is America's oil capital; as the United States weans its economy from carbon-based fuels, will Houston fade? Los Angeles is more than a one-industry town, but the entertainment industry looms so large there that one wonders if it has much to sustain it if that industry should decamp, as Richard Florida has suggested it could.[50]

Chicago frets incessantly about whether it really is a global city (it is, according to the Kearney rankings) and whether it can remain one. The city and its new mayor, Rahm Emanuel, are struggling with a huge civic deficit from the productive but expensive reign of Emanuel's predecessor, Richard M. Daley. It is working to fix a broken school system, to reconfigure its aging public transport system to meet the new needs of a shifting population and to retrofit O'Hare Airport, the city's shabby gateway, to keep Chicago on the itinerary of global travelers.[51]

Chicago, like many American cities, once thrived because it was a key part of the world's most dominant national economy. As America's clout in the world declines, just being an important American city won't be enough in the future. Instead, these cities must shine on their own, as Singapore has done for years and as London has learned to do since Britain's preeminence has declined.

Atlanta, the capital of the Sun Belt, would seem to be a candidate for membership in the global urban league. When the economy shifted to the Sun Belt, Atlanta blossomed. It is still a major center, home to the world's busiest airport. But globalization will challenge its economy. Atlanta's population growth seems to have stalled and, after a half-century of breakneck expansion, it faces severe infrastructure problems, especially in transport. In addition, Atlanta is challenged by a galaxy of growing southern stars—for instance, Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina, Nashville, Tennessee and Charlotte, North Carolina—in a way that midwestern Chicago is not.

Many smaller cities occupy powerful niches in the global economy. Boston, San Francisco, Minneapolis and Seattle all have the brainpower and information-based industries to thrive in a global economy. But San Francisco's cost of living may soon be too high to compete, and the others need serious infrastructure improvements—Minneapolis's bridges, Boston's airport and Seattle's highways, for example.[52]

Conclusion

So far the pull of geography has worked to turn some regional capitals into global cities. Cities like Sydney, Toronto, Johannesburg and São Paulo rank as global cities simply because they dominate substantial regions or countries.[53] The same geographic dominance has propelled the growth of regional metropolises like Chicago, Atlanta and, to a lesser degree, Minneapolis, Ironically, these regional centers have achieved some of their growth at the expense of their less-urban environs.[54] We do not know if this process will continue or, as hinterlands empty out, if regional dominance will decline in importance.

In the end, we come back to the need for global cities to attract talent: educated and creative people of all nationalities who can live anywhere but will settle where they can best use their intellect and skills. This migration is already happening to newer, creative cities like Seattle and Minneapolis and to older, educated cities like New York and Chicago. These cities no longer compete just with each other, but also with global cities like Paris, Shanghai and Mumbai. If their feet rest on American soil, their heads are in cyberspace. If their history is local, their future is global. Not all cities can manage or afford to maintain this balance.

Globalization is brand new. For American cities and their residents, the second act of history has just begun.

Notes

1. Carl Sandburg, "The Windy City," *Slabs of the Sunburnt West* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922), 12.
2. "2009 Revision of World Urbanization Prospects," news release, UN Population Fund, 25 March 2010, http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Documents/WUP2009_PressRelease_Final_Revl.pdf.
3. The Hanseatic League was founded by German merchants in the thirteenth century to protect their trading rights and goods. The League controlled much of Northern Europe's international commercial activity into the fifteenth century. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, s.v. "Hanseatic League," accessed 1 February 2012, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/254543/Hanseatic-League.
4. Richard C. Longworth, *Caught in the Middle: America's Heartland in the Age of Globalism* (New York: Bloomsbury USA, 2008), 10–13.
5. See, for example, James Kynge, *China Shakes the World: A Titan's Rise and Troubled Future—and the Challenge for America* (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 2007), 25.
6. Longworth, *Caught in the Middle*; "Chicago in the 1890s," University of Chicago Library, 4 June 2010, http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/su/maps/chi1890.
7. Longworth, *Caught in the Middle*, 156–57.
8. Ibid.
9. Though San Francisco's rise was place-based, the Gold Rush, which initiated a population boom and an influx of migrants, made its urbanization trajectory unique. "The excitement, and enthusiasm of Gold Washing still continues—increases," *California Star*, 10 June 1848, http://www.sfmuseum.net/hist6/star.html.
10. Longworth, *Caught in the Middle*, 156–57.
11. Percentages reflect 2010 data. The World *Factbook*, s.v. "North America: United States," Central Intelligence Agency, accessed 19 January 2012, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html; *U.S. Metro Economies: GMP and Employment Forecasts* (Lexington, MA: IHS Global Insight (USA), June 2011), 2, http://www.usmayors.org/metroeconomies/2011/rport.pdf.
12. Adam Davidson, "Small Cities Feed the Knowledge Economy," *Wired*, 31 May 2011; "The Four Pillars of the Knowledge Economy," World Bank, http://go.worldbank.org/5WOSIRFA70.
13. D. G. H. Thorpe, "A history of English clearing banks," British Banking History Society, 2010, http://www.banking-history.co.uk/history.html.
14. The Rust Belt describes areas in the midwestern and northeastern regions of the United States where industrial manufacturing was once prevalent. The Sun Belt refers to regions in the southern United States that made agriculture a major industry, to which manufacturing has now moved. Ramit Plushnick-Masti, "Shrunken Rust Belt city shows grit," Associated Press, 14 March 2008, http://www.thestar.com/Business/article/346139; Longworth, *Caught in the Middle*, 2, 162, 164, 166, 208.
15. "Globalisation and Emerging Economies," OECD Policy Brief, March 2009, 2, http://www.oecd.org/data oecd/35/34/42324460.pdf; Jake Berliner, "The Rise of the

Rest: How New Economic Powers are Reshaping the Globe," (white paper, NDN, Washington, DC, 23 April 2010), http://ndn.org/essay/2010/04/rise-rest-how-new-economic-powers-are-reshaping-globe.

16. Longworth, *Caught in the Middle*, 78–79.
17. Ibid., 8.
18. Richard Florida, *The Flight of the Creative Class: The New Global Competition for Talent* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006); Longworth, *Caught in the Middle*, 162.
19. *The Urban Elite: The A.T. Kearney Global Cities Index 2010* (Chicago: A.T. Kearney, 2010), 1.
20. Ibid., 2.
21. Ibid., 3. The Knight Frank Global Cities Survey ranks New York, London, Paris and Tokyo as the top four cities, in that order. The same four cities led a ranking by PricewaterhouseCoopers and the Partnership for New York City based on "power indicators." "Tales of the Cities," *The Wealth Report 2011*, Knight Frank, http://www.knightfrank.com/wealthreport/2011/global-cities-survey; *Cities of Opportunity* (New York: PricewaterhouseCoopers-Partnership for New York City, 2011), http://www.pfnyc.org/reports/2011-Cities-of-Opportunity.pdf.
22. *The Urban Elite*, 3.
23. Based on the author's reporting between 2006 and 2011.
24. Dana L. Mitra and William C. Frick, "Civic Capacity in Educational Reform Efforts: Emerging and Established Regimes in Rust Belt Cities," *Educational Policy* 25, no. 5 (September 2011): 810–43.
25. See, for example, a book by Albuquerque's former mayor. David Rusk, *Cities Without Suburbs:* A *Census 2000 Update* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2003).
26. Richard C. Longworth, "Shrinking City Syndrome? It's Catching," *Midwesterner* (blog), 12 May 2011.
27. Jennifer Agiesta, "Stark divisions found between Detroit and its suburbs," *Washington Post*, 6 January 2010.
28. Longworth, "Shrinking City Syndrome?"; "State and County QuickFacts," U.S. Census Bureau, accessed 31 January 2012, http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states.
29. Longworth, *Caught in the Middle,* 162–63.
35. Reflects the author's original reporting and analysis.
36. Witold Rybczynski, "Cities and Globalization," *Wharton Real Estate Review 8*, No. 1 (Spring 2004): 100.
37. Saskia Sassen, "A Global City," in *Global Chicago*, Charles Madigan (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 131.
38. The three preceding quotations are taken from Rybczynski, "Cities and Globalization," 100.
39. Richard Florida, "How the Crash Will Reshape America," *The Atlantic* (March 2009); *The Urban Elite*, 2.
40. "State Fact Sheets: United States: Population, Income, Food Insecurity, Education, and Employment," U.S. Department of Agricultural Economic Research Service, 17 January 2012, http://www.ers.usda.gov/statefacts/us.htm#pie; *U.S. Metro Economies*.
41. The *Urban Elite*, 2: Jon Bruner, "Interactive: Is Your State A Debt Disaster?" *Forbes*, 20 January 2010; Elena Moya, "$2tn debt crisis threatens to bring down 100 US cities," *Guardian*, 20 December 2010.
42. The Southern Growth Policies Board is a public policy think-tank formed by the governors of thirteen southern states to advance economic development through various public-private partnerships. "About Southern Growth Policies Board," Southern Growth Policies Board, accessed 8 March 2012, http://www.southerngrowth.com/about/about.html.
43. Robert E. Lang and his staff at Virginia Tech are the prime movers behind the megalopolis idea, though it was Jean Gottman who originally coined the term in 1961. Robert E. Lang and Dawn Dhavale, "America's Megapolitan Areas," *Land Lines* 17 (July 2005): 14.
44. Lang and Dhavale. "America's Megapolitan Areas," 1.
45 William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1991).
46. Moya, "$2tn debt crisis."
47. Rob Paral, *What Does the 2010 Census Tell Us About Metropolitan Chicago?* (Chicago: Chicago Community Trust, 2011), 10–18.
48. Edward L. Glaeser, "Done Right, New Applied cience Center for New York Makes Sense," *Economix* (blog), *New York Times*, 22 March 2011.
49. Author's opinion, based on experience living in Brussels and reporting from Europe.
50. Florida, *Flight of the Creative Class*, 17.
51. *The Global Edge: An Agenda for Chicago's Future* (Chicago: Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2007).
52. Based on the author's own reporting in all of these cities.
53. *The Urban Elite*, 3.
54. Florida, "Crash Will Reshape America."

1-2 "The Great Inversion"

Alan Ehrenhalt

Governing

In the midst of the 1980s, at a time when poverty, violence and abandonment had settled over most of the big cities in America, the great urban historian Donald Olsen made an intriguing prediction. "If we are to achieve an urban renaissance," Olsen wrote, "it is the 19th-century city that will be reborn."

It was a cryptic comment, and Olsen is no longer around to be asked precisely what he meant, but he was not the only urbanist of taste and judgment who voiced similar sentiments. Jean-Christophe Bailly, the French architect and critic, looked at cities all across North America around the same time and declared that "the 19th century invented modernity, and it must now be reinvented to make up for the damage done by the systematic negligence of 20th-century urban planners."

Today, more than a quarter century later, at least a part of this vision seems to be coming true.

It would be absurd to make the claim that the great European cities of the late 19th century will reappear in this country in anything like their original form. No American city will create a *Ringstrasse* like the one that circled central Vienna. None could reproduce the city of London even if it wanted to. And it's impossible to imagine a central planner with the powers of Baron Haussmann in Paris (or even Robert Moses in New York) emerging anywhere today.

But it would also be a mistake to deny the relevance of these older cities to the evolving urban experience, or not to notice that Donald Olsen, hyperbole notwithstanding, was onto something.

American cities all but lost their street life in the last decades of the 20th century; anybody walking around downtown Philadelphia, Boston or Chicago after 5 in the afternoon found the sidewalks deserted and dangerous. Today, in various forms, street life is returning. One can walk down Michigan Avenue in Chicago or Walnut Street in Philadelphia long after dark and find them throbbing with activity.

Much of this activity, as in the Paris or Vienna of another time, is clustered around entertainment. In the 21st century, this is less likely to mean performances at an immense concert hall, although a few cities have built them, and more likely to mean plays at storefront black box theaters and live music coming out of the bars that line the street. Most of all, however, street life in the emerging city means restaurant life. Walk along Tryon Street in downtown Charlotte, N.C., that highly untraditional American city, and you will see diners at sidewalk tables on every block. There is little retail shopping in downtown Charlotte, but there are restaurants almost everywhere.

And there are cafés. One can make fun of the ubiquitous presence and the uniformity of Starbucks, but the fact remains that just 20 years ago, the idea of coffeehouses in urban centers seemed a quaint vision of the vanished past. Now one can walk into a Starbucks in the center of any large American city at 10 in the morning or 8 in the evening and find clusters of coffee drinkers deep in conversation, many of them lingering as much to talk as to consume. It is not going too far to say that Starbucks resurrected the coffeehouse experience in present-day America: Small independent cafés have returned to the street along with it. We have not recreated the *Ringstrasse* café, where raconteurs held forth for hours at a time—but we have taken a step in that direction.

Source: Alan Ehrenhalt, "The Great Inversion," *Governing*, 25 (7), April 2012. Reprinted with permission from *Governing* magazine.

We have also taken a step toward the urban diversity and tolerance that prevailed in European cities a hundred years ago. People with widely different backgrounds and modes of living come together on the sidewalks of Boston, Chicago, San Francisco and a growing number of other cities in ways that would have been unthinkable in 1980. American cities are also returning to diversity of use. The idea of zoning for segregation of uses is slowly dying in America. Virtually every city planning official is now looking for ways to promote mixed-use zoning, perhaps not the chaotic jumble of much of 19th-century Paris, but a mixture of uses nevertheless.

At the level of the metropolitan region, modern American urban patterns are coming to resemble older ones in a more dramatic fashion. For most of Western history, affluent people lived in the center of metropolitan areas. The latter half of the 20th century was defined by fast-growing suburbs and shrinking inner cities, where wealth moved to the periphery and poverty was concentrated close to the core. The 21st-century city will be defined by the opposite—affluent inner neighborhoods, striving and sometimes struggling farther-out neighborhoods. In short, American cities are undergoing a full-fledged demographic inversion. Midtown Atlanta, for example, is filling up with upper-middle-class professionals, both black and white, while exurban counties that were all but homogeneous white bastions of cul-de-sacs and shopping malls as recently as 20 years ago now have become magnets for immigration. Similar events are taking place in Boston, Chicago and Washington, D.C. Look closely at the changes under way in or near the center of these cities and the 19th-century flavor of 21st-century urban America becomes clear.

Sheffield is a quiet neighborhood three miles north of downtown Chicago. It is six thirty in the morning, and I'm sitting by the window at a bagel and coffeehouse just off the corner of Sheffield and Armitage, across the street from the Armitage elevated train station. Every few minutes a Brown Line train rumbles by directly overhead, its noise so consistent and regular that it feels like an icon of neighborhood life, not an annoyance of any sort.

Armitage Avenue is no Parisian boulevard; there are no boulevards in Sheffield, only business streets and residential streets. But the buildings are about the same age as those in central Paris. Nearly all of them were built between 1880 and 1910. The Argo Tea Café on the other side of the street reveals the date 1885 in large letters on the second story wall.

A parade of early risers marches down the street in front of me: joggers, men in suits on their way to the train, art students from nearby DePaul University carrying their supplies to the studio. It is the sort of diversity Jane Jacobs saw in Greenwich Village in the 1950s, a diversity of occupations, ages and daily schedules. There are people on their way to 9-to-5 jobs, others returning from night shifts, young singles who jog this route every morning, older people who cover the same route at a slower pace. The one thing you won't notice about Sheffield through the windows of the Chicago Bagel Authority may be the most important thing about the place. It is rich. Actually, very rich.

In 1970, Sheffield was poor, unstable, gang-ridden and dangerous to roam around in. But by the time the 2000 Census was taken in Tract 711, where comparatively modest old houses still fill the residential blocks north of Armitage, the median household income was $93,279. The median home value was $675,532. When mid-decade projections were released in 2007 by Esri, an independent demographic research company, the median household income was up to $133,535, and the median home price had surpassed $1 million. Gentrification is not a word that accurately describes Sheffield. It is a neighborhood of stable and substantial affluence where scarcely any of the people we normally consider gentrifiers can afford to live.

It is easier to demonstrate that Sheffield is rich than to explain why. "At first glance," the *Chicago Tribune* wrote in 2006, "it's hard to see why some of Chicago's most wealthy people have chosen this formerly nondescript area as their new enclave. It doesn't have a lake view. It isn't even that close to the lake." And the land is flat as a pancake.

In fact, Lake Michigan is a little more than a mile from the center of Sheffield, and one can walk there in half an hour at a leisurely pace. But few of the residents do that very often. There are other factors that clearly have something to do with what has happened—the 14-minute train ride to downtown, the presence of DePaul University, the tree-lined streets and pleasingly eclectic stock of houses—but none of these quite suffice as explanations. It is more instructive simply to say that Sheffield's current prosperity reflects a realignment of urban life.

This is a controversial subject. Free market purists argue that once the economic downturn ends, Americans will resume their 20th-century thrust outward and seek ever newer greenfield homes on plots of land further and further from the city, transporting themselves back and forth on longer and longer commutes by means of the automobile.

They have some statistics to back them up. One study in 2009 reported that only a small portion of Generation Y (or the Millennials, born roughly between 1980 and 1995) expressed a preference for urban living over a suburban mode of life. But there are equally compelling results on the other side. A competing study by the consulting firm RCLCO in 2008 revealed an almost precisely opposite result: 77 percent of Generation Y wanted to live some variant of the urban life. "Generation Y's attitudes toward homeownership have been changed by the housing crisis and the recession," the Urban Land Institute found in commenting on the RCLCO study. "The number of people trapped by underwater homes that cannot be sold and the millions of foreclosures are tempering their interest in buying their own homes and they will be renters by necessity rather than by choice for years ahead." In many cases, if not most, that means urban rather than suburban rental.

Between 1990 and 2007, central cities increased their share of housing permits within their metropolitan areas by more than double, the Urban Land Institute found. This continued after the housing recession caused the number of permits to plummet in the outer suburbs. What is more, statistics show, housing in cities and inner suburbs held their value during the recession far better than their exurban counterparts.

Where does the Millennial generation want to live? In many ways, this is the question that will determine the face of metropolitan America in the next 20 years. This seems to me a case in which common sense wins a battle of dueling statistics. Most of the major demographic trends going on right now work in favor of an urban preference, at least among a significant cohort of the emerging adult population—smaller households, later marriages, decisions not to marry at all, decisions not to have children, the emergence of a huge and active baby boom population in its 60s and 70s—point to some form of reemergence of urban choice.

But suppose one grants many of the predictions made by those who attempt to debunk any significant back-to-the-city movement among the Millennial generation. The generation is simply so large—by one measure, 60 million to 70 million people—that even a respectable minority of this cohort seeking an urban life is bound to change American metropolitan areas dramatically.

In a poll cited by *The New York Times* in 2009, 45 percent of Americans between the ages of 20 and 35 said they would like to live in New York City someday if they could. This is an absurdly large number of people—well more than 20 million, in fact. It's a safe assumption that, other than the ones who already live in New York, not too many of them will ever get there. So the poll does not offer much insight into the future demographics of the nation's largest city. But it says a great deal about the values, tastes and wishes of an enormous cohort of American young people.

There is a thirst for urban life among Millennials. It shows up in polls, in anecdotal conversation, in blogs and other casual writing. It is not based primarily on watching television shows such as *Friends* or *Seinfeld*, though those should not be discounted. It is based on an inchoate feeling that the cul-de-sac suburbia in which millions of them grew up is a cul-de-sac in more ways than one: It cuts off not only streets, but also diversity and the casual outdoor life crucial to meaningful human sociability.

Once again, it is necessary to say that outer suburbs are not going to empty out in the coming generation. They remain home to millions of current residents with families who like the space, are concerned about safety and want to stay put; newcomers to this country who are determined to avoid the crowding they encountered in other parts of the world; and poorer people who simply are able to find acceptable housing on the periphery that is not available in the center.

The inhabitants of the center cities of the 21st century will be largely those with money—those who have the greatest choice about where to live. Those who inhabit the periphery will be for the most part those for whom prices in the center are prohibitive. As the Urban Land Institute concludes, "Once the economy recovers and household formation resumes, the demand for urban housing will greatly outstrip the supply."

For students of cities and community, perhaps the final intriguing question is what will happen to the structure of urban life in general. Will the enhanced street vitality and personal contact that is already occurring in many of America's largest cities bring about a return to the casual social cohesiveness that Jane Jacobs praised in 1961 in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities?* Or will the immense changes in human technological communication diminish the ultimate importance of the street life that seems to be a magnet for so many youthful newcomers in the first place?

When Jacobs wrote her book, there were really only two methods of real-time personal communication. One was the telephone. The other was face-to-face human interaction. The world of communication that the microchip has wrought is so fast and so current as to make detailed explanation unnecessary. The person we run into on the street possibly several times a day—the contact that Jacobs prized—has been compromised by iPads, cellphones, email, social media and other tools Jacobs could not imagine in her wildest dreams. To put the question simply, will technology be a substitute for the regular social contact of Jacobs' day, or will it provide a crucial supplement? As anyone who walks down an urban street knows, a significant proportion of the cellphone conversations that take place are simply logistical arrangements, as people seek to reveal to others where they are in space and how soon they can meet each other at an agreed-upon location. Social media are, among other things, ways for large numbers of people to settle on mutual congregating spaces instantly. The more that people are enabled by technology to communicate with one another while remaining physically solitary, the more they crave a physical form of social life to balance out all the electronics. They are settling in cities—those that have a choice—to experience the things that citizens of Paris and Vienna experienced a century ago: round-the-clock street life, café sociability, casual acquaintances they meet on the sidewalk every day, local merchants who recognize them. This is the direction we are heading in, even if we do not get there for a while.

The 23-year-old student glued to a laptop computer in a corner café in a Chicago neighborhood like Sheffield should not be seen as too different from the Viennese reading his newspaper in a café on Vienna's *Ringstrasse* in 1910. He remains a social animal. He merely expresses the balance between his sociability and his individuality in a different, 21st-century way.

1-3 "The Uncoupling of the Economic City: Increasing Spatial and Economic Polarization in American Older Cities"*

Alan Mallach

Urban Affairs Review

Introduction

America's older industrial cities have in recent years become the subject of a growing number of books (Dewar and Thomas 2012; Mallach 2012b; Ryan 2012) and a steady flow of articles, reports, case studies, and newspaper accounts. While rich in descriptions of historic decline, current physical conditions, and prescriptions for changing those conditions, few of these address the dramatic changes that have taken place in many of these cities in recent years. That is not to suggest that there has not been an extensive and valuable literature on urban change in recent years; the process by which cities, not just in the United States but throughout the developed world, have been transformed by population and economic change has been widely addressed, including important works by Sassen (1991), Smith (1996), and Hackworth (2007). At the same time, significant gaps remain, particularly in our understanding of how those changes are spreading from global cities to what might be called the American hinterland, in particular the secondary cities—historically dominated by manufacturing—such as Detroit, Baltimore, and St. Louis which have experienced dramatic losses in population and economic activity since the end of World War II, sometimes termed *shrinking cities* (Oswalt 2006) or, more recently, *legacy cities* (American Assembly 2011).

This article will attempt to describe those changes, focusing on a particular dimension of change that has received relatively little attention; specifically, how change is affecting the distribution of jobs and jobholders in these cities and the implications of those changes for the economic conditions of these cities' residents. In broad terms, I argue that the economic trends during the past decade within these cities have followed a bipolar pattern in which unprecedented growth in small parts of the cities is paralleled by an ongoing and even accelerating pattern of economic decline elsewhere, and that the decline is being most profoundly experienced by these cities' African-American communities, leading to growing racial as well as spatial disparities.

While the redevelopment of shrinking cities has always been uneven, the past decade has seen an increasingly dichotomized pattern of revival and decline, further exacerbating the economic, spatial, and racial divides that have historically characterized these cities, undermining both the narrative of urban triumphalism exemplified by Grogan and Proscio (2000) and Leinberger (2008), and the parallel opposite narrative of continued decline and decay, reflected most prominently in a cluster of books published about Detroit in recent years (Binelli 2012; LeDuff 2013, among others). This article will attempt to provide an initial framework for exploring these divides by focusing on the way in which patterns of job growth associated with revitalization, and the distribution of those who hold those jobs, have exacerbated rather than relieved inequities within cities.[1] My central proposition is that a spatial redistribution of jobs in formerly industrial American cities is taking place, which reflects a dramatic change in the

Source: Alan Mallach, "The Uncoupling of the Economic City: Increasing Spatial and Economic Polarization in American Older Cities," *Urban Affairs Review,* vol. 51, no. 4, July 2015. Reprinted with permission from SAGE Publications, Inc.

*Endnotes and references have been omitted. Please consult the original source.

relationship between the "economic city,"[2] the city as a locus of jobs and economic activity, and what might be called the "demographic city," the city as a residential community and the people who live there. I refer to this change as the "uncoupling" of the economic city.

The first section of this article will provide the framework for that analysis by describing the growing spatial divide in these cities, followed by a direct exploration of the changing distribution of jobs and jobholders in the reviving city, the findings of which form the basis for my proposition about the uncoupling of the economic city. From there, I look at the racial implications of these trends, focusing specifically on the growing disparities between white and African-American households, while a closing section offers some initial thoughts on the implications of the increasing bipolarity of these cities.

This article is based on preliminary findings from ongoing research in a cluster of 10 cities in the United States, which share two common features: sustained population loss of 25% or more from 1950 to 2000 and a 2010 population of 250,000 or larger. These include cities that are continuing to lose both population and jobs, such as Detroit and Cleveland, as well as a few whose populations have stabilized between 2000 and 2010 such as Philadelphia or Newark, New Jersey; most, however, continue to lose population. While recognizing the interrelationships between these cities and their suburban surroundings, and the significance of changes that cut across municipal boundaries, my focus is on the area within the borders of the central city, rather than metropolitan areas as a whole. In that light, it is worth noting that notwithstanding the recent and well-deserved focus on the growth in suburban poverty (Kneebone and Berube 2013), poverty rates and the social ills associated with concentrated poverty continue to remain far more pervasive in central cities than in their suburban rings, although many if not most metropolitan areas contain at least some suburban areas of high poverty concentration.[3]

These cities are more representative of the generality of American cities than are global cities like New York or the handful of other cities that have featured heavily in the gentrification discourse like Washington, D.C., or San Francisco. Large cities, like Chicago, Kansas City, and Minneapolis, to name but three, are affected by the same trends, while many cities below my population cutoff point, such as Richmond, Virginia, or Jersey City, New Jersey, as well as even smaller cities, like Wilmington, Delaware, show even more pronounced patterns of spatial, economic, and racial polarization. While some still smaller cities may also be similarly affected, many of the large number of small shrinking cities—as well as many cities, particularly in the Northeastern states, which may not be shrinking but are similarly distressed[4]—are seeing fewer positive trends than the larger cities, so that these effects tend to be less pronounced.

The rising inequality in cities raised in this article forms part of the larger issue of the growth in economic inequality in the United States, reflected in scholarly literature (Saez 2013; Smeedling 2005) and in magazine articles and blogs (Hargreaves 2013; Krugman 2012, among others). This, along with increased inequality in the distribution of wealth (Keister 2000), has justifiably become a matter of increasingly intense public concern. While the dynamics I describe are clearly linked to that larger issue, they are both narrower and broader; I am concerned with how inequality is linked to the economic revival of cities, how economic changes parallel changes in the spatial organization of cities, and with the increasingly tenuous relationship of the urban population to their cities in those cities' role as economic entities.

In contrast to the effects of economic change on residential patterns, which are the subject of an extensive literature, these particular changes have been given less attention, having been noted in a few case studies of individual cities—see Wolf-Powers (2013) on New York City, Zimmerman (2008) on Milwaukee, Madison (2011) on Pittsburgh, and Baumgart and Scruggs (2013) on Wilmington—and having recently drawn the attention of Richard Florida and his Martin Prosperity Institute at the University of Toronto (Florida 2012).[5] They have not, however, been the subject of a systematic investigation. While this article can do no more than scratch the surface of such complex issues, I hope that by so doing, it will not only increase the understanding of the nature of these issues and trends but also foster greater awareness of how these trends are affecting the vitality of cities and regions in which millions of people live. These trends also have powerful implications for public policy at the federal, state, and local levels.

The Spatial Divide

The ideological as well as spatial tension between central city downtowns and neighborhoods has been a long-standing issue in American cities since the days of urban renewal if not even earlier (Bauman 1981; Fogelson 2001). The issue for most of the second half of the past century, however, was not that downtowns were prospering and neighborhoods were not. On the contrary, both were in decline, and the tension was over what priority to give the reinvigoration of downtowns versus other objectives more closely associated with social equity goals such as affordable housing or neighborhood revitalization (Keating and Krumholtz 1991). Well into the 1990s, the downtowns of most older cities, despite the addition of some new office buildings, shopping malls, and apartments, often heavily subsidized with public resources, shared, and even exemplified, the city's distress; the blighted and heavily abandoned downtown was a recurrent trope of the narrative of urban decline (Beauregard 1993).

This is no longer the case. Downtowns or central core areas in secondary cities that otherwise continue to lose population like St. Louis, Baltimore, and Cincinnati are thriving. Central core areas as I use that term here encompass not only these cities' traditional Central Business Districts (CBDs) but also the quasi-downtown areas, such as Pittsburgh's Oakland, Detroit's Midtown, or Cleveland's University Circle, that house these cities' major universities and medical centers, along with a small number of predominately residential areas usually adjacent to or closely linked to CBDs or university/medical complexes such as Cincinnati's Over-the-Rhine or the Central West End in St. Louis.

During the past decade, these areas have seen dramatic growth both in their populations and in their share of their city's population, jobs, and wealth. St. Louis' Washington Avenue, all but abandoned 20 years ago, now regularly prompts descriptions like this:

> If your image of shopping in downtown St. Louis conjures up images of dark empty streets and bargain shops with bars on the windows, then you haven't strolled down Washington Avenue recently. Completely renovated and now a thriving entertainment district, Washington Avenue is also coming alive with a wide range of designer shops, furniture stores and art galleries.[6]

Midtown Detroit now boasts a Whole Foods Market to accompany the Starbucks that arrived a few years earlier.

The growth in single people and nontraditional households and the manner in which it has fueled central core revitalization in St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and many other cities have been widely celebrated (Bevilaqua 2013; Chang et al. 2013). There is growing evidence that a new generation, the so-called millennial generation, has an affinity for high-density urban living epitomized by areas such as St. Louis' Washington Avenue or Cleveland's Warehouse District (Breen and Rigby 2004; Norris 2012). That generation, and in particular the relatively highly skilled, college-educated members of that generation, has fueled the population growth and economic revival of the central cores of the cities discussed here (Cortright 2005). Most of these cities have seen a sharp increase since 2000 in their number and population share of college-educated adults between 25 and 34 (Mallach 2014). As these areas gain population and Whole Foods Markets, however, the cities taken as a whole continue to lose ground, showing significant increases between 2000 and 2010 in such measures as the number of vacant properties, the number of homeowners, or the percentage of households in poverty.

Many downtowns are gaining residents, while the rest of the city continues to lose population. The five downtowns shown in Table 1 added nearly 24,000 people between 2000 and 2010, for a growth rate of 28%. While these are not large numbers, it is worth noting that as these five cities as a group lost 167,000 people during the same period, downtown growth offset 15% of the population loss taking place elsewhere in the city.[7] With the notable exception of Philadelphia, whose downtown, unusual for American cities, has historically accommodated a large residential population, these areas had little or no residential base, at least since the late nineteenth century (Fogelson 2001).

These disparities are reflected in the spatial distribution of house values. . . . High value census tracts

Table 1 Downtown Population Change 2000–2010 in Selected Cities

City	Downtown Population 2000	Downtown Population 2010	Δn	$\Delta\%$
St. Louis	3,539	8,155	+4,616	+130.4
Cincinnati	5,538	7,397	+1,859	+33.6
Cleveland[a]	8,182	10,861	+2,679	+32.7
Baltimore	15,970	21,854	+5,884	+36.8
Philadelphia	53,216	62,004	+8,788	+16.5
Total	86,445	110,271	+23,826	+27.6

Source: U.S. Census 2000 and 2010.

Note: Designation of downtown tracts and block groups by author.

[a]Downtown and Cleveland Circle areas combined.

are concentrated in the central corridor, a narrow strip including downtown, the University of St. Louis, Barnes Jewish Hospital (a major research hospital), and a handful of adjacent neighborhoods such as the Central West End. North of the corridor, with the exception of a small pocket of gentrification immediately adjacent to downtown, market demand hardly exists. South of the corridor, a handful of strong market "pockets" are noticeable amid generally weak markets; the strongest is Lafayette Square, again adjacent to downtown. The median house sales price in 2012 was $142,000 in the central corridor, compared with $59,000 outside.

Although Delmar Boulevard—the northern border of the central core—is no longer the hard and fast line dividing white and African-American populations that it was for much of the past century (Gordon 2008), it is still a powerful boundary. Houses in neighborhoods south of the line often sell for $300,000 or more when they come on the market; north of Delmar, prices are little more than $10,000, and many houses do not sell at all and are eventually abandoned. Similar patterns, although not always as sharply demarcated, can be seen in the other cities.

This spatial disparity forms the geographic framework for the trends driving the location of jobs within the city. Although quantitative data are hard to come by for earlier eras, it seems safe to say that from the late nineteenth century through the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, jobs were distributed widely across the city.[8] While downtowns were important job centers, they were only one of many; in 1970, less than 9% of the jobs in the city of St. Louis were located in the city's central business district. CBDs as job centers were often dwarfed by their cities' manufacturing sectors; Buffalo's Lackawanna Works and Bethlehem Steel in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, each employed over 25,000 workers in their heyday. In Trenton, New Jersey, over 70 separate potteries or ceramic factories, distributed widely across the city, employed nearly 5,000 people in the early years of the twentieth century, a significant number in a city of less than 75,000 population (Potteries of Trenton Society 2001).

Universities and hospitals were modest employers, far from the behemoths they have become in recent decades. Secondary or neighborhood-level commercial nodes and corridors, which provided most city residents with their goods and services, were also a major source of employment until their decimation by suburban automobile-oriented facilities after World War II. While by the mid-twentieth century many suburban workers commuted to downtown jobs, particularly in cities like Philadelphia with strong regional rail networks, most of the cities' workforce was made up of local residents, often people who lived in the neighborhoods that surrounded the factories. In 1960, 91% of all job-holding residents of St. Louis reporting a place of work worked inside the city.[9]

As the factories have closed and secondary commercial districts have declined or disappeared, the relative persistence of downtown office employment coupled with dramatic growth of universities and medical centers has led to a spatial concentration of employment into the central core areas of the city, paralleling the increases in population, wealth, and property values in these areas. The St. Louis Central Corridor, which contains roughly 5% of the city's land area,[10] contained 51% of the city's jobs in 2011, a significant increase from 45% in 2002.[11] Table 2 shows similar data on job concentrations for 2002 and 2011 for selected cities. As the table shows, not only are jobs concentrated in the central core but also the level of concentration increased sharply between 2002 and 2011. In most cases, this represented significant net job growth in the central core taking place at the same time that jobs were disappearing at a comparable pace in the balance of the city; in Detroit, both areas declined, but the decline was far more precipitous outside the central core, thus increasing the central core job share and reinforcing the spatial divide. Jobs in the central core on the whole pay better, and demand more higher education, than jobs in the rest of the city, as shown for selected cities in Table 3.

The central core is not only gaining a growing share of the city's jobs but also a growing share of the city's jobholders, wherever they may work. Between 2002 and 2011, the number of jobholders living in 9 of the 10 cities dropped sharply. Reflecting the growing spatial divide, however, the resident workforce is growing in central core areas and declining elsewhere. Between 2002 and 2011, the number of jobholders living in St. Louis' central corridor increased by 17% or over 2,000, while the number of jobholders living in the city's much larger northside declined by 26% or over 9,000 workers.

The decline in both the city's worker base and its pool of traditional blue-collar jobs, coupled with the growth of jobs and workers in the central core, has led to growing economic inequality among urban families generally, as the number of households in the lowest and highest income ranges grows and those in the middle decline. Table 4 shows this pattern for Pittsburgh; from 1960, when 71% of all families could be considered to be in a broad "middle" range,

Table 2 Distribution of Jobs between Central Core and Balance of City for Selected Cities 2002 and 2011

City	Citywide Job Change 2002–2011	Central Core % of City Land Area	Central Core Job Change 2002–2011	Balance of City Job Change 2002–2011	% Change Central Core	% Change Balance	% of All Jobs in Central Core 2002	% of All Jobs in Central Core 2011
Cleveland	−6,106	5	+11,288	−17,394	+10.0	−11.6	48	54
Detroit	−44,278	2	−8,014	−36,264	−6.0	−25.3	43	48
Milwaukee	+550	4	+13,064	−13,614	+13.0	−7.7	36	41
Newark	−767	4	+3,512	−4,280	+6.2	−5.5	42	45
St. Louis	+1,757	5	+13,326	−11,569	+13.7	−9.8	45	51

Source: OnTheMap.

Note: Central core areas defined by author using OnTheMap interactive features.

Table 3 Characteristics of Workers in Central Core and Balance of City 2011

	% of Workers Earning $40,000+		% of Workers with BA or Higher Degree	
	Core	**Balance**	**Core**	**Balance**
Newark	72	49	38	27
Detroit	61	42	36	23
St. Louis	49	42	26	21

Source: OnTheMap.

earning between 50% and 200% of the citywide median income, that number had dropped to less than 57% by 2011. Over a period during which the city's population declined by 55%, the number of middle-income families (earning 100%–200% of the city median) dropped by 66%, from nearly 58,000 to fewer than 20,000 families. This growing inequality is driven to a significant degree by these cities' job trends.

The Uncoupling of the Economic City

The spatial redistribution of jobs in formerly industrial American cities reflects a dramatic change in the relationship between the "economic city,"[2] the city as a locus of jobs and economic activity, and what might be called the "demographic city," the city as a residential community and the people who live there. This is most pronounced in the diminishing relationship between the city's jobs and its resident workforce. That workforce is shrinking, income disparities in the city are increasing, and the jobs in the city are increasingly held by commuters rather than city residents. As discussed below, these changes are disproportionately affecting these cities' African-American population.

A historical perspective can illuminate the magnitude of this change. Table 5 shows the relationship between three categories of central city worker over time: (1) people who both live and work in the city, (2) people who live in the city but work elsewhere, and (3) people who commute into the city from its suburbs. In 1960, although the postwar decline of the cities was already under way, the historic pattern in which the overwhelming majority of city residents both worked in the city and filled the majority of the

Table 4 Change in Distribution of Families by Income in Pittsburgh 1960–2011

	1960		2000		2011		
Income Range	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	**Change in Families 1960–2011**
<50% of city median	25,774	17.0	17,170	23.0	15,079	23.6	−10,604
50%–99% of city median	50,134	33.0	20,134	27.0	16,792	26.3	−33,336
100%–199% of city median	57,761	38.0	24,438	32.7	19,498	30.5	−38,623
200%+ of city median	18,205	12.0	12,966	17.4	12,498	19.6	−6,707
Total	151,874		74,708		63,867		−88,007

Source: 1960 Census of Population, 2000 Census; 2007–2011 Five-Year American Community Survey.

Table 5 Long-Term Trends in Jobs and Workforce 1960 to 2011

	% of City Residents Working in City			% of City Jobs Held by City Residents			%Δ in City Residents Working in City		%Δ in Number of Commuters Working in City
City	**1960**	**1980**	**2011**	**1960**	**1980**	**2011**	**1960–1980**	**1980–2011**	**1960–2011**
Baltimore	86.8	66.6	46.2	73.4	52.1	33.9	−31.2	−48.0	+92.5
Buffalo	NA	NA	45.2	NA	NA	29.9	NA	NA	NA
Cincinnati	87.9	68.0	42.3	63.8	43.1	22.8	−29.8	−43.4	+81.3
Cleveland	92.3	63.1	46.9	62.4	40.5	24.2	−54.8	−52.3	+11.5
Detroit	81.8	57.1	38.0	65.8	51.2	28.0	−53.7	−69.7	−30.2
Milwaukee	90.1	NA	52.9	74.5	NA	40.8	NA	NA	+83.7
Newark	64.0	NA	28.8	46.6	NA	17.4	NA	NA	+4.6
Philadelphia	91.8	79.4	63.5	76.4	69.1	52.7	−29.4	−30.7	+41.8
Pittsburgh	88.1	73.6	56.6	64.1	40.8	25.1	−31.7	−45.3	+98.9
St. Louis	91.2	67.0	44.1	58.7	37.1	24.7	−52.9	−52.8	−3.5

Source: 1960 and 1980 from U.S. Census of Population, 2011 from OnTheMap.

Note: 1980 Census data were unavailable for Newark and Milwaukee. Data were unusable for Buffalo (data are provided at Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) level, and Buffalo–Niagara SMSA contained two central cities making it impossible to separate Buffalo data).

jobs that the city offered was still largely intact. With the exception of Newark, 80% or more of city-resident jobholders in the 10 cities worked in the city where they lived; on average, they filled roughly two-thirds of the jobs in the city. At least 25%, and in some cases over 40%, of all of the jobs in each city were manufacturing jobs.

By 1980, these cities had undergone traumatic waves of depopulation, demographic change, and deindustrialization; predictably, the role of city residents in the city's economy had declined, yet despite the damage of the 1960s and 1970s to these cities' fabric, the decline was not precipitous. In most cases, two-thirds or more of city residents still worked in the city and filled roughly half of the jobs in the city. Since the 1980s, even as many of these cities have begun to revive their economies and, at least in relative terms, stabilize their populations, the number of city residents working in the city, however, has continued to decline at a rate comparable with that of the period of these cities' greatest overall economic and population loss. This drop has been far greater than the decline in the total number of jobs in the city and greater than the simultaneous decline in the number of city residents working in the suburbs.

As the number of city residents in the workforce generally and those holding jobs in the city in particular have both declined, the number of suburban commuters to city-based jobs has increased, often in substantial numbers, nearly doubling between 1960 and 2011 in four of the nine cities for which data are available. By 2011, the great majority of jobs in all of the cities except for Philadelphia were held not by residents but by workers who live outside the city and commute to work in the city; 71% of all the jobs in the other nine cities were filled by commuters and only 29% by city residents, a reversal of the historic pattern.

The number of commuters holding jobs in the cities has grown by an average of greater than 10% since 2002. As the cities were not growing jobs to any meaningful extent—only 2 of the 10 showed more than nominal growth in jobs between 2002 and 2011—this growth reflected a zero sum relationship with the resident workforce; during the same period, the number of city residents holding jobs in the city dropped by nearly 180,000 or nearly 17%. This reflects a decline not only in the number of residents working in the city but also in the absolute size of the resident workforce, as the number of residents working outside the city also declined in 7 of the 10 cities, but at a lower rate.

Although it is a subject that requires further investigation, it is likely that the growing share of urban workers reverse-commuting to the suburbs reflects the greater number of low-skill, but also low-wage, jobs being created in the suburbs, in such areas as retail trade, fast food restaurants, or eldercare, as in nursing homes and assisted living facilities. Support for this proposition comes from OnTheMap data that show that city residents working outside the city earned consistently lower wages than those working in the city, as well as that the percentage of workers with BA or higher degrees is consistently higher in central cities than in their surrounding metropolitan areas. This is in marked contrast to 50 years earlier, when city residents working in the suburbs earned substantially more than those working inside the city.

Overall, the number of active workforce participants living in the 10 cities dropped over the past decade at a pace considerably faster than the decline in population; while the cities lost 8% of their population between 2000 and 2010, they lost nearly 16% of their resident workforce between 2002 and 2011. Pittsburgh was the only city to see any growth in the relative size of its resident workforce compared with its total population, while Philadelphia's job base remained more or less stable relative to its population.[12]

As the city's resident workforce has shrunk, the city's employers are becoming progressively less dependent on that workforce as a source of people to fill their jobs. As Table 6 shows, the job base in all 10 cities substantially exceeds the size of the resident workforce; taken as a whole, they show a ratio of 1.48 jobs for each resident worker, with 3 cities—Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh—with job/worker ratios close to or above 2.0. Instead of creating job opportunities for city residents, however, the pool from which employers fill these jobs, particularly those that pay well, is increasingly a suburban pool.

The uncoupling of the city's jobs from its population may be in part a reflection of a skills mismatch, as reflected in the disparity between the number of jobs held by college graduates and the share of college graduates in the resident adult population. It may not necessarily be the case that all of the jobs held by college graduates *require* that level of formal education; as has been suggested elsewhere, employers may be taking advantage of weak job market conditions to upgrade the skill levels of their workforce, crowding out less educated workers who might have filled these positions in years past,[13] or college graduates having difficulty finding jobs in their fields are taking jobs that do not require a degree; a recent study found that that was true for 4 out of 10 new graduates (Stone, Van Horn, and Zukin 2012). At the same time, as jobs increasingly concentrate in education, health services, and other white-collar and professional categories, much of the disparity may reflect actual job requirements.

The skill mismatch varies widely from city to city. The gap is modest in Pittsburgh and only slightly greater in Cincinnati; it is pronounced, however, in many cities—most notably Cleveland, Detroit, and Newark—where the percentage of jobholders with college degrees is roughly three times the percentage of adult city residents with college degrees. The apparent absence of a mismatch in some cities is misleading, however, as it fails to recognize the educational disparity between white and African-American adults in these cities. It is more accurate to say that there is no skill mismatch in cities like Pittsburgh and Cincinnati between the jobs and the city's *white non-Latino* population. The mismatch between the city's job base and its African-American population, however, as will be discussed later, is large and growing. The skill mismatch is far from a complete or even satisfactory explanation, however; the share of suburban workers in these cities' goods-producing sector (essentially, manufacturing and construction), where formal education is a far less important condition of employment, is comparable with and often higher than their share of the total job base.[14]

Shifts in the city's economy away from manufacturing to a new economy rooted in higher education and health services have brought significant growth to these

Table 6 Job Inflow/Outflow Trends

	Number of Jobs in City			Number of Commuters Holding Jobs in City			Number of Residents Holding Jobs in City			Total City Residents Working (Whether Inside or Outside City)		
City	**2002**	**2011**	**%**	**2002**	**2011**	**Δ**	**2002**	**2011**	**%Δ**	***n*2011**	**%Δ 2002–2011**	**Jobs/Workers Ratio 2011**
Baltimore	298,539	301,928	+l.1	175,465	199,562	+13.7	123,074	102,366	−16.8	221,496	−17.1	1.34
Buffalo	140,587	134,427	−4.4	88,447	94,241	+6.6	51,140	40,186	−21.4	88,947	−13.3	1.58
Cincinnati	213,424	199,550	−6.5	159,008	153,989	−3.2	64,416	45,561	−29.3	107,808	−23.1	1.98
Cleveland	262,586	256,480	−2.3	179,684	194,320	+8.1	82,902	62,160	−25.0	132,526	−26.5	1.98
Detroit	276,083	231,805	−16.0	160,666	167,010	+3.9	115,417	64,795	−43.9	168,628	−42.6	1.64
Milwaukee	276,906	277,251	+0.1	145,939	160,061	+9.7	114,934	117,190	+2.0	223,573	−10.5	1.24
Newark	135,466	134,699	−0.6	105,593	111,225	+5.3	29,873	23,474	−21.4	81,550	−8.1	1.66
Philadelphia	571,150	624,801	+9.4	238,619	294,518	+23.4	332,521	328,283	−1.3	516,937	−0.9	1.10
Pittsburgh	245,289	266,933	+8.8	174,068	199,942	+14.9	71,216	66,961	−6.0	118,451	−3.7	2.07
St. Louis	215,229	216,986	+0.8	148,264	163,402	+10.2	66,965	53,584	−20.0	121,579	−14.3	1.77
10 cities	2,635,259	2,644,860	+0.4	1,575,753	1,738,270	+10.3	1,052,458	874,560	−16.9	1,781,495	−15.6	1.48

Source: OnTheMap.

cities' central core areas, but that growth has been paralleled by continued erosion of jobs and workforce attachment in much of the rest of the city, reflecting the uncoupling of the city's newly emerging economy from the city's residents. Whether a function of the increased educational requirements for participation in the city's workforce, which have rendered a growing share of the city's population less competitive for the jobs that are available, or for other reasons, the workforce that supports central core job growth is largely, and increasingly, suburban. This is taking place at the same time as the city's resident workforce—whether employed inside the city or outside—is shrinking faster than its population, reflecting the growing marginalization of large parts of these cities' populations. The growing impoverishment of the urban population does not reflect the absence of jobs in the city where they lived; it reflects the growing disconnect between the cities' population, particularly their African-American population, and the jobs that are there.

The Growing Racial Divide

The growing economic divide in older American industrial cities is in many respects a racial divide. While this divide has always been a reality of urban America, over the past decade it has grown wider rather than diminishing. The affluent in-migrants who are repopulating city downtowns and other parts of the central core are predominately white; at the same time, these same cities are seeing a significant attrition of their African-American middle class. The size of the black population, either citywide or in many sections of the city, is declining, and the remaining black households are increasingly likely to be poor or near-poor.

The increase in the racial divide can be seen vividly in the dramatic disparity between white and African-American income growth during the past decade, as shown in Table 7. African-American income growth lagged white income growth in all 10 cities, in most cases by significant margins; as the table indicates, white households saw net income growth in constant dollars in 4 of the 10 cities, while their income growth significantly outstripped the national average in 3 more. African-Americans in all 10 cities saw their median income decline in constant dollars, with those declines pronounced in all cities except for Newark and Baltimore.[15] This growing income disparity is *not* the continuation of an ongoing trend but reflects the reversal of a widespread trend which had previously led to a narrowing of the gap between white and African-American household incomes. Between 1990 and 2000, the racial income gap narrowed—in some cases significantly—in 8 of the 10 cities, only to widen precipitously in the subsequent decade. . . .

While some households undoubtedly experienced income declines during the decade, the decline in the incomes of African-American households is too pronounced to be credibly accounted for by changes taking place within a static pool of households. Rather, it appears to be heavily driven by the acceleration in the movement of middle-class African-American households from the cities to the suburbs during this past decade. Although this is not a new phenomenon, earlier commentators tended to focus on movement within the city to more historically upscale white neighborhoods (Winsberg 1985) or on the effect of migration on the suburbs (Wiese 2004). Although recent trends in Black migration have received only limited scholarly attention (Clerge and Silver 2012), they have been described in numerous journalistic accounts; in addition to detailed reporting from Philadelphia (Ferrick 2011; Mallowe 2011) and Detroit (Kellogg 2010), a web search identified similar accounts from many other cities, including Birmingham, Dallas, Los Angeles, Memphis, and Oakland.

The existence of this trend is borne out by Table 8, which compares the change between 2000 and 2011 in white and African-American families and nonfamily households (mainly single individuals) as a whole with the change in families and nonfamily households earning $50,000 or more (in 1999 dollars) in 4 of the 10 cities. While the number of Black families in all four cities declined during the decade, the number with family incomes above $50,000—a rough surrogate for middle-class status—dropped far more rapidly. While the number of Black families in Cleveland declined by 18%, the number of Black families with incomes above $50,000 dropped by over 40%. The disparity by income is even more pronounced for nonfamily households.

Many white families also continue to leave the cities. Their numbers, including many working-class survivors of these cities' industrial heyday, are also declining. The data presented in Table 8, however, show sharply different overall migration patterns for

Table 7 Percentage Change in Median Income for White and African-American Households 1999–2011

	All Households (%)	White Households (%)	African-American Households (%)
Baltimore	33.3	54.3	28.1
Buffalo	23.2	37.2	18.2
Cincinnati	15.6	31.9	7.7
Cleveland	5.9	7.9	0.7
Detroit	–5.6	0.7	–7.1
Milwaukee	11.3	20.7	9.6
Newark	32.6	33.2	30.7
Philadelphia	20.2	34.8	14.8
Pittsburgh	30.0	36.5	8.5
St. Louis	26.7	40.5	14.8
The United States	25.6	27.0	21.1

Source: 2000 Census and 2007–2011 Five-Year American Community Survey.

White and African-American households. While African-American out-migration is disproportionately concentrated among higher-earning families, White out-migration is more mixed. While White out-migrants are likely to be replaced by younger, affluent White households, middle-income Black out-migrants are being replaced, if at all, by lower-income households, including particularly large numbers of low-income nonfamily households or single individuals. As a result, in three of the four cities shown in Table 8, a growing share of both White families and nonfamily households is in the middle or upper-income brackets, while the opposite is true of Black families and, even more strongly, Black nonfamily households. As the middle continues to shrink, the economic gap between the conditions of White and African-American households continues to grow.

The income gap is becoming a chasm in the cities which have seen the greatest central core revitalization, such as Pittsburgh and St. Louis, compared with Cleveland, where both White and Black populations are seeing their middle-class share decline. Many of the 10 cities are seeing significant White in-migration; as Table 9 shows, the average annual in-migration of White non-Latino households from outside the state into Baltimore, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis between 2007 and 2011 exceeded 4% of the total white population base, and in 6 of the 10 cities exceeded 5,000 per year. Conversely, in only 2 cities did African-American out-of-state in-migration exceed 2% of the black population base, Newark and Pittsburgh. White out-of-state in-migration—measured as a percentage of the city's same-race population—exceeded African-American in-migration in *every* city.

A further widening racial divide, which may be even more important in its long-term implications, is that of educational attainment. The relationship between educational attainment and economic achievement has been widely noted (Kodrzycki 2002 and others), while the powerful association between educational attainment and both income and unemployment rate has been well documented (Day and Newburger 2002). The gap in educational attainment between White and African-American households in

Table 8 Change in Income Distribution by Race for Families and Nonfamily Households 2000–2011 in Selected Cities

	Cincinnati		Cleveland		Pittsburgh		St. Louis	
	2000	**2011**	**2000**	**2011**	**2000**	**2011**	**2000**	**2011**
White households (HHs)								
Families								
%Δ families 2000–2011		−20.3		−26.9		−17.0		−15.2
%Δ families >$50,000 2000–2011		−19.2		−37.8		−12.7		−4.8
% families >$50,000	52.0	52.8	36.2	30.8	44.6	47.0	44.3	49.7
Nonfamily households								
%Δ nonfamily HHs 2000–2011		−14.2		−15.1		−3.8		−3.2
%Δ nonfamily HHs >$50,000 2000–2011		−9.7		−25.3		+3.3		+29.3
% nonfamily HHs >$50,000	22.2	23.3	18.2	16.0	18.2	19.5	18.8	25.1
African-American households								
Families								
%Δ families 2000–2011		−11.1		−18.0		−15.9		−15.4
%Δ families >$50,000 2000–2011		−28.3		−40.6		−28.7		−27.5
% families >$50,000	16.4	12.3	19.5	14.1	20.7	17.6	20.2	17.3
Nonfamily households								
%Δ nonfamily HHs 2000–2011		+4.4		+20.6		+7.8		+13.0
%Δ nonfamily HHs >$50,000 2000–2011		−27.9		−49.4		−31.5		−26.3
% nonfamily HHs >$50,000	9.9	6.8	11.2	4.7	9.3	5.0	10.5	6.9

Source: 2000 Census and 2007–2011 Five-Year American Community Survey.

Table 9 Average Annual Out-of-State In-Migration of White and African-American Population 2007–2011 (Number and As a Percentage of Same-Race Population Base) (See Note)

	White Non-Latino Individuals		African-American Individuals		
	n	% of Same-Race Population	*n*	% of Same-Race Population	% Ratio
Baltimore	8,326	5.8	4,271	1.3	.224
Buffalo	1,889	2.2	1,152	1.7	.773
Cincinnati	5,521	4.2	1,852	1.9	.452
Cleveland	2,313	2.0	1,975	1.2	.600
Detroit	2,218	1.9	3,725	0.7	.368
Milwaukee	5,834	2.9	2,095	1.2	.414
Newark	566	2.4	2,380	2.1	.875
Philadelphia	18,110	3.9	6,677	1.3	.333
Pittsburgh	7,696	4.5	1,487	2.3	.511
St. Louis	8,649	5.6	2,311	1.6	.286

Source: 2007–2011 Five-Year American Community Survey.

Note: Includes only migrants from outside state in which city is located.

Table 10 Change in Educational Attainment for White and African-American Adults 25+ 1990–2011

	White Non-Latino Adults % with BA/BS or Higher Degree			African-American Adults % with BA/BS or Higher Degree			Ratio		
City	**1990**	**2000**	**2011**	**1990**	**2000**	**2011**	**1990**	**2000**	**2011**
Baltimore	23.5	39.6	47.1	8.6	8.8	13.2	0.366	0.222	0.280
Buffalo	18.2	23.0	30.4	10.1	10.2	12.6	0.555	0.443	0.413
Cincinnati	28.9	36.4	44.8	7.9	10.0	11.7	0.273	0.274	0.261
Cleveland	10.2	15.9	20.5	5.0	6.5	7.9	0.490	0.409	0.385
Detroit	12.1	21.8	18.6	8.4	10.1	11.6	0.694	0.463	0.618
Milwaukee	17.6	24.8	33.6	6.9	9.1	10.4	0.392	0.367	0.309
Newark	8.2	11.6	16.2	8.3	8.9	13.4	1.012	0.767	0.827
Philadelphia	19.0	22.8	34.7	9.1	10.3	12.2	0.479	0.452	0.352
Pittsburgh	22.6	28.9	37.5	8.8	12.0	13.6	0.389	0.415	0.363
St. Louis	20.2	28.2	42.0	8.0	8.8	11.7	0.396	0.312	0.279
The United States	21.5	27.0	31.3	11.4	14.3	18.0	0.530	0.530	0.575

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census and 2009–2011 3-Year American Community Survey.

the majority of the cities studied is a huge one, as shown in Table 10. For example, 42% of White adults in St. Louis have college degrees, compared with only 12% for African-American adults. In 6 of the 10 cities, the percentage of white adults with college degrees is higher than the national average for White adults; the same is true in no city for African-American adults. The only two cities to show no more than a modest attainment gap are Detroit and Newark; the narrower disparity in those two cities, however, rather than reflecting greater educational attainment by the city's African-American residents, is the product of *lower* educational levels for those cities' White adults. It is notable that these are two of the cities that have among the lowest levels of current White in-migration and which have seen less central core revitalization than the other cities studied.

While the presence of substantial racial disparities in educational attainment has long-standing historical roots, the *increase* in the size of the attainment gap over the past decade arguably has deeper implications for these cities' future. Although African-American adults in the 10 cities exhibited modest improvement in educational attainment between 2000 and 2011, their progress was far outstripped by much greater improvement in the educational attainment of white adults in these cities. With the exception of Detroit, Newark, and Baltimore, every city saw a widening racial educational attainment gap, in contrast to the nation as a whole, which saw a modest decrease in the gap during the same period. Newark and Baltimore were the only cities in which the gap narrowed between 2000 and 2011 as a result of more than modest progress by African-American households, although in Newark gains made up only a small part of the ground lost during the 1990s.

Looked at differently, between 2000 and 2011, the *rate of increase* in educational attainment for Whites exceeded the national rate for White adults in 9 of the 10 cities; for African-Americans, the same was true, outside of Newark and Baltimore, only in St. Louis. The gap grew significantly wider in St. Louis, however, during the decade because of the even stronger growth in educational attainment by White households. As these cities complete their shift to a postindustrial economy and the educational and skill demands of the emerging economic sectors continue to increase, lack of education becomes a permanent barrier to upward mobility and opportunity, which is likely to have long-term ramifications for these cities' racial divide.

Conclusion

While there is strong evidence of revitalization since 2000 in the central core areas of many cities, the evidence is equally compelling that this revitalization is resulting in little benefit to much of the rest of these same cities and that the residents of these cities, taken as a whole, may be losing ground economically. The city's job base is increasingly becoming concentrated in the central core, while those jobs are increasingly held by commuters rather than city residents. During this period, the size of the city's resident labor force has shrunk at a rate roughly double the overall rate of population loss. In effect, the economic city has become increasingly uncoupled from the people who live in the city, the demographic or social city.

The growing bipolarity of these cities is increasingly racial in character. While these cities have historically had social and economic gaps between their White and their African-American populations, these gaps have widened significantly during the past decade, as shown in two critical measures—increased disparities in income and in educational attainment. Middle-class Black families appear to be leaving the cities at an accelerating pace; although White families also continue to leave the city, not only are White out-migrants not disproportionately from the more affluent middle class, but many cities are seeing an influx of young, affluent White households that far outstrips simultaneous African-American in-migration. The outcome is an increasingly affluent and well-educated—and growing—White population in these cities, juxtaposed against an increasingly poor or near-poor African-American population lacking the education and skills to compete for an increasingly white-collar, college-degree-oriented job base clustered around downtowns and major educational and medical institutions.

Some of these cities are already seeing a reversal of the trend of many decades during which African-American populations grew and White populations declined. This may increase in coming decades, if economic growth continues to draw younger and predominately White professionals to these cities while safety concerns, poor school performance, and inadequate public services continue to draw predominately African-American families to the suburbs. This may lead in turn to the acceleration of a trend already widely visible, the impoverishment of many inner-ring suburbs. This trend is already well advanced in the suburbs of Cleveland, St. Louis, and other cities. This population reversal may also change the political and social dynamics of many cities, including a decline in the political base of Black elected officials. While that change may not have major practical implications in terms of the delivery of services or the allocation of resources, it is fraught with powerful symbolic significance.

These findings strongly indicate that revitalization, at least at the scale and of the character that is being experienced in these cities, does not confer citywide benefits; if anything, it may even redirect jobs, resources, and wealth away from large parts of the city, concentrating them in a smaller area and leaving the rest worse off than before. Large parts of all of these cities, even where downtowns are thriving, are market "deserts," where little sales activity takes place except for the occasional investor or speculator and where vacant lots and abandoned buildings are widespread. While this is not new, it is getting worse rather than better.[16]

The specter of a reviving core largely surrounded by poverty and blight is becoming a reality in many of these cities. To what extent such a spatial pattern is sustainable is an open question. If central core jobs, as well as the amenities associated with the core, grow significantly, housing demand may spread into adjacent or nearby areas; that appears to be happening to a limited extent in a few of the cities discussed here such as Pittsburgh or Baltimore. If that fails to happen, the boundaries between the central core and its surroundings are likely to harden—if not literally—in a manner not unlike the walls that protected the prosperity of the medieval city from its impoverished countryside. If it *does* happen, though, it may merely push the walls gradually outward, rather than materially changing the underlying bipolarity of the city.

From a social justice perspective, it would be appealing to be able to assert unequivocally that this emerging spatial pattern is *not* economically sustainable. While the pattern has not been in place long enough in the cities discussed here to answer the question, the experience of cities in other parts of the world, notably Latin America, suggests that an urban settlement pattern based on extreme spatial and economic inequality can persist seemingly indefinitely; whether that pattern is conducive to strong economic growth and vitality, however, is another matter. Benner and Pastor (2012) argued, based on a substantial body of economic research, that "doing good and doing well can go hand in hand" (p. 2).

Beyond the question of sustainability is that of equity or justice. This is, as Fainstein (2010) pointed out, "obviously value laden." From what might be considered a neoliberal perspective, there is arguably little to fault with the trends described in this article. The market is working. Jobs are growing in those areas with the greatest competitive advantage, while employers are maximizing the quality of their workforce by recruiting from throughout the region. Areas like Oakland in Pittsburgh or Cleveland's Warehouse District have become vibrant hubs of activity, while neighborhoods with competitive market advantages are reviving. The city is drawing young people bringing skills, talent, and energy, while African-American middle-class families are acting out of rational self-interest by leaving a city that, from their perspective, is no longer competitive with suburban jurisdictions with respect to the quality of services it offers or the economic and psychological costs it imposes.

From that perspective, therefore, one can argue that the trends described in this article are not only not a problem but also arguably positive, in that they foster a more efficient use of urban resources and maximize the competitive edge of those parts of the city that are indeed market-competitive. Although the neoliberal paradigm is popular with many private- and public-sector policy makers in twenty-first-century America, it is not the only framework through which one can look at a city. It privileges individual, free market activity over all other activities and fails to recognize the many complex ways in which the different sectors of a city, or a society, are interconnected. It attributes little or no value to core principles such as democracy, opportunity,[17] and social cohesion that have long been part of the American tradition. With Fainstein, I would argue that it is not enough. That perspective is inimical to the vision of a just city that she has articulated, with its focus on equity, diversity, and democracy. Indeed, these trends seem destined to lead to a heightened level of segregation, in which households are segregated by race, by economic status—which, within these cities, is increasingly a function of race—and potentially by demography or life cycle.

Moreover, the implications of these trends for the city as a physical environment, and for the quality of life of a large part of its resident population, are equally problematic. As the number of jobholders in the city declines and of that dwindling number, more and more are commuting long distances to the suburbs for what is more often than not low-paying work, the economic framework for the neighborhoods where they live is likely to weaken, bringing in its train declining property values, increased vacancy, and a deteriorating quality of life. There is strong evidence that this is indeed taking place.[18]

The trends described in this article contain significant implications for public policy, and yet may well be highly resistant to change, at least within the present economic and political environment. While a detailed discussion of policies is beyond the scope of this article, a few comments may be appropriate. Although measures to combat inequality are being widely discussed, many of the measures under consideration, such as increasing the minimum wage or adopting local "living wage" ordinances, while likely to benefit some individuals in low-wage jobs, would have little impact on the process of economic uncoupling taking place in these cities. Measures directly designed to increase access for city residents to jobs may hold more promise.

The most obvious recommendation would be for measures to build human capital and increase the competitive position of the urban workforce, focusing on improving educational outcomes and workforce readiness (Perna 2014).[19] Over and above that, one should advocate for concerted use of public policy levers to link the city's workforce to economic opportunity, reflecting the reality that much job and business growth in urban areasis furthered to varying degrees by public resources, investment, or outright subsidy (Weber and Santacroce 2007; Wolf-Powers 2013). Such strategies can include broad reframing of tax incentives away from broadly available and largely undifferentiated subsidies to targeted approaches focusing on creation of local workforce opportunities, to specific programs, such as "first source" ordinances, mandating that employers receiving public benefits provide preferential hiring opportunities to qualified local workers. Alternatively, one might acknowledge the growing centrality of the suburban job pool for the urban workforce, and press for improved transportation linkages between urban workers and suburban jobs (Katz and Allen 1999).

One cannot be overly optimistic about the likelihood of initiatives of this sort coming into being, particularly in the older industrial cities discussed in this article. Despite the modest improvements resulting from uneven, limited revitalization, all of these cities are subject to severe resource constraints drastically limiting their ability to undertake new initiatives; moreover, while a uniquely situated city like New York may contemplate limiting business incentives or imposing obligations on its private sector, such steps are far harder for the strapped cities of the rustbelt, few of which are experiencing more than at best anemic job growth and which are in a weak competitive position in the global marketplace (Longworth 2008; Moretti 2012). Moreover, it is unclear that the political will is there to provide the resources any serious attempt to address this issue demands; notwithstanding the rise of mayors like Bill de Blasio in New York and Bill Peduto in Pittsburgh, neither the federal government nor more than at most a handful of state governments appear to have any interest in providing the financial support without which the best local ideas are likely to founder.

Finally, one must ask whether, assuming against all odds that truly effective, sustained strategies were indeed put in place that led to significantly greater opportunities for city residents to gain good, well-paying, jobs, whether those strategies would lead to inadvertent consequences; for the cities where those residents now live [*sic*]. In the absence of fundamental changes to the quality of life in their neighborhoods, it is not only possible but also likely that large numbers of them would move to the suburbs as their economic conditions improved, further hollowing out the central cities. That may be an acceptable trade-off for the improvement to their lives but cannot be considered an entirely positive outcome.

Conclusion

Public Policy Applications: Neighborhood Revitalization and Gentrification

Policy Then

Globalization and technological advances in communications have intensified the competition among cities for mobile wealth and talent. For many years, the conventional wisdom among economic development planners seeking to promote growth was to lure big employers such as large manufacturing firms and *Fortune* 500 corporations by offering inducements such as tax breaks, sweetheart land sales, and infrastructure improvements. Landing a giant company would then stimulate further investment by smaller industrial enterprises, corporate service firms, and restaurants and retail shops, all of which supply additional job opportunities and tax revenues.

More recently, an alternative approach to promoting economic growth in cities has emerged—one inspired by the economist Richard Florida. Rather than trying to attract new business firms, cities are focusing more on enticing desirable employees—highly educated and skilled individuals who are well endowed in the human capital valued by employers in the postindustrial, information-based economy. The assumption is that if cities succeed in accumulating a quality labor pool, substantial business investment will follow.

The capable employees so prized by companies and urban planners alike—Florida calls them "the creative class"—flock to cities that are rich in lifestyle attributes like a vibrant music scene, dynamic neighborhoods, and plentiful outdoor recreation. Add to the mix a multitude of places such as cafes, bookstores, and brewpubs that encourage social interaction within a diverse, tolerant, and cosmopolitan atmosphere and the result is an environment that breeds creativity, innovation, and productivity.

Economic development policy making becomes a matter of establishing social and cultural amenities in neighborhoods that will attract the creative class in droves—arts districts, lively entertainment corridors, cultural heritage museums, waterfront development, and recreational sports. Success stories are trumpeted in local, glossy magazines that celebrate the latest trendy neighborhood in a prospering city.

Policy Now

One serious limitation to this urban revitalization strategy is that some cities are far better positioned than others to appeal to the creative class. San Francisco, for instance, with its breathtaking natural beauty and large stock of lifestyle assets holds an enormous competitive advantage over an aging Rust Belt city with fewer social and cultural resources. The latter's construction of a multimillion-dollar, state-of-the-art performing arts center in an area pockmarked by obsolete factories and abandoned warehouses is not likely to be a sufficient incentive for the creative class.

Even where such policies have been effective, the price of success may be steep. When the creative class moves into a neighborhood that is increasingly perceived as a beacon of urban vitality, rising housing costs may drive older residents out of their homes. Small-business owners who had long served the neighborhood lose their leases and are replaced by upscale restaurants, wine bars, and boutiques catering to the more affluent newcomers.

It is a thorny problem for policy makers. On the one hand, struggling cities have an interest in fostering neighborhood revitalization that brings in new residents to bolster slumping retail businesses, reinvigorate street life and thus inhibit illicit activity, boost mass transit ridership, and strengthen the city's tax base to better support the many public services that benefit all citizens. On the other hand, if neighborhood revitalization is tantamount to gentrification—the displacement of long-time residents and business owners by a wealthier class of people—then is such a "success" a Pyrrhic victory?

Courtesy of Pawel Loj, Flickr/Pawel Loj

Revitalized neighborhood of Little Five Points, Atlanta, Georgia

Additional Resources

Richard L. Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

Lance Freeman, *There Goes the 'Hood: Views of Gentrification From the Ground Up* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006).

"International Making Cities Livable." An international movement devoted to improving the quality of urban life and enhancing community and civic engagement by reshaping the built environment. www.livablecities.org.

Loretta Lees, Tom Slater, and Elvin Wyly. *The Gentrification Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

Joshua Long, *Weird City: Sense of Place and Creative Resistance in Austin, Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010).

Mitchell L. Moss, "Reinventing the Central City as a Place to Live and Work," *Housing Policy Debate*, 8 (2), 1997.

"Northeast Passage: The Inner City and the American Dream." Documentary film about gentrification in Portland, Oregon.

Neil Smith, *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

Daniel Monroe Sullivan and Samuel Shaw, "Retail Gentrification and Race: The Case of Alberta Street in Portland, Oregon," *Urban Affairs Review*, 47 (3), 2011.

Sharon Zukin, *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Discussion Questions

1. Should local governments try to promote urban revitalization by attracting the creative class to their cities? If so, how?
2. What would motivate you to move to a particular city?
3. Is it possible to encourage neighborhood revitalization while controlling the negative effects? How might urban policy minimize the displacement of longtime residents and small business owners?
4. What can urban policymakers do about the increasing gap between the rich and the poor in American cities? What can urban policymakers do about other forms of inequality related to race and ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation?
5. How meaningful is citizen participation in urban politics? Is it possible for ordinary citizens to exercise significant influence over public policy at the local level?
6. Who wields power in American cities?