

After Gentrification: Social Mix, Settler Colonialism, and Cruel Optimism in the Transformation of Neighbourhood Space

Jean-Paul D. Addie 

Urban Studies Institute, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA;
jaddie@gsu.edu

James C. Fraser

Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA;
fraserj@umn.edu

Abstract: Social mix policies have emerged as a prominent mechanism to legitimate neighbourhood redevelopment efforts across the US. Despite integrationist rhetoric, results often disabuse marginalised communities of their claims to the city. This paper employs a hybrid spatio-temporal analysis at the intersection of political-economic theories of gentrification and post-colonial and Black geographies literatures to examine underlying cultural logics and affective experiences animating such processes of neighbourhood transformation, contestation, and succession. Reflecting on 15 years of experience researching Over-the-Rhine (OTR), Cincinnati, we contribute a stylised distinction between the foundational, mature, and ongoing legacies of urban settler colonial relations. Our account discloses the power geometries shaping neighbourhood space by illustrating the impact of the discourses, tactics, and strategies employed by pro-development actors and neighbourhood activists as OTR's socio-political landscape shifted over time. In conclusion, we engage the thorny questions these dynamics raise surrounding how inner-city neighbourhoods are theorised and struggled over *after* gentrification.

Resumen: Políticas de mezcla social han emergido como un mecanismo prominente para legitimar los esfuerzos de redesarrollo vecinal a lo largo de los Estados Unidos. A pesar de la retórica integracionista, los resultados frecuentemente reniegan a las comunidades marginalizadas de sus derechos a la ciudad. Este artículo usa un análisis híbrido espaciotemporal en la intersección de teorías político-económicas y las literaturas pos-coloniales y de las Afro-geografías para examinar las lógicas culturales subyacentes y las experiencias afectivas que animan tales procesos de transformación, contestación, y sucesión vecinal. Basándonos en 15 años de experiencia investigativa en Over-the-Rhine (OTR), Cincinnati, contribuimos con una distinción estilizada entre los legados del "colonialismo de colonos" urbano, que pueden distinguirse entre legados fundacionales, maduros, o en proceso. Ilustrando el efecto de los discursos, tácticas y estrategias que han empleado los actores pro-desarrollo y las activistas vecinales a través de los cambios históricos en el paisaje sociopolítico en OTR, nuestra crónica revela las geometrías del poder que dan forma al espacio vecinal. En conclusión, abordamos las arduas preguntas planteadas por estas dinámicas, preguntas acerca de cómo teorizar y cómo luchan por los barrios marginales después de la gentrificación.

Keywords: displacement, gentrification, racial capitalism, settler colonialism, Cincinnati

Redeveloping Over-The-Rhine: A Walk in the Park

In a 2013 media story about Over-the-Rhine (OTR), a neighbourhood adjacent to Downtown Cincinnati, Ohio, a news camera pans across a green expanse with people practicing yoga. The reporter, gesturing toward the participants, frames the event as an uplifting narrative of neighbourhood revitalisation and health. Their instructor marvels:

This is amazing because we are in Washington Park. I remember four years ago what this park was, and the fact that this many people can come together here in safety and joy; and, that you can get three hundred people who are willing to lay down and close their eyes in this park, you know, it's a huge transformation. (Williams 2013)

Prior to its current incarnation, Washington Park was a place where those experiencing homelessness and poverty could lay down and close their eyes, but municipal ordinances have made that more precarious for threat of police intervention. It is now illegal to sort through public trashcans for goods that others have discarded while neighbourhood activists need a city permit to use this public space for political organising. Vendors who sell *Street Vibes*, a newspaper that provides a voice for homeless and other low-income populations, are subject to arrest if they come within 20 feet of an ATM. The park's basketball courts are gone. So too is the deep-water swimming pool that served local youths and adults. Washington Park Elementary School, which occupied the park's north end, has been demolished and cleared. In their place, the City and corporate-sponsors have invested more than \$50 million to re-engineer the six-acre park as a green space for festivals and events geared toward attracting more affluent populations to the neighbourhood.

Washington Park is emblematic of neighbourhood transformations galvanised in the wake of a major urban uprising (or "race riot") centred in OTR in 2001. Like the park, other neighbourhood spaces have, and continue to be, remade for people other than those who have limited options to secure housing and live their everyday lives with a sense of precarity. City officials and for-profit interests have long eyed OTR as a frontier for capital to expand its presence through land development—its location between the downtown business and entertainment district and the upscale neighbourhoods and university district to its north gives it particular significance in terms of how Cincinnati is imagined as a city. Across the neighbourhood, signage appears with the logo of Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation (3CDC) (Figures 1 and 2). 3CDC is a private nonprofit corporation headed by corporate CEOs and politicians, formed by Cincinnati City Council in July 2003 and tasked with transforming OTR into a "diverse and mixed-income neighborhood" alongside the redevelopment of The Banks and Fountain Square in Downtown. 3CDC's initial plans focused on redeveloping Washington Park as a civic space, rather than OTR as a whole and were presented first to the City, then to the neighbourhood without any public involvement in the planning process (Dunlap 2004). The City has supported their efforts by using its legal powers to approve land use changes and acquire state and federal funding, while the private sector supplies additional capital flows for the redevelopment effort.



Figure 1: Vine and 15th, OTR, looking northeast in 2005 (source: authors)



Figure 2: 3CDC signage at Vine and 15th, OTR, looking northeast in 2018 (source: authors)

The dominant narrative accompanying the 3CDC-led (re)investment drive in OTR is one of “urban renaissance”—a revanchist trope that affectionately (and with no little irony) identifies the neighbourhood’s 19th and early 20th century German immigrant populations as the original settlers of the area. This discourse further serves to re-inscribe the highly racialised tale of urban decline and

dysfunction that has reproduced the neighbourhood as a ghettoised space following its transition to a predominantly Black resident population through the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. Alter 2018; Chester 2013). Referring to the era prior to the 2000s, the Urban Land Institute states that the neighbourhood suffered due to “the criminal element” in the area and that the takeover and renovation of Washington Park represented nothing less than the creation of the “most democratic site in the region ... including a civic lawn ... and a civil war era bandstand” (Sowers 2017). Once accessible to people experiencing poverty, OTR now boasts housing prices in excess of \$1 million. Characterised by the media as a “fashionable urban playground”, the neighbourhood has been celebrated by Cincinnati Mayor John Cranley (2013–) as “the most dramatic and positive urban development in 50 years” (Greenblatt 2014).

Not everyone shares these sentiments. For instance, the People’s Movement for Equality and Justice (People’s Movement), formed in OTR during the 1970s by a coalition of community-based organisations and local residents, has long-maintained that the neighbourhood’s transformation is occurring at the expense of longtime residents (Figure 3). The People’s Movement has sought to alleviate poverty, homelessness, and urban decline in OTR through an expansive approach to community-based revitalisation. For four decades, they have pursued political advocacy and concrete actions, including supporting social service provision, providing legal advice, operating homeless shelters, and mobilising homeless residents and volunteers to renovate derelict buildings to create affordable housing units. Their main platform reads: “We want neighborhoods where all citizens are respected and appreciated for who they are” (People’s Movement 2010:1). Among the more specific demands, they assert: “We want the renovation of Washington Park to welcome all citizens and to be maintained as a genuine



Figure 3: The long-standing People’s Movement mural on Buddy’s Place (aka Miami University’s Center for Community Engagement), Vine Street, OTR (source: authors)

public space" (People's Movement 2010:2). In contrast to the tropes of "social mix" and revitalisation forwarded by the proponents of the City's adopted plan for OTR, the People's Movement contend 3CDC's investments have created the conditions for gentrification, escalating property value, and the accelerated out-migration of the neighbourhood's low-income, primarily Black, population.

Reflecting on 15 years of research in OTR, we find that while the neighbourhood continues to experience classic gentrification trends, something more is occurring whereby pre-existing populations of residents have been actively disabused of the notion that this is still (or even ever was) their neighbourhood.¹ Since its inception, we have observed 3CDC acquiring vacant and occupied properties (both residential and commercial), pressuring social service organisations to relocate outside of the neighbourhood, working with the City to increase the surveillance and regulation of public spaces, and aggressively seeking to discredit the People's Movement for supposedly opposing neighbourhood "progress". Smith (1996:16) draws attention to how the invention of frontier ideology "rationalizes social differentiation and exclusion as natural, inevitable" and "at the same time reaffirm[s] a set of class-specific and race-specific social norms" that are said to constitute the divide between the affiliated (civil) and the unaffiliated (uncivil). While he relates spatial logics that were foundational to settler colonialism in the US to current urban regeneration efforts by evoking the term "extermination", this provocation towards an analysis of settler mentalities as they relate to gentrification has only recently been taken up by urban geographers in any sustained manner (e.g. Blomley 2003, 2004; Roy 2017; Safransky 2017). Arguing that political-economic analyses of neoliberal urban development particularly found in treatments of gentrification do not sufficiently account for the centrality of race and racism as constitutive moments in processes of capital accumulation, these critical race, indigenous, and postcolonial contributions draw on decades of research and activism undertaken by scholars of colour (e.g. Du Bois 1996; Fanon 1963; Wynter 2003) to reveal how the production of locality "involves the assertion of socially (often ritually) organized power over places and settings that are viewed as potentially chaotic or rebellious" (Appadurai 1996:183–184). That is, when theorised from the vantage point of settler colonial cities, the desire to redevelop urban areas is not solely a manifestation of political-economic restructuring, it is also a spatial and racial project to reimagine the city and whom cities are for (Blatman-Thomas and Porter 2019; Porter and Yiftachel 2019; Shaw 2007).

Political-economic accounts of inner-city transformation tend to operate at a level of abstraction that often omits the lived values, modalities, and practices of everyday life—and risks theoretical overextension when drawn over these terrains (Smart and Smart 2017). To be clear, we hold the violence and class-based dynamics of gentrification as its essential and entrenched characteristic (Smith 2008), and understand controlled, social mix-style gentrification as an inherently inequitable and revanchist process of class transition. However, we are interested here in how the urbanisation of capital inscribes new social meanings onto racialised and classed bodies, communities, and landscapes through the rearticulation of urban consciousness and everyday life.

In this paper, we continue the task of reading across political-economy and Black geographies literatures by employing a hybrid analysis based upon the logic of settler colonial relations that pivots upon “ethnaclass” (Wynter 2003) distinctions that saturate the production of neighbourhood space and reinforce a hierarchy of subject positions in the US context. Our analysis, while not explicitly using the language of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1989), parallels recent advances in that line of theorisation. Following McKinzie and Richards’s (2019:10–11) argument that context-driven research provides “proper space to understanding how history, politics and geographic location shape particular inequalities”, we add that the process scholars most often label as gentrification elides the ways in which many axes of oppression (Curran 2018; Hill Collins and Bilge 2016) have constituted the spatial logics animating political-economic processes connected to city-building. We illustrate this by excavating a genealogy of settler colonialism in OTR that emphasises the spatio-temporal shifts in 3CDC’s strategies for remaking the neighbourhood and the experiences of OTR residents and activists (also see Kern 2016). The foundational moments of OTR’s transformation were marked by explicit state violence and social uprising, followed by a City-imposed moratorium on the production of affordable housing and the takeover of Washington Park. As the campaign to settle the neighbourhood matured—albeit through experimentation rather than linear progression—new political-economic infrastructures were put in place to promote “governance beyond the state” (Swyngedouw 2005), whereby incoming residents were conferred with the status of stakeholder while much of the pre-existing community governance architecture was dismantled. Bringing these strands together, we conclude with a discussion of whether or not it is worth fighting “to stay put” under conditions of “cruel optimism”; “a relation of attachment to compromised conditions of possibility whose realisation is discovered either to be *impossible*, sheer fantasy, or *too possible*, and toxic” (Berlant 2011:24). As we demonstrate, spaces of racialised optimism are wearying in part because of the implicit and explicit promises made and broken—and the optimism that continually drives the occupants to structure their experience of the spaces they inhabit through these promises.

From Social Mix to Settler Colonial Mentality

While treatments of the type of neighbourhood change underway in OTR often deploy the theoretical scaffolding of gentrification, we begin with an interrogation of social mix and the purported benefits of integration itself. Calls to produce a “mixed economic and cultural community” have been a recurrent trope across the socio-political constituencies struggling over OTR’s future. It appears in the manifesto of the People’s Movement, the neighbourhood Community Comprehensive Plan (City of Cincinnati 2002) and 3CDC’s mission statement. Drawing on the observation that mixed-income housing and social mix are almost always put forward by policymakers and politicians as viable strategies for low-income “inner-city” neighbourhoods (Newman and Ashton 2004), it is not unreasonable to question the outcomes of these initiatives in terms of their original intent.

Social Mix as “Gentrification by Stealth”

It is not difficult to make the connection between mixed-income housing development and gentrification. These interventions, by definition, aim to attract more affluent populations to targeted low-income areas, with people in poverty presumed to benefit from the ability to remain in a neighbourhood that is rising socio-economically. Mixed-income development projects are designed and implemented by public–private consortiums of urban elites, supported by a range of experts who provide an evidence base for what they are trying to accomplish (typically evaluated through market research and housing economics). Meanwhile, people living in poverty usually operate from a condition of constraint. Those who live in poverty are already cast as members of a dysfunctional neighbourhood milieu. The abstract representations of the everyday lives of the poor and the places they call home are often damage-centred (Tuck 2009).

In theorising the drive to deconcentrate poverty and transform inner-city neighbourhoods, scholars have noted the role of social abjection that is attached to certain states of being (Tyler 2013). Unsurprisingly, social mix—operationalised in a vague and malleable fashion—often results in not-so-controllable gentrification since it is animated by an interplay of humanness and habitability that renders a population of people as both the cause and effect of unhealthy environments that must be excised. Yet, to attract more affluent populations to a neighbourhood characterised as a space of concentrated poverty, state-market actors not only subsidise market-rate housing development via financial innovations such as tax increment financings, but they also reconfigure urban governance by unevenly granting “stakeholder” status in neighbourhood redevelopment efforts. Swyngedouw (2005:1999–2000) notes:

While the concept of (stake)“holder” is inclusive and presumably exhaustive, the actual concrete forms of governance are necessarily constrained and limited in terms of who can, is, or will be allowed to participate. Hence, status and assigning or appropriating entitlement to participate, are of prime importance. In particular, assigning “holder” status to an individual or social group is not neutral in terms of exercising power. In most cases, entitlements are conferred upon participants by those who already hold a certain power or status.

The implementation of social mix as a strategy for place-making is necessarily about revitalisation; both in terms of bringing new life to a locale and shifting the terms of belonging such that the governance of urban space is in alignment with processes of capitalist expansion into low-income neighbourhoods. As such, critical scholars have argued that the lexicon of social mix in neighbourhood economic development policy is a technique to “politely avoid the class constitution of the processes involved” (Bridge et al. 2012:1).

Bridge et al. (2012:320) call into question how social mix through housing policy can lead to anything but, at best, partial gentrification, and, at worst, complete demographic transformation of targeted urban neighbourhoods. This has ramifications for the actually existing relations that are engendered through these efforts. Providing a nuanced analysis of the tectonics of social mixing through neighbourhood social upgrading, Davidson (2012:236) notes, “in terms of new

(gentrifying) residents mixing with incumbent (the working-class) residents, the gentrification literature has been quite unanimous: there is little mixing between these groups and even fewer signs that social class divisions are eroded by the generated spatial proximity". Unlike other treatments which maintain that these are examples of imperfect practice, he interrogates the terms on which social mix is promoted "whereby the middle classes are the agents of change, civilising the socially excluded through various means—sharing social capital, providing informal employment opportunity, providing 'good' role models, etc." (Davidson 2012:248).

Viewed as geographies of decline, "inner-city" neighbourhoods in the US are often framed as moral geographies that transgress norms of appropriate living, but when questioned as to why this is the case, the common response is to suggest neighbourhood poverty itself is the culprit of *inappropriate* living, which eschews any analysis of the social relations involved in place-making. "Inner-city" neighbourhoods are constructed as autonomous and self-reproducing, and are thus imagined geographies where the people living within them are made legible through a series of spatialisations that render "them" as different than "us" in a hierarchical manner (Ansfield 2018). A central component of this includes classification and enumeration for the purpose of constructing reliably known neighbourhood subjects toward which interventions are targeted. The gaze through which spaces are constructed as places matters. Social mix may well be about the business of finding value in the built environment, but it does so by creating public sentiment that there is no alternative than to reshuffle neighbourhood populations to extinguish "transgressive" ways of being (Davidson 2012; Fraser 2004). This may be expressed through sanitised lexicons but the message is clear that US neighbourhoods diagnosed as places of concentrated poverty are not only classed, but typically racialised, as Black spaces (Boyd 2008; Wilson 2007). Theorisation beyond gentrification must account for the contextually specific racialisation of space, the people who occupy these places, and racialising assemblages that discipline humanity into tiered states of being/becoming (Goldberg 2009; Weheliye 2014:4).

Settler Colonialism, the Production of Locality, and Racialised Precarity

Practices of defining low-income, Black, neighbourhoods as uninhabitable have always been founded on structures of meaning constituted by the production of classed racial hierarchy and white supremacy (Ansfield 2015). What passes for urban policy today pivots on the production of alterity through socio-spatial practices that create and maintain boundaries and categories, rendering existing populations of residents as the *Other* of normal society. Urban redevelopment initiatives targeting these geographies—ones that were created during the 20th century by visions of racial purity and the separation of White and Black populations—is occurring throughout cities across the US. Acts of institutionalised racism initiated by government agencies are often recited as part of America's past, yet

they are intimately linked to present-day practices of urban redevelopment (Rothstein 2017).

Following Appadurai (1996:183–184), “all locality building has a moment of colonization ... in the sense that it involves the assertion of socially (often ritually) organized power over places and settings that are viewed as potentially chaotic or rebellious”. This requires the production of reliably known subjects and the categorisation of life itself. In one of the only scholarly accounts that frames social mix and mixed-income housing policy as colonisation, Kipfer and Petrunia (2009:121) find, “diversity, and particularly the notion of social mixing, now operate as code words to incorporate and submerge racialized public housing tenants under a cohesive form of normalcy defined by private property and the (middle-class and typically white) sensibilities of the ‘new normal’”.² Fraser et al. (2013:532) similarly note that social mix “draws on the persistent purchase of classed and raced cultural signifiers evoking images of the slum, hood, ghetto, or project”. Once a space is targeted for revitalisation by integration, novel ways of constructing community, belonging, and citizenship in relation to place are set in motion which produce difference in regards to social inclusion/exclusion. Here, the ability of the poor to perform their attachment to place becomes rapidly unpredictable based upon their construction as individual subjects relative to a normative standard.

The possibility of co-existing is made precarious on various grounds. The production of locality for settler colonists involves dispossession of land and property, and at the same time disavows the presence of indigenous others (Blatman-Thomas and Porter 2019; Veracini 2012). Settler colonialism operates to “displace people and their lifeways, livelihoods, memories” (Porter 2014:388) and ultimately, the settler colonial relationship seeks to extinguish itself through processes of making existing neighbourhood residents either go away or except the new conditions upon which inclusion rests. Settler colonialism is therefore an “ongoing effect” as opposed to a singular event (Inwood and Bonds 2017). While there may be disagreement over how this “lived process of loss” (Roy 2017:A3) actually manifests itself, it typically involves “being physically eliminated or displaced, having one’s cultural practices erased, [and] being ‘absorbed’, ‘assimilated’ or ‘amalgamated’ in the wider population” (Veracini 2011:2). Displacement does not simply revolve around forced eviction (Davidson 2012; Elliott-Cooper et al. 2019). It involves the incremental marginalisation of modes of life and the building of different social relations that are recognised and legitimated in revitalising neighbourhoods (Hyra 2015; Madden and Marcuse 2016).

Rather than marginalising precarious groups as simply vulnerable or reactive, it is important to note that even those in poverty hold aspirations—oppositional or not—for place-making. Appadurai (2004:68) conceptualises these activities of subaltern actors as engaging in the “capacity to aspire”:

The poor, no less than any other group in a society, do express horizons in choices made and choices voiced, often in terms of specific goods and outcomes ... [which] are inevitably tied up with more general norms, presumptions, and axioms about the good life, and life more generally.

Yet, these attachments to objects of desire, such as being able to remain “in place” in a context of neighbourhood change, are *cruelly optimistic* (Berlant 2011). Insofar as social mix entails a collection of promises that might be summed up as cooperative living (if not socioeconomic or racial justice), the inscription of racial and spatial hierarchy that underpin its capitalist foundations are consistently toxic for Black spaces and bodies that exist in neighbourhoods targeted for revitalisation. The settler colonial relationship enables a critical interrogation of social mix interventions that can reveal the power geometries that shape neighbourhood spaces “by always foregrounding the spatial distribution of hierarchical power relations ... [to] understand the process whereby a space achieves a distinctive identity as a place” (Gupta and Ferguson 1992:8). It is this project that we turn to next through a genealogy of settler colonialism in OTR.

Foundations: The Violent Separation of Society and Space

While settler colonialism is experienced as an ongoing effect of dispossession and loss, it is enacted through structural and implicit moments of violence: “a recognition of the force that is required to wrest a locality from previously uncontrolled peoples and places” (Appadurai 1996:183). Central to this process is the ability, and right, to produce space. Cincinnati’s designation of the neighbourhood as a historic district in 1983 marked an early declaration of conquest. The rediscovery of value in OTR’s Italianate architecture by political and corporate elites privileged the preservation and commodification of the neighbourhood as a built form over the needs of racialised low-income residents, who were framed as responsible for OTR’s social and physical decay. This could only be achieved via a violent break between the neighbourhood as place (the built environment) and as social structure (the “community”).

Through the 1980s, the social model of neighbourhood improvement forwarded by the People’s Movement increasingly faced virulent opposition from pro-development politicians and developers. Early investment in bars, galleries, coffee houses, and entertainment amenities along the Main Street strip drew a wealthier white clientele, including students from the University of Cincinnati, into OTR. The iconic neighbourhood coffee shop and bookstore, Kaldi’s—once dubbed “the living room of Over-the-Rhine”—opened in 1993 and served as an emblem of the reemergence of the neighbourhood after decades of decline.³ Into the 1990s, interest in protecting OTR’s new patrons resulted in the imposition of regressive racialised policing practices and the harassment of low-income and Black residents (Dikeç 2017:46). The regulation of these gentrifying beachheads heightened tensions as Black bodies were codified as threats to OTR’s rebirth.

In the early hours of Saturday, 7 April 2001, following a pursuit through OTR, Cincinnati Police Officer Stephen Roach fatally shot 19-year-old African-American Timothy Thomas at the corner of Republic and 13th Street, a mere block from Washington Park. Thomas was unarmed. He had no history of violence, just a number of minor outstanding citations (mostly for traffic violations). Yet his was the 15th death of a Black man at the hands of Cincinnati Police officers in only a

six-year period. It proved the final straw in a line of documented racial police discriminations in the city. Frustrations exploded onto the streets in the form of mass protests, demonstrations, and rioting. Cincinnati, in the week of 7–14 April 2001, witnessed the largest urban unrest in the United States since the 1992 “LA Riots”.

The tinderbox produced by highly racialised state actions did not catch fire immediately. Demonstrations that took place in the immediate aftermath of the shooting linked OTR and downtown as protestors headed from the site of Thomas’s death to gather outside City Hall and demand answers and accountability. Tensions escalated on 10 April as the police used tear gas and fired rubber bullets into the crowd, hitting both protesters and bystanders. Violence, looting, and arson broke out across the neighbourhood into the night. By the next day, as a Black Panther Party organised demonstration began marching south down Race Street, riot police formed a barrier across Central Parkway to prevent them from entering the city centre. This spatial strategy not only sought to prevent potential damage to private property in Cincinnati’s downtown and financial core but reinforced the material and symbolic production of OTR as a container space for violence and unrest. Material and discursive practices linking OTR and Downtown were broken via techniques of spatialisation that associated the demonstrators’ grievances with endemic representations of “ghetto pathology” and the territorial stigmatisation of place. Containing (the visibility of) purportedly transgressive behaviour in OTR provided the City with a representational form of legitimacy that justified the roll out of repressive policing and the removal of those associated with these behaviours.

In the wake of the 2001 uprising, OTR was subject to a series of paradoxical claims over space that reproduced the territory as stigmatised while forwarding new representations that discursively and administratively absorbed OTR into a reimagined, rescaled Downtown. Instead of repressive, violent displacement, spatially and temporally uneven policing formed a key state strategy—alongside other wide-ranging neoliberal urban policies (Addie 2008)—that exacerbated deteriorating living conditions and localised crime that did much to drive low-income and Black residents from the neighbourhood. Long running mistrust relating both to police discrimination and apathy left lower-income residents to express feelings of alienation. In 2005, an OTR resident lamented, “They offer no protection. They may be protecting someone, but it is certainly not us” (Black female resident, 45, interview). Elsewhere in OTR, however, it was a different story, as a resident of a newly renovated condo on Central Parkway explained:

When all the kids from the suburbs come down at the weekends there’s suddenly an extraordinary police presence [outside the bars and clubs on Main Street] but it’s simply to protect the white kids from the people who live on Vine Street ... There’s usually no cops walking the street at all, they’re all in cars. (White female condo owner, 35, interview 2005)

Urban settler colonialism is intimately linked with processes of neoliberal urbanism and gentrification that depend on brute force in regulating space, whether through sanctioned state violence, housing evictions, or restrictions placed on

public space. It does not, though, rely on these processes alone. Claiming and performing citizenship rights in the context of place-making (those initiatives which in their fullest measure are revealed to be similar in colonial intent to the civilising of another distant place) are predicated upon the annihilation of current states of being and belonging. Those defined as responsible for urban decline lose their rights to the city whereas those groups upon which neighbourhood revitalisation is premised, gain them (Lepofsky and Fraser 2003). The circulation of cultural repertoires founded upon “ghetto ontology” provided legibility for public–private redevelopment efforts while underwriting the moral authority of the City and Cincinnati’s corporate actors over the People’s Movement. In an hour-long 2002 documentary, *Visions of Vine Street*, airing widely throughout the greater Cincinnati region, an investigative reporter evoked a discourse of transgressive citizenship in concluding that the plans created for OTR by the People’s Movement and neighbourhood residents are a “racially and socio-economically separatist attempt to commit the city to maintaining Over-The-Rhine as a predominantly black and overwhelmingly poor enclave” (Quinlivan 2002).

After 2001, OTR’s transformation was characterised by the formation of separate lifeworlds between established residents and newcomers (both residents and those consuming the neighbourhood’s entertainment amenities). OTR thus became framed through competing ideological understandings of the economy, society, and social provision and lived through divergent practices of everyday life. Gregory (2004:17) points out that such productions of space are not innocent but instead place different populations on a continuum of modernity in which “their” space is often seen as inverse to “our” space: a sort of negative in the photographic sense that “they” might “develop” into something like “us”, but also the site of an absence, because “they” are seen somehow to lack the positive tonalities that supposedly distinguish “us”. Residents on both sides of OTR’s socio-economic divide viewed the spaces produced by, and for, the “other” as not providing for their own social, cultural, and economic needs. Here, we see a foundational moment of social mix initiatives as supporters of state-led interventions not only decried the environmental conditions of a bounded geography, but—not subtly—constituted existing residents in places like OTR as potential threats. For affluent gentrifiers, the stigma and reality of the neighbourhood’s construction as “ghetto” was rendered and reinforced through material spatial practices, creating a distinct line beyond which they felt out of place: “[West of Walnut] I feel like I don’t belong. I don’t think I fit the profile of people over there and I just feel tension and the possibility of violence breaking out” (White male condo resident, 24, interview 2005). Echoing the critiques of Bridge et al. (2012) and Davidson (2012), even areas of OTR with a degree of socially mixed housing internalised contradictions between the rhetoric and lived experience “mixed” neighbourhood space. As an older, white resident explained:

I don’t want to oversell it but the Pendleton District is a bit utopian actually because there is an extraordinary diversity; Section 8 housing next to the most expensive house in Over-the-Rhine [but] it’s not utopian to the extent that everyone knows or cares about each other equally. (Male resident, 60, interview 2005)

Social mix is rationalised through a widespread acceptance of “new integrationist” urban policies that aim at some sort of (soft) integration, but the terms of inclusion pivot on the cultural-politics surrounding the repeated act of remembering what the new neighbourhood is being produced from, or against.

Maturation: The Closing Possibility of Politics

The maturation of the settler colonialism project in OTR moved beyond the initial moments of state violence and pioneer conquest through the consolidation of new modalities through which claims of legitimacy—over governance, occupation, and everyday life—could be asserted. Central to this process has been the ability of 3CDC to assert itself as a “legitimate” stakeholder. An implicit, often barely concealed, discursive violence pervaded 3CDC’s claims over the neighbourhood that foreclosed the political agency of those framed as responsible for OTR’s decline. The neighbourhood subsequently became a space of unpredictability—especially as urban development produced a population of people who live with an enhanced sense of the housing precarity. Whereas theories of gentrification tend to draw attention to physical displacement (the loss of one’s home), the commodification and privatisation of public space, and the development of upscale commercial districts (all of which apply in this case), the emergent production of space in OTR is conditioned by settler appropriations and erasures of memory, history, and legitimacy (Fanon 1963:9). We illustrate these dynamics through the following three moments.

Moment 1: Governance Usurpers and Claims on Legitimacy

Constituted by selective borrowings from the past and deployed as a form of spatial claims-making, settlers come to see themselves as Smith’s (1996) urban pioneers who are integral to creating the “right type” of diversity and social mix. But claiming a stake in the neighbourhood is premised on dispossession rather than inclusion. At its inception in 2003, 3CDC was inserted into a political space which was already occupied by the OTR Community Council, the People’s Movement, and a whole assemblage of existing actors engaging in neighbourhood planning and governance (Addie 2009). These organisations had just convened a series of participatory planning sessions and co-developed the 2002 neighbourhood plan, which had subsequently been adopted by the mayor’s office and City Council. The 2002 plan was itself a contentious document that reflected the rising influence of pro-development organisations and agencies alongside low-income housing advocates and the People’s Movement. It included, for the first time, proposals to adopt a mixed-income housing model that stressed at least 50% of rehabbed and new housing to be rented or sold at market rate. Signalling a departure from typical community plans which focused on existing resident’s needs and desires, “the pro-development faction praised the plan as an end to the debate over ‘gentrification’ (Korte 2002)” (Dyson 2016:20–21). Planning discourse and practice foreshadowed the years to come. Existing residents and advocacy organisations have experienced a heightened sense of precarity in their

ability to stay in the neighbourhood and hold influence within the shifting tectonics of neighbourhood governance.

The seeds for institutional succession in OTR were planted in 1984, when pro-development City councillor and neighbourhood resident James Tarbell led a small group of local businessmen and civic leaders in establishing the Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce as a means to facilitate private investment in the neighbourhood. The OTR Chamber formed a partnership with the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce in 2004 to establish the Over-the-Rhine Foundation, which promotes cultural and artistic programming in the neighbourhood. The OTR Chamber and Foundation acted as a parallel set of institutions that both bypassed the established Community Council and actively sought to discredit the organisations and development model of the People's Movement (Addie 2009). A community organiser noted early on that these new institutions were "speaking on behalf of Over-the-Rhine and their interests do not include low-income people. They can easily call up a Jim Tarbell or some other councillor and get the things they need and want. It's discrediting the Community Council" (community organiser, 40, interview 2005). Tarbell's significance cannot be overstated (Figure 4). While heralded as a leader in Cincinnati whose agenda includes improvement of the arts, economic development, and historical preservation, he was also a self-proclaimed supporter of "re-establishing the balance of influence in the inner city" (OurCampaigns 2005). Alongside other private-sector development enthusiasts, he was often quoted in local and national publications attributing the fall of the neighbourhood to its residential composition of people experiencing poverty, race riots, and crack dens. This was not as much a description of reality but a performative act that interpolated what it described which later allowed 3CDC and its supporters to begin efforts at moving out unwanted populations that used the neighbourhood for their everyday lives in order to create spaces of capital investment and renewal.

Moment 2: The Materiality of Displacement

Political power plays at the institutional level were matched by material practices to move out unwanted populations and political constituencies. 3CDC would purchase properties to hold until they sold the property to new owners resulting in the forced eviction of hundreds of neighbourhood residents. The Metropole, as a case in point, is emblematic of 3CDC's attempts to evict current residents as the corporation sought to sell the property to a boutique hotel chain. Built in 1912, the Metropole was a hotel until 1971, when it was converted into 230 efficiency and one-bedroom rooms for low-income people. Located in one of the busiest intersections in OTR, 3CDC acquired the property in 2009 for \$6.2 million and sold it to 21c Museum Hotels to be converted into a 90-room boutique hotel (Jernigan 2014). The cited rationale was that this was a prime location for a boutique hotel to drive economic development in OTR and Downtown. Yet because 3CDC chose this specific building—which still provided affordable housing—rather than another vacant building in their portfolio, 206 residents needed to be evicted and relocated.



Figure 4: James Tarbell “welcoming” people into OTR on Vine Street in 2018 (source: authors)

Of course, the majority of tenants did not want to leave their homes. They organised a resistance campaign as the newly formed Metropole Tenants Association, maintaining that the Metropole should be renovated and kept as affordable housing. Residents and advocates would flier every apartment before organising meetings, but 3CDC sent security to take down their materials. As the Tenant Association continued their campaign to remain in place, 3CDC upped the use of scare tactics, including having police enter the building to inform the residents they had to leave. Tenants’ demands were met with consistent opposition until they served 3CDC and the City with a lawsuit—which would ultimately be settled in the US District Court in Cincinnati for a total of \$80,000 in 2011 (or \$520 per resident after attorney fees). For one advocate, the two-and-a-half-year conflict hit a pinnacle when tenants figured out that they could have a voice in telling 3CDC what they wanted:

We believe a step out of oppression is expression, and once you can express your anger you might be moved to act. Along the way when you are working with people using your hands, feet, voice and passion you have a strong connection to your

brothers and sisters. (White, female, activist and non-profit director, 58, interview 2013)

However, the end result was the completion of the 21c Museum Hotel—which has nightly rates in excess of \$520. When we asked a group of residents how these events fit into 3CDC’s larger plans, there was a strong feeling that the moving of people was part of a larger project to get Black bodies out of the neighbourhood; efforts to remove people from buildings understandably felt like being banished while primary white people moved into the neighbourhood.

Racial discourses were conjoined with issues of class and transgressive behaviour. 3CDC introduced an initiative to move all homeless shelters out of OTR in 2010. Their chief target was the Drop Inn Center; then the largest homeless shelter in Ohio. Since opening its doors in the 1970s, the Center served as vital resource for Cincinnati’s homeless community, a hub for advocacy work and organising, and a crucial symbolic space of contestation for the People’s Movement. Over a multi-year span, 3CDC was able to put forth a plan to close the Drop Inn Center by suggesting that the care they provided homeless people was not state-of-the-art and that 3CDC along with its supporters would build a new facility over a half mile away. 3CDC also pressured the Drop Inn Center board, but were only able to realise their goals by infiltrating the board itself with new members sympathetic to the results they wished to achieve. In 2016, after a years-long battle, the doors of the Drop Inn Center closed for good to be replaced by a new theatre for the Cincinnati Shakespeare Company (Figures 5 and 6). Episodes similar to the Metropole and Drop Inn Center continue quietly as if it was an acceptable practice for 3CDC to sell buildings and setup low-income residents for eviction or rent increases.



Figure 5: The Drop Inn Center in 2005 (source: authors)



Figure 6: The Otto M. Budig Theater, home to the Cincinnati Shakespeare Company, which replaced the Drop Inn Center in 2017, corner of Elm and 12th, OTR—note the tracks of the Cincinnati Streetcar which runs through Downtown and OTR (opened in 2016) (source: authors)

Moment 3: Belonging and Affective Dislocation

Beyond the specific moment of physical displacement, the trauma of settler colonialism is now firmly internalised within the affective precarity experienced by OTR's low-income communities and the activists working to support them. One of the primary concerns is that even for residents who are able to stay in OTR (including in a substantial number of subsidised housing units that remain in the neighbourhood), there is a definite sense that 3CDC-led redevelopment and neighbourhood transformation is not for them—in Madden and Marcuse's (2016) words, they are experiencing a sense of "residential alienation". This affective experience is not simply about housing: it is about the neighbourhood as a whole and has social, material, and aesthetic dimensions (Linz 2017). It is common to see 3CDC sponsored signs declaring "NO LOITERING" (Figure 7). New businesses virtually all cater to a wealthier clientele with disposable income. As one advocate reflected, "If you're not going to have neighbourhood businesses that serve the [existing low-income] community, there are not going to be families who can live here or want to live here. There's no place for mom to buy socks and underwear for her kids" (Black, male non-profit employee, 41, interview 2015).

The designation of OTR as "dangerous", particularly after the 2001 "race riots", paradoxically subjected the inhabitants to an unwavering critical visibility resulting from an inverse relationship between visibility and power. Under the conditions of maturing settler colonialism, that critical visibility has been remodelled. Transgressive behaviours and racialised bodies are no longer required as discursive leverage to legitimise the aggressive takeover of neighborhood space. On one hand, existing residents' increasing marginality underpins a renewed invisibility. One long-



Figure 7: No loitering signs on Vine Street in 2018 (source: authors)

time black resident stated that she sits on her stoop every day and that most of the white people walk by her as if she were invisible or not there at all (Black, female, resident, 51, interview 2014). During the interview, every black person who walked by greeted us, but virtually no white people acknowledged we were on the sidewalk where they were walking by. On the other hand, the neighbourhood's legacies of unrest and risk appear as a fetishised cache for incoming residents looking to perform an aestheticised modality of urban life (Hyra 2017: Chapter 4) that hinges on a distinct geography of morality. As one resident put it, "I have to trust people when they say that I came here for the diversity, well, that diversity ain't going to be here too long ... I think they [newcomers] believe there are the deserving poor and the undeserving poor" (Black, female, resident, 60, interview 2016).

Such observations speak to moments of ongoing colonisation whereby urban “pioneers”, once the gentrification frontier is settled, oppose existing communities, not so much with an overt fear of the “Other”, but an indifference that itself has the flexibility to accommodate the restricted presence of transgression from the new norm. Together these types of neighbourhood changes may not cause physical displacement, but rather broader dispossessions experienced as a generalised condition of economic precarity (rising rents/mortgages and costs of living) and “political and cultural displacement” that infringes upon urban inhabitants’ ability to reproduce their everyday lives (Hyra 2015). “Exclusionary displacement”, as Marcuse (1985) argued, occurs along an economic and socio-cultural axis as material deprivation and alienation are overlaid.

(Dealing with the) Aftermath: “Cruel Optimism” and the Battlegrounds of Social Justice

While struggles over the future of the neighbourhood persist, in this concluding section we turn to considering the practical and conceptual challenges surrounding how urban space is theorised and contested once the settler colonial project has reached near completion. What are the implications for urban social justice *after* gentrification?

The discourse and policy logic of social mix remains central in legitimising OTR’s transformation. In recent years 3CDC have referred to their goals in OTR as the development of “diverse, mixed-income neighborhoods supported by local businesses” designed to “preserve historic structures, improve streetscapes, and build high-density, mixed-use projects”, and to “create and manage great civic spaces” (3CDC 2017:2). The targets, impact, and saliency of this rhetoric, though, are different now: the rules of the game have changed. A coalition of urban elites enlisted the local news media to portray OTR as uninhabitable and then launched revitalisation initiatives without the input of neighbourhood residents. Branding their effort as creating a socially mixed OTR, redevelopment proponents and architects draw upon the hegemony of social inclusion as a goal to pursue. Yet in 2019, 3CDC could declare on its website’s homepage that the corporation was “building life in our city’s center”, as if none existed previously. Such language suffocates and erases the activism and livelihood of racialised and classed bodies in OTR. This reflects current conditions in OTR. While marked in certain sections by a bifurcation of affluent and poor residents, the ways in which communities experience the neighbourhood through their everyday lives renders distinct (dis)connections between people and place as *habitus*. As Davidson (2009:223) emphasises, “[p]ut simply, displacement understood purely as spatial dislocation tells us very little about why it matters”. Displacement can be thought about as a loss of place or lived space that does not necessarily map onto eviction from Cartesian understandings of abstract space. From the beginning 3CDC sought to create a “fashionable urban playground” full of high-end restaurants, boutique shops, and a redesigned, re-regulated Washington Park. Although recent development efforts have gestured toward creating some affordable housing for households making up to 60% of the area median income, with virtually no

development geared to providing for the needs of the poor, it is not surprising that many advocates and low-income residents of colour experience the redevelopment as alienating (Dyson 2016).

This presents certain social groups with an enhanced condition of precarity; an unpredictability connected to disruption for which one may or may not have resources to remain in their current residence. The possibility of producing and inhabiting a particular place is inextricably linked to notions of existing as an intelligible subject regarded by others as deserving; drawing attention toward the relationship between states of being (human life), states of belonging (political life), and the historical and geographical processes by which these are made and unmade (Tyler 2013:20). Significantly, this not only refers to the poor but also the organisations that serve the poor. The People's Movement and their allies have attempted (and accomplished) good work, like the opening of affordable housing units and advocating for the rights of the poor, and directly empowering marginalised residents. One founding activist remarked:

Because it was and is a movement, but it's not like there's a place for it or an office for it. It was just all of us together realising what we were building and all of our organisations are sisters and brothers. This was the result of our efforts. I remember too in the early years. Progressives were saying the place to be is in the factory. The worker movement. We were sometimes criticised by the socialists or whatever, and we would always say you got to be and do the work where you're at, and we felt it could come from the poor as well as the workers in the factory. (White, female, activist and nonprofit employee, 55, interview 2016)

With such convictions and a long track record in the neighbourhood, People's Movement members have experienced the redevelopment led by 3CDC—and the associated loss of residents and social service agencies—as an attritional assault on their beliefs for a just city. They have been challenged not only in their efforts to alter the material practices of 3CDC and the City, but in maintaining their legitimate claims to speak for residents in OTR, as pro-gentrification factions have systematically sought to discredit their members and actions. This is the “slow violence” of “chronic urban trauma” (Kern 2016; Pain 2019). At the culmination of the settler colonial process, 3CDC and their affiliates now have the leverage to make concessions, to carve out some space of concern for notions of housing affordability and make correctives for the “right mix” on their, not the People's Movement's, terms: thus opposing the colonised with a vision of their own dreams rendered in the culture and values of the colonialist (Fanon 1963).

These experiences raise a set of troubling questions for both activists and critical urban scholarship; what happens to the inner-city as an object of analysis, and to low-income, racialised communities, after settler colonialism has fundamentally redefined the social and physical fabric of urban space? How can people fight for their place in the gentrifying city under these conditions, and where is this fight engaged?

Attachment in the forms of community building, economic and emotional investment in land and structures, and interpersonal relationships organises and renders productive the affectual anxiety of precarious life. The enormous energy demands

of promoting an illusion of permanence accounts in part for the affectual weariness characteristic of the inhabitants of OTR. While cruel optimism can and does affect all races, classes, genders, sexualities, and ethnicities, there are specific clusters of promises that draw in certain subject positions more than others. Threatened by the sense of temporariness, many inhabitants of OTR have assiduously battled the anxiety of looming dispossession, and “a huge amount of their social energy and personal creativity is devoted to producing, if not the *illusion*, then the sense of *permanence* in the face of the temporary” (Appadurai 2003:47). Perhaps the cruellest aspect of the optimism in play for those activists and residents affiliated with the People’s Movement is the quest for recognition. What inhabitants of spaces of racialised optimism seek is recognition rather than visibility. But as Appadurai (2003:50) demonstrates, the poor are denigrated to live in a “fishbowl kind of transparency” in which their actions encounter a scrutinising gaze. The recognition sought in spaces characterised by racialised optimism is proffered and denied repeatedly by public, private, and even non-profit actors like 3CDC through promises related to personal value (Black lives are as precious as white lives), justice (capitalism affords equal opportunities and advantages), and political legitimacy (Black voices produce political change). The result is the wearing down of the occupants of these spaces with frustrated hope (Berlant 2011).

The transformation of OTR, and the narratives of this transformation (both popular and academic), raise the question as to what extent can we (critical urbanists) continue to, with the best intentions, effectively support the political projects of groups whose political capital has been usurped and whose social base has been systematically erased? Can we continue to read neighbourhoods such as OTR as ghettoised places to be studied now as they would have been in the second wave of 1970s/1980s gentrification or following the riotous uprising of 2001? Such approaches reproduce the industry of academic bleeding-heart autopsies that Harvey (2009) railed against in *Social Justice and the City*, and which we understand this paper’s contentious relationship to. Our desire to identify with, and support, those struggling against the tide of revanchist urbanism can obscure our own understandings of social space and ability to develop constructive critique with/of social justice organisations. As Allen (2008:182) notes, “academic nobility” plays a problematic role in normalising the assumptions that middle class values and cultural practices are good for all elements of society. Students taking classes at Buddy’s Place (Miami University’s Center for Community Engagement) in the heart of OTR during the mid-2000s may have witnessed drug dealing, heard gun shots, or been subject to heckling or cat-calls from people on the street. Yet today they are more likely to be confronted with the violence of designer cocktails, vintage boutiques, and a \$15 Belgian waffle—even if the neighbourhood continues to be discursively constructed as a stereotypical “inner city” space in which the process of (resistance to) gentrification remains vital. Much like Hunter S. Thompson climbing the hills outside Las Vegas and looking west, we can almost see the high-water of anti-gentrification struggles—the opposition of neoliberal urbanism, and the attempt to forge a new form of urbanism—in OTR. But following the violent state response to Timothy Thomas’s murder, we must come to terms with the fact that the wave has broken and rolled back.

Does this mean that all is lost? Far from it. But on a certain level, uncomfortable truths need to be confronted. Terrains of resistance need to be reimagined and alternative scales and temporalities of displacement and resistance must be considered (see Elliott-Cooper et al. 2019). Physical displacement is a widely studied phenomenon by both academics and concerned publics engaging in activist work to promote alternative projects founded upon some conception of a “just city”. This has often translated into the material demand for “a right to stay put” (Hartman 1984; Hartman et al. 1982; Slater 2013). Yet place-based declarations of the right to occupy urban space, as we have seen in OTR, are problematic in that they are unable to accommodate or adjust to the violent appropriation of space in material, social, and cultural terms. The People’s Movement, for all the principled work, grassroots organisation, and material impact have found themselves tactically and systematically outmanoeuvred. As we have noted, the maturation of settler colonialism in OTR brought with it the introduction of new political modalities that either bypassed or aggressively *colonised* the neighbourhood’s governance institutions. Concomitantly, innovations in the neoliberal regulation and governance of space enabled many low-income people—the People’s Movement’s political base—to leave the neighbourhood’s dilapidated accommodation and absentee slumlords. Despite strong social ties and the provision of social services, it would be a mistake to romanticise or wax nostalgic about the experience of living in OTR, just as it would be to fetishise the suffering of its poor, Black, disenfranchised urban inhabitants (Derickson 2017). In this sense, a politics based on the right to stay put confronts the same political problematic carved out by the separation of society and space. Is the neighbourhood what needs to be defended? Or do we need to look for new trans-scalar strategies to support those Othered and alienated from “acceptable” urban society?

The lens of colonial settlement points to some innovative reconceptualisation, but there is also a need to shift our social and spatial attention around non-territorially-bound analyses of dispossession and displacement. As centralised ghettoised spaces become targets for urban regeneration, gentrification, and capital investment, “problem” communities are subsequently displaced outwards into declining inner suburban areas (Kneebone et al. 2011). This is not an appeal to move to place-based rights claims, but rather rescale the spatial imaginaries that tie our vision and politics around gentrification to a metropolitan scale. The housing question remains unanswered, and is indeed rearticulated in the suburbanisation of poverty, race, and insecurity. This interpolates not only a defensive war of position in gentrifying inner cities, but the challenge to forge a “right to the suburbs” amidst the turbulent uneven geographies of regional urbanisation (Carpio et al. 2011; Veracini 2012).

Critical academic research and discourse still holds a one-sided fascination with the visceral struggles in the near-fetishised ghetto spaces of the US inner-city. Our observations of OTR over a decade and a half leave us unsatisfied with the potential of both “social mix” (whether grounded in neoliberal or progressive rhetoric) and the tactics of territorially articulated struggles for the “right to the city”. The centrality at the heart of the potential of urban society, as Lefebvre (1996) argued, is a social, not simply geographical. We see a productive way forward in a twofold

extension of analyses of our revanchist urban condition—(1) moving beyond sites of the global ghetto to engage the suburbanisation and racialisation of poverty; and (2) re-energising explorations of placed-based spatio-temporal moments of settler colonialism in action—to inform rescaled and reimagined terrains of social struggle and urban theory in the 21st century metropolis. Our provocation to think through *after* gentrification aims to encourage critical urbanists to take this path.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Nik Theodore and two anonymous reviewers, as well as Deirdre Oakley, Derek Hyra, and Ashleigh McKenzie for their constructive comments on previous versions of the paper. The authors also wish to thank Patricia Richards and Oscar Chamosa for providing the Spanish language translation of the article's abstract. The authors are listed in alphabetical order. Each contributed equally to the theoretical development and empirical analysis of the paper.

Endnotes

¹ This paper draws empirically from several research projects conducted in OTR, which include a number of common participants from the People's Movement. The first author undertook a qualitative case study focused on the intersection of neoliberal urban policy and the everyday urban experience (2005–2006). Primary research included semi-structured interviews with community organisers, developers, and neighbourhood residents (n=21), alongside ethnographic research and participant observation in neighbourhood meetings, and discourse analysis of planning documents and media reports. The second author has a nine-year (2009–2018) project in OTR conducting ethnographic work and collecting interviews (n=43) with the People's Movement, 3CDC, and neighbourhood residents, with a focus on understanding gentrification dynamics and political-economic restructuring in OTR. The ideas in this paper have emerged from conversations and collaborative research following the 2015 American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting.

² A growing number of studies on urban redevelopment have taken a settler colonial approach. Some simply use the term colonisation as a replacement for gentrification without adding much theoretical heft, while others have deeply considered the constitutive elements of colonisation that are applicable to the wholesale transformation of urban neighbourhoods (e.g. Dutton 2007; Fraser et al. 2013; Kipfer 2007; Kipfer and Petrunia 2009; Roy 2017; Safransky 2017; Wharton 2008).

³ Kaldi's itself fell victim to gentrification and escalating rents, closing its doors in 2008.

References

- 3CDC (2017) "Annual Report." Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation https://www.3cdc.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/3/files/2018/07/2017-annual-report-FINAL_reduced-1.pdf (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Addie J-P D (2008) The rhetoric and reality of urban policy in the neoliberal city: Implications for social struggle in Over-the-Rhine, Cincinnati. *Environment and Planning A* 40 (11):2674–2692
- Addie J-P D (2009) Constructing neoliberal urban democracy in the American inner-city. *Local Economy* 24(6/7):536–554
- Allen C (2008) Gentrification "research" and the academic nobility: A different class? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1):180–185
- Alter M (2018) Then and now: The rise, fall, and rebirth of Over-the-Rhine. *WCPO* <https://www.wcpo.com/news/local-news/then-and-now-the-rise-fall-and-rebirth-of-over-the-rhine> (last accessed 20 November 2018)

- Ansfield B (2015) Still submerged: The uninhabitability of urban redevelopment. In K McKittrick (ed) *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis* (pp 124–141). Durham: Duke University Press
- Ansfield B (2018) Unsettling “inner city”: Liberal Protestantism and the postwar origins of a keyword in urban studies. *Antipode* 50(5):1166–1185
- Appadurai A (1996) *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Appadurai A (2003) Illusion of permanence: Interview with Arjun Appadurai. *Perspecta* 34:44–52
- Appadurai A (2004) The capacity to aspire. In V Rao and M Walton (eds) *Culture and Public Action* (pp 59–84). Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Berlant L G (2011) *Cruel Optimism*. Durham: Duke University Press
- Blatman-Thomas N and Porter L (2019) Placing property: Theorizing the urban from settler colonial cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43(1):30–45
- Blomley N (2003) Law, property, and the geography of violence: The frontier, the survey, and the grid. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93(1):121–141
- Blomley N (2004) *Unsettling the City: Urban Land and the Politics of Property*. New York: Routledge
- Boyd M (2008) Defensive development: The role of racial conflict in gentrification. *Urban Affairs Review* 43(6):751–776
- Bridge G, Butler T and Lees L (eds) (2012) *Mixed Communities: Gentrification By Stealth?* Bristol: Policy Press
- Carpio G, Irazabel C and Pulido L (2011) Right to the suburb? Rethinking Lefebvre and immigrant activism. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 33(2):185–208
- Chester C (2013) Public–private partnerships lead the way in a Cincinnati neighborhood’s revival. *Smart Growth America* 4 February <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/public-private-partnerships-lead-the-way-in-a-cincinnati-neighborhoods-revival/> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- City of Cincinnati (2002) “Over-The-Rhine Comprehensive Plan.” City Planning Department, City of Cincinnati https://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/planning/assets/File/2002_otr_c_omprehensive_plan.pdf (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Crenshaw K (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140:139–167
- Curran W (2018) *Gender and Gentrification*. New York: Routledge
- Davidson M (2009) Displacement, space, and dwelling: Placing gentrification debate. *Ethics, Place and Environment* 12(2):219–234
- Davidson M (2012) The impossibility of gentrification and social mixing. In G Bridge, T Butler and L Lees (eds) *Mixed Communities: Gentrification By Stealth?* (pp 233–250). Bristol: Policy Press
- Derickson K D (2017) Urban geography II: Urban geography in the Age of Ferguson. *Progress in Human Geography* 41(2):230–244
- Dikeç M (2017) *Urban Rage: The Revolt of the Excluded*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Du Bois W E B (1996 [1899]) *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Dunlap S (2004) Taking over the park. *CityBeat* 14 July
- Dutton T A (2007) Colony Over-the-Rhine. *The Black Scholar* 37(3):14–27
- Dyson R A (2016) “Spatial Distribution of Housing Choice Vouchers in a Gentrifying Neighborhood: A Study of Over-the-Rhine, Cincinnati, Ohio.” Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cincinnati
- Elliott-Cooper A, Hubbard P and Lees L (2019) Moving beyond Marcuse: Gentrification, displacement, and the violence of un-homing. *Progress in Human Geography* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519830511>
- Fanon F (1963) *The Wretched of the Earth* (trans C Farrington). New York: Grove Press
- Fraser J C (2004) Beyond gentrification: Mobilizing communities and claiming space. *Urban Geography* 25(5):437–457

- Fraser J C, Burns A B, Bazuin J T and Oakley D Á (2013) HOPE VI, colonization, and the production of difference. *Urban Affairs Review* 49(4):525–556
- Goldberg D T (2009) *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Malden: Wiley
- Greenblatt A (2014) From vacant to vibrant: Cincinnati's urban transformation. *Governing: The States and Localities* September <http://www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-cincinnati-urban-transformation.html> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Gregory D (2004) *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Malden: Blackwell
- Gupta A and Ferguson J (1992) Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1):6–23
- Hartman C (1984) Right to stay put. In C C Geisler and F J Popper (eds) *Land Reform, American Style* (pp 302–318) Totowa: Rowman and Allanheld
- Hartman C, Keating D and LeGates R (1982) *Displacement, How to Fight It*. San Francisco: National Housing Law Project
- Harvey D (2009) *Social Justice and the City* (new edn). Athens: University of Georgia Press
- Hill Collins P and Bilge S (2016) *Key Concepts: Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity
- Hyra D (2015) The back-to-the-city movement: Neighborhood redevelopment and processes of political and cultural displacement. *Urban Studies* 52(10):1753–1773
- Hyra D (2017) *Race, Class, and Politics in the Cappuccino City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Inwood J F and Bonds A (2017) Property and whiteness: The Oregon standoff and the contradictions of the US settler state. *Space and Polity* 21(3):253–268
- Jernigan M (2014) History of the Metropole Hotel in Cincinnati. *USA Today* <https://traveltips.usatoday.com/history-metropole-hotel-cincinnati-62135.html> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Kern L (2016) Rhythms of gentrification: Eventfulness and slow violence in a happening neighborhood. *Cultural Geographies* 23(3):441–457
- Kipfer S (2007) Fanon and space: Colonization, urbanization, and liberation from the colonial to the global city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25(4):701–726
- Kipfer S and Petrunia J (2009) "Recolonization" and public housing: A Toronto case study. *Studies in Political Economy* 83(1):111–139
- Kneebone E, Nadeau C and Berube A (2011) *The Re-emergence of Concentrated Poverty: Metropolitan Trends in the 2000s*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute
- Korte G (2002) Over-the-Rhine plan irks advocates for poor. *Cincinnati Enquirer* 23 June http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2002/06/23/loc_overthe-rhine_plan.html (last accessed 9 December 2015)
- Lefebvre H (1996) *Writings on Cities* (E Kofman and E Lebas, trans.). Oxford: Blackwell
- Lepofsky J and Fraser J C (2003) Building community citizens: Claiming the right to place-making in the city. *Urban Studies* 40(1):127–142
- Linz J D (2017) Inhabiting the impasse: Social exclusion through visible assemblage in neighborhood gentrification. *Geoforum* 85:131–139
- Madden D and Marcuse P (2016) *In Defense of Housing*. London: Verso
- Marcuse P (1985) Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. *Washington University Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law* 28(4):195–240
- McKinzie A E and Richards P L (2019) An argument for context-driven intersectionality. *Sociology Compass* <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12671>
- Newman K and Ashton P (2004) Neoliberal urban policy and new paths of neighborhood change in the American inner city. *Environment and Planning A* 36(7):1151–1172
- OurCampaigns (2005) "Candidate details: James 'Jim' R. Tarbell." <https://www.ourcampaigns.com/CandidateDetail.html?CandidateID=73400> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Pain R (2019) Chronic urban trauma: The slow violence of housing dispossession. *Urban Studies* 56(2):385–400
- People's Movement (2010) "People's Platform for Equality and Justice." <https://blogs.miamioh.edu/cce-otr/papers/> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Porter L (2014) Possessory politics and the conceit of procedure: Exposing the cost of rights under conditions of dispossession. *Planning Theory* 13(4):387–406

- Porter L and Yiftachel O (2019) Urbanizing settler-colonial studies: Introduction to the special issue. *Settler Colonial Studies* 9(2):177–186
- Quinlivan L (2002) Channel 9 News I-Team special report: “Visions of Vine Street”. *Channel 9 WCPO* http://www.wcpo.com/localshows/iteam/visionsofvine/1201_script.html (last accessed 11 November 2004)
- Rothstein R (2017) *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. New York: Liveright
- Roy A (2017) Dis/possessive collectivism: Property and personhood at city’s end. *Geoforum* 80:A1–A11
- Safransky S (2017) Rethinking land struggle in the postindustrial city. *Antipode* 49(4):1079–1100
- Shaw W S (2007) *Cities of Whiteness*. Malden: Wiley
- Slater T (2013) Expulsions from public housing: The hidden context of concentrated affluence. *Cities* 35:384–390
- Smart A and Smart J (2017) Ain’t talkin’ ‘bout gentrification: The erasure of alternative idioms of displacement resulting from Anglo-American academic hegemony. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41(3):518–525
- Smith N (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge
- Smith N (2008) On “The eviction of critical perspectives”. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1):195–197
- Sowers S (2017) What US cities are learning from Cincinnati’s downtown revival. *Urban Land* 19 December <https://urbanland.uli.org/industry-sectors/public-spaces/u-s-cities-learning-cincinnati-downtown-revival/> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Swyngedouw E (2005) Governance innovation and the citizen: The Janus-face of governance-beyond-the-state. *Urban Studies* 42(11):1991–2006
- Tyler I (2013) *Revolted Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain*. London: Zed
- Tuck E (2009) Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review* 79(3):409–428
- Veracini L (2011) Introducing *Settler Colonial Studies*. *Settler Colonial Studies* 1(1):1–12
- Veracini L (2012) Suburbia, settler colonialism, and the world turned inside out. *Housing, Theory and Society* 29(4):339–357
- Weheliye A G (2014) *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Durham: Duke University Press
- Wharton J L (2008) Gentrification: The new colonialism in the modern era. *Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table* <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-218606468/gentrification-the-new-colonialism-in-the-modern> (last accessed 20 November 2018)
- Williams C (2013) Washington Park hosts outdoor yoga classes this summer. *WCPO* 6 August <https://www.wcpo.com> (last accessed 5 January 2014)
- Wilson D (2007) *Cities and Race: America’s New Black Ghetto*. New York: Routledge
- Wynter S (2003) Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after Man, its overrepresentation—An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3(3):257–337