17

Urban spaces, city cultures, and collective memories

Kevin Loughran, Gary Alan Fine, and Marcus Anthony Hunter

Cities are indelibly shaped by memory. City governments, real estate developers, entrepreneurs, community organizers, and neighborhood residents constantly present and debate ideas about how local history and character should be utilized to construct urban space. Urban theorists, however, have tended to overlook the critical role of memory in shaping city spaces. Most accounts of urban processes have focused on matters such as political economy, culture, social (dis)organization, institutions of power, and growth coalitions. Theories are often presented as universal but are inextricably linked to the cities where scholars developed them and that serve as empirical models. The major "schools" of American urban sociology were each generated by scholars operating in unique times and places: industrial Chicago (Park and Burgess 1925; Wirth 1928; Drake and Cayton 1945), postindustrial Los Angeles (Davis 1990; Flusty 1994; Soja 1996), and New York as a cultural nexus (Jacobs 1961; Greenberg 2008; Zukin 2010). These three schools represent distinct ways to theorize the city (Halle 2003; Hunter 2014); each has its share of boosters and detractors. While the intellectual distinctions among the three schools may be exaggerated, as Molotch (2002) suggests, it is undeniable that these constellations of social-scientific inquiry contain many of the canonical works of urban scholarship and remain theoretical and ideological guideposts for contemporary scholars. An approach to urban sociology that is grounded in a city in which history—and its display—is an insistent reality for residents (Boyer 1994), and even a justification for a tourist economy, might have a very different tenor as urban actors look to the past as a basis of civic affiliation and local planning. Such cities include Philadelphia, Venice, and Jerusalem.

While we make no claims about the relative merits of each approach, we argue that a crucial gap exists in urban sociological scholarship at the intersection of collective memory and urban development. This gap has been addressed only sporadically, often lacking a common theoretical narrative to draw these disparate pieces into conversation.

Our chapter addresses this gap, delineating a framework for theorizing the nexus between collective memory and urban change. We illustrate how collective memory works in conjunction with political economy, culture, and human ecology to create community. Urban memories can be leveraged for development, used as a basis of political mobilization, and model the daily socio-spatial practices and lived experiences of citizens. For reasons of space, we do not describe the growing literature on social mnemonics and collective

memory (Olick and Robbins 1998; Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy 2011). However, this approach, even when not grounded in spatial organization, recognizes the power of the past ("the past as a foreign country" [Lowenthal 1986]) to create social order and communal affiliation. In this chapter, we attempt to situate the linkage of memory and urban space by analyzing socio-spatial transformations "from above," "from the middle," and "from below." In so doing, we demonstrate the critical interplay between urban change and collective memory. With a focus on three (macro, meso, and micro) dimensions of urban change, we demonstrate the central role of memory and history in the production of urban space. Our review focuses on claims-making that deploys real or imagined histories and memories, where local character and visions of a common past are linked to an imagined future. This is what French historian Pierre Nora (2006) speaks of as places of memory ("les lieux de mémoire"). Ultimately we argue that collective memory can either frustrate or facilitate urban change, as it is mobilized at all three levels. It becomes a powerful tool for framing and advancing urbanites' actions for and against particular forms of development across time and place.

The city and collective memory "from above"

While collective memory has not been a formal aspect of growth machine analyses, urban regime theory is built on the assumption that the social construction of "place" is fundamentally shaped by collective ideas about local character and history (Molotch 1976; Logan and Molotch 1987; Molotch et al. 2000; Suttles 1984). In the process of "creative destruction" that characterizes urban development under capitalism, the city is continually built anew. As an 1860 *New York Times* article put it, "old landmarks are swept away, and even good buildings are pulled down to make room for better. The iconoclastic hand of improvement is everywhere busy and everywhere visible" (quoted in Munn 2004: 5). When older buildings, infrastructure, and public spaces are torn down, to be replaced with structures that are considered to be better suited to contemporary demands, a recognition of what *was* tends to remain and sometimes that past is longed for. As Maurice Halbwachs (1992) notes in his study of the "legendary topography" of the Holy Land, place memory shifts as a function of the social frameworks of the present. Further, whether held solely in the memory of local residents—like the *Times* writer of 1860—or revealed materially by architects or civic leaders—in memorials such as the one found on the site of Chicago's since-demolished Haymarket Square—these places are in dialogue with the past. New structures often speak to the spaces that came before them in recall or, famously as in Berlin, in their erasure.

The modern city is rich with gestures to the past—from the innumerable local tributes captured in place names, such as Philadelphia's Germantown or Brooklyn's Boerum Hill (Kasinitz 1988; Osman 2011), to broad architectural styles, such as Renaissance Revival, that reimagined historical buildings for the contemporary city. These built forms embody an effort by urban developers and architects to glorify a real or imagined past, both in appeals to the "high culture" of another time and place and in assertions of harmony with local architectural styles. Certainly, such links to the past are not always readily visible. But even the most functionalist aspects of the built environment are colored by local character and identity. Many Chicagoans have their favorite skyscraper; New Yorkers, their favorite subway line; and Angelenos, their favorite freeway. Thus, even while forging a universalistic fusion of architecture and society, the work of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Frank Lloyd Wright, or Louis Kahn and the other modernists has everywhere taken on a decidedly local complexion.

More recent architectural styles have evoked an explicitly *local* connection with the past. The tenets of postmodernism—the current hegemonic style in urban planning and design—emphasize, among other principles, the importance of local context and history. Rather than reimagining European palaces for American cities à la Daniel Burnham or implementing grand modernizing plans à la Le Corbusier, the designers of postmodern projects have rooted the production of space in a reimagined local, rather than universal, history. We find an oft-cited example of this trend in the wave of "festival marketplaces" that swept the United States in the 1970s and 1980s, such as Baltimore's Harborplace, Boston's Faneuil Hall, and Chicago's Navy Pier. At South Street Seaport, for example, the merchant shipyards of colonial Manhattan were transformed into a pastiche for middle-class leisure and consumption that reimagined a particular vision of New York's history.

Recent studies of urban development have affirmed the growing importance of "authenticity" and "place" in shaping how developers and city governments leverage history for real estate speculation and capital accumulation. In the contemporary city, where real estate development, tourism, and culture industries tend to dominate economic activity, place-based identities have become key assets for political and economic elites. To be sure, global cities in particular have long histories of commodified "places," as countless Chinatowns and Little Italys can attest. These types of places illustrate elites' desire to connect certain aspects of local history and identity—namely, those that can be neatly packaged and readily consumed by tourists—with strategies to create economic growth.

Following the tradition of scholars such as Booth (1889–1891), Addams (1895), and Du Bois (1899), the Chicago School made studies of "place" a major line of inquiry into the dynamics of urban life. The sharply segregated metropolis of early twentieth-century Chicago provided sociologists with a "mosaic" of different urban communities (Park 1925: 40). The classic community studies of areas such as the Near North Side (Zorbaugh 1929), the city's Jewish ghettos (Wirth 1928), and African American Bronzeville (Drake and Cayton 1945) became a model for thinking about how ideas about local community fuse with particular places. These studies that rooted urban communities in their historical context and encompassed many dimensions of local community life foreground our understanding of how collective memories and shared pasts structure communal spatial meanings.

From the Chicago model's insights, we can consider how contemporary "growth machine" development efforts interact with established local communities. Today's urban development projects are typically antithetical to the federally funded postwar projects that leveled entire neighborhoods in the name of civic progress, creating abstract spaces in their wake—such as university campuses, state buildings, and the ubiquitous "barracks style" housing projects. Today, the specter of postwar urban renewal's well-known failures (Zipp 2010), coupled with the increasingly visible political agency of individual communities (Hunter 2013; Marwell 2007), means that elite-led attempts to "renew" particular neighborhoods must work with local leaders and institutions to respect the "authentic" urban community (Loughran 2014). Such deference to "the local" can ostensibly legitimize contemporary urban redevelopment projects to outside stakeholders and can make such projects more palatable to local residents.

Of course, elite engagements with community interests are purely superficial in some cases. When the power relations between elites and the local community are especially one-sided—as is often the case when city governments attempt to redevelop poor or "ethnic" communities—community input is often illusory, superseded by the interests of growth coalitions that tend to favor the commodification of local cultures and traditions over "legitimate" partnerships with marginalized communities (Dávila 2004; Arena 2012). Place-based

identities then become valorized by elites for their legibility as tourist zones, as the links that residents form with each other—expressed in shared memories as well as in cultural objects, such as culinary and artistic traditions—help make a community legible to outside consumers.

These visible symbols often serve as the focus of top-down efforts at community redevelopment. Scholars have illustrated numerous examples of this process: Gotham (2002), for example, demonstrates how New Orleans elites have used the tradition of Mardi Gras as an anchor for the city's place-marketing strategies. In his study of the Philadelphia Barrio, Wherry (2011) details how symbols of the neighborhood's arts scene became a crucial dimension of larger redevelopment efforts. In a similar context, Dávila (2004) illustrates how ideas about East Harlem's Latina/o identity have been leveraged by growth machine elites to foster "culture industries," redevelop the neighborhood, and attract tourists. Grams (2010) similarly demonstrates that ethnic communities in Chicago can leverage heritage for the purposes of community development. Other studies reiterate the notion that places rich in collective memory—especially those linked to a particular ethno-racial group, as further suggested by Harvey's (2007) study of Black heritage sites in New Jersey and Shaw's (2007) study of Montreal's Chinatown—have become increasingly attractive sites for urban redevelopment.

The leveraging of place-based collective memories for urban development extends well beyond ethno-racial enclaves. As many scholars have shown, this practice is seen in arts districts, gay neighborhoods, and other urban areas that have a strong (or at least easily legible) sense of collective identity. Zukin (1982, 1995) has illustrated how artist enclaves—neighborhoods where artists work and live—transform into arts districts—places where art and other commodities are consumed. Through this process, developers appropriate the aesthetic and spatial dimensions that embody artistic production (for example, industrial lofts) and use this place-identity to drive tourism and commerce (Whitt 1987; Strom 2002). More recently, this development strategy is also apparent in top-down efforts to brand the historical enclaves of (white, middle-class) gays and lesbians for cultural consumption. This co-optation has grown into a widespread phenomenon in large Western cities, as suggested by evidence from Chicago (Reed 2003), Paris (Sibalis 2004), London (Collins 2004), and Manchester (Binnie and Skeggs 2004).

The city and collective memory "from the middle"

But the use of collective memories for reshaping urban space is not the exclusive practice of city governments, growth coalitions, and real estate interests. Groups of urbanites also read and interpret the visible symbols of community in their everyday socio-spatial practices. Constellations of local symbols create visions of "authentic" urban neighborhoods that often are highly valorized by today's middle-class consumers (Brown-Saracino 2009; Zukin 2010). This connection between local symbols of collective memory and middle-class consumption has important implications for urban space. In the "search for authenticity" that has been bound up in gentrification processes (Brown-Saracino 2009; Osman 2011), individual gentrifiers—usually white, highly educated, and middle-class (Zukin 1987; Lees 2000; Smith 2002)—move into communities that have been deemed "authentic," in contrast to the "mass-produced" suburbs and "sanitized" downtown districts. As scholars such as Neil Smith (2002) have argued, contemporary gentrification processes represent a much more pervasive "urban strategy" than the narratives of individual gentrifiers would suggest (Lloyd 2006; Pattillo 2007). Thus, while the movement *en masse* of middle-class whites into communities

of color is less of a "bootstraps" movement than many gentrifiers would like to believe, how gentrifiers read and understand local collective memories is a crucial, and sometimes overlooked, aspect of gentrification processes.

Gentrifiers armed with "authentic" local histories intersect in numerous ways with their "new" urban neighborhoods. Interventions by gentrifiers at the levels of housing, commerce, and public space reify the legible past, inscribing new spaces with a "gentrified" vision of community (Brown-Saracino 2009; Zukin 2010). Gentrifiers use their readings of collective memories to assert a connection with the local. Such connections can be deployed in a variety of ways; some use them as a means to respect (their interpretation of) history and local character—seen, for example, in painstaking attempts to restore the "authentic" details of brownstones (Kasinitz 1988; Osman 2011). Others leverage collective memories as legitimating strategies, often deployed for potential profit by entrepreneurs and brownstoners who hold a "mix of cultural, social, and economic motivations" (Zukin 2010: 20).

In spite of collective memory's peripheral role in most studies of gentrification, some influential scholars have underscored the importance of history in shaping urban change. In particular, Sharon Zukin has written extensively on the interrelationships among cultural tastes, gentrification, and the production of socio-spatial meanings in the city (1982, 1995, 2010). Zukin describes how the valorization of "authentic" cultural products has been translated to the level of the neighborhood and shapes both the aesthetic and social dimensions of urban space. Zukin's research suggests that attention to collective memory in gentrification processes illuminates the contradictory impulses and practices that emerge in gentrifying contexts. Even when gentrifiers sympathize with the existing spatial needs of longtime residents and respect local history, their very presence in the neighborhood creates conflicts that can undermine tenuous political or socio-spatial solidarities and threaten the "authenticity" that many newcomers fetishize.

Other scholars have illustrated various dimensions of this process. In his study of Chicago's "neo-bohemian" Wicker Park neighborhood, Lloyd (2006) demonstrates how older gentrifiers use their comparatively deeper connections to local history to distinguish themselves from newer middle-class arrivals. Various "waves" of gentrification create layers of local memories and expose the flows of economic and cultural capital that migrate with gentrifiers in their quest for an "authentic" habitus. Illustrating that the "search for authenticity" and the valorization of "place" goes beyond middle-class white residents, Pattillo (2007) shows how African American gentrifiers engage with local history on Chicago's South Side, as Hunter (2013) does in Philadelphia's Seventh Ward. In her multi-site study of four gentrifying communities, Brown-Saracino (2009) reveals the threads that link "social preservationists"—gentrifiers who seek to preserve the social and spatial characteristics of their new neighborhoods.

These studies illustrate how collective memory intersects with gentrification processes, impacting the production of new urban spaces and the cultural interpretation of existing ones. While gentrifiers differ in magnitude from vast "urban renewal" schemes, the process of reading local history and character for the stimulation of economic and cultural capital is markedly similar. For outsiders, local collective memories often amount to little more than a text to be read, and engagement with local traditions and histories is largely superficial for many gentrifiers, cultural consumers, real estate developers, and government actors. Gentrifiers may, as Zukin (2010: 20) suggests, bring a "mix of cultural, social, and economic motivations" to their socio-spatial interactions with existing communities. However, the relationship between collective memory and gentrification is deeply affected by power relations—newcomers who hold disproportionate levels of the "forms of capital"

(Bourdieu 1984) relative to existing residents often see their "vision" for community and memory triumph (Lloyd 2006; Brown-Saracino 2009).

But collective memories have more than one side. In spite of top-down efforts at co-optation and commodification, urbanites continually reclaim the city of the past through everyday practices and collective actions. Residents reinscribe urban spaces with memory, even when material traces of local histories have been erased from the built environment. Gestures to the past are not the exclusive province of developers and other growth machine elites. Just as the legible symbols of collective memory can be co-opted by elites in the name of economic development, urban residents—"the active, sometimes skilled users of culture" (Swidler 1986: 277)—similarly utilize history to shape their locales.

The city and collective memory "from below"

Throughout history, memory-rich urban spaces have often served as the focus of political mobilizations. From the Bastille to Tahrir Square, the people who drive revolutions and other social movements look to spaces infused with history to give legitimacy and visibility to their movements. These events can be linked to a variety of emotions from anger, sadness, to crowd joys (Lofland 1982; Ehrenreich 2006). Like the developers and gentrifiers discussed in the above sections, activists and revolutionaries leverage their city's cultural symbols to make spatial claims. The same areas targeted by elites for redevelopment projects can serve as counter-hegemonic spaces of refuge and mobilization. The same socio-spatial symbols that make collective memories "visible" to consumers and developers can be activated by the very cultural producers and everyday people whose labors and life histories create and shape local identities.

Despite the links among urban space, collective memory, and social movements, sociological scholarship contains little analysis of these connections. In each of the major schools of urban sociology, the "from-below" aspect of collective memory is underdeveloped, as their respective theoretical frameworks predominantly focus on the top-down restructuring of urban space. New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles have all been the sites of important social movements, yet scholars have largely ignored these events as key dimensions of urban processes. When sociologists have gone beyond elite-led processes—whether conceived of as "growth machines," "ecology," or "revanchism"—they have focused on the ethnographic texture of urban poverty (Duneier 1999; Venkatesh 2000), rather than on the contestations that emerge around political-economic restructuring, racial segregation, poverty, and other issues. The result is a theoretical and an empirical void around issues of memory in the urban-sociological literature.

In this section, we link sociological studies of urban movements to our theory of cities and collective memory, illustrating how memory processes work in a dialectical fashion. The malleability of local collective memories enables strategic actors to leverage cultural symbols in the name of diverse social movements. In some cases, this comes in response to the top-down co-optation by powerful actors discussed in the previous section. In other cases, mobilizations around resonant spatial symbols provide visibility for activists and revolutionaries, even in the absence of preexisting conflicts over the use of local places. For many people, the symbolic capital inscribed in urban space is underused until enterprising actors, serving as movement entrepreneurs, reignite relevant values and historical memories.

Urban public spaces infused with the symbolic power of state ideology—*liberté, égalité, fraternité* and the like—become resonant even for groups that wish to challenge the status quo. It is precisely the spatialization of master narratives and nationalistic collective memories

that make public spaces key venues for revolutions and popular uprisings. Insurgent groups that successfully link their movements to preexisting national symbols can stake claim to the power of the state. For that reason it is not surprising that movements as disparate as the African American Civil Rights Movement, the Tea Party, and Abortion Rights and Pro-Life groups have gathered on the National Mall and invoked the Declaration of Independence in their rhetoric. The attachment of diverse groups to these and other symbols of U.S. national identity evince the malleability of collective memories and the spaces that contain them (Schwartz 2000; Fine 2001; Berezin 2002).

Though scholars of memory have long studied how social groups or "mnemonic communities" (Zerubavel 1997) adapt state ideologies and collective memories for strategic purposes, few scholars have translated these ideas to the urban environment. To link empirical studies of place, culture, and development to the theoretical and empirical traditions of memory studies, we draw from a variety of studies to illustrate the mnemonic texture of the city. We focus our analysis specifically on three broad types: state spaces, subaltern places, and what Sassen (2011) terms the "global street."

State spaces represent one key site where collective memories intersect with mobilizations. In cities, these environments have long histories, dating at least to the emergence of modern urbanization processes and nation-states. New systems of governance spurred the development of public spaces, marked as sites of ritual and governmental power (Foucault [1978] 2009; Levinson 1998; Doss 2010). Monuments and other permanent sites of commemoration, such as Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia or the National Mall in Washington, organize the city as a tool of communal recall. They emphasize features that those with resources and interests wish to preserve or build. Such spaces often stand silent, or as sites for the tourist gaze, but they also can be used for festival events or for sponsored rituals of commemoration. Physical spaces include the parade grounds, piazzas, and plazas of imperial and colonial cities, in addition to government buildings and other spatial symbols that express the power of the sovereign or the state and make this power legible to the mass of subjects (Brenner et al. 2003). Yet, as Scott (2012) points out, even jaywalking can be a political statement, capturing the right to own the street in the face of systems of control.

As sites of memory, state spaces present a governing ideology and official history at the level of the built environment (Wagner-Pacifici and Schwartz 1991; Vinitzky-Seroussi 2002). But such sites remain open to multiple interpretations—just as Abraham Lincoln's memory was appropriated, in different ways, by socialists, conservatives, and immigrants (Schwartz 2000). The memory of place is translated through the ideological lens of the user (Hayden 1995). Often a master narrative inscribed in urban space—such as the National Mall in Washington or the Place de la Concorde in Paris—is far from the final word. As in the case of other master narratives, groups can position themselves vis-à-vis state space in multiple ways. In some cases, groups mobilize to draw distinctions between their "populist" demands and a "repressive" political structure, seen for example in the cases of Cairo's Tahrir Square in 2011 (Nanabhaya and Farmanfarmaian 2011), Beijing's Tiananmen Square in 1989 (Hershkovitz 1993; Lee 2009), and Washington, D.C.'s March on Washington in 1963 (Barber 2002). Such political gatherings, made dramatic through the crush of bodies, can draw distinctions between a nation's ideals and its practices or can give visibility to marginalized groups. These movements can also build on collective memories around past achievements, particularly in spaces with a history of democratic contestation of state power, seen for example in protests in New York's Union Square (Zukin 2010: ch. 4) or London's Hyde Park (Mitchell 2003).

Activists also mobilize around collective memories in subaltern places to shape cities. Forged in the face of socio-spatial marginalization along lines of race, gender, class, sexuality, or national origin, these sites are often rich with collective memories "from below," particularly in light of responses to shared trauma (Huyssen 2003). In such locations, communities, activists, and social movement groups forge common identities around salient cultural or political issues (Roy 2011; Clayton 2011). We find a prime example in the long history of activism in Black communities in the United States, as places like Harlem and South Philadelphia—and even Montgomery, Alabama—take on a spiritual and cultural significance (Kelley 1992; Marable and Mullings 1999; Hunter 2013). Moments of place-based artistic production, such as the Harlem Renaissance, evince the power of subaltern places to foster the collective identities, actions, and memories that shape cities in material and symbolic ways. Immigrant enclaves (Iskander 2007; Liu and Geron 2008), queer spaces (Armstrong 2002; Shepard and Smithsimon 2011: ch. 4), and gendered communities (Damousi 1991; Anwar 2010) have also provided the mnemonic basis for collective mobilizations (Nicholls 2009; Hou 2010; Parkinson 2012).

Saskia Sassen has invoked the term "global street" to express the revolutionary political possibilities that exist in the modern city. In her theoretical framing, the street is "a rawer and less ritualized space" than parks and squares, and critically, "a space where new forms of the social and the political can be *made*" (2011: 574, emphasis in original). In Sassen's conception, the global street is a venue for the oppressed to seize power, if only temporarily, and assert their "presence" in the political realm. We have witnessed the rise of the global street in the remarkable number of revolutionary movements that have occurred around the world in the last few years.

In places as diverse as Egypt, Greece, Myanmar, and the United States, activists have taken to the streets to protest authoritarian regimes, austerity politics, and rising inequality. With the myriad protestors sharing visibility and a transnational affinity linked to the proliferation of social media and communication technologies, much of the media and scholarly analysis of Occupy and recent revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa centered on the question of whether or to what extent these uprisings were driven by technology, sometimes attributing a problematic agency to Facebook, Twitter, and other social media (Morozov 2009; Aday et al. 2010). Lost in the rush to anoint the next "Twitter revolution" was how actual groups mobilized, asserted claims to space, and linked their movements with collective memories.

Occupy Wall Street provides an instructive case. For two months in 2011, activists "occupied" Zuccotti Park, an otherwise nondescript public plaza in downtown Manhattan. Located a few blocks north of Wall Street, Occupy demonstrators leveraged Wall Street's resonance (Schudson 1989) as the symbolic center of global finance and capitalism to provide power to their movement. Occupy's successful linking of social movement and spatial symbol indicates the malleability of both collective memory and urban space. Through the process of "occupation," activists transformed Zuccotti Park into a collective marker in its own right, serving as the symbolic and spiritual home of what rapidly became an international Occupy movement. The tented encampments that popped up across the United States in 2011 became mnemonically bound to Wall Street and Zuccotti Park. In this process, even small postindustrial cities, such as Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Portland, Maine—places in many ways external to the "command centers" of finance capitalism—became outposts in the struggle against a "street" found hundreds of miles away (Juris 2012; Wengronowitz 2013).

In sum, ordinary people, activists, and revolutionaries have long used the power of collective memory to shape urban space from below. In state environments, in subaltern places, and

in the global street, people often challenge the top-down reordering of cities by governments, developers, and other elites, even if these occasions are punctuated by times of acceptance and acquiescence. By operationalizing history and spatial symbols of collective memory as sites to contest powerful actors, movement groups assert their "right to the city" and give visibility to their cultural and political claims. While not always successful, these actions are powerful markers of the role of collective memory.

Cities of memories

In this chapter, we have asserted the significance of collective memory in shaping urban space. We argue that the production of place is a dialectical process, with collective memories "from above," "from the middle," and "from below," each factoring into the material and symbolic dimensions of cities. In considering these processes "from above" and "from the middle," we have examined the roles of city governments, developers, and gentrifiers in claims-making that draws on local histories. In many cases, elites reduce local history and culture to "texts" through the commodification of collective memories. Developers and consumers read local history and character for the stimulation of economic and cultural capital, expressed through real estate development and place-based consumption. In considering these processes "from below," we have examined the role of urban social movements in leveraging spatial symbols and shared memories to make claims. We have considered state spaces, subaltern locales, and the "global street" as three key socio-spatial venues for movement groups to utilize collective memories. We argue that contestations around spatial symbols of collective memory provide an important way for marginalized groups to make claims on the state and assert their political and cultural presence.

We have also emphasized the under-examination of collective memory within American urban sociology. The empirical and theoretical achievements of the New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago Schools have provided a rich foundation for research and theory, yet each approach can benefit from an emphasis on the role of collective memory in shaping urban environments. In analyzing works that operationalize human ecology, political economy, and cultural production, we point out how shared history can complement each of these approaches. Scholars need to develop theoretical and empirical projects that link urban sociology with mnemonic studies. Cities, we have argued, are ultimately sites of memory.

References

Aday, Sean, Henry Farrell, Marc Lynch, John Sides, John Kelly, and Ethan Zuckerman. 2010. "Blogs and Bullets: New Media in Contentious Politics." *Peaceworks Report* No. 65 United States Institute of Peace.

Addams, Jane, (Ed.). 1895. *Hull House Maps and Papers*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Company.

Anwar, Etin. 2010. "Gendered Space and Shared Security: Women's Activism in Peace and Conflict Resolution in Indonesia." In *Women and Islam*, edited by Z. Kassam. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 19–42.

Arena, John. 2012. *Driven from New Orleans: How Nonprofits Betray Public Housing and Promote Privatization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 2002. *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950–1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Barber, Lucy G. 2002. *Marching on Washington: The Forging of an American Political Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berezin, Mabel. 2002. "Secure States: Towards a Political Sociology of Emotion." In *Emotions and Sociology*, edited by J. Barbalet. London: Basil Blackwell, pp. 33–52.

Binnie, Jon, and Beverly Skeggs. 2004. "Cosmopolitan Knowledge and the Production and Consumption of Sexualized Space: Manchester's Gay Village." *The Sociological Review* 52(1): 39–61.

Booth, Charles. 1889–1891. *Life and Labor of the People*. Vol. II. London: Macmillan and Company.
Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Boyer, M. Christine. 1994. *City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imaginary and Architectural Entertainments*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Brenner, Neil, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon Macleod (Eds.). 2003. *State/Space: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Brown-Saracino, Japonica. 2009. *A Neighborhood That Never Changes: Gentrification, Social Preservation, and the Search for Authenticity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Clayton, Daniel. 2011. "Subaltern Space." In *The Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, edited by J. A. Agnew and D. N. Livingstone. London: Sage Publications, pp. 246–60.
Collins, Alan. 2004. "Sexual Dissidence, Enterprise, and Assimilation." *Urban Studies* 41: 1789–1806.
Damousi, Joy. 1991. "Socialist Women and Gendered Space: The Anti-Conscription and Anti-War Campaigns of 1914–1918." *Labour History* 60: 1–15.
Dávila, Arlene M. 2004. *Barrio Dreams: Puerto Ricans, Latinos, and the Neoliberal City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Davis, Mike. 1990. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. New York: Verso.
Doss, Erika. 2010. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Drake, St. Clair, and Horace R. Cayton. 1945. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Du Bois, W.E.B. 1899. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Duneier, Mitchell. 1999. *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Ehrenreich, Barbara. 2006. *Dancing in the Streets: A History of Collective Joy*. New York: Metropolitan.
Fine, Gary Alan. 2001. *Difficult Reputations: Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept, and Controversial*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Flusty, Steven. 1994. *Building Paranoia: The Proliferation of Interdictory Space and the Erosion of Spatial Justice*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design.
Foucault, Michel. [1978] 2009. *Security, Territory, Population*, translated by G. Burchell. New York: Picador.
Gotham, Kevin Fox. 2002. *Race, Real Estate, and Uneven Development: The Kansas City Experience, 1900–2000*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Grams, Diane. 2010. *Producing Local Culture: Art Networks in Ethnic Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Greenberg, Miriam. 2008. *Branding New York: How a City in Crisis Was Sold to the World*. New York: Routledge.
Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Halle, David. 2003. *New York & Los Angeles: Politics, Society, and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Harvey, Daina Cheyenne. 2007. "(Re) Creating Culture through Tourism: Black Heritage Sites in New Jersey." In *Tourism, Culture and Regeneration*, edited by M. K. Smith. Cambridge, MA: CABI, pp. 59–68.
Hayden, Dolores. 1995. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Hershkovitz, Linda. 1993. "Tiananmen Square and the Politics of Place." *Political Geography* 12(5): 395–420.
Hou, Jeffrey, (Ed.). 2010. *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. New York: Routledge.
Hunter, Marcus Anthony. 2013. *Black Citymakers: How the Philadelphia Negro Changed Urban America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Hunter, Marcus Anthony. 2014. "Ecologies, Post-Modern Urbanisms, and Symbolic Economies: A Comparative Assessment of American Urban Sociology." *Comparative Sociology* 13(1): 1–30.
Huyssen, Andreas. 2003. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
Iskander, Natasha. 2007. "Informal Work and Protest: Undocumented Immigrant Activism in France, 1996–2000." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45(2): 309–34.
Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.
Juris, Jeffrey S. 2012. "Reflections on Occupy Everywhere: Social Media, Public Space, and Emerging Logics of Aggregation." *American Ethnologist* 39(2): 259–79.

Kasinitz, Philip. 1988. "The Gentrification of 'Boerum Hill': Neighborhood Change and Conflicts over Definitions." *Qualitative Sociology* 11(3): 163–82.
Kelley, Robin D.G. 1992. *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class*. New York: Free Press.
Lee, Nelson K. 2009. "How Is a Political Public Space Made? The Birth of Tiananmen Square and the May Fourth Movement." *Political Geography* 28(1): 32–43.
Lees, Loretta. 2000. "A Reappraisal of Gentrification: Towards a 'Geography of Gentrification'." *Progress in Human Geography* 24(3): 389–408.
Levinson, Sanford. 1998. *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Liu, Michael, and Kim Geron. 2008. "Changing Neighborhood: Ethnic Enclaves and the Struggle for Social Justice." *Social Justice* 35(2): 18–35.
Lloyd, Richard. 2006. *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City*. New York: Routledge.
Lofland, John. 1982. "Crowd Joys." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 10: 355–81.
Logan, John R., and Harvey Molotch. 1987. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Loughran, Kevin. 2014. "Parks for Profit: The High Line, Growth Machines, and the Uneven Development of Urban Public Spaces." *City & Community* 13(1): 49–68.
Lowenthal, David. 1986. *The Past Is a Foreign Country*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Marable, Manning, and Leith Mullings (Eds.). 1999. *Let Nobody Turn Us Around: Voices of Resistance, Reform, and Renewal*. New York: Roman and Littlefield.
Marwell, Nicole P. 2007. *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Mitchell, Don. 2003. *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York: The Guilford Press.
Molotch, Harvey. 1976. "The City as Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(2): 309–32.
Molotch, Harvey. 2002. "School's Out: A Response to Michael Dear." *City & Community* 1(1): 39–43.
Molotch, Harvey, William Freudenburg, and Krista E. Paulsen. 2000. "History Repeats Itself, But How? City Character, Urban Tradition, and the Accomplishment of Place." *American Sociological Review* 65(6): 791–823.
Morozov, Evgeny. 2009. "Iran: Downside to the 'Twitter Revolution.'" *Dissent* Fall: 10–4.
Munn, Nancy D. 2004. "The 'Becoming-Past' of Places: Spacetime and Memory in Nineteenth Century Pre-Civil War New York." *Suomen Antropologi* 29: 2–19.
Nanabhaya, Mohamed, and Roxane Farmanfarmaian. 2011. "From Spectacle to Spectacular: How Physical Space, Social Media and Mainstream Broadcast Amplified the Public Sphere in Egypt's 'Revolution'." *The Journal of North African Studies* 16(4): 573–603.
Nicholls, Walter. 2009. "Place, Networks, Space: Theorising the Geographies of Social Movements." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34(1): 78–93.
Nora, Pierre. 2006. *Rethinking France: Les Lieux de Mémoire. Volume Two*: *Space*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Olick, Jeffrey, and Joyce Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 105–40.
Olick, Jeffrey, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy. 2011. *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Osman, Suleiman. 2011. *The Invention of Brownstone Brooklyn: Gentrification and the Search for Authenticity in Postwar New York*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Park, Robert E. 1925. "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment." In *The City*, edited by Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp 1–46.
Park, Robert E., and Ernest W. Burgess. 1925. *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Parkinson, John. 2012. *Democracy and Public Space: The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Pattillo, Mary. 2007. *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Reed, Christopher. 2003. "We're from Oz: Marking Ethnic and Sexual Identity in Chicago." *Environment and Planning D* 21(4): 425–40.

Roy, Ananya. 2011. "Slumdog Cities: Rethinking Subaltern Urbanism." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(2): 223–38.
Sassen, Saskia. 2011. "The Global Street: Making the Political." *Globalizations* 8(5): 565–71.
Schudson, Michael. 1989. "How Culture Works: Perspectives from Media Studies on the Efficacy of Symbols." *Theory and Society* 18(2): 153–80.
Schwartz, Barry. 2000. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Scott, James. 2012. *Two Cheers for Anarchism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Shaw, Stephen. 2007. "Ethnoscapes as Cultural Attractions in Canadian 'World Cities'." In *Tourism, Culture and Regeneration*, edited by M.K. Smith. Cambridge, MA: CABI, pp. 49–58.
Shepard, Benjamin, and Gregory Smithsimon. 2011. *The Beach Beneath the Streets: Contesting New York City's Public Spaces*. New York: SUNY Press.
Sibalis, Michael. 2004. "Urban Space and Homosexuality: The Example of the Marais, Paris' 'Gay Ghetto'." *Urban Studies* 41(9): 1739–58.
Smith, Neil. 2002. "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy." *Antipode* 34(3): 427–50.
Soja, Edward. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Strom, Elizabeth. 2002. "Converting Pork into Porcelain: Cultural Institutions and Downtown Development." *Urban Affairs Review* 38(1): 3–21.
Suttles, Gerald. 1984. "The Cumulative Texture of Local Urban Culture." *American Journal of Sociology* 90(2): 283–304.
Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51(2): 273–86.
Venkatesh, Sudhir Alladi. 2000. *American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Vinitzky-Seroussi, Vered. 2002. "Commemorating a Difficult Past: Yitzhak Rabin's Memorials." *American Sociological Review* 67(1): 30–51.
Wagner-Pacifici, Robin, and Barry Schwartz. 1991. "The Vietnam Veterans Memorial: Commemorating a Difficult Past." *American Journal of Sociology* 97(2): 376–420.
Wengronowitz, Robert. 2013. "Lessons from Occupy Providence." *The Sociological Quarterly* 54(2): 213–19.
Wherry, Frederick F. 2011. *The Philadelphia Barrio: The Arts, Branding, and Neighborhood Transformation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Whitt, J. Allen. 1987. "Mozart in the Metropolis: The Arts Coalition and the Urban Growth Machine." *Urban Affairs Review* 23(1): 15–36.
Wirth, Louis. 1928. *The Ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1997. *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Zipp, Samuel. 2010. *Manhattan Projects: The Rise and Fall of Urban Renewal in Cold War New York*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Zorbaugh, Harvey W. 1929. *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Zukin, Sharon. 1982. *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Zukin, Sharon. 1987. "Gentrification: Culture and Capital in the Urban Core." *Annual Review of Sociology* 13: 129–47.
Zukin, Sharon. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
Zukin, Sharon. 2010. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. New York: Oxford University Press.