

# ScholarWorks@GSU

## It Makes Atlanta Feel Like a Real City: Biopolitical Urbanism and Public Art on the Atlanta BeltLine

Authors	Faulkner, Sherah
Citation	Faulkner, Sherah. "It Makes Atlanta Feel Like a Real City: Biopolitical Urbanism and Public Art on the Atlanta BeltLine." 2014. Thesis, Georgia State University. <a href="https://doi.org/10.57709/4995628">https://doi.org/10.57709/4995628</a>
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.57709/4995628">https://doi.org/10.57709/4995628</a>
Download date	2026-06-09 12:18:36
Link to Item	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14694/15264">https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14694/15264</a>

IT MAKES ATLANTA FEEL LIKE A REAL CITY:  
BIOPOLITICAL URBANISM AND PUBLIC ART ON THE ATLANTA BELTLINE

by

SHERAH FAULKNER

Under the Direction of Dr. Amira Jarmakani

ABSTRACT

Functioning as both a light rail transit project and a comprehensive redevelopment program, the Atlanta BeltLine is widely expected to impact the city of Atlanta as profoundly as did the 1996 Olympic Games. In this paper, the Atlanta BeltLine is examined as a biopolitical project and the manners in which its public arts program, Art on the Atlanta BeltLine, works to secure local consent to redevelopment are explored.

INDEX WORDS: Gentrification, Biopower, Public Art, Spatial Theory, Atlanta BeltLine

IT MAKES ATLANTA FEEL LIKE A REAL CITY:  
BIOPOLITICAL URBANISM AND PUBLIC ART ON THE ATLANTA BELTLINE

by

SHERAH FAULKNER

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Art

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2014

Copyright by  
Sherah Jade Faulkner  
2014

IT MAKES ATLANTA FEEL LIKE A REAL CITY:  
BIOPOLITICAL URBANISM AND PUBLIC ART ON THE ATLANTA BELTLINE

by

SHERAH FAULKNER

Committee Chair: Amira Jarmakani

Committee: Susan Talburt  
Julie Kubala

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2014

## DEDICATION

*To Nathan Frisch, and Julie Kubala*

I would not have applied to graduate school without his stubborn and not always well-received encouragement or her example of what thinking and learning can be when done well.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Neither graduate school nor writing this thesis would have been plausible for me without the substantial support I have been generously offered by a number of people both in and outside of the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Institute. I would like to offer my sincere thanks to my committee, Susan Talburt, Julie Kubala and Amira Jarmakani, for their guidance, patience and excellent teaching. I owe Amira particular thanks; she has gone well beyond what I would consider reasonable in fostering my thesis writing process. I have benefited endlessly from her tirelessness and her willingness to engage me as both a student and a friend. I would also like to thank Andy Reisinger and Julie Kubala for helping me navigate the ins and outs of being in school, even when my approach was beyond scattered-brained.

I'm afraid that Sherah-in-school can be a rather trying entity, so I also owe a great deal of thanks to several of my loved ones. This endeavor would not have been possible without the emotional and financial support given me by both of my parents. I would especially like to thank Mike Faulkner for his always helpful and incisive writing advice and Beth Wiggins for her indomitable encouragement. My siblings have endured my unusually erratic presences and absences—physical and mental—during this period with grace and I greatly appreciate their ever-consistent willingness to help me find my keys, wallet, confidence, sanity, and all the other things I misplace on a regular basis. I owe Lucas Power an incredible debt of gratitude for everything from computer loans to last minute coffee dates to endless thesis conversations that I'm sure strained his patience; he is, in my opinion, the model of a solid, supportive friend. Finally, I'm not sure that I even want to attempt to thank Nathan Frisch here—the unyielding encouragement and support he has offered me in every arena of my life over the past several years would make this a Sisyphean task and I simply don't have the words.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... v**

**1 INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**1.1 Literature Review ..... 4**

**1.2 Theoretical Framework ..... 15**

**2 SPACES OF SECURITY, SPACES OF DISCIPLINE AND THE CULTURAL POLITICS OF URBAN AUTHENTICITY ..... 24**

**2.1 Atlantic Station: Disciplining Urban Play ..... 27**

**2.2 Securing the Authentically Urban: The Milieu of the Atlanta BeltLine ..... 33**

**2.3 Defining Freedom, Defining Urbanity..... 37**

**3 CRAFTING CABBYREN: THE AFFECTS AND AESTHETICS OF AN AUTHENTICALLY URBAN ENCLAVE ..... 48**

**3.1 Street Art, Graffiti Vandalism and Other Weapons of Redevelopment ..... 50**

**3.2 Securing CabbyRen ..... 58**

**3.3 Disciplining Gentrification ..... 65**

**4 PITTSBURGH PAST, PITTSBURGH FUTURE: CONFLICTS AND IMPASSES ON THE SOUTHEAST TRAIL ..... 74**

**4.1 Pittsburgh Past, Pittsburgh Future: The (Re)development of an Affective Public ..... 79**

**4.2 Empowering Discipline: Preparing Pittsburgh for a Public Art Wonderland ..... 83**

**4.3 “The Future is Killing Us Now” ..... 89**

**REFERENCES..... 98**

**ENDNOTES ..... 117**

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Co-Exist, Michi Meko.....	60
Figure 2: Co-Exist Detail .....	62
Figure 3: Untitled, Labrona, OverUnder and Gawd .....	67
Figure 4: Graffiti Attributed to OverUnder .....	68
Figure 6: Steel Fabric, Loss Prevention Collective .....	70
Figure 7: Hands Along the Rail, Lonnie Holley .....	70
Figure 8: An Allegory of the Human City, Roti.....	74
Figure 9: Allegory Details, Before and After Buffing.....	75
Figure 10: Couples: Reimagined, Karen Shacham and Mike Carpenter .....	91
Figure 11: Couples Relocated.....	92
Figure 12: TiredOUT, Arseni Zeitsev & Anonymous Studio .....	93

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Despite some corruption, and considerable greed for the other man's vineyard,  
the intentions going into the messes we make are, on the whole, exemplary.

—Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*<sup>1</sup>

On a cold, clear January afternoon in 2003, Atlanta millionaire turned eco-developer Charles Brewer stood against a backdrop of stilled machinery on the lot of an abandoned concrete facility and, holding a red and white electric guitar, prepared to regale a waiting crowd with song.<sup>2</sup> The occasion was the groundbreaking ceremony for Glenwood Park, a brownfield<sup>1</sup> redevelopment project Brewer had been inspired to undertake after reading Andres Duany's New Urbanist classic *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream* in just one sitting. New Urbanism can be briefly described as a design movement that insists on the social and ethical values of carefully planned, beautifully landscaped and densely populated neighborhood-like developments, proffering these communitarian enclaves as antidotes to the socioeconomic and ecological ills he attributes to suburban sprawl. Motivated by Duany's polemic, Brewer declared himself a developer, assembled Green Street Properties, his development firm, and set out to build the place that he himself wanted to live.<sup>3</sup>

Despite this clarity of intention and the use of “an insider-only financing strategy” meant to ensure Green Street could bring “their [New Urbanist] vision to reality in an uncompromised way,” the song Brewer had penned especially for the groundbreaking, “The Development Blues,” was a lyrical catalog of obstacles, setbacks and waiting games. While his performance detailed unsurprising development issues, such as his “broken sewer pipe blues,” it also alluded to contestations with the city.<sup>4</sup> Although Atlanta officially adopted Smart Growth, a planning strategy that “developed within the framework of New Urbanism,”<sup>5</sup> as a planning model in 1999, Brewer's “springtime...street dimension blues,” “summertime... jurisdictional road transfer blues,” and “long, long time...building permit blues”<sup>6</sup> suggested that the city known as “the poster child for suburban sprawl”<sup>7</sup> was not necessarily zoned to enable the type of eco-friendly, walkable development Brewer envisioned.

---

<sup>1</sup>In urban planning jargon, the term “brownfield” refers to a formerly industrial or sometimes commercial site perceived to be affected by environmental contamination. The redevelopment of such sites generally involves some form of environmental remediation or cleanup prior to construction.

Although he would begin winning national and local awards for his sustainable development within the year, the righteous indignation these travails with the city prompted in Brewer remains persistent. In “Sprawlanta,” the 2010 pilot episode of *American Makeover*, a web series devoted to promoting a “vision of a post-sprawl America,” Brewer earnestly explicates the issues his New Urbanist development faced:

All we ever looked for was just permission to do it. I mean, people want it. The mixed use was illegal, it wasn't in the zoning codes. The street dimensions, which you really need, they were prohibited by the municipality. Can't we at least just make [New Urbanism] legal?

As Brewer was breaking ground on his semi-legal eco-friendly mini-city, another group with similar interests and ambitions, the Friends of the Atlanta BeltLine, was busy working toward the transit project that would eventually render Brewer's blues a thing of the past.<sup>8</sup> Proposed in the 1999 graduate thesis of Georgia Tech student Ryan Gravel, the Atlanta BeltLine (ABL) was envisioned as a light rail transit system flanked by pedestrian and bicycle paths that would connect 45 intown neighborhoods, including Glenwood Park. Working from the same New Urbanist, smart growth ethos that informs Glenwood, the project is predicated on increasing walkability, greenspace, cycling and mass-transit usage throughout the city, an endeavor that would, it seemed, entangle its realization in many of the same zoning snarls that Brewer faced. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, in a city known for its near-mythic traffic congestion and suburban sprawl, both of which suggest its automobile-oriented design, neither Gravel nor the advisory board who reviewed this thesis thought the BeltLine would ever be constructed.<sup>9</sup> In 2002 Gravel nonetheless instituted Friends of the Atlanta BeltLine and after just one year of rallying “grassroots support,” was fairly certain that his vision would be realized. As he understands it, “the public fell in love with the project and took ownership of it”<sup>10</sup> and “when the public owns a vision and wants it to happen, they can make it happen.”<sup>11</sup>

Two years later, in 2005, the municipality not only officially adopted the BeltLine, but also used the project to anchor their comprehensive citywide redevelopment program, adopting an adapted version of Gravel's thesis as The Atlanta BeltLine Redevelopment Plan (ABRP) and approving a Tax Allocation District (TAD) that will provide up to 60% of the ABL's construction costs. A multifaceted, public-private hybrid, the ABRP works in tandem with BeltLine Inc., the non-profit that helms the project, to encourage, design and, in some cases, implement developments that adhere to BeltLine principles, namely New Urbanist style mixed-use

developments. Glenwood Park, for instance, is now considered a “model community for future development along the BeltLine.”<sup>12</sup>

Despite its rather slow implementation—only three one-to-two mile sections of the corridor are currently “open” (paved and landscaped)—the BeltLine is already reflecting some of the paradoxes of smart growth: touted as a “grassroots movement”<sup>13</sup> oriented around the needs of individual neighborhoods, the project has nonetheless already induced speculation and gentrification in the neighborhoods it impacts, particularly the low-income, predominately black neighborhoods on the southside of the city.<sup>14</sup> Even with its hallmark rail system at least a decade from completion, the BeltLine has proven an unquestionable driver in high-end real-estate, galvanizing the local housing market according to its requisite development principles: “transit-oriented development, dense urban development, pedestrian and bicycle paths...sustainability, city revitalization and the elimination of economic and cultural barriers.”<sup>15</sup>

Despite this entrenchment with local government and various capitalist ventures, the BeltLine has nonetheless continued to receive an outpouring of support marked by a sense of urgency and earnestness not unlike Charles Brewer’s. In 2009, for instance, a “self-proclaimed BeltLine cheerleader”<sup>16</sup> teamed with the independent arts organization WonderRoot to promote the project by mapping the corridor’s 46 intersections with local surface streets and then illegally posting hand-painted, plywood signs that exhorted viewers to, among other things, “Pray for BeltLine” at each of these crossings.<sup>17</sup> This endeavor led to the institution of the annual Art on the Atlanta BeltLine exhibition, which showcases the work of hundreds of local artists, particularly graffiti writers and street artists, along the trail each fall. Perhaps most notably, in 2012, residents of Glenwood Park and surrounding neighborhoods successfully blocked the construction of a Wal-Mart along the corridor, going into “hell-no-activist-mode” to fight the suburban-style development in the name of preserving the “BeltLine vision” of Atlanta.<sup>18</sup>

The construction of this “live-work-play-transit corridor”<sup>19</sup> and the greenspaces and mixed-use developments that it intends to proliferate are, as any New Urbanist would certainly attest, far from benign. Not only are a number of municipal, federal, private and residential actors, with all their conflicting interests, involved in their productions, but when space is thought of, as Nicky Gregson and Gillian Rose argue it should

be, “as brought into being by performance and as a performative articulation of power,”<sup>20</sup> the spatialities of the ventures can be addressed as actors in urban power relations as well. From this vantage point, the urbanist ethos and spatial formations that are currently restructuring Atlanta can serve as an entry point into a much broader question: how does spatial management function as a technology of contemporary biopolitics? Although New Urbanism eschews gated developments in the name of a humanist politic, these ‘neighborhoods’ tend to have distinct aesthetic boundaries—neotraditional architecture and conspicuously intentional landscape design spell out their insularity. Increasingly, the ABL corridor is similarly marked out by a particular, though distinct, aesthetic, namely the presence of street art and graffiti. Both reflect the “aestheticization of everyday life” that Paul Knox has noted is a central component of contemporary urbanism.<sup>21</sup> If, as Nigel Thrift has argued, “what might have been painted [in cities] in increasingly instrumental,” what does the popularization of these aesthetically bounded spatial formations suggest about the role of containment in urban landscapes? Further, how are they active in the modulation of city-goers' affective experiences of space, which Thrift contends are “more and more likely to be actively engineered” to predetermined ends in urban environments?<sup>22</sup>

## **1.1 Literature Review**

In order to address the above quandaries and gain some purchase on how the biopolitical urbanism that this paper will suggest undergirds the Atlanta BeltLine is functioning, some context is first necessary. As Charles Brewer’s frustrations during the realization of Glenwood Park suggest, urban development is an often labyrinthine and contentious process, involving as it does federal regulations, municipal codes and standards, and a host of socio-economic and design concerns. It is also a historically situated process embroiled in a number of overlapping and hotly contested social, legal, geographic, governmental and economic processes. While Green Street held to a singular, codified model for development, the Atlanta BeltLine amalgamates a number of contemporary urban development processes, namely New Urbanism, smart growth and the creative city theses. This literature review will contextualize this project by first giving a very brief overview of urban development and gentrification as they occurred in Atlanta, highlighting the ideological and lexicographic shifts in these processes to which the urban development discourses that influence the ABL respond. These will each

then be individually considered. As this thesis is interested in the ways in which these discourses are functioning to subjectify Atlantans, their popular presentations will be foregrounded and then a very limited number of relevant critiques will be addressed. Ultimately, the aim of this section will be to sketch out the gentrification and development debates that influence the ABL's production of space.

*Urban Renewal and Olympic Revanchism in the City Too Busy to Hate*

As acclaimed and self-taught urbanist Jane Jacobs' *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* provides a key touchstone for each of the urban development processes that are brought together in the ABL, its 1961 publication date is perhaps the most obvious place to begin this overview. Announcing itself as an "attack on current city planning and rebuilding"<sup>23</sup> from its first line, *Death and Life* distanced itself in every possible manner from urban development as it was then occurring. The torrent of self-proclaimed "unkind remarks about orthodox city planning"<sup>24</sup> that Jacobs unleashed in its subsequent pages had a particular virulence for the federal urban renewal plans that many cities in the United States were undergoing at that time.

So named in the 1954 Federal Housing Act, urban renewal involved the disbursement of federal funds to municipalities toward the acquisition of land in urban areas that had been deemed "slums," which were then sold at low rates to private developers who would "renew" these areas and construct new public housing. The boom in public housing construction that occurred in the 1950s and 60s proliferated Modernist architectural structures across the US, particularly in the form of high-rises that effectively warehoused the populations displaced by urban renewal programs.<sup>25</sup> In their oft-cited three-wave gentrification model, Jason Hackworth and Neil Smith associate early gentrification, then an isolated, sporadic process spurred by public agencies, with urban renewal programs.<sup>26</sup> Taking place against the backdrop of the Civil Rights Movement, this process was, as Olivia Hetzler et al have noted, "grounded in the utilitarian argument that an improved city center was best for everyone in the city, majority group and racial minorities alike."<sup>27</sup> Jacobs, however, insisted that urban renewal did little more than wipe away "slums and their populations...replacing them with projects intended to produce higher tax yields, or to lure back easier populations with less expensive public requirements."<sup>28</sup> In a 1963 interview with Kenneth Clark, James Baldwin made the racist implications of such programs explicit: "Most cities are engaged in...something called urban renewal, which means moving Negroes out; it means Negro removal, that is what it

means. The federal government is an accomplice to this fact.”<sup>29</sup>

By the mid-1960s, government slum clearance was invoking not only critiques but also strident neighborhood oppositions, and riots began occurring in many of the US cities undergoing renewal, including Atlanta. As one of the two-hundred cities to be redlined in the 1930s by the federal agency the Home Owners Loan Corporation, an explicitly racist policy that firmly linked “discrimination to national banking policy,” Atlanta had already seen sharp disinvestment in its black neighborhoods, which were then more likely to be designated slums in need of clearance.<sup>30</sup> In 1966, two riots related to urban renewal and police brutality occurred in Atlanta’s Summerhill and Bedford Pine neighborhoods. Though not officially a renewal site, Summerhill was experiencing both the effects of the nearby displacement of black residents and was undergoing displacement of its own as the city was in the process of constructing a Major League Baseball stadium there for a team that did not yet exist. Then-mayor Ivan Allen, who was present at both uprisings, subsequently placed “a moratorium on additional urban renewal projects until the city addressed how to improve the rehousing process.”<sup>31</sup> This attempt at a “kinder, gentler version of urban renewal”<sup>32</sup> was widespread, with the federal government reconfiguring urban renewal into the Model Cities program and instituting requirements for educational and social services for populations undergoing renewal. Nonetheless, these critiques and events had laced the terms “urban renewal” and “gentrification,” coined by Ruth Glass in 1964, with stridently negative connotations. By the 1970s, “developers and public officials [had] learned to defend their actions against the ‘g’ label, because the word served as a powerful rallying cry.”<sup>33</sup>

During the 1970s and 80s, urban development processes and gentrification both underwent significant changes. Concomitant with neoliberal policy reform, this period saw the withdrawal of most federal funding for urban development, a rise in colorblind, market-based corporate-led approaches to development and the systemization of gentrification as the process became “increasingly entwined with wider processes of urban and economic restructuring.”<sup>34</sup> While white flight increased Atlanta’s suburban population throughout this period, corporate-led downtown revitalization efforts were concerted between 1973 and 1988 and disproportionately impacted the homeless.<sup>35</sup> Also under development during this period was the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA), which had in the 1960s been “hailed as the solution to the region’s growing traffic and

pollution problems,<sup>36</sup> and was officially instituted as a bus service in 1971. Construction of rail service began in 1974 and was completed in 1979, but the economic development that many hoped would attend this construction never materialized. Although MARTA had “no significant impact in shaping the region’s development pattern...sprawl and highways were cited as the dominant players”<sup>37</sup> in the process. Many have suggested that this is partially due to the series of racist opt-outs of many predominately white counties in the fiscal support of MARTA, which has never received any state funding but relies on a 1% sales tax from two intown counties. A 1994 research program intended to identify the county-homes of MARTA riders found that this tax was “subsidizing people who live in outlying counties who park their cars...and ride on MARTA trains into the city and the airport.”<sup>38</sup>

During the early 1990s, Atlanta began preparing to host the 1996 Olympic Games as gentrification and urban development underwent another major reconfiguration in the United States. Despite the scaling back on explicitly racist redevelopment discourses, this period notably saw the emergence of what Neil Smith has termed the revanchist city. From the French for revenge and exemplified by the “active viciousness” of New York mayor Rudy Giuliani’s attempts to “make the city safe for gentrification,” revanchism “represents a reaction against the supposed ‘theft’ of the city” from the middle-class and “portends a vicious reaction against minorities, the working class, the unemployed, women, gays and lesbians, [and] immigrants.”<sup>39</sup> As Giuliani undertook it, this process is grounded in the criminalization of “a whole range of behaviors, internally defined” and blames “the failure of post-1968 policy on the populations it was supposed to assist.”<sup>40</sup> As Gregory Sholette has noted, Giuliani was “merely an overt symptom of a far more sweeping ideological shift”<sup>41</sup> and the level of open aggression he used to reclaim the city for the middle class was reflected in the brutal redevelopment undertaken in Atlanta as it prepared for its Olympic debut. As the city worked diligently to “create an image of itself as a prosperous, authentically global city”<sup>42</sup> for an international audience, its local population suffered: over 30,000 of its residents were displaced in a six year period; over 9,000 of its homeless, primarily black men, were illegally arrested in a one year period, resulting in a federal cease and desist order; and poor people of color were also spatially invisibilized.<sup>43</sup> As Thomas Wolfe describes in *A Man in Full*, in tourist guides of Olympic Atlanta “the maps—the maps!—were all bobtailed—cut off at the bottom—so no white tourist would even think about

wandering down into [predominantly black] South Atlanta.”<sup>44</sup> Although the cosmopolitan multiculturalism associated with global cities placed an interdiction on the overt racism of urban renewal, the rhetoric of colorblindness often propped up by these similar measures. So, while the “cradle of the Civil Rights Movement” rhetoric was rolled out in force in Atlanta’s Olympic propaganda,<sup>45</sup> the city also exhibited the “extreme bifurcations of wealth and poverty, dramatic realignments of class relations, and dependence on new streams of immigrant labor” that are paradigmatic of global cities.<sup>46</sup>

Both revanchism and neoliberal urbanism, which Smith argues “has been slouching towards birth since the 1980s,”<sup>47</sup> are notable aspects of the third iteration of gentrification that coalesced in the 1990s. This period has experienced the “generalization of gentrification”<sup>48</sup> as the process has become a “crucial urban strategy for city governments who consort with private capital in cities around the world.”<sup>49</sup> Although still a “highly varied and unevenly distributed” practice, gentrification has “evolved into a vehicle for transforming whole areas into new landscape complexes that pioneer a comprehensive class-inflected urban remake.”<sup>50</sup> Along with its diffusion from the city core, neoliberal urbanism is characterized by the impacts of global financialization on neighborhoods, the notable return of the state in urban development programs, primarily through the “intensification of partnerships between private capital and the local state” which results “in larger, more expensive, and more symbolic developments,”<sup>51</sup> and a decreased opposition to gentrification.

The smart growth, sustainable development and creative city development processes that moved to the fore of North American city planning and development during the 1990s and early 2000s could each, as will be seen, be considered particular manifestations of neoliberal urbanism. As they have come to dominate policy agendas and planning curricula, each has experienced a similar discursive explosion, generating in the past decade copious popular publications, a seemingly endless flow of ‘grey’ literature and a host of academic critiques that range from wary to scathing. The ABL interweaves these processes in relation to the tangled histories of Atlanta’s urban development—which this review only barely begins to hint at. As these discourses have impacted not only urban imaginaries at a global scale, entrenching their lexicons and logics as commonsensical in regards to contemporary urbanism, they are also being directly deployed in the ABL’s restructuring of Atlanta; therefore, each will be briefly considered.

### *Smart Growth, New Urbanism and Sustainable Development*

Atlanta officially instituted smart growth after waking from its global-city dreams to find the very efforts it had taken to “clean up” its image for an international audience were now sullyng it at the national level. Although sprawl had long been an issue in the city, Atlanta was cast as irresponsibly “hungover” from its glut of Olympic development, deemed the national “poster child for suburban sprawl” and slapped with the first Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) freeze on highway funds issued in the country.<sup>52</sup> In 1999, the city adopted smart growth as a planning model in response to this punitive measure, but such initiatives were, as Brewer’s blues suggest, instituted erratically and largely as restrictive, rather than proactive, measures.

Although environmental conservation and sustainability issues have long concerned a variety of urbanists,<sup>53</sup> the sustainable urbanism that directs measures such as the EPA’s is a relatively recent phenomenon. In 2009, the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development organization (LEED), whose green certifications have become requisite credentials for sustainable development, defined sustainable urbanism as “a combination of Sustainable Development, New Urbanism and Smart Growth movements.”<sup>54</sup> Growing out of the environmental discourses of the 1970s and 80s that developed in tandem with neoliberalism and reconceptualized the environment as a social issue in the public imaginary, these discourses attempt to facilitate the simultaneous expansion of capitalist development and alleviation of its most damaging ecological effects. First defined in the 1987 UN-supported Brundtland report *Our Common Future* as a move to “ensure that humanity meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs,”<sup>55</sup> sustainable development is often presented in intentionally vague terms that attempt to sidestep some of its most overt contradictions. The EPA does, however, center development in its definition and hints at the impacts of gentrification: “the effort to reconcile the competing demands of regional development, namely community integrity, economic development and environmental protection.”<sup>56</sup> Although, as Mike Raco notes, “normative notions of SD advocate equality, empowerment and environmentally sensitive development”<sup>57</sup> in that order, the EPA’s more development-driven agenda has been a major engine of the sustainability movement in the US. The practicalities of this somewhat fuzzy process can be summarized as revolving “around brownfield redevelopment, open space preservation, public space development, housing strategies, transit-

oriented development and ‘mixed-use’ or ‘new urbanist’ development.”<sup>58</sup> Taken as an unalloyed good in and of itself, increased density is stridently encouraged: “building [dense housing] in city centers, the argument goes, preserves open space, puts people near public transit and brings much needed investment to the urban core.”<sup>59</sup>

While the various definitions, aims and executions of sustainability are flexible and contingent, the New Urbanism that is associated with them works from a relatively rigid design model. The Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU), the non-profit that acts as this movement’s governing US body, was formed in 1993 and delineates the stakes and methods of the master-planned spatial arrangements that New Urbanists insist can yield a particular type of social engagement and urban experience that the suburban, unplanned or ill-planned areas are said to lack. Although known as a social movement, New Urbanism has been “developer-driven rather than originating from idealistic political, academic or grassroots-based organizations.”<sup>60</sup> Vocal, however, about its commitment to “reestablishing the relationship between the art of building and the making of community through citizen-based participatory planning and design,”<sup>61</sup> the CNU engages in “bottom-up” planning through the use of its much-vaunted charrettes, “intensive design-based planning workshop[s] where all required information and specialists are present to enable relevant issues to be considered *simultaneously* and in an *interactive way*” [emphasis in original].<sup>62</sup> Although site-specific input is taken into account in these charrettes, this design model relies on the neo-traditional architecture it presumes to be universal in its echoing of small-town America and relegation of unsightly trash bins and garages to unseen areas of its neighborhood enclaves.

In its unilateral commendation of “a return to...front porches, pedestrian areas, shared urban assets, mixed communities and the city of many public spaces,”<sup>63</sup> New Urbanism “reflects a vision not so much of the future,” towards which its development is ostensibly geared, “but of a better past.”<sup>64</sup> As Ash Amin has noted, this aesthetic is meant to regenerate a presumably lost civic engagement through “the politics of spontaneity and agonistic interaction among an empowered citizenry.”<sup>65</sup> *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream*, Duany’s best-seller that introduced New Urbanism to the popular realm in the US, attributes this loss and a startling host of other social issues, from crime to health issues to alienation, to the post-World War Two expansion and popularization of suburbia. Despite sustaining pervasive criticism for any number of ills itself—it has been cast as, among other things, an example of top-down, heavy-handed government

intervention, as too utopian or communitarian, and as aggravating the very economic and racial segregation it attempts to alleviate—“the proliferation of New Urbanist-designed projects is astounding.”<sup>66</sup>

This is, at least, partially due to New Urbanism’s imbrication with smart growth, which Alberto Vanolo suggests is “one of the major intellectual results of New Urbanism.” Interestingly, he also cites smart growth as “a political idea of grassroots movements, especially in urban social movements in the 1990s” though his citation suggests that the major players in this “movement” were development-oriented lobbies such as the National Home Builders Association, the American Planning Association and the Conference of Mayors.<sup>67</sup> Further, smart growth, despite the potentially progressive valences of its pared down ecologically-friendly, mass-transportation encouraging and diversity-endorsing public persona, has often been assessed as functioning as little more than a “synonym for many of the explicit values and tools”<sup>68</sup> already available to city planning. As Anthony Downs, an economist who has served as a consultant for HUD and a variety of corporate entities, notes, many of smart growth’s most ardent supporters, whom he names as “environmentalists, planners, some public officials and innovative developers,” often use “this approach as means to somewhat different ends.”<sup>69</sup> As Rob Kruger and Susan Buckingham assert, “whether called smart growth, new urbanism, or compact urban development,” a term more often used in the UK, “this vision and set of accompanying policies,” which “of course” include space for “plenty of retail and coffee,” are “defining urban regeneration” in North America.<sup>70</sup>

### *The Creative City*

Although not always, or even often, linked by scholars and considered largely incompatible by a number of urban planners, smart growth and the creative city, as Kruger and Buckingham have worked to show, are nonetheless linked, if not co-constitutive. Like the smart city of sustainable urbanism, the creative city is theoretically filled with mixed-use developments, transit initiatives, dense and diverse populations, and plenty of coffee and retail. While an admittedly aspirational planning model and utopian ideal when initially set forth by Charles Landry in the 1980s, the creative city nonetheless functions primarily to concretize a marketable local identity through a coherent vision of “the city” while also restructuring the landscape of said city through policy agendas focused on development.<sup>71</sup> While Landry’s focus on branding a city’s “authenticity” resonated with many deindustrialized cities seeking to produce tourist economies in the 1980s, his later *The Creative City: A*

*Toolkit for Innovators* (published in 2000) has been more central to crafting creative city policy as it currently stands. Despite Landry's influence, as well as that of many others, it was arguably Richard Florida's 2002 *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* that brought the creative city "out of the realm of academic debate" and home to roost in "local city halls" across the globe.<sup>72</sup>

Florida's notoriously popular book details his "discovery" of an emergent "creative class." Comprised of young, upwardly mobile and mostly single (or at least childless) "artists, intellectuals, entertainers, designers [and] high-tech engineers,"<sup>73</sup> these theoretical workers, whom Florida asserts make up one-third of the US workforce, value "high levels of mobility," urban scenes, diversity, meritocracy, near-manic work ethics, free-market ideals and "flexibility, compatibility with their boss[es], and location over company growth."<sup>74</sup> Meanwhile, Florida posits that the increase in low wage occupations—particularly servers, janitors, systems analysts and computer support techs—during the 90s and 00s was necessary for the rise of the creative class; "because they are well-compensated and work long and unpredictable hours, [creatives] require a growing pool of low-end service workers to take care of them and do their chores."<sup>75</sup>

Ostensibly appealing to municipal governments due to their high levels of self-sufficiency, one of Florida's most strident assertions concerning the creative class relates to city planning. Given their propensity for mobility and independence, any city could theoretically attract these mythic workers, but in order for a city to court the creative class—as any city must, according to Florida, if it is to be successful—it must have "buzz." By this, Florida means multiple, overlapping, art, film literature and music scenes, preferably independent and with a high level of walkability, or, as he puts it, an "indigenous street-level culture—a teeming blend of cafés, sidewalk musicians, and small galleries and bistros, where it is hard to draw the line between participant and observer, or between creativity and its creators."<sup>76</sup> Cities must cater to the creative lifestyle, which Florida insists is exemplified not by "conspicuous consumption," as "material goods no longer confer the status that they once did," but by more modest and particular consumption; creatives are known not by the jet but by the "small cabin in the woods furnished by IKEA," not by the sports cars, but the bicycle—the symbol of creatives. Concerned not only with their modes of transportation, but also with their fitness, attractiveness and health, cycling constitutes one of the primary physical ventures attributed to this "active class."<sup>77</sup> While the "fittest" and

“fattest” cities in the US are taxonomized in Florida’s tome,<sup>78</sup> to assess the potential attractiveness of any given city to the creative class, two primary indexes are offered: the Gay Index, which takes a city’s visible LGBT population to be an indicator of diversity and tolerance, and the Bohemian Index, which presumes that a city’s again visible artists and musicians indicate such scenes.

As the creative city concepts have “diffused globally into different geographical contexts,” their “forms of implementation” have, like smart growth, varied wildly. A “normative policy script” has, however, according to Kruger and Buckingham, emerged and “captured the imaginations of city governments and elites.” They follow Chris Gibson and Lily Kong in understanding the script to insist that

to compete in the new creative economy, cities should seek to implement particular initiatives such as encouraging creative industry clusters, incubate learning and knowledge economies, maximize networks with other successful places and companies, value and reward innovation, and aggressively campaign to attract the ‘creative class.’<sup>79</sup>

Ash Amin and Stephen Graham further this script, suggesting that “the answer to economic and social crisis is thought to be through creative practice, focusing on projects of urban renewal and lived experience that make the most of the diversity, difference and intersection traditionally offered by cities.”<sup>80</sup> As “creative euphoria” has been “progressively introduced” into planning agendas,<sup>81</sup> creative urban development projects have been increasingly focused on highlighting these aspects of urbanity in geographically specific frames, often attempting to arrange Florida’s scenes in the form of designated arts, entertainment and/or retail districts. The containment of culture that these areas represent resonate and overlap with the containment of community New Urbanist developments attempt to produce; in both cases, the conscientious manipulation of space through architecture and aesthetics to produce a certain “sense of place” is meant not only to generate revenue and residents, but also to bring into being the city that targeted demographics are presumed to desire.

#### *Creative and Sustainable Neoliberal Governance*

Although, as aforementioned, sustainable urbanism and/or smart growth are often understood in policy literature to be incommensurate or at least conflicting, Kruger and Buckingham have argued that “many cities across North America and Western Europe,” particularly smaller cities, “are deploying planning discourses and practices that lie at the nexus of economic regeneration, urban sustainability and creative city planning.”<sup>82</sup> The

development styles and lifestyle aims of each of these processes also overlap: although “language is different...the implications are similar. These ‘spaces of creativity’ are regenerated brownfields, where people live and work, putting fewer miles on their cars while consuming retail products and enjoying public space.”<sup>83</sup>

Smart growth and creative planning lexicons and policy agendas also share similarities in terms of the critiques they illicit. Each discourse has, for instance, been taken to task for vagueness of conception and subsequent variance of implementation. Sustainable development has been deemed a “meta-narrative” by James Meadowcroft and described by Mike Raco as “a chameleon-like discourse which has been (re)interpreted and deployed for a range of often contradictory and divergent agendas.”<sup>84</sup> Michael Gunder and Jean Hiller have suggested that “smart growth performs as yet another Lacanian master signifier, resulting in an “array of very different policies, not all of which are compatible.”<sup>85</sup> Florida’s creative class concept has been widely evaluated as “impoverished by a fuzziness of conception, [and] weakness of evidence and political science.”<sup>86</sup>

Each of these development models has also been strongly linked with neoliberalism, particularly neoliberal urbanism, perhaps reflecting this “predatory system’s flexibility and contingency”<sup>87</sup> in their ever-shifting implementations. Some scholars are hesitant about aligning the much maligned label neoliberal too closely with the more ecologically-centered development models, suggesting crossover rather than intent: sustainable development, for instance, has been accused of “allowing unreformed patterns of neoliberal urban development”<sup>88</sup> to unfold unchecked, while Vanolo’s assessment of smart growth suggests that there are simply “links between neoliberal urban development policies and smart city imaginary.”<sup>89</sup> A number of scholars have, as Raco notes, presented various forms of sustainable development, including smart growth, as having “*become* increasingly neoliberalized,”<sup>90</sup> which seems to suggest that inherently these strategies are or have been distinct from neoliberal development agendas [emphasis mine]. The creative class and New Urbanism have experienced more direct scrutiny. At least one Atlanta New Urbanist development, Atlantic Station, which will be examined in Chapter One, has been understood by scholars to largely embody the neoliberal ideal, while Jamie Peck has launched a well-known critique of the neoliberal orthodoxy of the creative class in which he insists that although “the hyperbolic and overstated character of Florida’s sales pitch...takes the form of an unstoppable social revolution,”<sup>91</sup> his strategies lead to little more than “cappuccino urban policies, with plenty of froth.”<sup>92</sup> As Jeffery

Zimmerman, who also links the creative class to neoliberal development directly, succinctly describes Peck's argument, creative strategies are grounded in "interlocking and established neoliberal strategies, including intensifying urban competition, property-led development and gentrification."<sup>93</sup>

Lastly, New Urbanism, smart growth, sustainability and creative cities have also been assessed individually as forms of governmentality: using phrases such as "smartmentality,"<sup>94</sup> "green subjection,"<sup>95</sup> and "creative governmentality,"<sup>96</sup> a handful of scholars have also examined how these processes work not only to reshape the city but also to subjectify its citizens. It is from this point that this thesis will now proceed, drawing these critiques together and working from the assumption that just as the lexicon of euphemism that dictates development discourse relies on contingency, context and constant adaptation to repeatedly reproduce itself, so too do the ideological underpinnings, commercial interests and interventions of specific development processes assemble and reassemble as they take on various geographic incarnations, encounter shifting power formations, and interact with contesting conceptions of what constitutes the city and its residents.

## 1.2 Theoretical Framework

Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose have quipped that "more than a quarter century after the concept was introduced...the term 'biopower' is more likely to be taken to refer to the generation of energy from renewable materials"<sup>97</sup> than the writings of Michel Foucault. Their allusion to the ascendancy of sustainability in popular discourses aside, their assertion can be taken as largely tongue-in-cheek as in the several past years, particularly since the translation of Foucault's College de France lecture series, there has been a veritable explosion of Anglophone academic work addressing the related concepts of biopower, biopolitics, governmentality and security. The article in which Rabinow and Rose make their jest, "Biopower Today," is, in fact, an attempt to navigate several major adaptive critiques of biopower and relate them to Foucault's theses.

To traverse, then, what is by now a well-traveled terrain, biopower can be briefly understood as the outcome of a "profound transformation" in the "mechanisms of power"<sup>98</sup> during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries that prompted the supersession of the most fundamental tenet of sovereign power—"the ancient right to *take* life or *let* live"—with the imperative that power "*foster* life or *disallow* it to the point of death."<sup>99</sup> Although biopower did not

eradicate sovereignty through this injunction to “make live and let die,” power’s “highest function” was no longer “to kill, but to invest life through and through,”<sup>100</sup> to generate “forces, making them grow and ordering them rather than...impeding them, making them submit or destroying them.”<sup>101</sup> As the “defining trait” of government, which shifted here from an art to a “management of the health, wealth and morality of its subjects,”<sup>102</sup> biopower addresses itself to this task through a bipolar strategy. The first pole, which can be thought of as a “body-organism-discipline-institutions”<sup>103</sup> relay, addresses the individual, understanding the human body as a machine and conditioning it towards “the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls.”<sup>104</sup> The second pole, a “population-biological processes-regulatory mechanisms-State”<sup>105</sup> relay, addresses not the individual but the “species body,” a target population understood as an entity with manageable and relatively predictable birth and morbidity rates, levels of health, patterns of movement, etc. These are managed through the regulatory interventions known as biopolitics and, later, security.

Importantly, while Foucault insists in “various places that as an assemblage of rationalities and techniques, biopower has no over-arching or inherent political valence,”<sup>106</sup> its central paradox—that making live must always involve the divisive willingness to let die—is animated by the biological racism that inscribed itself “as the basic mechanism of power” with the emergence of biopower. This racist, adapted evolutionism Foucault names as “a mechanism that allows biopower to work”<sup>107</sup> and attributes to it not only biopolitical war but “every form of indirect murder: exposing someone to death, increasing the risk of death for some people, or, quite simply political death, expulsion, rejection and so on.”<sup>108</sup>

### *Biopolitical Urbanism*

In “our current ‘biological century,’” Rabinow and Rose argue, this “contested field of problems and strategies is more crucial and enigmatic than ever” and therefore suggest a set of criteria for identifying biopolitical projects that will aid in the concept’s retention of analytic utility. Biopower, they suggest, refers to a “plane of actuality” that includes: “one or more truth discourses about the ‘vital’ character of living human beings, and an array of authorities considered competent to speak the truth”; “strategies for intervention upon collective existence in the name of life and health”; and “modes of subjectification, in which individuals can be

brought to work on themselves, under certain forms of authority, in relation to truth discourse, by means of practices of the self, in the name of individual or collective health.”<sup>109</sup>

When applied to the rationalities of the health-, community- and vitality-centered discourses discussed above, as well as their coteries of planners, architects and high-profile advocates and myriad methods for intervening in the self-perceptions and practices of target populations, the biopolitical nature of these urban projects comes quickly to the fore. Further, the development processes and problematics of urbanity are frequently presented as inextricably linked to biopower’s beginnings in Foucault’s work: he cites the impetus for the birth of biopolitics as urbanization, describes the deployment of sexuality as prompted by “particularly conflicts over urban space,”<sup>110</sup> and presents urban planning, along with architecture, as necessary supports for not only the emergence but the functioning of discipline, biopolitics and security.

Despite these imbrications of biopower, spatial management and urbanity, there has been, as Joe Penny has noted, “comparatively little work linking biopolitics, urban planning and the production of space.”<sup>111</sup> As at the current moment in our ‘biological century’ we are also witnessing, as Neil Brenner has described it, “*nothing less than the urbanization of the world*—the ‘urban revolution’ anticipated nearly four decades ago by Henri Lefebvre” [emphasis in original],<sup>112</sup> ‘biopolitical urbanism’ seems an apt framework for examining contemporary urban development processes. The phrase is meant not only to suggest the salience of biopower as an analytic for grappling with the protean complexities of urban processes, spatialities and politics, but also to highlight the embeddedness of biopolitical technologies and truth discourses in the mainstream forms of urbanism and urban planning that are shaping both continuing and emergent urbanizations. Given the intimate connection between neoliberalism and biopolitics that Foucault elucidates in *The Birth of Biopolitics*, it is worth noting that biopolitical urbanism is not being suggested as discrete from neoliberal urbanism, but is simply an attempt to highlight some of its aspects from a slightly different purview. Smith, for instance, suggests that “the new authoritarianism”<sup>113</sup> of the revanchist city is causal to the decrease in anti-gentrification organizing that marks neoliberal urbanism. Approached as a biopolitical issue, this waning could perhaps be explored as related to what Matteo Pasquinelli has called “the impasse of biopolitics” (i.e. “how can you rebel against your own life, when it is your life with its desires, need of communication, social relations, lifestyles, etc. that become

productive of value?")<sup>114</sup> or to the expansion of subjectivities that are conducive to the gentrification process.

The broad analytic approach, then, will be to examine how the Atlanta BeltLine's truth discourses, modes of subjectification and interventions into collective existence function through the production of its space, of which its urban planning agenda is but one aspect. Although this approach could—and perhaps should—produce a ranging and somewhat unwieldy analysis of the project, a focus on the BeltLine's attempts at reshaping what and who will constitute the authentically urban in its vision of Atlanta bring each of these elements into play in a somewhat more limited field. This mode of subjectification involves a (re)production of the Atlanta cityscape, truth discourses related to development and to a sub/urban binary, and the deployment of public art as both a support for gentrification and an active intervention into the affective registers of city-goers. The assessment of it here is intended to add a modest contribution to discussions of how and why opposition to North American gentrification has decreased in the past two decades. The remainder of this section will offer some limited comments, which will expand throughout the chapters, on how the particular elements of gentrification, aestheticization, affect and the production of space are being theoretically approached.

### *The Production of Space*

Coined by Henri Lefebvre in his book of the same name, 'the production of space' refers to the dynamism and dimensionality of all spaces, which Lefebvre suggests are formed by an overlapping triad of elements: conceived space, which is related to representations of space by experts and/or the powerful, such as politicians, architects and planners; perceived space, which is related to practices and is where the ideologies that undergird conceptions of space are concretized; and lived space, which is representation and "directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols"<sup>115</sup> [emphasis in original]. Although this tripartite schematic is not adhered to as an analytic device here, it does suggest how space is being conceived of: as active, processual, riddled with extant and emerging power relations, and unable to complete or be completed in any way. Although Lefebvre was one of many scholars to chide Foucault for his use of "floating spatial metaphors,"<sup>116</sup> this paper will also take seriously the conflicting view that the latter's "vision of how the subject emerges is highly spatialized."<sup>117</sup>

As Doreen Massey reminds readers, while space is "from the beginning integral to the constitution

of...political subjectivities,” it too “is the production of interrelations” and “does not exist prior to identities/entities.”<sup>118</sup> Nicky Gregson and Gillian Rose offer a useful analog in “Taking [Judith] Butler Elsewhere.” Alluding to Butler’s assertion that “gender is a kind of imitation for which there is no original,” they suggest that space “is produced through citation in performances of particular subject positions and that—precisely because of this—it, this space, is citational, and itself iterative, unstable, performative.”<sup>119</sup> Brought about through repetition and performativity, space can never be static or assured. Massey refers to attempts to render space so “the taming of the spatial,”<sup>120</sup> tactics for which include collapsing space with or subjugating it to time, hewing it with sharp conceptual segmentations, such as “local place” and “space out there,” and presenting it as “a surface on which we are placed.”<sup>121</sup> Many of the techniques and tactics of the Atlanta BeltLine’s production of space employ or respond to exactly these tactics.

#### *Affective Modulation in the Biopolitical City*

In “Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect,” Nigel Thrift warns that “systematic knowledges of the creation and mobilization of affect have become an integral part of the urban landscape,” allowing for “more and more sophisticated interventions in various registers of urban life” that are “being deployed (mainly but not only by the rich and powerful) to political ends.”<sup>122</sup> As Lisa Blackman also notes, although affect “opens up analysis of subjectification to the realm of the potential,” scholars such as Brian Massumi, Lauren Berlant and Patricia Clough have also insisted that “capitalism has developed more and more strategies for the modulating and augmenting of affect in ways that might close down hope and extend biopolitical racism.”<sup>123</sup> Such warnings animate one of the central concerns of this paper: how are the affective registers of urbanites being modulated in order to further the spatialized expansion of biopolitical racism?

It is important to note here that while there is no stable definition of affect, it is being used here to denote something that is related but irreducible to emotion. Although there are substantial disagreements concerning this disjuncture, affect has been differentiated from emotion by a number of scholars, particularly with regard to its non- or pre-conscious qualities: Gilles Deleuze refers to affect as “an anonymous force (force for existing, capacity for being affected)”<sup>124</sup>; Massumi as “one’s own vitality,”<sup>125</sup> which has an “unformed and unstructured”<sup>126</sup> quality; and both Sianne Ngai and Ben Anderson have aligned affective environments with

Raymond Williams' 'structure of feeling,' relating the former's ability to "escape qualification" to the latter's tendency to lie "at the very edge of semantic availability."<sup>127</sup> Lawrence Grossberg differentiates between affect and emotion by highlighting that affect is not, as is emotion, constrained to a subject and "unlike emotions, affective states are neither structured narratively nor organized in response to our interpretations of situations."<sup>128</sup> Emotions, then, could be said to be situated or, in Massumi's language, captured affects, contingent on encounters and reliant on social construction.

Though noting that neither affect nor biopower can be singularly defined "as both terms morph and mutate as they are drawn into connection with different theorists, issues, sites, concerns and problems,"<sup>129</sup> Anderson nonetheless understands the two concepts to have a direct and distinct relation. Anderson suggests that the "surpluses of life"<sup>130</sup>—the "life" that Foucault insists constantly escapes the "techniques that govern and administrate it"<sup>131</sup>—can be productively explored as an "affective life" that he claims is both an "object-target of" and a "condition for" contemporary forms of biopower (as "power has not just discovered affectivity," Anderson limits his argument to advanced liberal democracies).<sup>132</sup> Quoting Foucault, he notes that as a *dispositif*, biopower consists of "a certain manipulation of relations of forces, either developing them in a particular direction, blocking them, stabilizing them, utilizing them, etc." Discipline and biopolitics attempt to manipulate the force of affect differently: the former, which "has as its primary target *actions*," will condition "the physical and biological basis of what a body can do; the body's reactions and actions are automated through a continuous entraining of sequences of action"<sup>133</sup>; the latter will address instead populations, understanding them "in terms of collective affects" which can be charted and regulated, and to that end segmenting them "into a set of differentiated affective publics."<sup>134</sup>

Although such techniques, in a broad sense, are specifically relational to biopower whatever the temporal context, Thrift relates the increased modulation of affect, always central to urban imaginaries, to the ascendancy of the creative city thesis:

As cities are increasingly expected to have 'buzz', to be 'creative', and to generally bring forth the powers of invention and intuition, all of which can be forged into economic weapons, so the active engineering of the affective registers of cities has become highlighted as the harnessing of the talent of transformation ... whereas affect has always, of course, been a constant of urban experience, now affect is more and more likely to be actively engineered with the result that it is

becoming something more akin to...a set of constantly performing relays and junctions that are laying down all manner of new emotional histories and geographies.

In other words, although cities may be seen, as he rather poetically suggests, as “roiling maelstroms of affect,”<sup>135</sup> those storms are increasingly delimited, delineated and deployed through projects, policies and narratives related to the creative city.

### *The Aestheticization of Everyday Gentrification*

Although the discussion of gentrification given earlier in this paper focused on “events,” so to speak, the process is far more variable, dynamic and, as Hackworth and Smith’s temporal schematic suggests, intentionally induced. Further and importantly for the Atlanta BeltLine, the process, as Loretta Lees notes, has become “intertwined with shifts in housing finance and low-income housing assistance,” which sediments “the role of public policy in the phenomenon, and indeed the phenomenon in public policy.” HUD, particularly, encourages “the revitalization initiatives of community-based organizations (read pro-gentrification groups)” to address issues of “environmental sustainability” and “a decline in the sense of community” through “the redevelopment of brownfield sites” and increased “livability.” Through such efforts, gentrification is increasingly presented as “a blueprint for civilized city life” and “prescribed as medicine for decaying inner cities.”<sup>136</sup>

Although much of the scholarly literature on gentrification has addressed the materialist hows and whys of the processes, debating supply or demand-side causality and the relative salience of cultural and economic factors in the phenomenon, when approached as a feature of biopolitical urbanism, gentrification appears as a logical outcome and a spatialized reinforcement of the racism that allows biopower to work. As Foucault notes, such rationales are not strictly limited to the capitalist state. Further, as Rosalyn Deutsche insists, “uncovering the economic determinations of spatial redifferentiation” does not “illuminate the operations of space as a determining weight on social life or as ideology...Capitalist space or what Lefebvre calls abstract space” functions “as a space of control because it is generalized from specificity and diversity, from its relation to social subjects, and from their specific uses of space.”<sup>137</sup>

The aestheticization of everyday life, generalizing through the increasing prevalence of easily replicable and recognizable sets of aesthetics that infiltrate every aspect of lived space, certainly contributes to such

disjunctures. It also, this paper will argue, contributes to the gentrification process. The relations between public art and urban redevelopment are long-standing and contentious, but in the 1980s scholars began to note the interrelation of artists, gallery owners and art critics and gentrification in New York City. The two seminal texts on the issue from this period—Cara Gendel and Deutsche’s 1984 “The Fine Art of Gentrification” and Sharon Zukin’s *Loft Living*—both examine in close detail the economic processes involved in what would later become known as the “SoHo effect” or “artist-led gentrification.” While both Zukin and Gendel and Deutsche insisted on the culpability of the art world in these processes, they also followed Smith’s assertion that “where the ‘urban pioneers’ venture, the banks, real-estate companies, the state or other collective economic actors have generally gone before.”<sup>138</sup> The processes they described could be more aptly classified as artist-related or –supported gentrification.

Nonetheless, narratives linking gentrification and artists in New York, as well as gay and lesbian ‘pioneers’ in San Francisco, eventually culminated in a standardized narrative concerning gentrification.<sup>139</sup> The story goes that, lured by low rents and diverse environments and nonplussed by crime, poverty and/or structural dilapidation, artists and/or LGBT people move into low-income, generally people of color neighborhoods and invest the area with either “sweat equity” geared towards architectural revitalization (usually gay men) or a general bohemian veneer (artists) which attracts the middle-class who move into the area, displace both populations and proceed to hollow out the aesthetic that attracted them there in the first place. Through this story, gentrification is naturalized, its origins predicated on essentialized views of artists and/or LGBT individuals who are often presented in media coverage of such occurrences as iconoclasts, independent, innovative, inspired or in need of inspiration, optimistic, progressive or even simply beyond social responsibility. Also implicit in this narrative is that artist-led gentrification requires a certain amount of spatial containment to function—a particular neighborhood ‘feel’ or hip, and therefore necessarily limited, arts scene must be established by the “shock troops” of gentrification to draw in the ‘true’ gentrifiers. States, banks, developers, landlords, other economic actors, public policy and even the city itself—in short, those actors likely to have already been on the block, so to speak—vanish.

*Biopolitical Urbanism on the Atlanta BeltLine*

In the chapter that follows, the disciplinary space of Atlantic Station, a New Urbanist development in Midtown, Atlanta, will be contrasted to the security space of the ABL corridor in order to draw out how each affects its users. Residents' and patrons' assessments of both spaces as they have been presented in local newspapers, online review sites and New Urbanist blogs, particularly those that describe the “feel” of these spaces and their designations of either site as suburban or urban will be considered to begin to chart out how the affective resonances produced by each mode of power are understood through the rubric of “authentic” urbanity. Chapter Three will focus on ABL-planned spatial realignments and aesthetics in co-joined neighborhoods of Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown. The former, a historically white, working-class neighborhood, has been undergoing artist-related gentrification since well before the involvement of the BeltLine in the area while the latter has worked to retain its predominately black resident base through periods of Olympic and Cabbagetown-related development. Three ABL artworks, including one that directly relates the threat of ABL displacement to both race and aesthetics, will be discussed in relation to the already-existing development that has occurred there in order to understand how the ABL intends to extend this process in an area where it has focused a considerable amount of attention and received substantial residential support. The final chapter will also consider the relationship between ABL aesthetics and development but in the context of Pittsburgh, a predominately black, working-class neighborhood in southwest Atlanta that has been particularly resistant to the BeltLine’s advances there. This chapter will consider a set of interviews that concern residential perceptions of the ABL and the first piece of art it attempted to place in the neighborhood. Two other pieces that have been removed by residents will be considered as well in order to map out both how these pieces attempt to align residents with the dominant aesthetic values of the project and how Pittsburgh residents address the impasse of biopower.

## 2 SPACES OF SECURITY, SPACES OF DISCIPLINE AND THE CULTURAL POLITICS OF URBAN

### AUTHENTICITY

Rather than an explicit conflict over political aims what we have now  
is a confrontation between imaginations of the city.  
—Doreen Massey, *For Space*<sup>140</sup>

On the weekend of October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2005, fireworks exploded, hot air balloons lifted, musicians performed and celebrities shopped at the grand opening of Atlantic Station in Midtown, Atlanta.<sup>141</sup> The largest New Urbanist redevelopment in the United States, this much anticipated project metamorphosed the 138-acre property of the former Atlantic Steel Mill into a mixed-use enclave that contains eleven acres slated for parkland development, millions of feet of retail and business space and enough residential property to house 10,000 Atlantans.<sup>142</sup> Home to the Southeast's first LEED-certified high-rise and its first IKEA location<sup>143</sup>—the first to serve sweet tea and grits<sup>144</sup>—Atlantic Station had been eagerly anticipated by sustainability proponents and shoppers alike, not to mention intown Atlantans looking for a new way to avoid the city's notorious traffic congestion. Lauded by the Congress for the New Urbanism as a walkable, “concentrated community with a functional mix of affordable housing, business and retail, and cultural elements”<sup>145</sup> in the midst of a transit-challenged city, Atlantic Station was ambitiously designed to offer residents a comprehensive “live, work, play” experience. Opened just four months after Glenwood Park's completion and two weeks prior to the municipal adoption of the Atlanta BeltLine Redevelopment Plan, the towering Atlantic Station (AS) is perhaps the city's most conspicuous manifestation of the smart growth planning agenda that was finally coalescing that fall.

As with the ABL, the AS concept originated in a Georgia Tech College of Architecture student's graduate thesis. Brian Leary, its author, attended Tech with Ryan Gravel during the 1990s, both pursuing bachelor's degrees in architecture and masters in city planning, both mentored by the same professor, Dr. Catherine Ross. Tech students have been central to the instrumentalization of smart growth in Atlanta and, as the ecstatic *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine* headline “Mentoring Masterminds: Catherine Ross Saw the Creative Birth of Atlantic Station and the BeltLine” suggests, the institution considers both projects exemplary of the sustainable urbanism

it attempts to advance locally.<sup>146</sup> After years of being paired in media coverage and on conference panels, Leary and Gravel began working together officially in 2009 when Leary was appointed President and CEO of BeltLine, Inc. The ABL cited his twelve years of experience at AS—particularly his “marketing efforts to attract corporate residents, national retailers and international attractions”<sup>147</sup> to the development—as instrumental to his appointment, intended to guide the brownfield and infill development expected to occur within the ABL’s Zoning Overlay.

Although the ABL expressed enthusiasm about its new hire, the Atlantic Station fanfare had all but vanished by the time of Leary’s appointment. Following a number of residential construction delays and the fiscal events of 2007-2008, many investors had walked away from the project and by 2008 AS was being portrayed in the media as a “flagging” development.<sup>148</sup> Further, negative assessments of AS resounded through the very discursive arenas where the project aimed to achieve (i.e. blogs, alternative newspapers and other media that address New Urbanism or urbanism more generally, or are otherwise associated with ‘creatives’). By the time a majority ownership of AS was sold on the last day of 2010, local criticisms of the development were so pervasive that the new owners not only publicly acknowledged them, but also sought them out—as AS had failed to attract the “young, affluent and creative populace”<sup>149</sup> of Midtown, their critiques were aggressively solicited in service of the “extreme makeover” planned for this “house on fire.”<sup>150</sup> And criticisms poured in. While the new ownership broke the suggestions for improvement they received into four categories (“Security,” “Better Experience,” “Intown,” “No Mall, No Corporate”), the complaints that prompted their taxonomy revolved around two main issues: patron behavior and/or public safety in the retail district and the suburban feel of the development.<sup>151</sup>

Given that the stated smart growth/New Urbanist goal of stemming sprawl is presumably accomplished by enticing suburbanites and/or potential suburbanites to inhabit the city center, assertions that their projects feel suburban could be read as an attribute. The accusatory tone of the AS complaints, however, suggests otherwise, gesturing to the development project’s broader aims. As Robert Cochran has explored at length, “Atlanta’s growth machine [smart growth], operating to advance its own designs, has worked to steer people into sculpting themselves as creative civic residents. The space of Atlantic Station...is elaborately constructed to help

accomplish this.”<sup>152</sup> As AS and the ABL are both constitutive elements of the same smart machine, the wary apprehension and outright rejection frequently elicited by AS could be understood as detrimental to the ABL, a failure to adequately contribute to the “live, work play” subjectification process that weakens the entire assemblage. The ABL has, however, experienced strikingly different fortunes than AS in the realm of public opinion, suggesting a somewhat different configuration. Read through Deleuze and Guattari's narrative of subjectification, AS appears as an intown materialization of a “point of subjectification,” instrumental in the processual creation of new subjectivities.

The “finite linear proceedings”<sup>153</sup> that constitute subjectification, they argue, depart from a particular point. Although that point “can be anything,” it must involve “the double turning away, betrayal and existence under reprieve.” One of the concrete examples they offer is the figure of an anorexic for whom food has become a point of subjectification: “anorexics...save themselves by betraying food, which is equally a traitor,” thereby enacting the double turning away and entering an existence under reprieve.<sup>154</sup> For contemporary urban development discourses, suburbia always constitutes such a point of subjectification. While US suburbia (always a monolith in these discourses) has “long [been] considered kitschy, consumerist and self-serving,”<sup>155</sup> popular New Urbanist and creative city tomes extend this somewhat banal dismissal. Their “blandly conservative,”<sup>156</sup> “alienated and generic”<sup>157</sup> suburbia is “an architectural version of *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*”<sup>158</sup> that preys on the “disposable city,”<sup>159</sup> indicted for everything from “unnecessary consumption”<sup>160</sup> to climate change to the excessive popularity of television and automobiles—“potentially sociopathic device[s]” that result in all manner of ills themselves, from “automobile-induced maladaptive behavior”<sup>161</sup> to the undermining of “America's ability to compete in the global economy.”<sup>162</sup> Having promised and then thusly betrayed the American dream, the health of the environment, the economy and/or the community, it is turned away from by those to whom it made such promises.

From this point of subjectification issues a subject of enunciation (a subject that states where the departing line might go) and the subjects of its statements (those betrayed). In this example then, the subject of enunciation could be any one (or more) of the development discourses, which address their statements to those who have turned away from the suburbs and promises reprieve from the implacable “march of suburbia.”<sup>163</sup> The

city, always defined relationally with the country and the suburbs, appears here as the antithesis of suburbia, the valued term in a sub/urban binary. Hierarchized by the argument that dense urban development, enhanced walkability and mass-transit construction could and should be the antidote to suburban sprawl, this binarization sets a regressive suburbia in antagonistic tension with an urbanity that is simultaneously nostalgic and progressive; in “commending a *return* to compact housing, front porches, pedestrian areas, shared urban assets, and the city of many public spaces” [emphasis mine],<sup>164</sup> these development discourses are commending a return to the 'authentic' city, to the city as it theoretically existed prior to the post-World War II popularization of the suburbs only updated to suit the needs of a post-class, post-race, post-gender meritocracy.

In the context of a smart, creative Atlanta, Atlantic Station appears as a particularly powerful point of subjectification, its betrayal perhaps even more offending than that of suburbia since it re-enacts the suburban within the city-limits and in the name of New Urbanism. The Atlanta BeltLine appears alongside this double turning away as a subject of enunciation (one that has, perhaps, even learned from the missteps of Brian Leary), its statements—verbal, spatial and aesthetic—charting a course for how such urbanism can be enacted authentically. As “various forms of the... 'normalization' imposed upon an individual consist in making him or her change points of subjectification,”<sup>165</sup> this chapter is particularly interested in how AS and the ABL normalize differently through their respective physical spaces and how those processes are understood by the individuals and populations they address. Subsequently, the relative city planning models of AS and the ABL will be detailed and contrasted

## **2.1 Atlantic Station: Disciplining Urban Play**

In some ways, Atlantic Station, like all New Urbanist developments, could be considered overtly disciplinary. The movement's emphatic espousal of the power of the built environment to transform individuals, particularly their physical bodies and their involvements in the social interactions that will then transform the community, make these aims plain. As Brian Leary is wont to point out, for instance, “Atlanta is a city where we are conditioned to drive. [AS's planners] want a community where you're conditioned to walk.”<sup>166</sup> The architectural structures and processes of city planning on which New Urbanists rely to effect such conditionings

are emphatically linked with discipline in Foucault's writing. Building towards his analysis of panopticism in *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault describes, for example, how architecture was elemental to the emergence of discipline. Particular institutional structures allowed “the old simple schema of confinement and enclosure” to be replaced with a working of power that, “without any physical instrument other than architecture and geometry,” operates to directly “act on those it shelters, to provide a hold on their conduct, to carry the effects of power right to them, to make it possible to know them, to alter them.” In short, “stones can make people docile and knowable.”<sup>167</sup> Panopticism's predecessors are found not only in such architectural structures, but also in entire cities, namely the plague town, a “utopia of the perfectly governed city,”<sup>168</sup> and the “almost ideal model” of the military camp, a “short-lived, artificial city, built and reshaped at will.”<sup>169</sup> While New Urbanist rhetoric links the interventions of its disciplinary architecture and city planning to empowerment, civic responsibility and the fulfillment of desire rather than docility and knowability, another of Leary's statements about the workings of AS suggests the latter set of effects: the development was intended to “capitalize on the high educational attainment of its market-rate residents” in order to train the residents of its more affordable units “to move up to market-rate units one day...The environment will be par excellence, supplying its residents with the tools they need to grow.”<sup>170</sup>

Foucault takes up the practicalities of both disciplinary and biopolitical urban planning in the opening lecture of *Security, Territory, Population*, which the following analyses of AS and the ABL's planning models will largely rely upon. As exemplars of disciplinary town planning, Foucault describes a “whole series of artificial towns” constructed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and not unlike NU brownfield developments. Both spaces are, for instance, entirely predicated on their construction sites, as they are “built from scratch...where there was previously nothing.”<sup>171</sup> While claims that an urban space slated for redevelopment is “empty” are always suspect (as Charles Ruteiser points out, such assertions elide the fact that these areas are usually “zones of conflict between different groups...usually full of undesirable and/or unacknowledged uses or users”<sup>172</sup>), the particular “nothingness” that brownfields offer is a dearth of functioning city infrastructure—a valuable commodity for developers interested in crafting comprehensive “live, work, play” environments. While the cost of constructing these necessary systems could be read as a detriment, there

increasingly exists federal, municipal and project-based funding for sustainable infrastructure construction and the absence allows developers an unusual—at least in established urban areas—amount of control over not only the interchangeable elements of their spaces, but also the foundational ones. Since all the streets in AS were built to order, for instance, the bicycle lanes and ample sidewalks that flank them did not have to be designed with the constraints of existing city streets—such as narrowness—in mind. Further, these streets, paths and sidewalks could be constructed to guide flows of traffic towards particular areas of AS, such as the retail district.

Discipline not only “works in an empty, artificial space that is to be completely constructed,”<sup>173</sup> but sometimes “requires enclosure” in order to specify “a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself.”<sup>174</sup> Reflecting the isolation of its former industrial tenant (factories have long been known for their enclosure, compared in the seventeenth century to “the monastery, the fortress, a walled town”<sup>175</sup>), AS is largely discrete from the cityscape as a whole, an aspect of its property that the development intentionally emphasizes. In addition to a rail line and an interstate that predate the development and form two of its borders, AS has spatialized its other boundary lines by constructing inward facing architectural structures along them, namely the IKEA building and a long row of townhouses. The semiotics of AS's internal space further spell out its insularity. The small, discreet, dark gray signs used to mark AS streets, for instance, stand in stark contrast to the glaring green and white City of Atlanta standard, making one's passage into or out of the development immediately apparent. Although many urbanists have criticized brownfield developments for hewing “islands unto themselves”<sup>176</sup> out of their cities, it is precisely such isolation from the regular activity of the urban landscape that allows the metronymic rhythms of such developments to unfold largely unhindered and uncontested. While the entirety of AS is zoned private property, these aesthetic, geographical and architectural specifications make visually apprehendable that AS is a “protected place of disciplinary monotony,”<sup>177</sup> a place where a particular set of behaviors is expected from those on its grounds. Although discipline can be “absolutely discreet,” as it functions “permanently and largely in silence,” such spatial markers render it “absolutely indiscreet”<sup>178</sup> as well, expressed by “innumerable petty mechanisms” in the architecture that can “only be seen as unimportant if one forgets the role of this instrumentation.”<sup>179</sup>

Reflecting the maxim that disciplinary towns “are not thought of on the basis of the larger territory,”<sup>180</sup>

in this case the city, AS is largely inaccessible by public transit (though it does run a private, erratically scheduled and oft-contested shuttle to a nearby MARTA station) and has only one major entrance, the 17<sup>th</sup> Street bridge. Ironically a major component of its Transit-Oriented Development status since no public buses traverse its dedicated bus lanes, the bridge was constructed to accommodate automobile traffic from Midtown, the area of Atlanta that AS most aggressively targets for patronage.<sup>181</sup> Working in tandem with its enclosure, private property status, and attendant enforceable “Rules for Conduct and Respect,” this limited accessibility aides the development in monitoring and managing its population and its production of the visible, consumable diversity that is a hallmark of New Urbanist rhetoric. AS's temporary institution of a motorcycle ban in 2008 exemplifies the disciplinary mechanisms of both its enclosure and its hermeneutics. When a group of motorcyclists, mostly black and male, who visited AS on weekends were deemed improperly disciplined to the space—ostensibly due to the loudness of their machines though their race and masculinity were invariably noted in online complaints—the development issued a wholesale ban. Although temporary, this action effectively charted out the behaviors and two-wheeled methods of “alternative” transportation (namely scooters and bicycles) deemed appropriate on AS grounds.

While this ban was legal due to AS's zoning (this caused all manner of confusion, as many presumed that at least 17<sup>th</sup> Street, which runs through Midtown, was public infrastructure), its layout enhanced its ability to be enforced. Based on the figure of the camp, “a diagram of power that acts by means of general visibility,”<sup>182</sup> the internal organization of disciplinary towns fosters high levels of surveillance and ensures the abilities of those within it to rapidly assess the rank of others distributed in and circulated through its network of relations. Not organized in relation to the rest of the territory, the disciplinary town is constructed “on the basis of a smaller, geometrical figure...a kind of architectural module,”<sup>183</sup> namely the subdivided square or rectangle. While the external boundaries of AS are more akin in shape to an isosceles triangle, the internal grounds, divided into three major areas, are dominated by this recurrent module. In both “well-planned camps and good architecture,” this figure is “not merely the application of symmetry...but is framed and functions thanks to well-calculated dissymmetries.”<sup>184</sup> Arranged according to the tightness of each module's internal grid system and its attendant primary use, the dissymmetries of these modules—both internally to each and as they function in concert

together—reflect distributions of wealth and social status throughout the town.

For all its mixed-use rhetoric and perhaps intentions, which would imply a co-mingling of architectural structures and their uses, as well as of various individuals, AS's grounds nonetheless reflect this segmented, purpose-driven figure of the camp. One end of town, where the grid is tightest, is reserved for “trades, artisans, and shops, as well as markets.”<sup>185</sup> In AS this is The District, situated on the end of the development nearest Midtown and tightly gridded to resemble an urban downtown. While there are some residential condos in this area, the massive underground parking garage atop which it is constructed and the brightly lit sign proclaiming “Welcome to Atlantic Station” suggest the primacy of commercial use. Its internal grid tightens as it moves inward, away from big box retailers such as Target and Publix and towards smaller, more expensive (or hip, as in the case of H&M) shops and boutiques. Adjacent to The District is The Commons, a dedicated residential zone constituted by several small grids arrayed around a central lake. The area “where people must live”<sup>186</sup> in disciplinary towns is much more loosely gridded than the commercial area, reflected most blatantly in the splitting of the main thoroughfare, 17<sup>th</sup> Street, so that each quadrant of The Commons is easily accessible by car. The larger, more expensive single family homes in this area are, in keeping with the camp schematic, closer to this “main street” and therefore the lake. Finally, there is The Village, situated on the farthest end of the property from the main entrance. The most affordable housing in the development is available here, deemed “student” housing though the buildings have no affiliation with any local educational institution. The grid system is loosest here, which in the camp implies residences; here, however, this is a result of IKEA, a mammoth structure that takes up most of The Village and around which some student housing is fitted in. Beyond this is a small, right-turn-only exit, the only on this end of the development.

In this “simple schema” can be seen “the disciplinary treatment of multiplicities in space,” an arrangement intended to construct and organize these multiplicities “according to the triple process of hierarchy, precise communications of relations of power, and functional effects specific to this distribution.”<sup>187</sup> While one of the functional effects is simply ensuring consumption, this is also an aspect of AS's subjectification process. As Katherine Hankins and Emily Powers, who conducted a three-month ethnography in Atlantic Station in 2006, have summarized, the ideal “consumer-resident” of AS is someone who owns her own home, furnishes it with

products from IKEA, works from home or on the grounds, and eats, socializes and shops in The District, eschewing automobile transportation and entering a sort of voluntary quarantine on AS's grounds in the name of walkable urbanism.<sup>188</sup>

As in the plague town, such a “social 'quarantine’”<sup>189</sup> is meant to meet chaos with order, to “sort out every possible confusion” in the snarl of ill-planned urbanity. In both cases, however, a “whole literary fiction of the festival” attends these spaces, suggesting an environment far less orderly.<sup>190</sup> While in the plague town this fiction of “suspended laws, lifted prohibitions, the frenzy of passing time, [and] bodies mingling together without respect”<sup>191</sup> was also a grotesquerie of death, in AS the festival is one of luxury, sexuality and a certain licentious hipness. Heralded as the city's “sexiest address,”<sup>192</sup> this “arcade-on-steroids”<sup>193</sup> bills itself as a place where residents can spend the time they save on commuting doing “anything [they] want.”<sup>194</sup> Prospective residents are promised that, given their presence (as the future tense in the AS copy implies) in this “oasis,”<sup>195</sup> the “24-hour community will buzz with pedestrian traffic on its wide boulevards and the crowd of people in the sidewalk cafes and expansive parks.”<sup>196</sup> Designed by Leary to be a set of “big buildings with big games for big kids costing big bucks,”<sup>197</sup> AS attempts to sell itself through creative class rhetoric as a locale that will “give residents an identity.”<sup>198</sup> Leary has had little reserve in attesting to this. In the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* article “Cracking the Zip Code of Atlanta Cool,” he admitted that his dogged procurement of a dedicated AS zip code was a “very deliberate” bid to use the number as a “lifestyle statement.” “We want them,” he proclaimed, “to think 'I am 30363.’”<sup>199</sup>

This carnivalesque fiction, though suggestive of sociality and freedom from restrictions, belies “the political dream” of the plague town “which was exactly [the fiction's] reverse: not the collective festival but strict divisions” and the “penetration of regulation into even the smallest details of everyday life.”<sup>200</sup> Utilizing discipline's constant codification between the permitted and the forbidden, AS codes particular modes of transportation, consumption patterns and social behaviors as effectively obligatory as it offers everything that is permissibly desirable within walking or cycling distance on its privately regulated grounds. Although decisions concerning preferred transit options, social networks and dwelling places are “aleatory and unpredictable” when taken “in themselves or individually,”<sup>201</sup> AS manages these unknowns by posing its optimal model—the

consumer-resident, the ideal urbanite—and then disciplining individual residents towards it on and through its grounds.

## **2.2 Securing the Authentically Urban: The Milieu of the Atlanta BeltLine**

Although the Atlanta BeltLine, as a smart growth project, addresses many of the same phenomena that AS attempts to manage, its approach to these issues is strikingly different. Rather than addressing individuals as “bodies capable of performances, and required performances,” as discipline does, the ABL instead “tries to affect, precisely, a population”<sup>202</sup> through the apparatuses of security. A “form of biopower that addresses the interplay between freedom and danger,” security, according to Ben Anderson, can be “understood as a break with discipline and an intensification of biopolitics.”<sup>203</sup> Using “forecasts, statistical estimates and overall mechanisms,” the biopolitical program of the ABL takes choices concerning transit and habitation at the “collective level” where, over time, they display “constants that are easy, or at least possible, to establish.”<sup>204</sup> Rather than using this information to decide what any given individual should be doing at any given time, the apparatuses of security will attempt to predict what populations will do on average and to adjust accordingly. From this approach the notion of the milieu appears as a “target for intervention”<sup>205</sup> through which populations can be reached. The milieu refers not only to the materiality to which populations are “biologically bound” but also to the “series of events produced by these individuals, populations, and groups, and quasi natural events which occur around them.”<sup>206</sup>

Such an approach to the management of populations places a primacy on circulation, which must be ensured, enhanced and regulated. As a larkish example of security's concern with circulation, Foucault offers the never-realized plan of an eighteenth-century architect for “reconstructing [a French town] around a sort of boulevard-promenade in the shape of a heart.”<sup>207</sup> While Foucault insists that “it's true he is dreaming,” this “delightful project” recalls immediately the form of the ABL,<sup>208</sup> a promenade that takes its shape by encircling and ensuring circulation the core, or heart, of the city. Acting almost as a foil to the enclosed brownfield of AS, decontextualized from the rest of the city, the ABL intends to restructure the rest of Atlanta in reference to its “boulevard-promenade,” which will reconstruct 6,454 acres itself, and which has already prompted over one-billion dollars worth of investment in the half-mile surrounding the corridor, and is expected to drive the

development of a sizable portion of the city's landmass that radiates out from this area. Along the Eastside Trail, extant businesses have refaced their back entrances to make themselves accessible from the trail, new businesses are constructed with patios that open onto the corridor and new housing has even been built facing the trail—a development for which a road had to be cut so that it could be accessible from surface streets.

Unlike discipline, security does not require complete construction nor will it reconstruct elements so that they “arrive at a point of perfection.” Instead, it will “work on site,” relying on “a number of material givens” and attempting to maximize “the positive elements, for which one provides the best possible circulation.”<sup>209</sup> Unlike brownfield redevelopments that rely on a lack of city infrastructure, the ABL intends to repurpose extant freight rail lines even though these do not fit the overall vision of the ABL perfectly: there are gaps in the proposed loops; the rails are set up for heavy freight rather than light rail; some of them are still in industrial use; there are several architectural impasses that impede the corridor and as of yet no single plan has been agreed upon for how to breach them. Nonetheless, construction moves forward in the name of “maximizing the good circulation by diminishing the bad.”<sup>210</sup>

One of the first practical interventions into security towns to this end “involved cutting routes through town” and widening streets so that they could ensure multiple functions, such as trade, hygiene, surveillance and connectivity.<sup>211</sup> Interestingly, the hygienic function that then involved opening up areas “where dwellings were too densely packed”<sup>212</sup> has been almost reversed in the ABL rhetoric; it will densely pack dwellings in the name of air pollution. At any rate, the new route cut through Atlanta by the ABL is perhaps its most appealing and certainly its most materially striking feature. Running through a portion of the city largely unseen from major roadways and formerly difficult to access by bicycle, the corridor not only dramatically reduces walking and cycling travel times between popular locales and a variety of neighborhoods but also attempts to optimize these experiences. Ranked in 2006 by *Bicycling Magazine* as one of the three worst cities in the US for cycling, Atlanta has long been known for the challenges it poses cyclists.<sup>213</sup> A lack of basic bicycle amenities, such as dedicated and consistent lanes, a hilly landscape, narrow, uneven roads that are often pocked and/or punctuated by steel plates, and motorists that are notoriously unfriendly to cycling traffic can make biking through the city stressful, physically demanding and potentially dangerous. The newly paved, flat, smooth and off-street ABL

trails, upon completion, attend to each of these concerns, altering the physical landscape in order to proliferate the health and longevity of some city residents while also making the city more appealing to the potential citizens—be they corporations or notoriously elusive creative class workers—it would most like to court. The “great movement,” as Brian Leary, acting as President of BeltLine, Inc., put it, offered by the rail lines also justified one of the ABL's first spatializations of a biopolitical caesura in the Atlanta population. Although Leary has suggested that the trails were formerly “empty,” he has also noted their widespread use by Atlanta's “residentially challenged,” many of whom had lived on the trails for years.<sup>214</sup> The onset of ABL construction has displaced an uncertain number of Atlanta's homeless and destroyed a number of dwellings, many of which were built by the Mad Housers, a local non-profit that constructs semi-permanent and temporary housing for homeless Atlantans. This mass displacement is generally discursively framed as an unintended consequence of ABL construction rather than an actively made decision.<sup>215</sup>

While residential usages are no longer plausible along most areas of the corridor, it is, as a “public asset” and a security space, open for use by anyone, including its former residents. In the eighteenth-century security towns that Foucault contrasts to the artificial disciplinary towns, the “insecurity” of the latter “was increased by the influx of the floating populations of beggars, vagrants, delinquents, criminals, thieves, murderers, and so on, who might come, as everyone knows, from the country.”<sup>216</sup> While it is suburbia that is being recoded as a source for delinquents and criminals that might come to the city, in spaces of security the circulation of everything and everyone, including these populations, must “be built into the plan”<sup>217</sup> of a good street or corridor with the aim of “minimizing what is risky and inconvenient, like theft and disease, while knowing that they will never be completely suppressed.”<sup>218</sup> The ABL has thus far undertaken measures to diminish theft and increase surveillance by clearing brush, pruning trees and installing user-requested lighting along the Eastside Trail and also employing a specialized and semi-private Path Police force comprised of military veterans and some on-duty police officers pulled from neighborhood beats. The ABL's primary response to incidents of crime along the Eastside Trail (none have been reported on the other two open trail segments) has been to encourage patrons to be “vigilant” as “there is only so much the police or the Atlanta BeltLine Inc. can do to make people safe,” reflecting that diminishment, rather than eradication, is the ABL's goal.<sup>219</sup>

Although risk may be involved in security spaces, “these town developments try to organize elements justified by their poly-functionality.”<sup>220</sup> The transition of the ABL from a transit project to a comprehensive redevelopment plan suggests this rationale at work. Much of the breadth of local support that the ABL has received has resulted from the multiplicity of its offerings: greenspace expansion, public art exhibitions, housing development, the stimulation of economic growth, and becoming “a living, breathing part of our community; not simply a means of getting somewhere, but a destination unto itself.”<sup>221</sup> Each element of the corridor is also designed to intersect with other forms of transit, increasing circulation options even beyond its own system. The ABL has become something of an umbrella for all extant and emerging transportation systems in Atlanta, lending its financial support and its name to projects such as the Atlanta Streetcar—now known as the Atlanta BeltLine and Atlanta Streetcar Transit and Trail System—to which it will connect.<sup>222</sup>

The easing of traffic congestion that this circulatory system intends to provide does not then rely on either disciplining individuals to one preferred mode of transit nor does it “attempt, at least not primarily or in a fundamental way, to make use of the relationship of obedience between a higher will, of the sovereign, and the wills of those subjugated to his will.”<sup>223</sup> Instead, traffic reduction will be encouraged by “the progressive self-cancellation of phenomena by the phenomena themselves.”<sup>224</sup> In other words, the variability of the ABL's offerings are meant to facilitate and anticipate a variety of uses that will progressively limit other transit options until using the ABL becomes commonsensical, thereby easing traffic congestion over the course of its twenty-five year implementation. Security's particular temporality is expressed here: this apparatus “works on the future.” Rather than planning a space “according to the static perception that would ensure the perfection of function then and there, as discipline does, it will “open onto a future that is not exactly controllable, not precisely measured or measurable” while also taking “into account precisely what might happen.” Hence security's “multivalent and transformable framework”—only with such flexibility can a hypothetical set of events be projected and regulated.<sup>225</sup>

This futurity and transformability is highlighted by the ABL's uneven construction schedule and erratic materialization. Various increments and elements of the corridor are not being built in accordance with a plan that has any obvious geographical or temporal coherency. Construction of the pedestrian and bicycle path does

not begin at any one point in the loop and extend linearly throughout the city, but is being completed in disjointed one-to-two mile segments peppered throughout the city. Interim or unpaved trails remain unlinked in many places and are in various states of accessibility, maintained and utilized according to the site-specific needs of the ABL and the neighborhoods in which they exist. Further, no one element of the ABL's construction is contingent on the completion of any others—except, perhaps, the rail system, which seems increasingly unlikely to materialize. As the ABL is working on a necessarily uncertain future, the expansion and production of its space functions not by “establishing limits and frontiers, or fixing locations,” but “above all and essentially, [by] making possible, guaranteeing, and ensuring circulation.”<sup>226</sup>

### **2.3 Defining Freedom, Defining Urbanity**

#### *The Death and Life of Great Atlanta Projects*

When Hankins and Powers conducted their ethnography of AS in the summer of 2006, they found the space being used as intended by “a 'well-behaved' public living and shopping in highly regulated spaces.”<sup>227</sup> While some of their interviewees noted the “hip feeling”<sup>228</sup> of the apartments and cited The District as a place to “feel trendy”<sup>229</sup> on a night out, this perception of AS was, as aforementioned, short-lived. Before long, assertions such as AS is “no better than a suburban strip mall hell”<sup>230</sup> dominated local discussions of the project. The 2011 AS social media campaign, launched by Mark Toro, set out under the auspices of discerning what might lure residents of Midtown, declared a “Mecca for the creative class,”<sup>231</sup> onto AS's grounds. Despite being a Midtown resident himself, Toro declared that he was “too old, white, male and straight to know what the intown market is seeking” and set about gathering critiques.<sup>232</sup> Overwhelmingly, the most oft-cited source of patrons' disenchantment with the development itself is its artificiality, which is strongly linked to perceptions of its suburbanity. Deemed a “surreal project”<sup>233</sup> from its outset and having long suffered accusations that it brings “the suburbs...to the city,”<sup>234</sup> AS has generated a steady stream of complaints since around 2008, the tone of which is suggested in the following comments: “Atlantic Station is a glorified suburban lifestyle center”; it “lack[s] soul and feel[s] like a movie set”; it “has always felt like a Disney wannabe”; AS “feels like a temporary amusement park”; it “feels like a tourist destination”; it “has this facade of being cool and unique” that isn't lived up to “once you get inside”; the restaurants all need to be revamped, replaced with “local ones, not crappy

chains”; Millennium Gate, AS's massive aesthetic centerpiece, is “extraterrestrial,” a “stupid fake archway” that should be replaced with “public art...approved by a panel of Atlanta tastemakers”; it offers an “urban-lite” experience; it is a “faux city-scape,” an example of “faux urbanism” and a “faux version of the city” that one commentator declared “unbearable for my urban sensitivities.”<sup>235</sup> Concerned that AS was becoming a “Potempkin village,” the local alternative paper *Creative Loafing* issued a direct plea to AS's new owners that epitomizes this strand of critique: “even though Atlantic Station is private property, please don't make it *feel* so much like private property” [emphasis in original].<sup>236</sup>

The second theme of AS complaints concerns public safety. Although Hankins and Powers found that AS “hosts people from different backgrounds who assert different identities” and co-exist there “without apparent conflict,”<sup>237</sup> the comments that comprise this strand tend to express blatantly anti-black racism. They correspondingly have very little relation to actual incidences of crime; as one commentator tellingly remarked to Toro, “whether there are incidents or not, security is perceived as an issue.”<sup>238</sup> When anti-black sentiments began appearing online in relation to AS (as early as 2006) they were rather sparse, but as the development's reputation as a desirable urban space has decreased, so has the racism increased. The current diatribe tends to speculate that AS has become “a new haven for thugs”<sup>239</sup> in the wake of the dismantlement of the nightclub scene in nearby Buckhead, which opened it up to “bad elements” and crime.<sup>240</sup> Complaints concerning AS being “overrun by truant kids,”<sup>241</sup> “wanna be...criminals,”<sup>242</sup> and dangerous, unruly teenagers serve as euphemistic but ultimately racialized iterations of the same commentary. Despite its ostensible aim of attracting “all people,” ownership has been incredibly receptive to these complaints; in direct response, curfews have been instituted, loitering banned, and three AS restaurants that often hosted hip hop DJs and were known to attract a young black clientele were shut down in the name of ridding the development of its “night club scene.”<sup>243</sup> Although some online commentators insist that the presence of inappropriately disciplined patrons are, in fact, the *only* authentic aspect of AS's otherwise sterile environment, others suggest that they are further evidence of AS's inauthenticity. The following statement, which refers to public safety in downtown Decatur but was made in response to the suggestion that AS needs a “little more danger”<sup>244</sup> to be authentic, summarizes this argument:

I am usually hit up for spare change after a certain hour. If there were more actual street life—

the positive type—this would either a) not happen or b) if it did it would not be so intimidating/frustrating, because there would be other people out and about. No, hookers and drug dealers do not thrive in thriving, authentic urban areas—quite the opposite they tend to thrive in the shadows of quite desolate areas.<sup>245</sup>

Contra these assertions about AS's inauthenticity and suburbanity, the ABL is consistently presented as revealing, reclaiming or reconstructing the authentic Atlanta. Even before a single aspect of the project was under construction, the concept was met with an enthusiasm that one local planner described as nearly blind: “People love it—and they don't know how much it is going to cost, what its going to look like, or what the technology is going to be! [Laughs] But they love it!”<sup>246</sup> Such sentiment has only increased as the project has developed, experiencing sharp spikes following the 2010 institution of the annual Art on the Atlanta BeltLine exhibitions and the 2012 opening of the Eastside Trail in much-sought-after Midtown. Expected to draw “coveted, young creative class workers”<sup>247</sup> to the city, the project has been “met with abundant eagerness”<sup>248</sup> not least, as Miriam Konrad notes in *Transporting Atlanta*, due to its “tantalizing possibility for revisioning the city's flavor.”<sup>249</sup> Interestingly, this 'flavor' is not necessarily something the ABL is understood to be crafting, but to be revealing. Offering urbanites the chance to, in Mayor Kasim Reed's words, “experience the city in a more intimate way,”<sup>250</sup> the ABL is not presented as constituting urbanity in and of itself. Instead, it “makes Atlanta,” the entirety of its milieu, “feel like a real city.”<sup>251</sup> Konrad suggests that the “unique sense of place” or “savory city feel” that the ABL promises prompt the evocative descriptions of the project, which has been variously described as “an emerald necklace,” “a band of green,” and an “oasis in the city.”<sup>252</sup> Perhaps the most telling assessments of the ABL are, however, those that define what it is not. The project has become so metonymic with urbanity in Atlanta that it is often presented as an obvious antithesis of the “soulless suburb[s],”<sup>253</sup> is lauded as an endeavor that will break the city's “suburban-centric” growth patterns and design,<sup>254</sup> and has even been situated as a potential victim of intown-suburbia that must be “saved” from “suburban-style development.”<sup>255</sup> Even if the ABL appears as chimerical to many, what it is not is decidedly clear. Konrad speculates that given the contingency of the project and the strength of its somewhat vague promise, the ABL's “potential for transforming Atlanta's image and mobility patterns is in large measure dependent on who claims ownership of its dream power.”<sup>256</sup>

Before moving forward with the comparison between the ABL and AS, it is important to note that although the former is a public space and the latter is private, it is unlikely that this aspect is the defining factor of the divergence in the projects' assessments. As the retail district of AS was recently rebranded as the “anti-mall,” it appears that complaints about AS's mall-like feel are likely in reference to the mall as an icon of suburbia rather than in reference to the development as a place of conspicuous consumption.<sup>257</sup> Retail is a major ABL component, as well; the Zoning Overlay mandates that the extant shops and restaurants behind which the trail runs provide direct access to trail users and that new developments place their storefronts and patios towards the trail.<sup>258</sup> Along the Eastside Trail, which has already spurred \$775 million worth of development in the half-mile around its two-mile length,<sup>259</sup> existing shops have already begun restructuring their back entrances as store fronts, prompting one user's observation that “the Eastside Trail is Atlanta’s boardwalk.”<sup>260</sup> Further, AS touts its “public” spaces as often as it does its retail shops and both The District and The Commons are centered on large greenspaces.

#### *Suburban Affectations, Affective Urbanity*

As Foucault notes, the development of biopolitics incited a shift in dominant perceptions of 'the population'; no longer viewed as a “collection of subjects of rights,” the population began to be perceived as “a set of processes to be managed at the level and on the basis of what is natural in those processes.”<sup>261</sup> Although this naturalness became “constantly accessible to agents and techniques of transformation,” the authority for such access came on the “condition that these agents and techniques [were] at once enlightened, reflected, analytical, calculated and calculating.”<sup>262</sup> Contemporary urban development discourses attempt to validate their claims to the “dream power” of the city writ large in a variety of fashions: by the presentation of New Urbanists as “urban design 'experts' who lead the public debate and try to democratically shape the dialogue...into holistic planning and design”;<sup>263</sup> by acknowledging the relations between spatiality and sociality, intervening in the former to enhance the latter; by linking enlightenment to urbanity by emphasizing the presence of gay and lesbian communities and artists, and by commending cosmopolitan multiculturalism; and, ultimately, by a constant analysis of how the “idealized artificial system”<sup>264</sup> of the suburbs infringes on the authenticity of the city. This authenticity is, however, largely related to visibility and to the production of an urban feel; as

*Suburban Nation* tellingly notes, within the New Urbanist framework, the more a place “resembles an authentic community, the more it is valued.”<sup>265</sup>

The production of such a resemblance relies not only on the built environment and visible social difference, but also on interventions into the affective registers of cities. Abby Smith, writing about users' perceptions of special collections artifacts, has argued that affect is always central to evaluations of authenticity:

what a single artifact seems to be can be understood not only with traditional forensic tools...but also by close examination of...its context, its implicit history as evidenced by its explicit appearance, and its uncanny ability to carry, through its very materiality, intangible affects...it is that capacity of an artifact to carry evidence that is accidental, unintentional, implicit or simply of secondary or tertiary importance from the point of view of the creator that is often most valued by users and is also referred to as its 'authenticity.'<sup>266</sup>

Following Smith, then, AS is illegible as an authentic urban object partially because its planners' use of an “optimal model” conveys overt authorial intent as the most salient feature of the development. When, for instance, AS began piping country music into its public spaces in response to the racist complaints about The District's young, black patrons, many commentators argued that this technique “smacked as blatant” even as they approved of attempts to alter the demographic of the development's clientèle.<sup>267</sup> Mark Toro's attempts to distance himself from his desired patrons through the deployment of identity markers could be read as an attempt to diminish such conveyance of intent. On the other hand, Ryan Gravel's frequent assertion that Atlantans “took ownership” of the ABL and molded it into a vision that outstrips the one presented in his thesis emphasizes the evolution of the ABL according to elements of tertiary importance from an authorial standpoint, heightening the project's ability to be perceived as authentic.

AS's ability to present itself as affectively authentic may be further interrupted by its disciplinary distribution of bodies through space, a compartmentalizing process that leaves little room for the unintentional. As Massey maintains, “an element of chance in space chimes with the current Zeitgeist,” which has “made it popular to revel in the glorious random mixity of it all.”<sup>268</sup> Creative cities, particularly, are expected to pulse with human difference—a city's “creative hubs”<sup>269</sup> are imagined to offer diverse, inclusive, active mixes of people and plenty of “indigenous street-level culture...where it is hard to draw the line between performer and spectator.”<sup>270</sup> While these imaginaries are evocative of the teeming crowd, discipline replaces just such a “crowd, the compact

mass” of mixity, with “a collection of separated individuals.”<sup>271</sup> As Hankins and Powers note, the public of AS coheres only “through the *visibility* of residents and consumers while they live, work and shop” without “apparent conflict or a collective identity” [emphasis in original]. While they argue that “the neoliberal ideal has been realized to a significant degree” in AS (insofar as “the state has become an individually based concept”),<sup>272</sup> AS's construction of the crowd nonetheless constitutes a salient stake in its attempt to become a “home to Midtown Atlanta's upwardly mobile creative class.”<sup>273</sup> Discipline functions through “dualistic mechanisms of exclusion” that identify and segregate the abnormal from the normal, the homogenized from the different.<sup>274</sup> While AS's divisive attempts to deter “the wrong crowd”<sup>275</sup> in The District respond directly to patron and resident complaints, “city life,” as Iris Marion Young maintains, “instantiates difference as the erotic, in the broad sense of attraction to the other.”<sup>276</sup> AS's disciplinary interventions appear as “blatant” partially because the development was expected to produce an erotic experience of consumable difference for its desired creative consumer-residents. AS's overt attempts at segregation appear as reductive of difference rather than productive of the “positive type” of street life associated with authentic urbanity.

Increasingly, Thrift argues, cities are expected not just to contain the erotic differences, glorious mixity and accidental encounters that signify affective authenticity—they are themselves expected to *be* affective. Cities must “exhibit intense expressivity,” they must buzz, they must be creative, they must radiate complexity and chance.<sup>277</sup> Cities, in this imaginary, are bastions of affective heterogeneity regardless of their inhabitants. Following Massumi's formulation that “affect is autonomous to the degree to which it escapes confinement in the particular body whose vitality, or potential for interaction, it is,”<sup>278</sup> then such an urban imaginary codes cities as places where affect necessarily “escapes” individual bodies and circulates autonomously. As the imperative of discipline is that it “allows nothing to escape,”<sup>279</sup> including affect, then disciplinary spaces cannot *feel* like cities. As “formed, qualified, situated perceptions and cognitions fulfilling functions of actual connects or blockages are the capture and closure of affect,”<sup>280</sup> then AS's attempts to subjectify residents through discipline, to give them an identity by creating the situated perception that they *are* 30363, circumscribe the circulation of affect. Further, as emotion is “the most intense (most concentrated) expression” of affective closure, then residents' perceptions that AS is spatially and rhetorically constructed to produce the emotions associated with identity

formation in them prohibits AS's ability to present itself as authentically urban—it is working too perceptibly to capture and condition affect instead of encouraging its escape. Massumi notes that the “continuity of affective escape...tends to take on positive connotations” because “it is nothing less than the perception of one's own vitality, *one's own sense of aliveness, of changeability* (often described as freedom).” This “continuous, nonconscious self-perception”<sup>281</sup> is necessarily interrupted in an environment carefully designed to produce or evoke particular emotions or perceptions, effectively limiting inhabitants' senses of their own freedom and vitality—qualities that New Urbanists claim to optimize in their environments. The optimal model of disciplinary city planning cannot accommodate such autonomous circulation, however, so these developments are understood to be something other than bastions of affective heterogeneity, something other than the city, something, therefore, suburban.

Importantly, the coding of affective circulation as authentically urban does not mean that all interventions into the affective registers of urbanites are understood as indicative of suburbanity. As cities have overtly attempted to court the creative class, so the “active engineering of the affective registers of cities has been highlighted as the harnessing of the talent of transformation.” Further, following the most recent “groundswell of public interest in urbanism,” many city-goers are increasingly expectant that developers, municipalities and other urban actors will intervene in these affective registers—but through the city itself rather than through the bodies of its inhabitants. Such an expectation can be heard in *Creative Loafing's* request that AS's new owners not make *it* feel so much like private property as opposed to not making *us* feel like we are on private property. This differentiation highlights how city-goers' perceptions of the workings of particular modalities of power are potent determiners of what constitutes the urban and what the suburban. When connected to suburbanity through developments like AS, discipline appears not as a generative force capable of making individuals, but as the repressive force of a mythologized suburbia—the top-down, oppressive normalization that has been attributed to suburbia in so many US cultural productions, from novels like *Babbitt* and *Mildred Pierce* to movies such as *The Truman Show*, *American Beauty* and *Pleasantville*. Conversely, the ABL's approach to space—addressing the milieu rather than the body—emphasizes possibilities and circulations in a manner that “*does not convey*,” as discipline does, “the exercise of a will over others in the most

homogeneous, continuous and exhaustive way possible.”<sup>282</sup> Instead, its security space—specifically the corridor—conveys a working of power that is bent on securing circulations, including those of affect, on minimizing risk while maintaining difference, and on optimizing the vitality and sense of changeability associated with freedom and with urbanity.

### *Conclusion: Feeling Urban*

Although the affective resonances explored in this chapter are largely understood to be both bound to and modulated through the spaces of AS and the ABL themselves, patrons' evaluations of the projects gesture to a process of affective subjectification that outstrips the temporal experience of such spatialized affects. The language used to describe the ABL is, for instance, unyieldingly emotive—love, intimacy and feeling are recurrent themes in discussions of the project. That its evocative “dream power” is based on its promise to reveal or revision an “authentically urban” Atlanta (one that will ameliorate the betrayal of the suburbs) highlights how the sub/urban is working as a mechanism for shaping the “impersonal intensities” of affect into situated perceptions and emotions. Operating on the futurity of promise and already an intangible imaginary at best, the authentically urban must be evaluated affectively. As urban is the already valued term in the binary, objects and spaces that feel urban are likely to feel pleasurable and objects and spaces that feel pleasurable are likely to feel urban. As Ahmed notes, such affective evaluations imply impact forceful enough to orient—“expressed in how bodies turn towards things,” such pleasurable urban feelings are central to Atlantans turning away from AS as a point of subjectification and turnings towards the ABL as a subject of enunciation.

At its broadest, then, the ABL could be said to both reflect and foster an “affective condition” or orientation particular to contemporary urban life. As described by Ben Anderson, an “affective condition” refers to an “affective atmosphere that predetermines how something...is habitually encountered, disclosed and can be related to.” Ahmed argues that circulation is central to the creation of such an atmosphere; as objects (used broadly) circulate socially, they can become sticky, “saturated with affect” that suggests in advance how they are to be encountered. As objects such as greenspace or transit, then, circulate as social goods, when one encounters them one may be predisposed to feel pleasure. Ahmed emphasizes, however, the “idiosyncratic nature of happy objects”—while the “stickiness” of any object circulating as a social good must be navigated, there is

nonetheless a great deal of variability in how individuals or groups define, experience and understand happiness, pleasure and happy objects. So, rather than a predetermining affective condition, the ABL could be said to support an affective orientation, a turning-towards that encourages certain affect-object relations while discouraging others.

While such an orientation cannot be experienced homogeneously, neither is it intended to be. While the deployment of some urban elements to circulate as unilateral social goods may be necessary for the ABL to ultimately succeed, the unidirectional orientation this would imply would produce a homogeneity associated with the suburban. It would also fail to explain the striking variability of the individuals and groups from whom the ABL elicits such avidity. From the small community arts organization that came out of pocket to promote the project to the developer who deemed the ABL “the most exciting redevelopment project since Sherman burned Atlanta,” this single urban planning program sometimes seems, in the words of one visiting British councilman, to have “virtually everyone” in Atlanta talking about “the BeltLine project and what it means to them.” The range of the ABL's popular success can likely be attributed to the manner in which it interarticulates biopolitics, discipline and security, emphasizing the latter as it has been linked to the production of authentic urban space.

Central to this process is the normalization of security which functions quite differently than the “normation” of discipline. While the latter predetermines an optimal model (*the* authentic urbanite) and then disciplines individuals towards that model, normalization instead functions through “the notion of the case.” The case here refers to “a way of individualizing [a] collective phenomenon” such as disease or development or of “collectivizing the phenomena, integrating individual phenomena within a collective field.”<sup>283</sup> Such collectivizing is accomplished by calculating various averages that appear within any given phenomenon (i.e. in this area of the city, development regularly occurs at x rate, while the regular rate of development is y in this area). Once a set of “normal” distributions, or cases, is established, the “normal, general curve” (or the average of the averages) will be determined. Security will then attempt to “reduce the most unfavorable, deviant normalities...to bring them in line with this normal, general curve.”<sup>284</sup>

As a manifestation of biopolitical urbanism, the ABL will address its population at a variety of levels (as individuals, as a human species, as various publics), but the neighborhood constitutes the project's most salient

population module. The bulk of Atlantans that will be directly impacted by the ABL's construction are the residents of its forty-five connected neighborhoods, which serve a tripartite function for the project. First, the neighborhood is the ABL's standard unit of city planning. Although the Master Planning processes group these neighborhoods into ten subareas, each is treated as its own unit in these Master Plan and is the subject of specific restructuring proposals. These are intended to guide the development and historic preservation of elements in each neighborhood and to reroute the patterns of movement and consumption that currently exist there, alterations that will discipline the bodies of individuals in reference to the corridor and the development that will surround it. Secondly, neighborhoods function in reference to the “case” of security. As Mindy Thompson Fullilove has taken pains to point out, urban neighborhoods serve as discrete spatial units that experience site-specific patterns of interrelated urban phenomena, including rates of disease, dis/investment, development, un/employment, etc.<sup>285</sup> For the apparatuses of security, then, the ABL's neighborhoods denote a set of collections of cases to be regulated. Finally, neighborhoods serve as a spatialized method for the biopolitical segmentation of a population into “a set of differentiated affective publics,”<sup>286</sup> which security can regulate through interventions into their various milieus. The public, according to Foucault, refers to the population seen “under the aspect of its opinions, ways of doing things, forms of behavior, customs, fears, prejudices, and requirements; it is what one gets a hold on through education, campaigns, and convictions.”<sup>287</sup> As will be explored through the variability of aesthetic forms deployed in different neighborhoods, the ABL's differentiation of affective publics by neighborhood boundaries is perhaps the most notable foundation for the project's success.

Consider the following ABL vision statement, published under the title “Bringing Atlanta's Neighborhoods Together.” Referring euphemistically to the uneven development of the city's neighborhoods (they “blossomed, matured and evolved” at different paces), the ABL insists that

obstacles, both natural and manmade, have created barriers separating many of these neighborhoods, and the result is a curious hodgepodge lacking a common thread — until now. The Atlanta BeltLine is changing the core dynamic of our city, *bringing all of these disparate neighborhoods together under one vision that will transform these separate entities into one cohesive community, while still maintaining the individual character of each.* The Atlanta BeltLine offers an opportunity to bridge gaps (literal and figurative), and unite the City of Atlanta in a way never before possible [emphasis mine].<sup>288</sup>

The ABL will, in other words, attempt to bring each of its forty-five neighborhoods in line with a normal, general curve, while allowing them to maintain their discrete identities. Interestingly, this statement implies not only the workings of security, but also of discipline: the “normal, general curve” that the ABL desires is not yet extant. The project does not work, as security normally does, from current statistical averages, but desires to create a new average. In order to yield that average, a whole new set of “normal” distributions must be created, neighborhood by neighborhood. To this end, some urban objects—such as transit and greenspace—will be circulated as universal social goods while others will be deployed site-specifically, intended to intervene in the affective registers of various publics to predetermined ends. In other words, a number of disciplinary optimal models for affect-object relations will be set, utilizing the “attention to detail that marks discipline [and] extends to the emotions as the physiological and biological basis of what a body can do.”<sup>289</sup> Importantly, this process involves not only orienting particular communities towards particular objects, but also away from others; establishing a new, normal curve requires diminishing a variety of factors that are incommensurate with the ABL's aims, including resistance to the project itself.

As Art on the Atlanta BeltLine (AAB) has proven to be the ABL's most successful venture for interacting directly with the public, it also constitutes the project's most potent forum for deploying such circulations and otherwise intervening in the affective registers of its various publics. Instituted in 2010 to “trick people into going for a walk”<sup>290</sup> down the various interim trails that were opened to the public in tandem with the inaugural AAB exhibition, the project has proven wildly efficacious at drawing bodies into the physical space of the ABL which, as one journalist wrote in 2011, formerly “sounded like a mystical place that only a chosen few had been.”<sup>291</sup> Public art, as will be explored in the following chapters, is always bound with urban development, the production of space and the production of the public. The unfinished, disjointed state of the interim trails offers the ABL a number of discrete arenas to engage and produce its publics, particularly as both the exhibitions and the permanent collections can be curated with the particular identities, histories and publics of the areas through which each trail runs in mind. In the following chapters, the ABL's use of public art to both define its own self-presentation and to function as a technology of sociospatial, affective subjectification will be examined in reference to the works showcased on two trails in three neighborhoods.

### 3 CRAFTING CABBYREN: THE AFFECTS AND AESTHETICS OF AN AUTHENTICALLY URBAN

#### ENCLAVE

A major reason for this new-found optimism is the Atlanta BeltLine, which will ultimately impact the city in bigger ways than the 1996 Olympic Games...*Art on the Atlanta BeltLine* exemplifies the best of this city's progress.

—Jim Kegley, President and CEO of U.S. Micro Corp<sup>292</sup>

Taking back public space from advertisers is a huge part of the graffiti mentality. In Atlanta, there's no real dialogue. The guys with money to buy the ads do all the talking. So street art engages people in a dialogue.

—Monica Campana, co-founder of *Living Walls, the City Speaks*<sup>293</sup>

In March of 2009, *Creative Loafing* ran a story covering art critic Jonathan Jones' call for public arts funding in Britain. Jones did not request money for established artists or those working in “mainstream” genres but insisted that “the state should pay the young to graffiti our streets.” Minding readers that they should “not forget that the UK is the home of Banksy, arguably the world's most daring street artist,” *CL* presented Jones' argument as “inspired though unorthodox” and implied that it was unlikely such a call would ever be answered by the local municipality. Speculating, however, that Atlanta arts foundations might consider “street art as a grant-worthy alternative” (to what wasn't specified), *CL* cited a popular 2006 street art exhibition mounted by Atlanta Celebrates Photography (ACP) as indicative of the possibilities. “Could you imagine,” the article's author mused, “seeing new, large-scale graffiti works by Heffner [the ACP artist] or other Atlantans—financed by grant money?”<sup>294</sup>

The incredulous tone of this query was far from unwarranted. US cities have long waged war on graffiti, particularly since the 1980s popularization of the infamous broken windows theory. Broken windows, which has interestingly been linked to Jane Jacobs' work, argues that signs of neglect and “urban decay,” including graffiti, are self-perpetuating and contribute to the insecure feel (though not necessarily the crime rates) of neighborhoods that display them.<sup>295</sup> Essentially an argument for increased informal regulation, the broken windows theory has chimed well with and informed revanchist models of redevelopment which tend to espouse total renovation rather than incremental redevelopment. Literal broken windows are, after all, replaced rather than repaired. A number of municipally funded public arts initiatives have followed this logic, utilizing public art and artists in an attempt to eliminate graffiti and recode particular spaces as amenable to capital investment.

Following the explosion of graffiti subculture during the 1970s, a number of US cities began to institute public arts programs that attempt to redirect the apparently wayward energies of graffiti writers into civic-minded mural productions.<sup>296</sup> Others, like New York City's Art in Transit program, attempt to utilize sanctioned public artworks themselves as graffiti deterrents; Art in Transit “stipulated that each station be embellished with decorative elements to uplift the spirits of riders” on its graffiti-covered and financially struggling subway system.<sup>297</sup>

Further, as the *CL* article referenced, Cabbagetown, a neighborhood known for its eye-catching graffiti, was in the midst of its own war with this form of art and/or vandalism. Although largely amenable to (or at least tolerant of) graffiti for some time, Cabbagetown was undergoing an intensive gentrification process that brought neighborhood tensions to a boiling point. In the summer of 2008 they exploded into what *CL* termed the “Cabbagetown graffiti showdown” in which neighborhood residents squared off and caustically “spat at each other” about the appropriate management of neighborhood aesthetics. The sensationalism of the event that sparked the showdown and the vehemence with which Cabbagetowners took to their sides vaulted the neighborhood into the center of an increasingly intense citywide debate about graffiti, street art, vandalism and, implicitly, development.<sup>298</sup>

Although these standing paradigms and local brouhahas certainly supported a hearty skepticism about the possibilities for local graffiti funding, a sea change that swept through Atlanta's public art scene between 2009 and 2010 would soon prove *CL*'s speculations to have been less a daydream than a harbinger of things to come. A number of public arts organizations and events—including Flux Projects, gloATL, Living Walls, Art Sign the BeltLine, Art on the Atlanta BeltLine and even the reinstatement of the Atlanta Graffiti Task Force—reflected, fostered and made visible many Atlantans' growing interest in DIY urbanisms and street art. Not only do many of these organizations certainly consider graffiti and street art to be “grant worthy alternatives,” but as a public-private hybrid, AAB directly responds to Jones' seemingly quixotic call for the state to pay the young to graffiti city streets.

At the end of the previous chapter, it was suggested that AAB provides the ABL with its most direct and perhaps efficacious avenue for intervention into the various affective publics it addresses. In this chapter, the workings of security that informed the emergence of AAB and constitute its claims to validity as an authentically

urban project will be examined in reference to Cabbagetown and its co-joined neighbor Reynoldstown.

Following this discussion, three AAB artworks exhibited in this area will be examined in detail in order to discern how the ABL deploys discipline in tandem with security in order to produce the “new, general curve” it desires to set for the city.

### **3.1 Street Art, Graffiti Vandalism and Other Weapons of Redevelopment**

#### *The Great Green Paint Debacle*

Situated in the eastern quadrant of Atlanta, the small, somewhat geographically isolated neighborhoods of Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown have, despite their relative insularity, produced any number of local legends. The rather well-documented and oft-rehearsed histories of both begin with their concomitant constructions, which began in the mid-to-late 1800s. Both neighborhoods were home to communities of industrial workers. A small mill town, Cabbagetown was mostly constructed by the owner of the Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill to house the indigent white Appalachians and rural Georgians who were bused or otherwise beckoned into the city to staff its operations. In the paternalistic fashion of mill owners during the period, owner Jacob Elias attempts to provide his resident-workers with “everything he thought they needed,” contributing to the insular feel of the community.<sup>299</sup> Reynoldstown, on the other hand, was “one of the first African American neighborhoods to develop in Atlanta”<sup>300</sup> and was constructed independently by workers employed at the Georgia Railroad, the local sawmill and, occasionally, the Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill. Although Reynoldstown has undergone a number of transit-oriented developments (the first prior to 1900) that have brought white middle-class residents into the neighborhood, it has nonetheless remained a largely black and working-class community.<sup>301</sup> Although Cabbagetown's racial demographic has remained relatively stable, the class dynamic has shifted substantially over the past several decades. Even after the mill's closure in the 1970s, mill families remained the predominant Cabbagetown residents until the mid-1990s, though they were infamously joined by a loosely affiliated group of artists and musicians during the late 1980s and early 1990s.<sup>302</sup> Olympic-related redevelopment dramatically impacted Cabbagetown, however, and the neighborhood has since been rather thoroughly gentrified by white middle-class residents.<sup>303</sup>

These neighborhoods still share a number of mill-era characteristics—narrow streets, closely set homes with small yards, shot-gun style houses, etc.—and contemporarily they comprise something of a single geographical enclave: their far western border (Cabbagetown) is blocked by the gated Fulton Cotton Mill Lofts complex; their eastern and southern borders are marked by major Atlanta thoroughfares from which neighborhood access is available by narrow residential streets only; and their shared northern border is formed by the CSX Hulsey railyard. The retaining wall for this yard runs the length of the neighborhoods, (mostly) paralleled by Wylie Street, and physically separates the area from its neighbors to the north. The Krog Street tunnel that punctures this wall is the best known entrance into the area; this much loved, maligned and debated architectural structure has become something of a destination unto itself in its relatively recent tenure as a nationally recognized graffiti landmark. The neighborhoods' shared reputation as home to much of Atlanta's graffiti is not, however, solely reliant on the tunnel. The internal side of the CSX wall was the site most heavily implicated in the aforementioned graffiti debates.

Following earlier neighborhood struggles with graffiti, between the early 2000s and the summer of 2008 both the tunnel and the wall were widely, if informally, acknowledged as sites where graffiti writers could practice largely undeterred and unpunished. Early that summer, however, a small group of Cabbagetown residents who were growing increasingly frustrated with the graffiti in their neighborhood expressed their sentiments to Rodney Bowman, a neighborhood resident whose eccentricities and love of Cabbagetown have made him something of an iconic local figure. Acting in the interests of this group, Bowman began patrolling the CSX wall regularly and in the early hours of June 28<sup>th</sup> leapt from his perch in a tree on Wylie Street to accost two young graffiti writers preparing to spray-paint the wall. The verbal forestallment he initiated escalated until Bowman punched one of the young men in the face and then broke into the other's car. The writers called the police and confusion ensued concerning the legalities and appropriateness of the actions of everyone involved. In the wake of this incident, the aforementioned group of residents mobilized quickly. Calling themselves the Wallkeepers Initiative, they approached CSX, obtained permission to paint the wall themselves and, much to the chagrin of many other Cabbagetowners, promptly covered its length (including a mural commissioned by the neighborhood association) in a thick layer of pea green latex paint.<sup>304</sup>

If the diction used by other residents to describe the “dictatorship of green paint” thus instituted by these “gung-ho gentrifiers” can serve as any indication, the Wallkeepers' actions sparked paroxysms of outrage and indignation in their detractors.<sup>305</sup> Commentary from outside the neighborhood immediately positioned Bowman as a homogenizing gentrifier: he was a “yuppie” invading a “neighborhood...inhabited by artists,”<sup>306</sup> a “crabby suburbanite who moved into town and doesn't understand how things work around here”<sup>307</sup> or a freak, but not “the kind of freak...us urbanites love” (this comment was followed by a photograph of the front of the Krog Tunnel painted to advertise the local queer festival MondoHomo).<sup>308</sup> Inside the neighborhood, the Wallkeepers were similarly represented as newcomers who simply did not or would not attempt to respect neighborhood traditions and urban aesthetics. As resident Karen Tauches summarizes,

Cabbagetown’s relatively new anti-graffiti stance is an amusing reversal. A poor neighborhood for decades, its squalor and geographical isolation created by the wall granted residents the freedom to keep their houses and yards any way they pleased. This resulted in a certain quirkiness...[that] ultimately made the neighborhood desirable real estate. Alas, so it is with gentrification.<sup>309</sup>

Although the stakes of this argument clearly exceeded graffiti, debates concerning The Great Green Paint Debacle often centralized aesthetics. Rather suddenly, the lexicon of a classic graffiti taxonomy was being broadly deployed in coverage of the event.<sup>310</sup> Although this adaptation cropped the interrelations between and subtitles of the terms it utilized, it was nonetheless widely adopted to assess marks to the CSX wall and to other graffitied areas of the city. The spectrum that concretized was as follows. Tags—which constitute the most basic element of graffiti writing and generally refer to a writer's visual signature—were taken to indicate any graffiti perceived as hasty, amateurish and monochromatic and were situated as always unwanted acts of rank vandalism. Throw-ups (or throwies, which are traditionally more elaborate tags) were seen as something of a step up from tags, but how they were to be designated was not entirely clear, allowing both proponents and detractors of certain works some ground from which to argue for the validity of the works in question. Pieces (short for masterpieces) retained most of their original definition; these were colorful, labor-intensive, talent-requiring works of art. They were situated, however, as antithetical to rather than reliant on tags, which also allowed for a slide between graffiti pieces and street art. A subgenre of graffiti that is sometimes termed “post-graffiti,” street art has developed its own, rapidly recognizable aesthetic. While graffiti writing is reliant on

letters, spray-paint and markers, street art is more often reliant on figures, utilizes a variety of materials and addresses a broader audience (the use of pseudonyms and the alterations of the alphabet common to graffiti writing often act as visual signals of a somewhat closed subculture). At any rate, pieces, be they street art or graffiti, were understood to be as welcome as tags were not—provided, according to the Wallkeepers, that they were undertaken with proper permission.

While Cabbagetowners argued over the relative merits of tags, pieces and green paint, Reynoldstown was also re-negotiating the management of its wall's aesthetics. After repeated whitewashings had failed to deter unwanted graffiti on their portion of the wall, several Reynoldstown neighborhood groups, helmed by WonderRoot Community Arts Center, began organizing a mural project intended to effect the same ends. Support was enlisted from a variety of sources outside the neighborhood and the co-ordination of these efforts culminated on October 4<sup>th</sup> when a number of well-known graffiti writers (several of whom had been active in NYC's early graffiti movement in the 1970s)<sup>311</sup> arrived from various parts of the country to re-paint the wall. The writers were given supplies, assistance and minimal instruction—nothing political or offensive—and the result was a long row of colorful, individually accomplished graffiti pieces that have, in fact, largely negated the presence of unwanted graffiti.<sup>312</sup> Although many Cabbagetowners lauded and envied the mural and most Reynoldstowners supported the project,<sup>313</sup> the “graffiti mural” was nonetheless another lightning rod for “fierce debate.” Some detractors contended that the work did not constitute a mural—or any kind of art—at all, but was simply more of the graffiti it purported to vanquish. In online debates and on neighborhood message boards, the lines between support and opposition were often drawn, like Cabbagetown's, in terms of the commenter's length of residency.<sup>314</sup> As one Reynoldstown resident summarized, “the wall may not represent the neighborhood some of the newer homeowners wanted but it looks like one I'm glad to be a part of.”<sup>315</sup>

#### *Authenticity, Urban Aesthetics and the New New Urbanism*

As art historian Rosalyn Deutsche has cogently argued, public art, as a “practice in the built environment...contributes to the production of meanings, uses, and forms for the city. In this capacity, it can help secure consent to redevelopment and to the restructuring that is the historical form of advanced capitalist urbanization” just as surely as it can “question and resist those operations.”<sup>316</sup> Although graffiti has been

criminalized by those who take it as an affront to urban redevelopment, others have long understood the practice to constitute this latter form of aesthetic resistance. Jean Baudrillard, who famously deemed the graffiti covering NYC's subway system during the 1970s a “scream, an injunction, an anti-discourse,”<sup>317</sup> links the emergence of widespread graffiti writing directly to the urban renewal related “great urban riots of 1966-1970.”<sup>318</sup> Similarly, Michel de Certeau suggests that graffiti necessarily marks the “uncodeable difference [that] insinuates itself into the happy relation the system would like to have with the operations it claims to administer.” Evocations of the “unregulatable” elements of lived space are, he claims, “sketched out, ironically and fleetingly, in graffiti, as if the bicycle painted on a wall, the insignia of a common transit, detached itself and made itself available for indeterminate tours.”<sup>319</sup>

As codified New Urbanism has become increasingly critiqued for re-enacting the Modernist city planning paradigm it claims to oppose, reinforcing the social, economic and racial segregations it claims to alleviate, and creating spaces that, like Atlantic Station, simply feel suburban, the interest in US urbanism that lent the Congress for the New Urbanism its popular notoriety has increasingly turned towards “alternative” urbanisms that often claim street art and/or graffiti as their most prominent mode of aesthetic representation. “DIY urbanism,” “guerrilla urbanism,” “tactical urbanism” and even “the new New Urbanism”<sup>320</sup> have recently come into widespread usage to describe any number of loosely aggregated urban projects known for their “informal, spontaneous [and] participatory”<sup>321</sup> forms. Certain cycling events, guerrilla gardening, yarn-bombing or urban knitting, flash mobs, street art productions, and a variety of other interventions meant to “activate” underused city space have been shepherded under these umbrella terms which are used to denote the ethos of these projects. Such urbanism “tends to be grassroots and bottom up, has anti-authoritarian characteristics and aims to enhance the urban lived experience through incremental strategies of improvement.”<sup>322</sup> The Congress for the New Urbanism has responded to the popularity of these projects by embracing and supporting them, creating something of a feedback loop between these “new” urbanisms and their more codified counterpart.<sup>323</sup> Both for ease of purpose and to highlight this imbrication, these processes will be here referred to simply as “new urbanism.”

As aforementioned, a number of prominent Atlanta projects work at the intersections between new

urbanism and public art but none, perhaps, better capture this particular configuration than the frequent ABL partner Living Walls, an organization that evolved out of a conference of the same name. In 2010, the Congress for the New Urbanism held its 18<sup>th</sup> annual conference, *Rx for Healthy Cities*, in Atlanta in conjunction with the Center for Disease Control. A number of local street artists who were interested in New Urbanism but frustrated by the high cost of attendance to (\$300 per day) and the exclusivity of the event decided to organize a “grassroots alternative” to the conference, which resulted in *Living Walls, the City Speaks*. This three-day conference was open to the public, free to attend and held across a variety of locations, including The Plaza Theater, Atlanta's oldest independent cinema, Eyedrum, a small artist-run gallery, and Georgia Tech. Comprised of gallery shows, lectures and a keynote address by “guerrilla ad interventionist” Jordan Seiler, *Living Walls* focused on the intersections between transportation, urbanism and street art. Its grounding component was, however, its aesthetic. As organizer Blackie Migliozi explains, after encountering New Urbanism while studying abroad he “couldn't stop thinking about public spaces, art, and urban development...Looking at the city through the lens of graffiti, that's really where the concept came from.” To this end, Living Walls hosted a number of street artists from a variety of far-flung locales who had been invited to paint Atlanta's public walls during the event. The results were diverse, engaging, and ultimately synchronous with the event's stated goals: “taking back public space from advertisers,” involving “people other than wealthy architects and urban planners” in the production of city space, and inciting Atlantans to “start noticing their surroundings in a more intimate way.”<sup>324</sup> Although there was no interaction between Living Walls and the CNU during the former's first two years, by 2012 the local CNU chapter was hosting talks from Living Walls' founders and announcing their enthusiastic support for the event.<sup>325</sup>

The spatial politics that undergird both street art and new urbanism constitute a striking divergence from those that are normally associated with urban redevelopment. As Deutsche argues “beauty and utility” are classic “weapons of redevelopment”<sup>326</sup> that work to neutralize the effects that the sociopolitical ramifications of uneven development tend to have on viewers. In this context, arguments that city spaces have particular and universal use values constitute a spatial fetishism that presents the city as an independent entity that functions to “fulfill needs presupposed to be natural, simply practical.” As Deutsche extrapolates,

to assert in the language of common sense that an urban space unequivocally refers to its intrinsic uses is to claim that the city itself speaks....This essentialist view obstructs—and this is actually its principal function—the perception that the organization and shaping of the city as well as the attribution of meanings to spaces are social processes.<sup>327</sup>

The Situationists named this process a “blackmail of utility” perpetrated by city planning and architecture that works in tandem with aesthetics, “a rather neglected branch of criminology.”<sup>328</sup> The espousal of a city's commitment to beauty, generally narrated as the “preservation of historical landmarks, architectural heterogeneity, and neighborhood context,” is, like utility, “presupposed to lie outside sociomaterial concerns.” Beauty and utility thus “present themselves as incontrovertible evidence of public accountability” while simultaneously reinforcing the hegemonic power relations that attempt to determine the production of city space.<sup>329</sup>

Drawing from the anti-authoritarianism understood to be inherent in graffiti practices, new urbanism and street art contest these paradigmatic notions of the spatialities of beauty and utility by foregrounding “an element of chance in space,” an approach that Massey notes is “often taken to be a form of rebellion against over-rationalization and the dominance of closed structures.”<sup>330</sup> The temporality, often questionable legality and apparent randomness of these ventures suggest happenstance and the insertion of a touch of chaos into the cityscape. Street art recodes the apparently inherent uses of the city spaces it addresses, challenges traditional notions of beauty and art production, and attempts to reveal, as Duetsche suggests public art production should, “the crucial interfaces between art and urbanism.”<sup>331</sup> The participatory ethos of street art and urbanism—both in terms of group participation in specific projects and the participation of those whose voices are often sublimated in the production of city space—highlights the social construction of space and (at least) suggests the democratization of this process. As discipline's complete construction and constant codification between the permitted and the forbidden have come to be associated with suburban space, these practices, which function in a fashion more akin to securitization—working with givens within the milieu, accounting for deviance, ensuring circulation, etc.—have come to provide a visual referent for authentic urbanity. As Cabbagetown resident Karen Tauches wrote in the wake of the Great Green Paint Debacle,

what is an urban environment without graffiti? It's a controlled environment, not an organic one—and certainly not one shared by a wild variety of people. It projects order and authority as

its cleanliness broadcasts the message: “Only approved expressions of aesthetics allowed here.” In less dense places like the traditional suburbs, this sort of control over common environments can be achieved and is acceptable. But is the enforced unity of aesthetics really appropriate or desirable inside a city?<sup>332</sup>

Art on the Atlanta BeltLine emerged from just such a new urbanist undertaking. Inspired by the unbridled BeltLine enthusiasm of CSX freight rail conductor and community activist Angel Poventud, Reynoldstown's WonderRoot Community Arts Center put out a call for artists and art lovers to gather at Eyedrum in June of 2009 and hand-paint over one-hundred plywood signs that would later be illegally posted at the intersection between the ABL corridor and surface streets. This event, Art Sign the BeltLine, was meant to “raise awareness”<sup>333</sup> about the ABL project by calling attention to its physical space with eye-catching public art. Undertaken independently, funded by a shoestring budget and accomplished in less than forty-eight hours, Art Sign exemplified the “lighter, quicker, cheaper” model of tactical urbanism.<sup>334</sup> Inspired by Poventud, backed by WonderRoot, hosted by Eyedrum and accomplished by a “small cadre of local artists,”<sup>335</sup> Art Sign also gave credence to Gravel's frequent assertion that Atlantans have “taken ownership” of the ABL project. And the event was a smashing success at which even Poventud marveled: “It's hard to believe you can pull off a project like this for less than a grand...But it's all about the passion. And it's here.”<sup>336</sup>

This project, which ran for two consecutive years, inspired WonderRoot to, in the words of its Executive Director, “get Art on the BeltLine going.”<sup>337</sup> And, indeed, during its second year the first ABL public art exhibition, “Art on the Atlanta BeltLine: Atlanta's New Public Place,” was launched. Although AAB rarely (if ever) references its origins in official propaganda, its exhibitions and permanent collection nonetheless evidence this ethos—all manner of proposals for its annual exhibitions are accepted from artists with various levels of skill and experience; street art and graffiti are its most recurrent art forms; and the shows are intentionally curated to produce a “rising current of community investment.”<sup>338</sup> Functioning as an apparatus of security, the ABL responded to the interests of these publics and integrated this element of the Atlanta milieu into its project through the institution of AAB; as Foucault notes, security's attention to “the play of desire” through a population distinguishes not only the “naturalness” of that population but also “the possible artificiality of the means one adopts to manage it.”<sup>339</sup>

### 3.2 Securing CabbyRen

Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown, along with Glenwood Park, constitute the neighborhoods of the ABL's Subarea 4 that sit adjacent to the Southeast Trail, the segment of the corridor that begins at the Krog Street tunnel. This small area has long been of particular interest to the ABL. Not only has Subarea 4 proven to be a bastion ABL support, but these particular neighborhoods have been the site of a number of ABL investments and struggles: the Southeast Trail was suggested for prioritized development in Gravel's thesis;<sup>340</sup> the aforementioned zoning battle with “suburban villain”<sup>341</sup> Jeff Fuqua over his proposed “suburban-style” Wal-Mart development occurred in this Subarea and set a legal precedent for future contestations concerning the ABL Zoning Overlay;<sup>342</sup> the ABL's first “workforce housing” redevelopment was undertaken in Reynoldstown; and finally, the build out of this segment of the trail has, in fact, been prioritized, set to begin within months of this writing despite the fact that it is bookended by a set of complicated and as-of-yet-unresolved construction impasses.

Although Glenwood Park is held up by the Congress for the New Urbanism as a “model community for future BeltLine development,”<sup>343</sup> CabbyRen may prove to be something more akin to the “new, general curve” the ABL is attempting to set for the city. Together, the neighborhoods exhibit a number of the urban elements that the ABL circulates as unilateral social goods: both are known for their walkability, distinct senses of place, historic preservation, tightly knit communities, public art, independent shops, bars, restaurants and arts organizations; Reynoldstown is currently involved in a number of sustainable housing ventures and bills itself as a home to “New Urbanists”;<sup>344</sup> and the “quirky enclave”<sup>345</sup> of Cabbagetown is known for being a residential haven for artists and creatives. Further, unlike Glenwood Park, neither Cabbagetown nor Reynoldstown exhibit the complete construction of discipline, which contributes substantially to their already authentically urban feel; Cabbagetown is, for instance, so known for its uniqueness and charm that one local urbanist deemed its main business block, Carroll Street, the “anti Atlantic Station.”<sup>346</sup>

This area not only offers the ABL a milieu amenable to its purposes, but also one in which securitization can work. Foucault's claim that security cannot “operate well except on the condition that it is given freedom”<sup>347</sup> is reflected in the Subarea 4 Master Plan that outlines the restructuring of this area—suggested alterations to

Glenwood Park are absolutely minimal, while Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown will undergo a number of changes.<sup>348</sup> The disciplinary city planning used in Glenwood Park has already predetermined how the space will serve New Urbanism's particular ends. Even those ends are similar to the aims of the ABL, the homeostasis discipline attempts to achieve is coded into the architecture and organization of Glenwood, discouraging alteration. Counter to such complete reconstruction, the change of place and increase of circulatory movement that security enacts is, in terms of urban redevelopment, gentrification—security will make incremental alteration to enhance the existing givens of a milieu in order to “enable the circulations that define the personal and commercial 'freedoms' of liberal-democratic life.”<sup>349</sup> By cutting routes through town, balancing factors of risk and arranging for both capital and people to flow into and through an area, security alters spaces through gentrification to proliferate the lives of the population it directly attends to.

Notably, the interim trail through Reynoldstown, a brief quarter mile stretch of defunct tracks that has been somewhat awkwardly deemed the “Eastside Hiking Trail South,”<sup>350</sup> is home to almost a quarter of the ABL's permanent art collection despite its brevity. Over 70% of this collection resides along the completed Eastside and West End Trails and in the parks that adjoin them. Reynoldstown, however, houses far more artwork than even the completed Northeast Trail.<sup>351</sup> Reflecting the “widespread concern about 'the decline of public space' in the neoliberal city,”<sup>352</sup> new urbanist projects often attempt to reclaim public space, often by marking it as public with street art and/or graffiti. In this spirit, the inaugural Art on the Atlanta exhibition was titled “Art on the Atlanta BeltLine: Atlanta's New Public Place.”<sup>353</sup> In the remainder of this chapter, a number of the artworks exhibited on the Reynoldsdtown interim trail will be examined in reference to paradigmatic development narratives in order to discern how the ABL is using public art along this trail to alleviate neighborhood anxieties concerning gentrification and secure consent to the redevelopment it plans for the area.

#### *Co-Existence in CabbyRen*

Atlanta artist Michi Meko refers to the area where he lives as “CabbyRen,”<sup>354</sup> an amalgamation of the names of the neighborhoods his home sits somewhere near the borders between. Coined to refer to the liminal space created by residents' simultaneous recognition of two dividing lines between Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown—the official Pearl Street boundary and the railroad tracks that parallel Pearl several blocks to the

east—Meko's neologism highlights both the spatial interarticulation of these neighborhoods, as well as their irreducibility. His 2010 Art on the Atlanta BeltLine installation *Co-Exist*, however, queries the area's potential future as a single ABL enclave; in the BeltLine vision of the area, the now divisive tracks will act as a seam between the neighborhoods that reorients their extant patterns of movement, consumption, development and habitation towards itself in the name of transforming these former agents of segregation into emblems of coexistence and diversity.

The first (and apparently only) ABL exhibited artwork to directly confront the interrelated threats of gentrification and displacement that the project poses its neighborhoods and residents, *Co-Exist* speculated on implications of the ABL's redevelopment plans. Comprised of two eighteen-foot high poles laden with Purple

Figure 1: Co-Exist, Michi Meko



Martin gourds and set across the railroad tracks from one another, *Co-Exist* was installed at the intersection between the Reynoldstown interim hiking trail and Wylie Street. At its broadest, the installation challenged the BeltLine's impending displacement of Atlanta residents from each of its neighborhoods. This critique, interestingly, relied on the temporality of the exhibition itself.

The work invited area birds to take up residence in the space of the installation beginning in early June of 2010, but Meko emphasized in his artist statement that such habitation would be necessarily temporary: when the exhibition closed in October “these homes *must* be taken away for new developments forcing [the birds] to seek shelter else

where.”<sup>355</sup> In an interview in *Burnaway*, Meko centralized his culpability in such displacement: “at the end of the project, I am going to move a lot of houses and displace a lot of birds; whether they have families or not, they

are going to be displaced. It will be my symbol for residents that live along the BeltLine...What are you going to do if you've been living there for 40 years?"<sup>356</sup>

Evocative of the rapid, cataclysmic style of gentrification typically enabled by “centralized state sponsorship or large-scale institutional involvement,”<sup>357</sup> Meko's abrupt and requisite evictions gesture to the violence commonly associated with state and corporate led redevelopment and renewal projects. Mining the “constellation of inaccurate, confusing and distorting terms” that have come to describe intentional metamorphoses of neighborhoods' extant demographics, Deutsche argues that 'redevelopment,' unlike 'gentrification,' is generally associated with “rebuilding, usually after buildings have been razed and sites cleared” and with intentionality. “In these aggressive acts,” she notes, “the power of the state and corporate capital is more obvious.”<sup>358</sup>

Although the ABL certainly constitutes redevelopment by state sponsorship and institutional involvement, the project is careful to distance itself from the overtly violent legacies of its predecessors. Consider, for instance, Brian Leary's rhetoric concerning the homeless individuals who have been evicted from the developing corridor; by framing this population as “the residentially challenged,”<sup>359</sup> he sidesteps the overt criminalization of homelessness associated with revanchism and enacted with viciousness in Atlanta during Olympic redevelopment. Even *Creative Loafing's* critical coverage of these evictions was careful to note that BeltLine Inc. was working *with* the homeless to ensure that their needs were being met.<sup>360</sup> Such presentations foster an image of ABL eviction as an unfortunate side-effect of the corridor's construction rather than as an integral element of the ABL's classed restructuring of the city center.

Ryan Gravel was careful to insist in his thesis that the ABL program was in no way meant to invoke or support a “1960s urban renewal-style overhaul of any entire district.”<sup>361</sup> Instead, its securitized gentrification works on a futurity that does, in fact, signify a break with the form of most state-led redevelopment projects. The private development courted by the project is not, for instance, primarily focused on segments of the corridor that are currently under development. To wit, the \$775 million worth of private development that has occurred within a half-mile (the breadth of the ABL Zoning Overlay) of the two-mile segment of the Eastside Trail has accumulated since 2005, when the ABRP was officially adopted.<sup>362</sup> The intentional pacing of both private and

direct ABL development is frequently, if euphemistically, referenced in the ABL Master Plans: each one repeatedly points out that the project will “provide appropriate transitions to existing residential neighborhoods” during redevelopment.

*Co-Exist* also pondered the implications of this more slowly instituted gentrification process at a number of levels. The first reflected the interwoven dynamics of class and race that, according to Meko, the tracks highlight. As *Burnaway* notes, the phrase “from the wrong side of the tracks” had “marinated in Michi Meko's great dreadlocked covered head for a lifetime” before it inspired *Co-Exist*. In many ways, Meko's installation functions to expose how such phrases mediate perceptions of the populations he refers to as simply the “haves and the have-nots.”<sup>363</sup> Deutsche suggests that the terms “gentrification” (which the ABL never uses) and “revitalization” (which it frequently invokes) both work to mediate perceptions of space in a similar manner. The former, she argues, often “yields erroneous perceptions of inner-city change as the rehabilitation of decaying buildings,” while the latter “conceals the very existence of those inhabitants already living in the frequently vital neighborhoods targeted for renovation.”<sup>364</sup> Although it is often suggested that the ABL will ultimately reclaim the tracks it repurposes from their history as a technique for enforcing spatialized segregation, *Co-Exist* questions what form such redevelopment will likely take in an area already riven by uneven development. He notes that although Reynoldstown is “a neighborhood in transition, the economic dynamics of Wylie Street from end to end [still] illustrates the phrase 'wrong side of the tracks'”<sup>365</sup> and suggests that the ABL's attempt to hew both sides of this area together will amount to little more than the accelerated encroachment of white, gentrified Cabbagetown into black, transitioning Reynoldstown.

Meko elucidated these suspicions through *Co-Exist's* visual vocabulary, which simultaneously gave voice to the gentrification-related anxieties and tensions already thick in the area by the time of the exhibition. Although, at first glance, the dual poles of *Co-Exist* may have appeared to be mirror images of one another, the relative aesthetics of each “colony” set Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown in antagonistic tension in the space of the installation. The pole set on the Cabbagetown side of the tracks held

Figure 3: Co-Exist Detail



“bright white pre-fab Purple Martin homes” that Meko simply installed, while the Reynoldstown pole held his “hand painted graffiti attacked natural Purple Martin homes.” The “plastic gourd colony” of Cabbagetown was meant to evoke “the many 'lofts' that have begun to overrun Atlanta and many cities throughout the United States.”<sup>366</sup> Although the representation of Cabbagetown as home to “lofts” could be taken to reference the Fulton Cotton Mill Lofts, many area residents do not view these lofts as part of Cabbagetown at all.<sup>367</sup> These lofts can, however, be read as representative of the impending extension of affluent Cabbagetown into Reynoldstown that Meko presents as an ABL-related threat. In 2005, the construction of the gated Mill Town Lofts complex (which faces Wylie Street and stretches between the eastern side of Pearl Street and the western edge of Chester Street) had effectively evicted the independent arts gallery and venue Art Farm from its location at the corner of Chester and Wylie.<sup>368</sup> Further, it had done so while simultaneously extending Cabbagetown's rhetorical borders: not only does the name “mill town” suggest Cabbagetown, but the Mill Town Loft's developers advertise the complex as located in Cabbagetown rather than in Reynoldstown. Obliquely referencing such extensions, Meko muses in his artist statement: “are we beginning to lose the character of old structures and neighborhoods and give in to gentrified prefab?”<sup>369</sup>

Although Cabbagetown remains widely recognized for its off-beat, artistic feel, Meko's representation of the neighborhood as slick and monochromatic gestured to the phase of artist-related gentrification that the community was beginning to express. Using the neighborhoods' variant approaches to the CSX wall as a referent for this process, the site for *Co-Exist* was chosen in part for its proximity to the wall, which provided a backdrop for the piece [see background of Fig. 1]. As Meko notes, this intersection between the corridor and the wall “further plays into the idea of the 'wrong side of the tracks' because the graffiti is a symbolic divide between the neighborhoods in this area.” In his artist statement, Meko extrapolates on the differing methods of urban planning the wall suggests. Referencing the Great Green Paint Debacle, he writes

Reynoldstown...seems to have embraced its writer problem by opening its walls to many great writers...[w]hile Cabbagetown has tried to battle its graffiti problem to a predictable loss with horrible green buff paint only to have messages that read ‘PUSSY PALACE ’ in a wretched scrawl [appear on the wall] and a Totem2 mural...ruined by the neighborhood's own vigilante graffiti cleaner.<sup>370</sup>

The issue at hand, then, is not simply one of graffiti, but also one of an overt disciplinaryity that is linked to

gentrification. While Cabbagetown uses discipline's constant codification of the permitted and the forbidden to determine how its wall is to be adorned, Reynoldstown utilizes security's technique of the progressive self-cancellation of phenomena by the phenomena themselves.

In order to accomplish this end, the planners of Reynoldstown's mural project drew on the “most critical” of graffiti subculture's “set of unwritten rules and ethical codes”—that “‘going over’ or crossing out another writer's work is disrespectful and should generally be avoided.”<sup>371</sup> It is particularly unlikely that pieces done by established, well-respected writers will be gone over with tags. The presumption was then made that unwanted tagging would be deterred if the taggers respected the writers whose work adorned the wall, which proved to be a successful venture that allowed Reynoldstown to take a largely passive approach to managing the wall's aesthetics.<sup>372</sup> The phenomenon of graffiti has been delimited “within acceptable limits, rather than” forbidden by “the imposition of a law that says no.”<sup>373</sup> As discipline's “principle is that things, the smallest things, must not be abandoned to themselves,”<sup>374</sup> Cabbagetown's Wallkeepers continue to find continuous action and coercion necessary to ensure the aesthetic sanctity of their wall. The summer that Meko's piece stood at the tracks, one Wallkeeper published an article in the *Cabbagetown Neighbor* that describes guiding a group of visiting elementary school children through the process of buffing the wall. When some of the children resisted, declaring that they liked the graffiti, the resident found it necessary to delineate the differences between graffiti vandalism and graffiti art (which, in his account, hinged solely on proper authorization). As one student later wrote in a thank you note, “before I came to Cabbagetown, I thought there was one type of graffiti. Now I know that one is art and one is vandalism...I was just glad to help out.” Despite the efficacious tutelage, the article's author nonetheless noted that “since the students helped paint the wall, graffiti has been a consistent problem.”<sup>375</sup>

The form of *Co-Exist* could be described, then, as a discipline—gentrified/suburban—Cabbagetown pole that threatens a security—not-yet-gentrified/urban—Reynoldstown pole. In many ways, this yoking reflects elements of the ABL's own vision of authentic urbanity. It also, however, recalls both supply and demand-side arguments concerning the causes of gentrification and implicates both the ABL and the residents it intends to lure into inhabiting the city center as culpable in the gentrification process. Understood to be already hollowing out the neighborhood's previous aesthetic, the increasingly gentrified population of Cabbagetown that was

represented by the chromatically homogeneous gourd colony appeared as the active agent of gentrification that the ABL will incite. By illustrating Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown and the development processes they exhibit through the presence and absence of graffiti, however, Meko situated the aesthetic homogeneity that is generally taken to be an eventual result of gentrification as the essential indicator of the displacement on which the process relies almost from its outset (the very first step would be disinvestment that creates an investment-worthy rent-gap). In Meko's artist statement, for instance, he records his concern with “whether the aesthetic of each colony is a factor in the birds' choice of residence,” suggesting that aesthetic variability plays a causal role in the gentrification process. The project's title was also meant to gesture towards Meko's “interest in bio-mimicry” (or looking to patterns in nature to find solutions to complex human problems) and the hope he expressed that different species of birds would coexist in the space of the artwork (thus producing a “natural sound installation”) seems to suggest a hope that gentrifiers can co-habitate with artists, creatives and/or the “have-nots” without destroying their visual cultures.<sup>376</sup> As *Co-Exist* was conceived in tandem with the ABL's initial venture into public art, it is difficult to discern if his piece reflected and/or fostered the ABL's expression of new urbanist tenets through street art and graffiti. It did, however, reference a concern to which the ABL was already prepared to respond.

### 3.3 Disciplining Gentrification

*Co-Exist*, like most of the individual pieces in the first AAB exhibition, received little direct media coverage, but what was published suggests the manner in which issues of ABL induced gentrification and displacement are being discussed in the local art world. In *ArtsATL*'s coverage of grant-approved works, *Co-Exist* is described without reference to gentrification or displacement but as grounded in the hope “that coexistence will be encouraged by way of the defined environment.”<sup>377</sup> Neither process was mentioned in Staci Stone's coverage of the exhibition either, which singled out five pieces, including *Co-Exist*, from the over forty exhibited for review. While Stone mentions that the work “addresses the lines drawn between class and race,” she follows the ABL rhetoric regarding the transformation of the tracks but insisting that these lines were “organized and perpetuated” by the historical placement of the rails. Stone further implies that Meko uses his

work to sidestep culpability in these hazily defined social issues: “If it is possible to disengage from social structures with an artistic gesture, that is what Meko attempts to do through *Co-Exist*.”<sup>378</sup> The installation garnered one dedicated review, written by Lara More and published in *Burnaway*. Although More's article emphasizes that ABL-led gentrification is the central issue of *Co-Exist*, a great deal of the article is dedicating to describing the BeltLine project as a whole. More quotes the ABL's Director of Communications' response to *Co-Exist*, in which he delineates the breadth of the project and notes that displacement has been anticipated and is being prepared for through “several short- and long-term initiatives to help residents.” Suggesting that it is “too soon to validate or deny Meko's suspicions,” More ends her article describing her discussion with another Atlanta resident who notes that “racism and classism” have “always plagued public transportation.” Her closing line quotes this resident: “class issues aside,” she writes, the ABL will likely “ease the city's 'dependence on...Gulf Coast-destroying fuel' and 'enable people to easily get to other parts of the city in a fun way.’”<sup>379</sup>

While Meko's invocation of gentrification in relation to the ABL seems to have largely run afoul of direct engagement, alterations to the ABL's trail the following year nonetheless indirectly addressed a number of his concerns. In October, construction began on the ABL's first “workforce housing” project, The Lofts at Reynoldstown Crossing, which is situated at the southern end of the Reynoldstown interim trail. While the details of this project are beyond the scope of this thesis, twenty-eight of the thirty units in the Lofts at Reynoldstown Crossing were available for purchase by families whose income ranged between \$35,000 and \$68,500 and three of those units are designated as “permanently” affordable, supported by a land trust initiative that will keep taxes on the properties from rising. None of the units are available to rent.<sup>380</sup>

Figure 4: Untitled, Labrona, OverUnder and Gawd



The ABL also acquired its first four permanent artworks for the Reynoldstown trail during its 2011 AAB exhibition. At least two of these noticeably engage themes related to the artist-led gentrification narrative that wove

throughout *Co-Exist*. The first, *Untitled*, was co-sponsored by Living Walls and painted on the eastern side of the South Park Lofts in Reynoldstown. Its creators, Labrona, OverUnder and Gawd, are all Canadian street artists who were, according to a banner that unfurls across a bus in their piece, in Atlanta in the midst of a “world tour.” Despite its relation to the international street art community that Living Walls attempts to bring into Atlanta, the work contains a number of references to the local street art and graffiti communities of Atlanta, including the tag of graffiti-writer OhNo who had died the year prior and whose works many were struggling to preserve in the face of the Atlanta Graffiti Task Force's operations.<sup>381</sup> Although the artists' statement declares the mural “champions the pedestrian over automotive transit,”<sup>382</sup> which is presumably represented by the figures walking atop highway traffic, a number of the cars bear insignia of local street artists and advertisements for establishments such as Sam Flax Art and Design Store.

The figures traversing this automotive landscape are painted in a spectrum of hues that range from black to bright yellow and are intended to suggest the “multicultural and varied communities that make up Atlanta.”<sup>383</sup> Although a large, ambiguously raced and possibly ambiguously gendered figure takes up the bulk of the foreground, the central figure in the piece—denoted by his positioning as the only one facing north—is a white male holding a guitar and dressed in a manner that suggests contemporary freight train hoppers. His vest is adorned with the pin that references OhNo and another that bears the logo of the local SoPo bicycle cooperative.

Although the mural was undertaken with both permission and encouragement from the property owner,<sup>384</sup> a number of graffiti pieces attributed to the three street artists went up on nearby buildings along the interim trail shortly after the work was completed [Fig. 4 is a piece attributed to OverUnder that was painted on a building adjacent to the trail].

Figure 5: Graffiti  
Attributed to OverUnder



*Untitled* includes a number of elements that manage to address two of Cabbagetown's affective communities as they were charted out through the Great Green Paint Debacle—those who desire the graffiti-endorsing, artist-inhabited Cabbagetown/Reynoldstown imaginary and those whose vision of the neighborhoods is one of an area that has been revitalized, or at least “cleaned up.” Most overtly, the mural endorses the multiculturalism that Chandan Reddy notes is a “form of racialization” that “in the contemporary period” secures “the 'fictive ethnicity' of the US national citizen.” The “multicultural citizen,” he writes, “is the racial formation of the national citizen, prefiguring and promising the citizen's ability to claim universality.”<sup>385</sup> The perceived homogeneity of the “whiteness” associated with both suburbanity and by extension gentrification operates in tandem with the aesthetic homogeneity also associated with both of these processes, calling into question the suburbanite/gentrifier's claim to viability as a citizen of the diverse, authentically urban city. By foregrounding both racial and aesthetic heterogeneity—through the races and various colors of its figures, the presence of three distinct aesthetic styles and the use of street art and graffiti forms that are taken as indicative of heterogeneity in and of themselves—*Untitled* works to signal that the “monstrous” monoculture that threatens to impose itself on the “multicultural citizen” through gentrification will not be supported by the ABL.<sup>386</sup>

While *Untitled* was officially sanctioned and supported by a number of established arts organizations and the Reynoldstown property owner, commissioning three street artists known for their illegal work to undertake a mural in an area known for its graffiti also suggests the workings of the apparatus of security rather than that of discipline. As *Creative Loafing* notes in reference to Living Walls, “let's just say you can't bring this many feisty art vandals into a fresh city and not expect a heady dose of unsanctioned side projects.”<sup>387</sup> By accounting for this expectation, both the ABL and Living Walls allow the mural and its satellite graffiti to function as representations of graffiti as both legitimated, institutionalized artwork and as anti-authoritarian

interventions into the cityscape. The references to local subcultures also secure an image of the work as operating to preserve these often illegal activities instead of simply eradicating or institutionalizing them. Similarly, while the muralists declare the automobile transit vanquished by the power of its pedestrian figures, the cars depicted are largely intact and in transit; this simultaneity highlights the ABL's support of 'alternative' methods of transportation but also its refusal to directly discipline city residents into using particular modes of transit. Ultimately, *Untitled* responds to *Co-Exist's* speculation on the possibility that gentrifiers can inhabit an area without homogenizing its aesthetic through discipline in the affirmative; instead it works to recode the affective impact of encountering graffiti and/or street art as positive or pleasurable. *Untitled* circulates these elements of the cityscape as social goods meant to be incorporated into the bodily horizons of residents who might have otherwise rejected these objects.

Positioned diagonally across the interim trail's intersection with Kirkwood Street is Stein Steel and Supply Company, an operable industrial facility. The half of the interim trail that runs from Wylie Street to Kirkwood Street parallels the back of the Stein Steel building, giving the wooded area a sense of enclosure. On the southern end of the building facing the trail is *Steel Fabric* by the Loss Prevention Collective. A portrait of a white steel worker, the piece is meant as an “homage to the fabricators of the Reynoldstown institution.”<sup>388</sup> Although evocative of traditional portraiture, this work involves materials (aerosol paint), color schematics and forms associated with street art. This piece was either painted with a stencil (which upon close inspection seems unlikely due to the material of the wall) or intentionally evokes the stencil, a common street art method and aesthetic. The work bears both the Stein Steel logo (emblazoned on the pocket of the figure's coveralls) and the Atlanta BeltLine logo, painted in red and black to the direct right of the figure.

Figure 6: Steel Fabric, Loss Prevention Collective



As an homage to Stein Steel's workers, *Steel Fabric* occupies an interesting niche in relation to other ABL artworks. AAB has a number of permanent pieces that commemorate industrial workers, but generally those of a by-gone era. Notably, Lonnie Holley's sculpture *Hands Along the Rail*, which sits at the southern end of the Reynoldstown interim trail, “pays tribute to all of the workers who worked tirelessly and without recognition to build American railways.” Declared by the AAB's Director of Design Fred Yalouris to be “one of our most important pieces,” Holley's sculpture is indicative of the way such commemorations function in relation to the ABL's narrative concerning the historical form of the rails. After noting to one reviewer that AAB was instituted in order to “trick people into going for a walk” along the corridor, Yalouris explains the importance of Holley's work in a similar fashion: “Art can be a way of tricking people into learning something about the history of social conditions.”<sup>389</sup>

Placed in this context, *Steel Fabric*, like *Untitled*, can be read as a commentary on one ABL-related issue from two contrasting purviews. On one hand, the work operates to call attention to the presence of light industry in the Reynoldstown neighborhood. As industrial facilities are not only known for being redeveloped as lofts but also provide the brownfield sites that New Urbanist revision as “live, work, play” environments, this overt

attention to Stein Steel's operations suggests that the encroachment of Cabbagetown's lofts into Reynoldstown's territory will not be intentionally enacted by the ABL. By acting as an homage, *Steel Fabric* arguably celebrates the presence of the (white) working-class in Reynoldstown and along the corridor, implying that neither this population nor this facility will be displaced. Further, the use of a street art aesthetic suggests the linkages commonly made between graffiti, the working-class and authenticity in histories of the art form. Stephanie Kane has defined “stencil graffiti” specifically as “an illegal, multi-vocal, visual urban discourse that alters the texture of street experience through inventive juxtaposition of mass-mediated and local imagery.”<sup>390</sup> Blek le Rat (a Frenchman who has been producing stencil graffiti since the 1980s) and Banksy are the two artists perhaps most popularly associated with this form and both are known to use their work to encourage social consciousness.<sup>391</sup> *Steel Fabric* could, then, be taken to extend the ABL's tendency to commemorate former industrial workers into the present, perhaps as part of the “workforce” for whom they provide affordable housing at the end of the trail.

As an ABL commissioned work, however, *Steel Fabric* can only support such a reading if one fails to attend to the common argument that smart growth and light industry are incompatible (a purview that will be further discussed in the next chapter). In the Master Plan that addresses the redevelopment of Subarea 4, the closure of all light industry, including Stein Steel, LaFarge, and the CSX Hulsey railyard, is both anticipated and emphasized. During the period that this mural was being painted, the ABL was in negotiations with LaFarge, a French concrete company situated across from Glenwood Park, to orchestrate its relocation. Similarly, in neighborhood information sessions ABL representatives have overtly encouraged CabbyRen residents to approach CSX Hulsey about relocating to “make room for development” as the ABL is not legally permitted to negotiate for the company's removal since both are designated as Transit-Oriented Developments.<sup>392</sup>

When these details are threaded into a reading of the work, the commemorative style of *Steel Fabric* can be more readily aligned with the other ABL works that evoke industrial workers. Such a configuration suggests that the mural functions to treat industry as a historical form that should be appreciated for its contributions to the current creative form of the city. While the extant workers could still appear as authentic in this reading, they are also themselves anachronistic; if their material presence is not entirely erased, their contemporary use value is. Viewers who respond to such a reading are encouraged, however, towards a commemoration that elides time

by taking the form of anticipatory nostalgia. Just as the artists, students, queers and other “shock troops” of gentrification tend to recall a “before” when their neighborhoods were more authentic and less inhabited by the middle-class, viewers are encouraged to recall the light industry whose facilities will one day provide them with “mixed-use nodes.”

### *Conclusion*

As this chapter has suggested, the ABL's functioning as an apparatus of security has encouraged a number of breaks between this project and more long-standing methods of institutional redevelopment in the US, including a significant divergence in the spatial politics that tend to inform these processes. While perhaps similar to processes of co-optation that assimilate the markers of subcultures into widely consumable forms, security's process of normalization attempts to make “other elements of reality function in relation to”<sup>393</sup> divergences; while this process serves to dampen the unfavorable effects of these elements, it does not necessarily strip them of their intentions. Instead, it locates and encourages the most favorable average between variable processes. *Co-Exist*, for instance, was fully operable as a critique of the ABL but also served as a gateway onto the interim trail that signified the ABL's commitment to encouraging agonistic public spaces. As security's tendency to “let things happen”<sup>394</sup> resonates strongly with the logics of new urbanism, street art and graffiti, the visual vocabularies of these urban art forms are easily incorporated into the workings of the ABL, particularly as they are associated with a relation of power often perceived to be antithetical to discipline. As Foucault emphasizes, however, security does not eradicate or operate independently of discipline; instead, “discipline was never more important or more valued than when the attempt was made to manage the population...managing the population means managing it in depth, in all its fine points and details.”<sup>395</sup>

In CabbyRen, street art and graffiti provide an intersection between the ABL's logics of security and of discipline; while the latter is necessary to effect the “new, general curve” that the project is overtly attempting to set for the city, the overt disciplinarity associated with paradigmatic narratives of gentrification and redevelopment is drawn into the process of security's normalization by working as phenomena that can be weighted against itself to produce a self-cancellation. By utilizing street art and graffiti to discipline middle-class gentrifiers into new forms of gentrification—namely forms that do not hollow out the aesthetics of the areas they

come to inhabit—their reliance on disciplinary city planning is progressively canceled out. Circulating these art forms as social goods attempts to recode their reception by viewers expected to reject them; rather than invoking a sense of fear or distaste, the ABL attempts to make them work to invoke a pleasurable sense of urbanity. Importantly, as Ahmed notes, the circulation of certain objects as social goods “before we 'happen' upon them” is often “why we might happen upon them in the first place.”<sup>396</sup> Street art and graffiti then, if effectively recoded as social goods, can serve as invitations into parts of the city where one's arrival might appear to be happenstance—an occurrence that mimics the process of artist-led gentrification and exonerates the ABL's intentional investment in some areas and disinvestment in others that produces both gentrification and displacement.

## 4 PITTSBURGH PAST, PITTSBURGH FUTURE: CONFLICTS AND IMPASSES ON THE SOUTHEAST TRAIL

We are faced with the troubling thought that in the molecular age, what appears to us in terms of an ethics of 'care of self', and as a pressing problem of democracy, may appear to others as yet another expression of empire.  
—Bruce Braun, "Biopolitics and the Molecularization of Life"<sup>397</sup>

To claim that the city speaks conceals the identity of those that speak through the city.  
—Rosalyn Deutsche, *Evictions*<sup>398</sup>

You don't live somewhere in the city, you live somewhere in the hierarchy.  
—The Situationists<sup>399</sup>

Figure 8: An Allegory of the Human City, Roti



On November 9<sup>th</sup> 2012, a “whiplash-inducing controversy”<sup>400</sup> ensued in the Pittsburgh neighborhood of southwest Atlanta when a small group of “angry residents”<sup>401</sup> buffed French street artist Pierre Roti's incredibly detailed 240-foot free-hand mural *An Allegory of the Human City* with gray paint. As the residents worked that morning, “people spilled out of their cars, shaking their fists”<sup>402</sup> and arguing with them about who had the right to paint the wall that stretches along the southern border of Pittsburgh facing University Avenue. In an interesting reversal of the dynamics of the Great Green Paint Debacle, Roti's work had been commissioned by Living Walls while the gray paint wielding residents were consciously acting without permit or authorization. Mural supporters from other areas of the city were alerted to the buffing through Facebook and “quickly rallied,”<sup>403</sup> arriving by one-thirty that afternoon to attempt to salvage the mural. They were joined by a Georgia Department of Transportation work crew with a pressure washer and by that evening the mural was uncovered, dimmed but legible. At some point during the day, “police cars [had] pulled up, sirens blaring. Politicians demanded arrests.”<sup>404</sup> Then, as Irina Dvalidze of *ANIMAL*, a New York City arts and culture website, recounts,

“shit got a little uncivil.”<sup>405</sup>

During the week that followed the buffing and restoration, national news organizations and

Figure 9: Allegory Details, Before and After Buffing



street art blogs picked up the story, a petition to save the mural was launched on *Change.org*, and rapidly received almost 2,000 signatures of support from around the world,<sup>406</sup> Pittsburgh residents on either side of the issue yelled at one another on the street and in barber shops,<sup>407</sup> and “Facebook groups and blog post comment sections became battlegrounds.”<sup>408</sup> In coverage of the event, the mural was largely presented as having been illegally and angrily “defaced”<sup>409</sup> by “some sort of vigilante mob.”<sup>410</sup> The buffers, however, argued that Living Walls had not taken the necessary or appropriate steps to gain community approval for the work, which was therefore subject to removal by residents—legal or not. During a press conference held on November 12<sup>th</sup> to discuss the mural's fate “tempers flared” so wildly that attendants were eventually dispersed by the Atlanta Police Department.<sup>411</sup>

*Allegory* centered on “a dense, machine-like cityscape” through which ran “an enormous fishlike creature, which the artist himself calls a snake” but had fins, a human torso and an alligator head that was swallowing or expelling “a series of ever smaller and ever more numerous fish of various species swimming into distant space in a swirling school.”<sup>412</sup> As the 23-year-old Roti explained to *The New York Times*, the work was meant as a commentary on “the brutality of capitalism”<sup>413</sup>—the fish were meant to represent humanity and the figure a mechanistic economic system.<sup>414</sup> No artist's statement accompanied *Allegory*, however, and, as *Burnaway* notes, the symbols in the work were known only to the artist himself.<sup>415</sup> Roti nonetheless expressed surprise at the fervor his piece evoked from locals, noting the kindness with which he was treated by Pittsburgh

residents during the two weeks it took him to accomplish the work.<sup>416</sup>

Although *Allegory* has been referred to as “trippy”<sup>417</sup> and “surreal”<sup>418</sup> even by supporters, the arguments surrounding the work were largely presented in the media as “more surreal than the mural, ranging from snakes and Satan to free speech and property rights.”<sup>419</sup> While supporters of the mural lauded its unquestionably intricate, time-consuming and complex form, they also deployed a justifying “cluster of well-worn clichés about art as such: that art is always socially beneficial, that art need never stoop to justify itself, that some art is always better than no art.”<sup>420</sup> Residential detractors, on the other hand, expressed a range of issues with the work's content and execution in relation to the community in which it resides. Some “wondered how it related to their history as one of Atlanta’s oldest African-American communities.”<sup>421</sup> Many were upset by the lack of consultation with residents and found the use of an online petition offensive: “It is so wrong for them to get petitions from people who live in [nearby neighborhoods] Capitol View and Sylvan Hills and not come to Pittsburgh and talk to us.”<sup>422</sup> Others found the dystopian landscape of the work to be a bit too evocative of the current reality of their neighborhood, which has suffered a long history of segregation, redlining, disinvestment, failed urban renewal projects, mortgage fraud, property vacancy and even the city's invocation of eminent domain. As *The Atlanta Journal Constitution* aptly points out, the neighborhood's Pittman Community Center “bears a mural with the kind of utopian image the neighborhood would like to achieve,” the figures of which are children playing sports and community leaders.<sup>423</sup>

While these issues were often foregrounded in residents' complaints about the piece, two particular interpretations of *Allegory's* content resounded through media coverage of the “mural uproar.”<sup>424</sup> The first was that the imagery in Roti's work was simply confusing, the second that it was evocative of the “demonic.” As Pittsburgh resident, clergy and former state representative Douglas Dean describes the latter issue, many of the Christian residents of the neighborhood read the snake figure as a serpent representing Satan. Further, they found the image of “dragons consuming people” to bring “to mind the type of destruction [the neighborhood is] seeking to eliminate.”<sup>425</sup> Residents who found the work to resist interpretation were divided in their support for the mural: some wanted it to remain as they were “still trying to figure out what it means,” while others hoped it would be replaced by “something that people can understand... something that represents the community rather

than just one artist's state of mind.”<sup>426</sup> Although Roti admittedly utilized an internally defined set of symbols when creating the work (rather than drawing on the imagery of any “generally available mythos”<sup>427</sup>), residents' interpretations of *Allegory* were foregrounded and often derided in media coverage of (and mural supporters' commentary about) the event. In video footage of the ill-fated press conference, one young white Pittsburgh resident sputters angrily that “they”—gesturing to his older black neighbors—are imposing an interpretation on the work that simply isn't valid.<sup>428</sup> In headlines, the words “satanic” and “demonic” appear perhaps as frequently as “vigilantes,” “vandalize,” and “defaced,” with the former set of terms always in scare quotes.

Although Dean's vehement arguments that “Pittsburgh is not against art” were frequently noted, they were just as frequently dismissed—“Naturally,” as Dvalidze wrote, “what's an angry mob to do but destroy art in the name of art.”<sup>429</sup> Accusations of “ingratitude” that resonated with the logic that the residents' “childish behavior” showed a lack of appreciation for a “project [LW] that attempts to beautify Atlanta's less scenic neighborhoods”<sup>430</sup> were so common that Dean defensively asserted to the *AJC* that “we aren't so stupid over here that we don't appreciate culture and art.”<sup>431</sup> Although the street art blog *Vandalog* and Roti himself approved the mural's removal in the wake of the public outcry against it<sup>432</sup> and arts publications *Burnaway* and *Temporary Art Review* called for a more careful consideration of the neighborhood's economic dynamics in coverage of the event,<sup>433</sup> the mural's detractors were effectively cast as “holy crusaders”<sup>434</sup> and subjected to all manner of lambasting in the comments sections of online articles. On a national level, they were often highlighted as “poor and uneducated”<sup>435</sup> residents of the South—where “everything is considered satanic”<sup>436</sup>—and as “religious fanatics” who “have no place in civilized society.”<sup>437</sup> Commentators speculated that perhaps these typically “closed minded poor southern Christians”<sup>438</sup> were “simple people”<sup>439</sup> who didn't understand that “fish was [sic] the sign of Christians.”<sup>440</sup> Locally, they were accused of giving “the middle finger to those that have tried to better the area,”<sup>441</sup> of ruining their own neighborhood, of looking for attention at any cost, of inhibiting artistic expression and even of deserving/desiring a replacement mural that depicts Jesus, Tyler Perry movies and/or high-profile crimes that have occurred in the area.<sup>442</sup>

Eventually, *Allegory* was found to have been rendered illegally due to a bit of property rights confusion. It was established that the wall is not the property of Carey Limousine Company—as both Carey and Living

Walls had assumed—but of the Georgia Department of Transportation who had not granted permission for their wall to be painted. In early December, GDOT removed the mural that one of its crews had previously helped salvage, bringing the fiasco to its official close. As CBS Atlanta would report the following year, however, the amount of attention this single work attracted in its brief lifespan was unprecedented: “no Atlanta mural is more internationally famous or infamous than Pierre Roti's piece commissioned by the Living Walls organization,”<sup>443</sup> the news outlet claims. While certainly the best-known controversy over a piece of art in Pittsburgh, the Roti debacle was far from the first instance of a commissioned artwork being contested, defaced, relocated and/or removed on demand by Pittsburgh residents. Further, the accusations made about the Pittsburgh residents who decried Roti's work drew from conceptions of the community that are routinely, if more euphemistically, presented by the startling array of civic organizations that work in and/or with the small neighborhood.<sup>444</sup>

It is in relation to this background, which will be discussed at more length in the following section, that the Atlanta BeltLine undertakes its involvement in both Pittsburgh and its surrounding neighborhoods, which constitute the ABL's Subarea 2. Known collectively as the “Heritage Communities of South Atlanta,” these historically black neighborhoods have long been home to a high percentage of working-class and poor residents, although many of the neighborhoods have and continue to house a substantial portion of Atlanta's black middle-class. Gentrification in this area has occurred in fits and starts over the past several decades, developing neighborhood by neighborhood and often block by block, but remaining largely constrained to residential properties and populations. The area noticeably suffers from a long history of institutional disinvestment—grocery stores are uncommon and countless industrial, commercial and residential properties stand empty across this Subarea. As redevelopment literature aimed at southwest Atlanta—including the ABL's Subarea 2 Master Plan—frequently points out, the high-end retail and coffee that often marks New Urbanist development is strikingly absent from the area. The hope expressed or implied in many of these documents is that southwest Atlanta can develop in a similar fashion to the neighborhoods of the ABL's Subarea 4; Pittsburgh, particularly, shares a number of architectural, geographical and historical features with Cabbagetown, which *Atlanta Intown* refers to as its “white cousin to the northeast.”<sup>445</sup> If in the ABL's redefining of authentic urbanity Cabbagetown is the antithesis of Atlantic Station, Pittsburgh is the Cabbagetown-that-could-be.

In this chapter, the localized issues surrounding public art and urban redevelopment that the Roti mural debates allude to will be developed in relation to the Atlanta BeltLine's contested involvement in Pittsburgh. Two works that the ABL has presented rather unsuccessfully in the area will be discussed in order to highlight the contrast between the objects and narratives that the ABL circulates in Cabbagetown/Reynoldstown and in Pittsburgh as it attempts to reduce the unfavorable deviance of the latter.

#### **4.1 Pittsburgh Past, Pittsburgh Future: The (Re)development of an Affective Public**

Like both Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown, Pittsburgh developed during the late 1800s as a home for the industrial workers who were migrating to Atlanta. The small shot-gun style homes that were constructed on the closely set lots that still line Pittsburgh's narrow residential streets tended to be owned by white Atlantans and rented to black workers employed by the Peagram railroad shops situated near the north end of the neighborhood. The haze of industrial pollution that hung in the area granted the neighborhood its name, a reference to the similar state of the neighborhoods that surrounded the steel mills of its Pennsylvania counterpart.<sup>446</sup> Currently, the triangular neighborhood, which comprises only one-square-mile of southwest Atlanta, is bordered by two major Atlanta thoroughfares and two railroad lines. The tracks that parallel University Avenue along the neighborhood's southern border are those down which the ABL will run. Only the southern third of Pittsburgh is within the ABL's Tax Allocation District and Overlay, so this portion of the neighborhood is focused on the Master Plan for Subarea 2.

Over the past fifteen years, this tiny neighborhood has become a source of much anxiety and redevelopment energy—notorious for being repeatedly designated one of the most dangerous neighborhood in the United States,<sup>447</sup> Pittsburgh currently has over twenty different civic organizations working towards its redevelopment. The BeltLine's Subarea 2 Master Plan is, according to its authors, meant to work in tandem with the redevelopment documents drawn up by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Georgia Conservancy and the Pittsburgh Community Improvement Association (PCIA). As these organizations all draw on a particular rhetoric of Pittsburgh's past to determine Pittsburgh's future, the neighborhood's history as they present it follows.

The 1883 establishment of Pittsburgh is a standard outset for histories of the neighborhood, though the

PCIA scrupulously avoids mention of the pollution that led to its naming. Although there is a good deal of documentation surrounding Pittsburgh near the turn of the last century—including the 1902 “Pittsburgh Riot” and the neighborhood's subsequent involvement in the 1906 Atlanta race riots and a number of railroad labor struggles<sup>448</sup>—most civic organizations' histories of the area jump from the late 1880s to the 1920s. By this period, a number of black-owned businesses had been established along McDaniel Street (where they were corralled due to segregation era zoning codes) and the neighborhood is described as a “thriving community...home to several important civic leaders” and to railroad workers who were “committed to the ethic of hard work” and to “faith, family and community.” During the 20s, Pittsburgh experienced a good deal of population growth, the instantiation of the Atlanta Theological School and of the locally funded Pittsburgh School. This decade is hailed as the era “when Pittsburgh was considered 'the place to be' by Black Atlantans,” but is generally followed by a recitation of the population loss that began occurring in the 1950s. This “decline” is often attributed to the “unintended negative consequences” of civil rights and integration, which arguably caused Pittsburgh to rather passively “lose...its residents” and businesses to nearby neighborhoods that formerly housed white residents and had been more sturdily constructed.<sup>449</sup>

The decades between the 1950s and early 2000s are often skipped over in these institutional histories, though PCIA does note that the failure of the Model Cities Program—the “kinder, gentler urban renewal” of the late 1960s and early 1970s—inspired a sense of promises going unfulfilled in neighborhood residents.<sup>450</sup> The program destroyed a number of single-family homes in the neighborhood, replacing them with multi-family developments that never became fully integrated into the neighborhood. The construction of I-75/85 during this period estranged the northern tip of Pittsburgh from the rest of the neighborhood and Pittsburgh acreage was also lost to MARTA construction. Between the 1970s and the 1990s, Pittsburgh's population was cut in half. At some point, the illegal trash and tire dumping by neighborhood outsiders that Pittsburgh continues to struggle with became common. Homelessness also became a prevalent neighborhood issue during this period, as did issues related to the aging of the incumbent population, many of whom have low fixed incomes.<sup>451</sup>

In the early 2000s, Pittsburgh's population began to rise again, new homes began being constructed in the area and gentrification looked as though it was immanent. The PCIA was installed in 1999 as the

neighborhood's Community Development Corporation and in 2001 Pittsburgh was officially deemed a federal Weed and Seed site. Briefly, Operation Weed and Seed, which is directed by the Community Capacity Development Office of the US Department of Justice and is frequently enforced by the FBI, is self-described as “foremost a strategy—rather than a grant program” for “crime prevention and community revitalization.” Weed and Seed utilizes a “two-pronged approach” of having law enforcement weed out “violent criminals and drug abusers” while “public agencies and community-based private organizations collaborat[e] to 'seed' much-needed human services.”<sup>452</sup> The aggressive nature of this program has led to strong criticism of Weed and Seed's activities; many activists utilize the name of the program to refer to its gentrifying effect of “weed[ing]-out low income residents and seed[ing]-in wealthier” ones.<sup>453</sup> Notably, Dan Immergluck's study of BeltLine induced gentrification and speculation between the years 2002 and 2005 suggests that at least some of Pittsburgh's population influx was sparked by media coverage of the BeltLine project.<sup>454</sup> All of the “long-depressed” neighborhoods of southwest Atlanta became centers for “frenzied real-estate speculation, house-flipping and subprime lending” as “the housing bubble was starting to inflate” and the “promise of the BeltLine” had “only served to ratchet up prices.” This gentrification process came to a screeching halt in 2007 when the foreclosure crisis swept through southwest Atlanta, particularly Pittsburgh—it was “like Hurricane Katrina without the water,” one neighborhood activist insists.<sup>455</sup> Almost half of Pittsburgh's residential properties—particularly those built in the early 2000s—continue to stand empty and boarded up.

To return to the redevelopment literature now focused on Pittsburgh, the Annie E. Casey Foundation opens their 2009 document “Recovering Pittsburgh as a Proud Community of Working Families” by noting that “there is no getting around [the] fact” that “few neighborhoods in America are in as much trouble as Pittsburgh.”<sup>456</sup> Casey, PICA, Weed and Seed and the Georgia Conservancy all hold this current state in direct tension with Pittsburgh's “vibrant heritage.”<sup>457</sup> The historic community, described on Weed and Seed's “That Was Then” webpage as comprised of “God-fearing, law-abiding, caring people,” is understood to have provided Pittsburgh with a “sense of place and belonging [that] defined the neighborhood for many decades.”<sup>458</sup> The Casey Foundation, particularly, is “determined” that this legacy “remain strongly fixed in the minds and stories of families”<sup>459</sup> that currently reside in Pittsburgh, acting as an impetus towards the goals listed in the PCIA's

vision statement for the neighborhood: “Pittsburgh will be a unique, historical and diverse community that promotes homeownership, economic and community development, public safety, education, recreation, and community pride.”<sup>460</sup>

The Casey report's authors describe the extant neighborhood as “disorderly, sometimes vacant and often chaotic,” filled with “existing residents” who do not have the capacity to “manage the community.”<sup>461</sup> Although emphasizing the historical linkages between these residents and their predecessors is meant to generate a coherent sense of community, it acts as a dividing practice, effectively segregating poor Pittsburgh residents according to a mythical binary that places the “ungrateful poor” in tension with “the good poor—hard-working, ragged but clean, and intrinsically honorable.”<sup>462</sup> Drawing on the logic of biopolitical racism, which marks its caesuras in the population according to which deviant populations act as a drain on the privileged species-body, this division marks out which residents are worthy of having their lives enhanced and which are inherently weakening the vitality of the community as an entity. Both Casey and Weed and Seed argue that eventual self-governance and empowerment “must be at the core of community rebuilding” and the former lists “growing community capacity” as the first step in the “process of truly recovering Pittsburgh as a proud community of workings families.”<sup>463</sup> As Barbara Cruikshank argues, this “political logic of empowerment” denotes a relationship “established by expertise” and “typically initiated by one party seeking to empower another” in a “democratically unaccountable exercise of power.”<sup>464</sup> Simultaneously “voluntary and coercive,” it establishes a set of truth discourses and modes of subjectification through which a virtual affective public that possesses “the capacity to act” that “empowerment alters and shapes”<sup>465</sup> could be brought into being, presumably to work as the driving force behind the creation of a Pittsburgh-present that emulates a Pittsburgh-past.

The burden of accomplishing this task not only falls to the proper subjectification of Pittsburgh residents, but also to the enhancement of the built environment. Resonant with the logic of New Urbanism's desired return to the “authentic” that has been updated to suit the current meritocracy, the literature on Pittsburgh also suggests that attempts to develop “a sense of pride and confidence” in residents should be undertaken through alterations to the built environment. In addition to “visible investments by the city,” these should include the development of “attractive commercial properties, good maintenance standards on the houses, and a positive

sense of place that includes a defined center, clear gateways...park assets and public art.”<sup>466</sup> Each of these organizations places a good deal of focus on revitalizing McDaniel Street as a “main street environment” around which PCIA's vision of Pittsburgh—a “city within a city” not unlike the mixed-use model that the Atlanta BeltLine and other New Urbanists employ—can be constructed. This development model is so integral to PCIA that it is part of the organizing statement of their redevelopment document which outlines twenty-seven different projects meant to revitalize the neighborhood and develop “community pride.”<sup>467</sup> Here, the Atlanta BeltLine and these civic organizations will theoretically interarticulate; as entities such as the PCIA attempt to empower residents through direct engagement tactics such as encouraging them to daily “utilize the phrase 'Change is in the Making,' the ABL will help fund and construct those changes to the built environment that both reflect and create individuals capable of “civic engagement.”<sup>468</sup>

#### **4.2 Empowering Discipline: Preparing Pittsburgh for a Public Art Wonderland**

In early February of 2011, both *Creative Loafing* and Jon Effron's real estate blog *A is for Atlanta* giddily announced “huge, huge happenings”<sup>469</sup> along the ABL's proposed Southeast Trail. In a stroke of “good news for BeltLine advocates,”<sup>470</sup> the French industrial supply company LaFarge had, after long negotiations with the ABL, “finally decided to part with its 20+ acre [concrete] facility” located across the corridor from Glenwood Park. Effron celebrated the plant's closure as a triumph for smart growth in its own right, insisting that “taking out of service what is essentially a parking lot for cement mixers and replacing it with smart development is never a bad thing.” Although Effron noted that this “sale could have major implications for this critical segment of the BeltLine,” he did not specifically spell them out, perhaps presuming that his readers were following the project or perhaps simply caught up in his musings about how “this once industrial stretch of Glenwood” was “beginning to look a lot like a neighborhood” in the wake of the LaFarge sale.<sup>471</sup>

*Creative Loafing*, on the other hand, extrapolated on Effron's allusions: the rail line down which the ABL would like to run its Southeast Trail is currently in use as freight rail, which inhibits the project's ability to acquire the right-of-way necessary for corridor construction in this area. The lines are owned by CSX, but they serve only one customer: LaFarge. Effron pointed out that the French company operates another rail-dependent

facility nearby, almost lamenting that “one can only hope that as BeltLine momentum builds, the freight trains are replaced by bikes, runners, strollers, green space and good cheer.”<sup>472</sup> *CL* expressed slightly more ABL optimism, presuming that LaFarge's willingness to sell one facility would eventually result in the sale of the other as well, effectively ending freight rail transit into the area and opening up access to the rail line. Although the article's author noted that the timing of such an event could not be foretold, he also emphasized that the subsequent right-of-way purchase would consolidate the ABL's “control [of] three of the project's four segments—creating a J-shape that could link West Enders to Piedmont Park.”

The curve of this J would be the Southeast Trail, which “snakes for approximately six miles past old warehouses and underneath interstates” to connect the neighborhoods of Subarea 4 to those of Subarea 2. Shortly before the LaFarge announcement, *CL* had taken a rather vocal interest in this segment of the ABL corridor, deeming this “sometimes gritty, sometimes bucolic stretch of tracks” to be “one of the BeltLine's coolest segments for rail—and art.” Noting that “Beltline supporters have been imagining such a scenario for quite some time,” *CL* speculated on the transformation of this trail that would follow the ABL's right-of-way purchase, delightedly suggesting that ABL “officials could leverage the street-art paradise” that currently resides along the tracks “into a public art hot spot.”<sup>473</sup> Pondering the possibility, the article's author happily crowed that *CL*'s “diabolical plan for a J-shaped wonderland of public art and bike trails [was] slowly fall[ing] into place.”<sup>474</sup>

While framing deindustrialization, the expansion of public greenspace and the construction of new residential and commercial properties as “good things to come”<sup>475</sup> from ABL construction is far from unusual, *CL*'s interest in the legitimation of this area's street art is noteworthy. The publication often expresses its support of illegal street art and graffiti practices: during the past several years, various *CL* articles have ardently criticized the Atlanta Graffiti Task Force, chided Cabbagetown's Wallkeepers and delighted in the extralegal pursuits of Living Wall's visiting artists.<sup>476</sup> The tracks between Glenwood Park and the Heritage Communities of Atlanta have developed the density of street art that they currently exhibit due in part to the isolation they offer; street artists and graffiti writers can work there—without permits or constraints—for relatively long periods without interruption or much threat of arrest. Also, *CL*'s description of the Southeast Trail as a simultaneously gritty and bucolic paradise for street art chimes with the conception of authentic urbanity that underpins many

new urbanist and street art practices, Although “activating” underused public space is also one of the tenets of these processes, the tracks are, as aforementioned, already in use and being put to a variety of purposes for those willing to venture down them. Nonetheless, *CL* encourages an increased ease of accessibility to this space and the institutionalization of the unauthorized art that it showcases.

This shift in tone is likely attributable in large part to perceptions of the neighborhoods of southwest Atlanta that cluster around the end of the Southeast Trail. In an area marked by disinvestment, underemployment and poverty, graffiti is more likely to be read as an indicator of crime and apathy than of engagement of the cityscape or a positively connotated “public.” To wit, the Atlanta Graffiti Task Force, which worked with Reynoldstown's WonderRoot to compile its list of works worth preservation, was reinstated in response to complaints about graffiti in southwest Atlanta.<sup>477</sup> Relatedly, *CL*'s push for the institutionalization of these art forms in this area suggests a perception that these communities are being “underserved” in terms of public art—the language Living Walls used to explain its expansion into the neighborhoods of southwest Atlanta.<sup>478</sup>

Such a theoretic configuration is not, as Malcolm Miles argues, unusual in urban development processes, but rather essential to them. Miles writes,

Urban development, [whether] futuristic towers of glass or homely vernacular, sets up an adversarial social model: 'good' affluence against 'defiling' deprivation, on a colonial model of 'developed' and 'developing' countries, the perception becoming a justification for the value-laden process which produces it...Art in development aids this socially divisive process by aestheticizing it.<sup>479</sup>

As Pittsburgh appears as “developing” in this schematic, the art exhibited by the ABL during redevelopment is likely to reflect this process. While *CL*'s expectation that the ABL will eventually produce a singular public art wonderland that incorporates the illegitimate art of the Southeast Trail anticipates the expansion of the urban aesthetic that marks the new, general curve the project is setting for the city, that presumption also reflects the futurity on which security works. Neither the closure of LaFarge's second plant nor the transformation of the Southeast Trail's street art are expected to happen with immediacy; as they are interrelated, the assertion that “there's no telling”<sup>480</sup> when the former will finally occur also applies to the latter. Further, the context in which street art and graffiti are read in the neighborhoods of southwest Atlanta will have to be developed, the spaces that they aide in the production of recoded in order to reflect these forms as expressions of authentic urbanity as

the ABL defines it.

In an area that does not appear threatened by suburban homogenization, graffiti and street art cannot function towards the same ends that they serve in neighborhoods like Midtown, Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown. The presence of new urbanist projects and aesthetics in these rapidly gentrifying or gentrified neighborhoods suggests a resistance to discipline that is taken to indicate the participants' investment in maintaining the authentic 'character' of their space—topophilia is expressed through an aesthetic dissent understood to refute homogeneity. The generative, recognizable aesthetic form of this dissent is, however, central to such a reading. Although Pittsburgh residents' rejection of *Allegory* could be read as a similar aesthetic resistance to outside forces that desire to shift the neighborhood's appearance, this action was, as evidenced in the debates surrounding it, widely interpreted as threatening the authentic “multicultural citizen” with a “monstrous monoculturalism” not unlike that of suburbia.<sup>481</sup> The removal of an artwork that was read as not adequately reflecting the black, working-class community in which it was rendered was understood by many as dangerously excessive and homogenizing. The young, white Pittsburgh resident who accused his older, black neighbors of misinterpreting *Allegory* explicated just such a reading of this social dynamic when he told CBS that “they keep encouraging dialogue and yet all we have is a monologue of like-minded people.”<sup>482</sup>

In order to bring Pittsburgh in line with the intertwined multiculturalism and aesthetic heterogeneity that the ABL has set as markers of authentic urbanity, a different set of art forms must be deployed in this area, an endeavor that the public arts goals outlined in the ABL's Subarea 2 Master Plan reflects. In order to highlight the site-specificity of these goals, a brief contrast with the parallel aims listed in the Subarea 4 Master Plan follows. Importantly, the production of these documents relied on a community engagement process akin to New Urbanist design charrettes; ABL officials conducted a series of community meetings in each subarea as its Master Plan was being prepared and utilized residents' input to clarify the overarching goals or “guiding principles” that organize each planning document. In the Subarea 4 plan, “greenspace and public art” is listed as one of the subarea's three major goals. Despite such a focus on public art programming, the document's recommendations for implementation are minimal. The intention to “celebrate local art” is highlighted and a number of spaces—primarily parks and gateway areas—are noted as appropriate for new public art

installations.<sup>483</sup> The ABL has already begun moving towards this goal in Subarea 4: as aforementioned, the Reynoldstown interim trail houses a substantial portion of AAB's permanent collection and each of these works resonates with the public art that already exists in the area.

The Subarea 2 Master Plan takes a noticeably different approach to public art. Although not so much as mentioned in any one of the ten “guiding principles” derived from the community meetings, public art is a prominent theme in this document.<sup>484</sup> Its authors insist that “the public realm of Subarea 2 should be enhanced with new art as the BeltLine vision is implemented”<sup>485</sup> and make numerous, detailed recommendations for how this end can be achieved. As in the Subarea 4 Master Plan, parks, gateway areas and new developments are recommended as desirable locations for new art installations. In this document, however, the express purpose of each of these as-of-yet unproposed works is detailed. Public art in this subarea, this Master Plan argues, should be comprised of content that achieves one or more of the following goals: artworks should “reflect local history,”<sup>486</sup> “celebrate industrial history,”<sup>487</sup> “include an educational component to celebrate the subarea's history and identity,”<sup>488</sup> and/or serve the purposes of “environmental education.”<sup>489</sup> “Historic relics” should be “preserved as public art and local landmarks”<sup>490</sup> and “local schools...should be capitalized on in planning for art,”<sup>491</sup> further ensuring the “creat[ion] of education-based art.”<sup>492</sup>

In many ways, this educational-historical model for public art is overtly disciplinary, a relation that has been expressed in many of the temporary AAB artworks exhibited in the area. Before turning to these works directly, it is important to note that this language also suggests the forms such works are likely to take: works that are meant to be directly educational are likely to take a form that emphasizes use or process while commemorative works often rely on portraiture (*Steel Fabric*) or, in the case of the ABL, sculpture evocative of industry (*Hands Along the Rail*). Community-based art, sometimes called “new genre public art,” is perhaps the most ubiquitous process utilized for artworks meant to commemorate and/or educate specific communities. In this process, the artist intentionally engages community members as collaborators in the creation of particular works.

Two pieces that were placed side-by-side along the interim trail in 2011 suggest these forms. Installed behind a row of small single-family homes, Mike Carpenter's *Concrete Chess Table* was exactly what its name

implies: a large, functional chess set. Carpenter's artist statement spells out both his intentions and intended audience: "Chess tables are a great way to promote community by providing space for individuals to gather and play chess. The game of chess also challenges people to think critically and to engage with people in a social and stimulating environment."<sup>493</sup> *Concrete Chess Table* was unequivocally meant to engage, educate and stimulate local residents through its use value. The nearby installation *BeltLine Dreams*, on the other hand, draws together both use and commemoration in an exemplary process of community-based art. The artists listed as responsible for the work are "J. Richard Laopus and the Youth of Peoplestown, Mechanicsville, Summerhill, Pittsburgh and Adair Park." Intended as a "tribute to the dreams of the Peoplestown youth," the installation is comprised of "a photo-wall" where close-up portraits of young individuals have been installed, each "festooned with small gardens to help their dreams grow."<sup>494</sup>

While such a community-based public art process is largely what Pittsburgh residents were calling for during the Roti debates, this form has, since the 1990s, become intimately involved with processes of gentrification and redevelopment. The history of new genre public art is generally traced back to the late 1960s or early 1970s when a number of politically engaged artists "challenged modernist tenants of aesthetic autonomy by exploring art's functions in mutable social circumstances."<sup>495</sup> Although intended as a critique of hegemonic forms of public art, community-based art began being institutionalized in the late 1980s or early 1990s as state and federally-funded arts programs began to mandate community engagement from commissioned artists.<sup>496</sup> Public arts grants began (and continue) to be largely offered to artists working in communities that have been deemed "at risk" in some fashion, blurring the lines between the labor of art production and of social work.<sup>497</sup> As Miriam Kwon has argued, "while such [new genre public art] efforts challenge [the] conventional power dynamics and hierarchies that sustain the contemporary art world" they also rely on uneven power relations. The artists undertaking them not only tend to presume "a unified public sphere," but also "often maintai[n] a certain paternalistic attitude toward the 'collaborating' audience members."<sup>498</sup>

Kwon's observations highlight the linkages between the politics of empowerment and the deployment of public art in service of urban redevelopment. From this purview, the community-based art process poses a number of questions about how such works are expected to function by those creating and commissioning them

and about who the works are meant to address. In the case of *BeltLine Dreams*, for instance, the intention to empower the artists' young collaborators is overt. While those family members, neighbors, friends and community members who are invested in the individuals pictured certainly constitute one audience for the work, *BeltLine Dreams* can also be read by those outside these communities as a visible display of the process of “empowerment” that has been linked to redevelopment in this subarea. As the production of community-based artworks involves an art “expert” and community members, these works signal that at least some residents of the neighborhoods in which they are displayed are willing to become empowered, so to speak. An appropriate topophilia is expressed through the product of one's engagement with the truth discourses and modes of subjectification that function through the logic of empowerment. Despite the forms' rootedness in localized communities, the NEA's insistence that community-based public art serves as an excellent tool for promoting “urban revitalization and cultural tourism”<sup>499</sup> highlights how these works function to mediate the perceptions of low-income neighborhoods for viewers who do not reside there. As many of the “at risk” communities with whom such works are undertaken inhabit urban neighborhoods with substantial rent-gaps, community-based art has, as Gregory Sholette points out, “too often become a fig-leaf for urban renewal projects and gentrification.”<sup>500</sup>

Similarly, as commemorative ABL works tend to suggest that industrial work/ers are anachronistic, they too signal the presence of a population willing to be empowered by “progressing” into the creative and service industries on which smart development relies. As such visual markers of development alter the landscapes of the neighborhoods of Subarea 2, the graffiti and street art that occasionally appear there will be able to be read by both residents and potential residents in a context other than “broken windows.” Such works may eventually serve to indicate that these neighborhoods, which are relatively inexpensive to inhabit and soon to be transit-oriented, are every bit as authentic and desirable as their Subarea 4 counterparts.

### **4.3 “The Future is Killing Us Now”**

#### *Couples: Reimagined*

In 2010, Atlanta artist Karen Shacham began exhibiting her work *Couples: Reimagined* in local

galleries. A series of portraits of local queer couples, these brightly colored, slightly stylized photographs are both grounded in and intentionally diverge from traditional styles of portraiture, using form to call attention to the 'queerness' of the subjects' relationships. The impetus for *Couples*, as Shacham describes it in her artist statement, was an examination of the manner in which her own “desire to be accepted by the mainstream community overshadowed the possibility of pursuing [her] own notion of family.” Although she argues that gay marriage and “equality [are] important,” Shacham wonders if “in pursuing the right to marry...queer couples [are] giving up something else? In creating these images, I invoked classical family portraiture...while also questioning the idea of blending in to the whole.”<sup>501</sup>

In 2012, *Couples* underwent two separate evolutions for two public exhibitions. The first, which was mounted in August, was funded by a grant from Idea Capital. Meant to allow Shacham's portraits to reach “a wider audience,”<sup>502</sup> this installation involved expanding three of the *Couples* photos to six feet by four feet and temporarily exhibiting them on the side of a building between the Old Fourth Ward and Midtown.<sup>503</sup> According to Idea Capital, the works invited “the viewer to question society's view of queer couples and wonder about their own role in changing perceptions” even after the photos were gone.

The following month, another version of *Couples: Reimagined* appeared in southwest Atlanta near Pittsburgh as part of the Art on the Atlanta BeltLine annual exhibition. A collaborative effort between Shacham and Mike Carpenter (the sculptor who designed *Concrete Chess Table*), this version of *Couples* involved three of the portraits being transferred to wood, painted and hung in the trees that line the interim trail that runs through Subarea 2.<sup>504</sup> In an almost shocking about-face, this incarnation of Shacham's series (a photo of which was used as the lead image for *CL's* “2012 Art on the Atlanta BeltLine Sneak Peek”) was accompanied on the trail by the following statement:

Photographer Karen Shacham and artist Mike Carpenter have come together to produce three large-scale photo murals of same-sex couples. The black-and-white photos have been painted along with the wall space around them in a mural that reflects the environment, as if the people in the portraits are trying to “fit in” to the surroundings.<sup>505</sup>

Although couched in somewhat tentative language (“as if”), this statement worked in tandem with the form of AAB's *Couples: Reimagined* to reconfigure the challenge to homonormativity expressed in the form of Shacham's initial work and the wording of her statement. Further, with viewers' attention directed towards the action of the paint surrounding the subjects (which presumably animates the subjects as well), the intentionally lingering questions Shacham's earlier public exhibition attempted to pose were succinctly answered.

Notably, the notorious role of LGBT individuals as the “shock troops of gentrification” and “the canaries of the creative economy” (particularly in artist-led gentrification narratives (in which gentrifiers bear the sole responsibility for the instigation of this process) has, as Theo Greene argues, “complicated the relationship between the gay (read as “white”) and African American communities,” often positioning them as “mutually exclusive” and antagonistic. Despite the myriad, endlessly overlapping and often conflicting set of relationships that exist between a variety of communities involved in the gentrification of people of color neighborhoods by queer and/or LGBT populations, the role of the black church as a promoter of homophobia during these processes has been the focus of a number of gentrification studies (for a local example, see the narrative concerning Kirkwood, Atlanta in “Resurgent Gentrification and the Assimilation of LGBT Neighborhoods ” by Petra L. Doan and Harrison Higgins). AAB's *Couples* rather forcefully responds to such narratives, insisting to local residents that the queer couples adorning their ABL trail represent not an encroaching presence but an assimilating one.

As Shacham notes in her blog, *Couples* did not remain in situ for long. On September 8<sup>th</sup>, the piece was “knocked down by someone ten hours after they originally went up.” Interestingly, Shacham's commentary expresses neither surprise nor frustration at this turn of events, but anticipation and resolve: “that hasn't stopped us,” she writes. “We'll keep putting them back up every time.”<sup>506</sup> And, indeed, someone had to. The murals were pushed over so many times that they were eventually relocated to an open space adjacent to the trail but in view

Figure 10: *Couples: Reimagined*, Karen Shacham and Mike Carpenter



Figure 11: Couples Relocated

of a major road. Reinstalled amongst fallen limbs and dying brush, *Couples* underwent some unauthorized alterations (facial hair and dreadlocks were added to two of the figures in pen), but the work remained in its new environment until the close of the exhibition on November 11<sup>th</sup>, the same weekend that Pittsburgh residents and Living Walls supporters were struggling over *Allegory*.



### *TiredOUT*

While the relocations of *Couples: Reimagined* proceeded rather quietly and the destruction of *Allegory* made international news, the brouhaha that surrounded the AAB work *TiredOUT* is perhaps the most telling conflict to occur between Pittsburgh residents and an institutional arts organization in recent years. A sculpture created by Arseni Zeitsev of Anonymous Studio and installed on the ABL trail between Pittsburgh and Adair Park as part of the AAB's first exhibition in 2010, *TiredOUT* filled the ABL's request that public artwork in Subarea 2 function to promote environmental education. The work's overarching themes were recycling, resourcefulness and beautification, each of which was also consonant with the "Preservation of Pittsburgh Master Plan," a 2008 document crafted by the Sustainable Neighborhood Development Strategies, Inc., PCIA and the Casey Foundation in order "to arrest the downward spiral in the Pittsburgh neighborhood and return it to the vibrant and thriving neighborhood it once was."<sup>507</sup>

*TiredOUT* was, as its name implies, constructed almost entirely of tires (cable and wire were used to hold the piece together). A large tire tunnel, the work, like *Co-Exist*, served as a gateway through which viewers could enter the interim trail. The work was meant to not only contribute to environmental education, but also to actively contribute to the production of space along the corridor by engaging the bodies of visitors in the exhibition space. As the artist statement expresses these intentions, *TiredOUT* was a set of "recovered tires creating something beautiful through the recycling of tires: they become the building blocks to create a highly sculptural and, at the same time, spatial artifact."<sup>508</sup>

That year, the AAB exhibition did not officially open until June 5<sup>th</sup>, but southwest Atlanta residents had been vocally expressing their discontent with the work even before its construction had begun. As local news station 11Alive reported on the 5<sup>th</sup>, “just days after the artists began stockpiling the tires, neighbors, including Regina McDuffie, started complaining.” The title of this news story, “Tire Art Along BeltLine Bugs Neighbors,” plays on the issue that was given primacy in coverage of the conflict: the health threat that the work potentially posed to local residents.<sup>509</sup> Although the artists who constructed the work had drilled each tire with holes,<sup>510</sup> the tires, residents argued, could potentially hold water thereby becoming a “giant mosquito condo”<sup>511</sup>

Figure 12: TiredOUT, Arseni Zeitsev & Anonymous Studio



potential source for Nile Virus. While this BeltLine officials to the neighborhood, TiredOUT far about a potential As would sensationalistically local media in the

and by extension a the spread of West argument convinced remove the work from residents' issues with outstripped concerns insect infestation. soon be splashed across the spring of 2003 when a

young gay man was attacked with an abandoned tire at a Pittsburgh corner store, the neighborhoods of southwest Atlanta—particularly Pittsburgh—have long been filled with illegally dumped tires and trash.<sup>512</sup> Although the City of Atlanta has a Tire Commission that ostensibly deals with illegal tire dumping, PCIA holds a volunteer clean-up once every three months in order to remove tires and other trash from the area. The materials for *TiredOUT* were taken from the piles of tires that have accumulated near the ABL's interim trail. Many southwest Atlanta residents found the transformation of these illegal tires into an art installation they were meant to appreciate and perhaps learn from offensive. Jonathan Henry, one of the Anonymous Studio artists who worked on the piece, nonetheless defended the sculpture, arguing that from the beginning their “concept was to recycle

something that this neighborhood has been dealing with—illegal dumping of tires—turning it into something that's a little more beautiful.”<sup>513</sup>

In the face of residents proclaiming a health scare, AAB's Director of Design Fred Yalouris quickly agreed to remove *TiredOUT* and the sculpture was dismantled just three days after the exhibition began.<sup>514</sup> As radio station 90.1 WABE would report on June 21<sup>st</sup>, however, the tires that had been culled from the neighborhood to construct the sculpture were still lying abandoned along the trail at the end of the month. Although a tire recycling facility is located in Pittsburgh, ABL officials told WABE that they had not yet removed the tires from the neighborhood because they were still attempting to locate a legitimate tire recycling service—they didn't want them to end up illegally dumped in another neighborhood.<sup>515</sup>

### *Public Art, Gentrification and the Impasse of Biopolitics*

While Henry's comment regarding the beauty of *TiredOUT* was intended as a defense of the artwork, his approach alludes to one of the most interesting issues Pittsburgh residents discussed in reference to the sculpture—how the determination of their neighborhood's aesthetics relates directly to the threat of BeltLine led gentrification. During the AAB exhibition, Georgia State University graduate student David Holmes was conducting research in Pittsburgh for his Masters in Geoscience thesis. Titled “Stakeholders' Perceptions of Risk for Gentrification in Atlanta's Pittsburgh Neighborhood,” Home's thesis queries how Pittsburgh residents and civic organizations conceptualize the threat of gentrification in the wake of the foreclosure crisis and in the face of BeltLine construction.

Despite the pervasive implications that Pittsburgh residents are apathetic (redevelopment literature), hopeless (local news coverage of crime in the area) and/or resistant to change (coverage of the *Allegory* fiasco), Holmes found that residents were wary of the civic operations currently operating in the neighborhood but nonetheless

expressed optimism about a [neighborhood] turn-around through the innovation of its residents, and civic leaders in partnership with private funding agencies and semi-governmental organizations. They see the hope producing a reversal of neighborhood decline at the very least and a model test case of community grassroots prevention of gentrification and displacement in the best case scenario.<sup>516</sup>

Residents' perceptions of risk, then, did not stem from the format of the projects currently working in the neighborhood, nor from the involvement of private or governmental entities, nor were they solely attributable to a lack of faith in specific civic leaders. Instead, residents' conceptualizations of gentrification and their assessments of how displacement currently threatens Pittsburgh were grounded in their previous experiences with gentrification and displacement in and around the neighborhood.

Holmes found that the various civic leaders of Pittsburgh all expressed substantial approval of the ABL project and argued that if the project did initiate gentrification in Pittsburgh that this process would not start until sometime well in the future. Residents, on the other hand, found the project to be intensely suspect. According to Holmes, their distrust of BeltLine officials stemmed from three primary sources. The first was based in the history of MARTA's actions within Pittsburgh. As MARTA was developing, they began purchasing property on the southside of the neighborhood to serve as a “buffer zone” for future transit stations and parking lots. When residents wouldn't sell, “the city condemned everyone's property in the area...and just basically “took” the property for very little money.” Residents in Holmes' focus group agreed that the BeltLine is likely “to do the same thing.”<sup>517</sup> The second source of mistrust was skepticism about the ABL's proposed “workforce housing” development in Pittsburgh: as units are priced around \$250,000 a piece, these “affordable” homes may well be “out of reach for the people of the south side,” most of whom earn less than \$25,000 annually.<sup>518</sup> Finally, the “monstrosity over near Murphy Street,” otherwise known as *TiredOUT* (though not named as such here), “engendered a sense of distrust in the motives of” BeltLine officials.

The issue Holmes' interviewees expressed concerning *TiredOUT* as a work were purely aesthetic—neither health hazards nor illegal tires were mentioned. Instead, as these residents related the incident, “the art work was so hideous that the whole area campaigned against it and finally the BeltLine officials took it down.” Like *Allegory's* later detractors, these residents told Holmes that “the community felt insulted that the BeltLine did not listen to the neighborhood's wishes about what would be considered good art.” A “more successful” public art project located on DeKalb Avenue was used as a contrast point—it had involved “a lot of local input” and simply “looked better to them.” In the discussion of these two works, Pittsburgh's residents not only expressed “a perceived loss of local control over what happens in their neighborhood” to “people with power,”

but also highlighted that “the contrast between a more prosperous northeast side versus a poorer south side made it clear in their minds that their area was deemed of less value.”<sup>519</sup>

Throughout Holmes' thesis, Pittsburgh residents assert that race has a direct impact on gentrification processes. One interviewee who summarized a general consensus on how racialized gentrification patterns function in Atlanta “suggested that by the first decade of the 2000s whites want[ed] back in and that the city will do whatever it takes to get the whites back.”<sup>520</sup> When Pittsburgh residents' analyses of the interrelations between race and gentrification are read against the feelings of passivity they describe AAB's exhibition to have evoked—feelings of being ignored, not taken seriously, losing control over their space—a sense of being caught in the workings of biopolitical racism emerges. Rather than exercising a directly murderous capacity, biopower will express racism through “every form of indirect murder”<sup>521</sup> or passively letting certain populations die.

Although Matteo Pasquinelli makes a strong argument that biopolitics and its related processes of gentrification and financialization are a “becoming faceless of power,”<sup>522</sup> the residents of Pittsburgh have cited BeltLine aesthetic processes, namely the installation of *TiredOUT*, as visual markers that they are on the receiving end of biopower's tendency to let die. Taken from this purview, Pittsburgh's rejections of various artworks—particularly overtly disciplinary artworks—appear as grounded in a much more complex resistance than they are often credited with. As Ahmed argues, the circulation of certain objects as social goods—in this case objects that express particular urban aesthetics—codes them as the causes of happiness even before “we 'happen' upon them.” Such coding, she argues, is in fact “why we might happen upon them in the first place.”<sup>523</sup> Although most of the artworks examined here appear to serve a disciplinary function that is aimed at the residents of Pittsburgh, they also, as discussed in the previous section, code neighborhoods and their affective populations as potentially “happy” objects onto which someone else—namely, someone able to gentrify—might stumble.

As Pasquinelli explicates, the notions of endocolonization and biopolitics—particularly as they relate to gentrification—“represent the diagram of an impasse.” This impasse, he writes, is

the problem and the drama of all the political analyses that insist on this biopolitical dimension. How can you rebel against your own life, when it is your own life with its desires, need of communication social relations, lifestyles, etc. that became productive of value? How can you

sabotage your own life?<sup>524</sup>

On one hand, Pittsburgh residents are hopeful that their neighborhood can be revitalized, even through public-private hybrids like the BeltLine. On the other, they seem intensely aware that the aestheticization of their neighborhood that accompanies such redevelopment is likely to produce their own displacement. By locating a process—the introduction of artwork into their neighborhood—that can act as something of a synecdoche for these larger issues and pushing against it, they not only reject the very specific disciplinary aims of works such as *Concrete Chess Table*, *Couples: Reimagined* or *TiredOUT* but of the docility the success of such works might be taken to indicate.

Although the Atlanta BeltLine's Subarea 2 Master Plan implies that the ABL is adapting to Pittsburgh residents' expressed desire for community-based artworks, this plan is long-term and does not dictate the relative abilities of artists constructing temporary works to engage with the community. And though the ABL may find a manner in which their interventions into the neighborhood can more successfully engage residents, the logic of security that marks the project's authentic urbanity in other areas of the city is not necessarily understood to be antithetical to discipline, overt displays of power and/or gentrification in Pittsburgh. Holmes describes residents' presumptions about how ABL development may unfold in the neighborhood as hinging on the futurity that defines security: residents find it likely that developers who have purchased now empty houses or lots (including the Annie E. Casey Foundation) will simply “leave [their] properties vacant while waiting for the BeltLine to transform the neighborhood.”<sup>525</sup> During one discussion concerning the foreclosure crisis and the subsequent increase in such properties in Pittsburgh, one resident “summed up everyone's feelings when he said 'the future is killing us now.’”<sup>526</sup>

## REFERENCES

- Abernathy, Jeremy. "Graffiti: Public Art Worth Funding? | Atlanta News & Opinion Blog." *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, March 3, 2009. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2009/03/03/graffiti-public-art-worth-funding>.
- "About." *Atlantic Station*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://www.atlanticstation.com/about>.
- "About Pittsburgh Community." *Pittsburgh Community Improvement Association*. Accessed December 13, 2013. <http://pcia-atlanta.org/about/about-pittsburgh-community/>.
- Ahmed, Sara. "Happy Objects." In *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J Seigworth, 29–51. Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Allison, Dorothy. "A Question of Class." *History Is a Weapon*. Accessed December 13, 2013. <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/skinall.html>.
- Altshuler, Alan A., and David Luberoff. *Mega-Projects: The Changing Politics of Urban Public Investment*. Brookings Institution Press, 2003.
- Amin, Ash. "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space." *City* 12, no. 1 (2008): 5–24. doi:10.1080/13604810801933495.
- Amin, Ash, and Stephen Graham. "The Ordinary City." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22, no. 4 (January 1, 1997): 411–429. doi:10.2307/623110.
- Anderson, Ben. "Affect and Biopower: Towards a Politics of Life." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37, no. 1 (2012): 28–43.
- AnotherRick. "Comment on 'National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.'" *Decatur Metro*, February 16, 2011. <http://www.decalurmetro.com/2011/02/16/national-chains-have-not-done-well-at-atlantic-station/>.
- "Areseni Zeitsev: TiredOUT." *Artists 2010: Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.
- "Art on the Atlanta BeltLine." *Grant Space: A Service of the Foundation Center*, October 12, 2011. <http://grantspace.org/Classroom/training-calendar/Atlanta/Art-on-the-Atlanta-BeltLine-2011-10-12-Atlanta-GA>.
- ATL. "Comment on 'First Slice 11/19/13: Grant Park Residents Ask Court to Overturn Permit for Proposed Glenwood Park Development.'" *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, November 19, 2013. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2013/11/19/first-slice-111913-grant-park-residents-head-to-court-to-overturn-permit-for-proposed-glenwood-park-development>.
- Atlanta BeltLine. *Lofts at Reynoldstown Crossing Section II - Project Narrative*. Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta BeltLine. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://beltlineorg.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/6-1-12-ULI-Kemp-2012-Sect.-II-Final.pdf>.
- "Atlanta BeltLine Overview." *Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://beltline.org/about/the-atlanta-beltline-project/atlanta-beltline-overview/>.

- “Atlanta BeltLine to Receive \$18 Million Grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation.” *Atlanta BeltLine Blog*, September 2, 2013. <http://beltline.org/2013/09/02/atlanta-beltline-to-receive-18-million-grant-from-the-u-s-department-of-transportation/>.
- “Atlanta Beltline, Inc. Names Brian M. Leary President and CEO.” *Atlanta BeltLine Blog*, September 16, 2009. <http://beltline.org/2009/09/16/atlanta-beltline-inc-names-brian-m-leary-president-and-ceo/>.
- “Atlantans Paint Over ‘Satanic’ Mural : Durability Design News.” *Renovate with Color*, November 13, 2012. <http://www.renovatewithcolor.com/2012/11/atlantans-paint-over-satanic-mural.html>.
- “Atlantic Station and West Midtown (Westside).” *Congress for the New Urbanism*. Accessed December 9, 2013. <http://www.cnu.org/AtlanticStation-Westside>.
- “Atlantic Station FAQs.” *Atlantic Station*. Accessed December 9, 2013. <http://www.atlanticstation.com/about/faqs>.
- Baird, David, Harry Basch, Amy Donohoe, Amy Eckert, Bill McRae, Matthew Poole, Darwin Porter, et al. *Frommer’s USA*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- Baldwin, James, Fred L. Standley, and Louis H. Pratt. *Conversations With James Baldwin*. Univ. Press of Mississippi, 1989.
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah, and Marita Sturken. “Shepard Fairey and the New Cultural Entrepreneurship.” In *Blowing Up the Brand: Critical Perspectives on Promotional Culture*, edited by Melissa Aronczyk and Devon Powers, 263–284. Peter Lang, 2010.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. London; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Bednar, Bob. “Banksy: Graffiti Is Art.” *COM 783: Visual Communication at Southwestern University*. Accessed December 12, 2013. [http://people.southwestern.edu/~bednarb/su\\_netWorks/projects/jle/index.html](http://people.southwestern.edu/~bednarb/su_netWorks/projects/jle/index.html).
- “Beltline.” *Shirley Franklin*. Accessed December 8, 2013. [http://shirley-franklin.com/?page\\_id=327](http://shirley-franklin.com/?page_id=327).
- “Beltline, Bees and a Victory for Our Communities!” *Lady Nyo’s Weblog*, June 5, 2010. <http://ladynyo.wordpress.com/2010/06/05/beltline-bees-and-a-victory-for-our-communities/>.
- Bentley, Rosalind. “Embattled Mural Prompts Question: How Much Say Should Public Have in Public Art?” *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, December 17, 2012, sec. Entertainment. <http://www.ajc.com/news/entertainment/embattled-mural-prompts-question-how-much-say-shou/nTYm3/>.
- Berowne. “Comment on ‘These Pictures Tell the Story of Art in Atlanta. At Least in Some Communities.’” *Lady Nyo’s Weblog*, June 3, 2010. <http://ladynyo.wordpress.com/2010/06/02/arrogance-and-disconnect/>.
- “Best Murals In Atlanta.” *CBS Atlanta: Arts & Culture*, September 30, 2013. <http://atlanta.cbslocal.com/top-lists/best-murals-in-atlanta/>.
- Blackman, Lisa. *Immaterial Bodies: Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*. London: Sage, 2012.
- Blakenship, Jessica. “Living Walls Welcomes Global Street Artists, Thinkers to Atlanta.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, August 13, 2010, sec. Cover Story. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/living-walls-welcomes-global-street-artists-thinkers-to-atlanta/Content?oid=1981611>.

- Blau, Max. "First Slice 11/19/13: Grant Park Residents Ask Court to Overturn Permit for Proposed Glenwood Park Development." *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, November 19, 2013. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2013/11/19/first-slice-111913-grant-park-residents-head-to-court-to-overturn-permit-for-proposed-glenwood-park-development>.
- Bond, Sophie, and Michelle Thompson-Fawcett. "Public Participation and New Urbanism: A Conflicting Agenda?" *Planning Theory & Practice* 8, no. 4 (December 2007): 449–472.
- Boone, Christian. "Atlantic Station Wants You to Go Carless." *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution* (November 8, 2007): METRO NEWS; Pg. 3D.
- Brand, Peter. "Green Subjection: The Politics of Neoliberal Urban Environmental Management." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 31, no. 3 (2007): 616–632. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2007.00748.x.
- Brand, Peter, and Michael Thomas. *Urban Environmentalism: Global Change and the Mediation of Local Conflict*. Routledge, 2013.
- Braun, Bruce. "Biopolitics and the Molecularization of Life." *Cultural Geographies* 14, no. 1 (January 1, 2007): 6–28. doi:10.1177/1474474007072817.
- Brenner, Neil. "What Is Critical Urban Theory?" *City* 13, no. 2–3 (June 1, 2009): 198–207. doi:10.1080/13604810902996466.
- Brianc. "Comment on 'National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.'" *Decatur Metro*, February 17, 2011. <http://www.decalurmetro.com/2011/02/16/national-chains-have-not-done-well-at-atlantic-station/>.
- Brown, Robbie. "BeltLine Provides New Life to Railroad Tracks in Atlanta." *The New York Times*, February 14, 2013, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/15/us/beltline-provides-new-life-to-railroad-tracks-in-atlanta.html>.
- . "Two Atlanta Murals Are Painted Over After Complaints." *The New York Times*, December 13, 2012, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/14/us/two-atlanta-murals-are-painted-over-after-complaints.html>.
- Bullard, Robert D. *The Black Metropolis in the Twenty-First Century: Race, Power, and Politics of Place*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Bullard, Robert, Glenn S. Johnson, and Angel O. Torres. *Sprawl City: Race, Politics, and Planning in Atlanta*. Island Press, 2000.
- Buntin, Simmons B. "UnSprawl Case Study: Glenwood Park, Atlanta, Georgia." *Terrain.org: A Journal of the Built + Natural Environments* 17, no. Fall/Winter (2005). <http://terrain.org/>.
- Carroll, Johnny. "Atlanta BeltLine Origins: An Interview with Ryan Gravel." *Purge*, June 3, 2011. <http://purgeatl.com/2011/06/03/atlanta-beltline-origins-an-interview-with-ryan-gravel/>.
- Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, 2011.
- chantaljoncs. "What Can You Tell Me about ATLANTIC STATION? (Atlanta: Apartments, Lofts)." *City-Data*

*Forum*, November 7, 2007. <http://www.city-data.com/forum/atlanta/176315-what-can-you-tell-me-about.html>.

ChrisInmanPark. "Comment on 'GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).'" *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, December 12, 2012. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2012/12/11/gdot-crews-covering-up-roti-mural-near-pittsburgh-neighborhood>.

City of Atlanta Department of Planning and Community Development. "BeltLine Zoning Ordinance Presentation." n.d. <http://www.atlantaga.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=1674>.

clinchier. "Comment on 'Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the "Anti-Mall!"'" *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, February 11, 2011. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2011/02/11/atlantic-station-prepare-for-your-spellbinding-transformation-into-the-anti-mall>.

"CNU 18 Tours." *Congress for the New Urbanism*. Accessed December 8, 2013. <http://www.cnu.org/tours#18>.

Cochran, Robert. "Governmentality: The New Urbanism and the Creative Class within Atlanta, Georgia." Doctor of Philosophy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012. [www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/31169/Cochran\\_Robert.pdf?sequence=1](http://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/31169/Cochran_Robert.pdf?sequence=1).

Cook, Rhonda. "Beltline Experiencing Crime." *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, December 16, 2012, sec. Crime & Law. <http://www.ajc.com/news/news/crime-law/beltline-experiencing-crime/nTW9R/>.

Cornwell, Nattalie. "The Sexiest Address in Atlanta." Real Estate Blog. *Active Rain*, April 26, 2007. <http://activerain.com/blogsview/84347/the-sexiest-address-in-atlanta>.

Costa, P., M. Magalhães, B. Vasconcelos, and G. Sugahara. "On 'creative Cities' Governance Models: A Comparative Approach." *The Service Industries Journal* 28, no. 3 (2008): 393–413. doi:10.1080/02642060701856282.

Courage, Cara. "The Global Phenomenon of Tactical Urbanism as an Indicator of New Forms of Citizenship." *Engage Journal Citizenship and Belonging*, no. 32 (n.d.): 88–97.

Cox, Wendell. "Atlanta's Atlantic Station: The Suburbs Come to the City." *Newgeography*, September 18, 2008. <http://www.newgeography.com/content/00262-atlantas-atlantic-station-the-suburbs-come-city>.

Crampton, Jeremy W. "Cabbagetown, Atlanta: (Re)Placing Identity." Department of Anthropology and Geography, Georgia State University, 2002. <http://geospatial.gsu.edu/projects/cabbagetown/cabbagetownpaper.pdf>.

Cruikshank, Barbara. *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Cornell University Press, 1999.

Davis, Ben. "Are Artists to Blame for Gentrification?" *Slate*, October 15, 2013. [http://www.slate.com/articles/life/culturebox/2013/10/are\\_artists\\_to\\_blame\\_for\\_gentrification\\_or\\_would\\_soho\\_chelsea\\_and\\_bushwick.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/life/culturebox/2013/10/are_artists_to_blame_for_gentrification_or_would_soho_chelsea_and_bushwick.html).

Decariollion. "Comment on 'Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry "satanic" Images.'" *NY Daily News*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/atlanta-mural-painted->

residents-decry-satanic-images-article-1.1200320.

- DeJesus, Rosalinda. "The Painting Is On The Wall." *Hartford Courant*, November 14, 1998. [http://articles.courant.com/1998-11-14/news/9811140222\\_1\\_mural-project-paint-vacant-building](http://articles.courant.com/1998-11-14/news/9811140222_1_mural-project-paint-vacant-building).
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. City Lights Books, 1988.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitaliism and Schizophrenia*. Bloomsbury USA Academic, 2013.
- Deutsche, Rosalyn. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*. Cambridge, Mass. [u.a.]: MIT Press, 2002.
- Dewan, Shaila. "An Elaborate Arch, an Opaque Significance." *The New York Times*, April 30, 2009, sec. US. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/30/us/30arch.html>.
- Dixon, Duffie. "Tire Art Along Beltline Bugs Neighbors." *11Alive Atlanta*, June 5, 2010. <http://www.11alive.com/news/article/144930/0/Tire-Art-Along-Beltline-Bugs-Neighbors>.
- Doig, Will. "Stop Thinking Big." *Salon.com*, June 16, 2012. [http://www.salon.com/2012/06/16/stop\\_thinking\\_big/](http://www.salon.com/2012/06/16/stop_thinking_big/).
- Dolan, P. "Space, Time and the Constitution of Subjectivity: Comparing Elias and Foucault" (2010).
- Duany, Andres, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck. *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream*. New York: North Point Press, 2010.
- Dvalidze, Irina. "Roti's Trippy Crocodile Mural." *ANIMAL*, September 24, 2012. <http://animalnewyork.com/2012/roti-does-new-mural-atlanta-gets-exponentially-cooler/>.
- . "Street Art Mural Gets Vandalized by Community Members Without 'Permit.'" *ANIMAL*, November 9, 2012. <http://animalnewyork.com/2012/street-art-mural-gets-vandalized-by-community-members-without-permit/>.
- Ebony B. "Comment on 'Eastside BeltLine Trail.'" *Yelp*, January 26, 2013. <http://www.yelp.com/biz/eastside-beltline-trail-atlanta>.
- Ecos Environmental Design, AECOM, Smith Dalia Architects, and Dovetail Consulting. *Atlanta BeltLine Master Plan Subarea 4*. Atlanta BeltLine Master Planning. Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta City Council, July 18, 2011. [http://beltlineorg.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Atlanta-BeltLine\\_Subarea-4\\_Master-Plan.pdf](http://beltlineorg.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Atlanta-BeltLine_Subarea-4_Master-Plan.pdf).
- Effron, Jon. "LaFarge Ready to Leave BeltLine?" *A Is for Atlanta*, February 1, 2011. <http://aisforatlanta.com/2011/02/lafarge-ready-to-leave-beltline/>.
- Erin. "Comment on 'Atlantic Station Begins Metamorphosis as White House Black Market Closes.'" *What Now Atlanta*, January 31, 2011. <http://www.whatnowatlanta.com/2011/01/30/atlantic-station-begins-metamorphosis-as-white-house-black-market-closes/>.
- Ferguson, Laura. "Pittsburgh Community History." Newspaper. *Atlanta Intown*, 2006. <http://www.atlantaintownpaper.com/features/PittsburghJUNE07.php>.

- figurama. "Reply #10 on 'Art or eyesore?..AJC Article Explores the Subject in Reynoldstown.'" *EAV Buzz*, October 22, 2008. <http://www.eavbuzz.net/forum/off-leash/art-or-eyesore-ajc-article-explores-the-subject-in-reynoldstown/>.
- "Flickr: Discussing Graffiti in Krog Tunnel Comes to Fisticuffs in Atlanta." *Flickr*. Accessed December 6, 2012. <http://www.flickr.com/groups/atlanta/discuss/72157605957387475/>.
- Flint, John, and Mike Raco. *The Future of Sustainable Cities: Critical Reflections*. The Policy Press, 2012.
- Florida, Richard L. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. Basic Books, 2002.
- Fotsch, Paul Mason. *Watching the Traffic Go By: Transportation and Isolation in Urban America*. University of Texas Press, 2009.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Random House LLC, 1977.
- . *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977--1978*. First Edition. Picador, 2009.
- . "Society Must Be Defended": *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. Translated by David Macey. Picador, 2003.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. Vintage, 1990.
- Fox, Catherine. "Artists Selected for 'Art on the BeltLine,' an Outdoor Show to Begin in May." *ArtsATL*, April 21, 2010. <http://www.artsatl.com/2010/04/breaking-news-artists-selected-for-art-on-the-beltline-a-visual-and-performing-arts-fest-to-begin-in-may/>.
- Freeman, Scott. "The Triumph and Tragedy of the Cabbagetown Sound." *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, June 24, 2010, Music Issue edition. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/the-triumph-and-tragedy-of-the-cabbagetown-sound/Content?oid=1549240>.
- . "The Triumph and Tragedy of the Cabbagetown Sound: Benjamin and Smoke." *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, June 30, 2010, sec. Music Feature. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/the-triumph-and-tragedy-of-the-cabbagetown-sound-benjamin-and-smoke/Content?oid=1571994>.
- Fullilove, Mindy Thompson. *Urban Alchemy Restoring Joy in America's Sorted-out Cities*. New York: New Village Press, 2013.
- Galperina, Marina. "Roti's Mural in Atlanta Buffed Again, Officially This Time." *ANIMAL*, December 14, 2012. <http://animalnewyork.com/2012/roti-buffed-by-cit/>.
- Garrett, Franklin M. *Atlanta and Environs: A Chronicle of Its People and Events, 1880s-1930s*. University of Georgia Press, 2011.
- "Gentrification." *Long Island Food Not Bombs*, November 9, 2009. <http://www.lifnb.com/tags/gentrification>.
- Georgia Conservancy. *Pittsburgh: Proud History, Bright Future*. Blueprints for Successful Communities. Atlanta, Georgia, Spring 2006.

- Germon, Mike. "ThoughtMarker: Art Sign the BeltLine." *ThoughtMarker*, July 1, 2009. <http://thoughtmarker.blogspot.com/2009/07/art-sign-beltline.html>.
- Gogoi, Pallavi. "Bringing Community to the City." *BusinessWeek: Innovation\_and\_design*, February 1, 2006. <http://www.businessweek.com/stories/2006-02-01/bringing-community-to-the-city>.
- Golgowski, Nini. "Community Outraged over French Artist's 'Satanic' Mural of 'Snakes' Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It." *Mail Online*, November 11, 2012. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2231339/Living-Walls-Community-outraged-French-artist-Rotis-satanic-mural-paints-petition-save-it.html>.
- Gravel, Ryan. "BeltLine - Atlanta: Design of Infrastructure as a Reflection of Public Policy." Master of Architecture & Master of City Planning, Georgia Tech University, 1999. <http://beltlineorg.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Ryan-Gravel-Thesis-1999.pdf>.
- Green, Josh. "Are 'Suburban-Style' Shopping Centers Banished?" *Curbed Atlanta*, February 6, 2013. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2013/02/06/are-suburbanstyle-shopping-centers-banished.php>.
- . "Atlantic Station Is Ready for an Evolution." *Midtown Patch*, February 16, 2011. <http://midtown.patch.com/groups/business-news/p/atlantic-station-is-ready-for-an-evolution>.
- . "Does New Apartment Project Verify Atlantic Station Rebound?" *Curbed Atlanta*, December 4, 2012. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2012/12/04/does-new-apartment-project-verify-atlantic-station-rebound.php>.
- . "Mural Uproar Enough to Alter Living Walls' Process." *Curbed Atlanta*, December 15, 2012. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2012/11/15/mural-uproar-enough-to-alter-living-walls-process.php>.
- Gregson, Nicky, and Gillian Rose. "Taking Butler Elsewhere: Performativities, Spatialities and Subjectivities." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, no. 4 (2000): 433–452. doi:10.1068/d232.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture*. Psychology Press, 1992.
- guest #13. "Comment on 'Leaders Say Atlantic Station Ripe For New Development.'" *Curbed Atlanta*, July 22, 2013. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2013/07/22/leaders-say-atlantic-station-ripe-for-new-development.php>.
- guest #19. "Comment on 'Leaders Say Atlantic Station Ripe For New Development.'" *Curbed Atlanta*, July 22, 2013. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2013/07/22/leaders-say-atlantic-station-ripe-for-new-development.php>.
- guest #5. "Comment on 'Eastside Trail Stroll Anointed Top ATL Activity.'" *Curbed Atlanta*, May 6, 2013. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2013/05/06/eastside-trail-stroll-anointed-top-atl-activity.php>.
- Gumbrecht, Jamie. "Artwork or Eyesore?; Neighborhood Debates Whether Wall Painting Defies or Encourages Graffiti." *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, October 22, 2008, sec. Metro News.
- . "Cracking the Zip Code of Atlanta Cool." *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, April 25, 2008, sec. LifeStyle.

- Gunder, Michael, and Jean Hillier. *Planning in Ten Words Or Less: A Lacanian Entanglement With Spatial Planning*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2009.
- Gustafson, Seth. "Displacement and the Racial State in Olympic Atlanta 1990–1996." *Southeastern Geographer* 53, no. 2 (2013): 198–213. doi:10.1353/sgo.2013.0016.
- Hackworth, Jason, and Neil Smith. "The Changing State of Gentrification." *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 92, no. 4 (2001): 464–477. doi:10.1111/1467-9663.00172.
- Hall, Ed. "Neighborhood Vigilantes Paint over Living Walls Mural, Raising Questions of Permits and Public Art." *ArtsATL*, December 13, 2012. <http://www.artsatl.com/2012/11/living-walls-mural-controversy-south-atlanta-permits-power-public-art/>.
- hambamlamdam. "Comment on 'Community Outraged over French Artist's 'Satanic' Mural of 'Snakes' Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It'." *Daily Mail Online*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2231339/Living-Walls-Community-outraged-French-artist-Rotis-satanic-mural-paints-petition-save-it.html>.
- Hankins, Katherine B., and Emily M. Powers. "The Disappearance of the State from 'Livable' Urban Spaces." *Antipode* 41, no. 5 (2009): 845–866. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00699.x.
- Hannah, Matthew G. "Biopower, Life and Left Politics." *Antipode* 43, no. 4 (September 1, 2011): 1034–1055. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00840.x.
- Hatfield, Edward A. "A Well-Tied Knot: Atlanta's Mobility Crisis and the 2012 T-SPLOST Debate." *Southern Spaces* (April 29, 2013). <http://southernspaces.org/2013/well-tied-knot-atlantas-mobility-crisis-and-2012-t-splost-debate>.
- Heckert, Jason. "Ryan Gravel Is Remaking Atlanta." *Esquire Magazine*, November 30, 2006. [http://www.esquire.com/features/best-n-brightest-2006/ESQ1206GRAVEL\\_222](http://www.esquire.com/features/best-n-brightest-2006/ESQ1206GRAVEL_222).
- Helen. "Comment on 'Community Outraged over French Artist's 'Satanic' Mural of 'Snakes' Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It'." *Daily Mail Online*. Accessed December 13, 2013. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2231339/Living-Walls-Community-outraged-French-artist-Rotis-satanic-mural-paints-petition-save-it.html>.
- Henry, Scott, and Thomas Wheatley. "City of Blight." *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, March 1, 2010, sec. News Feature. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/city-of-blight/Content?oid=1430293>.
- Herrick, Keely. "More Controversy in Atlanta's Living Walls Art Project." *Examiner.com*, December 10, 2012. <http://www.examiner.com/article/more-controversy-atlanta-s-living-walls-art-project>.
- Hetzler, Olivia, Veronica E. Medina, and David Overfelt. "Gentrification, Displacement and New Urbanism: The Next Racial Project." *Sociation Today* 4, no. 2 (Fall 2006). <http://www.ncsociology.org/sociationtoday/v42/gent.htm>.
- Hicks, Cinque. "Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part I." *BurnAway*, January 11, 2013. <http://burnaway.org/living-walls-and-the-perils-of-public-space-part-1/>.
- . "Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part II." *BurnAway*, January 17, 2013. <http://burnaway.org/living-walls-and-the-perils-of-public-space-part-2/>.

- Hirt, Sonia, and Diane L. Zahm. *The Urban Wisdom of Jane Jacobs*. Routledge, 2012.
- Holliman, Irene V. "From Crackertown to Model City? Urban Renewal and Community Building in Atlanta, 1963—1966." *Journal of Urban History* 35, no. 3 (March 1, 2009): 369–386. doi:10.1177/0096144208330402.
- Holmes, D. C. "Stakeholders' Perceptions of Risk for Gentrification in Atlanta's Pittsburgh Neighborhood." Master's Program, Georgia State University, 2011.
- Howard, Ebenezer. *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*. Ulan Press, 2012.
- Immergluck, Dan. "Large Redevelopment Initiatives, Housing Values and Gentrification: The Case of the Atlanta Beltline." *Urban Studies* 46, no. 8 (July 1, 2009): 1723–1745. doi:10.1177/0042098009105500.
- "Interim Hiking Trails." *Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://beltline.org/trails/interim-hiking-trails/>.
- "J. Richard Laopus & the Youth of Peoplestown, Mechanicsville, Summerhill, Pittsburgh & Adair Park: BeltLine Dreams." *Artists 2011: Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.
- Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Random House LLC, 1961.
- Jarvie, Jennie. "The Limits of Commissioned Street Art." *The Atlantic Cities*, December 11, 2012. <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/arts-and-lifestyle/2012/12/limits-commissioned-street-art/4058/>.
- johnnyurban. "Comment on 'Carroll Street Cafe.'" *Flickr*, November 23, 2006. <http://www.flickr.com/photos/vanceypants/304557319/>.
- Kaczmariski, Ryan. "Comment on 'GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).'" *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, December 13, 2012. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2012/12/11/gdot-crews-covering-up-roti-mural-near-pittsburgh-neighborhood>.
- Kane, Stephanie C. "Stencil Graffiti in Urban Waterscapes of Buenos Aires and Rosario, Argentina." *Crime, Media, Culture* 5, no. 1 (April 2009): 9–28. doi:10.1177/1741659008102060.
- "Karen Shacham." *Idea Capital :: Idea Grants for Atlanta Artists*. Accessed December 13, 2013. <http://www.ideacapitalatlanta.org/artist.php?id=22>.
- "Karen Shacham and Mike Carpenter: Couples Reimagined." *Artists 2012: Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.
- Keaton-Young, Jessica. "Neighborhood: Cabbagetown." *Atlanta Magazine*, September 1, 2013. <http://www.atlantamagazine.com/homeandgarden/2013/09/01/neighborhood-cabbagetown>.
- Kegley, Jim. "Art Installment Reminds Local CEO That Atlanta Is Going Places." *Atlanta BeltLine Blog*, August 19, 2013. <http://beltline.org/2013/08/19/art-installment-reminds-u-s-micro-ceo-that-atlanta-is-going-places/>.
- Keith F. "Comment on 'National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.'" *Decatur Metro*, February 16,

2011. <http://www.decalurmetro.com/2011/02/16/national-chains-have-not-done-well-at-atlantic-station/>.
- Kelbaugh, Doug. *Repairing the American Metropolis: Common Place Revisited*. University of Washington Press, 2002.
- Kelling, George L., and James Q. Wilson. "Broken Windows." *The Atlantic*, March 1982. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>.
- Knox, Paul L. *Cities and Design*. Taylor & Francis, 2011.
- Kobler, Lee. "Best Repositioning of a Flagging Project: Atlantic Station Rights the Ship." *Curbed Atlanta*, December 29, 2011. [atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2011/12/29/new-owners-right-atlantic-station.php](http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2011/12/29/new-owners-right-atlantic-station.php).
- Konrad, Miriam Fiedler. *Transporting Atlanta: The Mode of Mobility under Construction*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.
- Kotanyi, Attila, and Raoul Veneigem. "Basic Program of the Bureau of Unitary Urbanism." In *Situationist International Anthology*, edited by Ken Knabb, 86–89. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets, 2006.
- "Krog Tunnel Graffiti History." Tmblr. *It's All in My Head*, October 29, 2009. <http://itsallinmyhead.tumblr.com/post/227222283/krog-tunnel-graffiti-history>.
- Krueger, Rob, and Susan Buckingham. "Creative-City Scripts, Economic Development, and Sustainability\*." *Geographical Review* 99, no. 1 (2009): iii–xii. doi:10.1111/j.1931-0846.2009.tb00414.x.
- . "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 36, no. 3 (2012): 486–503. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2011.01073.x.
- Kushner, James A. "Smart Growth, New Urbanism and Diversity: Progressive Planning Movements in America and Their Impact on Poor and Minority Ethnic Populations." *UCLA Journal of Environmental Law and Policy* 21, no. 1 (2002). <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/7095r4dk>.
- Kwon, Miwon. *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. MIT Press, 2004.
- . "Public Art as Publicity." *Republicart: European Institute for Progressive Cultural Politics Multilingual Webjournal* (January 2002). [http://republicart.net/disc/publicum/kwon01\\_en.htm](http://republicart.net/disc/publicum/kwon01_en.htm).
- Lampe, Lily. "Year Two of Art on the Beltline Comes to a Close." *BurnAway*, November 11, 2011. <http://burnaway.org/year-two-of-art-on-the-beltline-comes-to-a-close/>.
- Landry, Charles. *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*. 2nd ed. Routledge, 2008.
- Lang, Peter, and Tam Miller. *Suburban Discipline*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997.
- Leary, Brian. "Atlantic Station: A Place to Live, Work and Play." Master's Program, Georgia Tech University, 1998.
- . "Guido A. Binda Lecture: Latent Cityspace and the Opportunity Therein." Taubman College of Architecture, University of Michigan, April 5, 2012. <http://archinect.com/taubmancollege/release/guido-a-binda-lecture-brian-leary-atlanta-beltline-inc>.

- Lees, Loretta. "A Reappraisal of Gentrification: Towards a 'geography of Gentrification.'" *Progress in Human Geography* 24, no. 3 (September 1, 2000): 389–408. doi:10.1191/030913200701540483.
- Lefebvre, Henri, Nicholson-Smith, Donald. *The Production of Space*. Malden, Mass. [u.a.: Blackwell, 2011.
- Lewis, Paul G., and Mark Baldassare. "The Complexity of Public Attitudes Toward Compact Development." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 76, no. 2 (2010): 219–237. doi:10.1080/01944361003646471.
- "Living Walls: Labrona, OverUnder and Gawd." *Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.
- "Loss Prevention Collective: Steel Fabric." *Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.
- macomberjohnd. "Atlanta's BeltLine: Ambitious Plan Fit for Atlanta." *Sustainable Cities: Urbanization, Infrastructure, and Finance*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://sustainablecitiesfinance.wordpress.com/2013/03/04/atlantas-beltline-ambitious-plan-fit-for-atlanta/>.
- Makagon, Daniel. "Bring on the Shock Troops: Artists and Gentrification in the Popular Press." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 7, no. 1 (March 2010): 26–52. doi:10.1080/14791420903527772.
- malbeclover. "Comment on 'Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the "Anti-Mall!"'" *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, February 11, 2011. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2011/02/11/atlantic-station-prepare-for-your-spellbinding-transformation-into-the-anti-mall.>
- Markusen, Ann. "Urban Development and the Politics of a Creative Class: Evidence from a Study of Artists." *Environment and Planning A* 38, no. 10 (2006): 1921–1940. doi:10.1068/a38179.
- Marshall. "Comment on 'National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.'" *Decatur Metro*, February 16, 2011. <http://www.decaturm metro.com/2011/02/16/national-chains-have-not-done-well-at-atlantic-station/>.
- Massey, Doreen B. *For Space*. 1st ed. Sage Publications Ltd, 2005.
- Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Duke University Press, 2002.
- mateofiero. "Comment on 'Discussing Graffiti in Krog Tunnel Comes to Fisticuffs in Atlanta.'" *Flickr: Atlanta*, July 3, 2008. <http://www.flickr.com/groups/atlanta/discuss/72157605957387475/>.
- McPherson, Michael. "Notes on Community Service." *Cabbagetown Neighbor* 18, no. 8 (August 2010): 4–5.
- McRuer, Robert. "Crippling Queer Politics, or the Dangers of Neoliberalism." *S&F Online*. Accessed October 18, 2012. <http://sfonline.barnard.edu/a-new-queer-agenda/cripping-queer-politics-or-the-dangers-of-neoliberalism/>.
- Meko, Michi. "Email to Sherah Faulkner," n.d.
- . "Idea." *MekoCoexistproject: Arist Michi Meko's Investigation of Nature*. Accessed December 12, 2013.

<http://mekocoexistproject.wordpress.com/the-site/>.

———. “The Site.” *MekoCoexistproject: Arist Michi Meko’s Investigation of Nature*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://mekocoexistproject.wordpress.com/the-site/>.

“Mentoring Masterminds.” *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine*, 2007.

Michaud, Debbie. “Art Sign the Beltline.” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, July 1, 2009. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2009/07/01/art-sign-the-beltline>.

Michele, Lucinda. “Roti’s ‘Allegory of the Human City’ and Its Fate in Capitol View/Pittsburgh.” *Atlanta MetBlogs*, January 6, 2012. <http://atlanta.metblogs.com/2012/12/06/rotis-allegory-of-the-human-city-and-its-fate-insouthatlantascapitol-viewpittsburg-neighborhoods/>.

“Mike Carpenter: Concrete Chess Table.” *Artists 2011: Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.

Miles, Malcolm. *Art, Space and the City*. Routledge, 1997.

Miller, Jason. “Evolution of a Brownfield.” *New Towns*, Summer 2006 edition. Accessed November 3, 2013. [http://www.tndtownpaper.com/Volume8/evolution\\_of\\_brownfield.htm](http://www.tndtownpaper.com/Volume8/evolution_of_brownfield.htm).

Mittleman, Susan. “Beltline Tires.” *90.1FM WABE: Atlanta’s NPR Station*, June 21, 2010. <http://wabe.org/post/beltline-tires>.

Moore, Lara. “Art on the BeltLine Project Coexist Explores Issues of Gentrification.” *BurnAway*, May 20, 2010. <http://burnaway.org/art-on-the-beltline-project-coexist-explores-issues-of-gentrification/>.

Murphy, Adam. “Tempers Flare over Wall Mural in Southwest Atlanta.” *CBS Atlanta*, November 12, 2012. <http://www.cbsatlanta.com/story/20076522/tempers-flare-over-wall-mural-in-southwest-atlanta>.

Nairobi. “Comment on ‘What’s Wrong with Atlantic Station? (Atlanta: Mall, Airport, Nightlife)’.” *City-Data Forum*, December 15, 2011. <http://www.city-data.com/forum/atlanta/1437765-whats-wrong-atlantic-station-18.html#post22130207>.

“Neighborhoods.” *Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://beltline.org/about/the-atlanta-beltline-project/neighborhoods/>.

Newman, Kathe, and Elvin Wyly. “Gentrification and Resistance in New York City.” *Shelterforce Online* no. 142 (August 2005). <http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/142/gentrification.html>.

Ngai, Sianne. *Ugly Feelings*. Harvard University Press, 2005.

Noble, Fredrick. “Save Roti’s Mural in Southwest Atlanta.” *Change.org*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.change.org/petitions/save-roti-s-mural-in-southwest-atlanta>.

“November T3: Living Walls and Street Art+Public Space.” *Congress for the New Urbanism: Atlanta*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.cnuatlanta.org/november-t3-living-walls-and-street-artpublic-space/>.

NY in ATL. “Comment on ‘Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry “satanic” Images.’” *NY Daily News*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/atlanta-mural-painted->

residents-decry-satanic-images-article-1.1200320.

Olenski, Steve. "Using Social Media to Engage an Audience." *Social Media Today*, June 8, 2012. <http://socialmediatoday.com/steve-olenski/546368/using-social-media-engage-audience-case-study>.

Onyschuk, B.S. "Smart Growth: A Model for Toronto." *Sustainable City News*, April 13, 2000. [http://sustainablecitynews.com/sg\\_toronto.html](http://sustainablecitynews.com/sg_toronto.html).

"Our Neighborhoods: Pittsburgh." *City of Atlanta Weed and Seed*. Accessed April 25, 2012. <http://web.atlantaga.gov/weedandseed/Neighborhoods/pittsburgh.htm>.

"Outcry Dooms 'Demonic' Atlanta Mural." *Durability + Design News*, December 17, 2012. <http://www.durabilityanddesign.com/news/?fuseaction=view&id=8857>.

Pasquinnelli, Matteo. "Can the New Urban Frontiers Be Sabotaged?" *Kontainer* 14 (2011). <http://www.personalcinema.org/warport/index.php?n=Main.CanTheNewUrbanFrontiersBeSabotaged?>

Peck, Jamie. *Constructions of Neoliberal Reason*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

———. "Struggling with the Creative Class." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29, no. 4 (2005): 740–770. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00620.x.

Pendered, David. "BeltLine's Public Safety Upgrades First Suggested in 2007 Report from Tech's Center for Quality Growth." *SaportaReport*, July 28, 2013. <http://saportareport.com/blog/2013/07/beltlines-public-safety-upgrades-first-suggested-in-2007-report-from-georgia-tech/>.

———. "What's in a Name? Atlanta BeltLine Brand Takes in Many Streetcar, Pathway Projects." *SaportaReport*, April 2, 2012. <http://saportareport.com/blog/2012/04/whats-in-a-name-atlanta-beltline-brand-takes-in-many-transit-projects/>.

Penny, Joe, London University College, and Development Planning Unit. *Insecure Spaces, Precarious Geographies: Biopolitics, Security and the Production of Space in Jerusalem and beyond*. London: Development Planning Unit, University College London, 2010.

"Permanent Collection." *Art on the Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://art.beltline.org/permanent-collection/>.

Petty, Kelly. "Atlantic Station Opens for Business." *The Signal: The Official Student Newspaper of Georgia State University*, October 25, 2005. <http://www.gsusignal.com/2.14092/atlantic-station-opens-for-business-1.1949765>.

*Pittsburgh Community Redevelopment Plan*. The Pittsburgh Community Improvement Association, September 2001. [sndsi.org/images/approved\\_pittsburgh\\_plan.pdf](http://sndsi.org/images/approved_pittsburgh_plan.pdf).

"Portland, Oregon Once Again Tops Bicycling's Rankings of America's Best Cycling Cities." *Business Wire*, January 26, 2006. <http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20060126005585/en/Portland-Oregon-Tops-Bicyclings-Rankings-Americas-Cycling>.

*Preservation of Pittsburgh: Pre-Planning Community Engagement*. Pittsburgh Community Improvement Association and Sustainable Neighborhood Development Strategies, Inc, June 2011.

- “Project History.” *Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 8, 2013. <http://beltline.org/progress/progress/project-history/>.
- Rabinow, Paul, and Nikolas Rose. “Biopower Today.” *BioSocieties* 1, no. 2 (June 2006): 195–217. doi:10.1017/S1745855206040014.
- Raco, M. “Sustainable Development, Rolled-Out Neo-Liberalism and Sustainable Communities.” Article. *Antipode*, October 19, 2011. <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1326216/>.
- Recovering Pittsburgh as a Proud Community of Working Families*. Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2009. [www.czb.org/cmsdocuments/AECF\\_FinalReport.pdf](http://www.czb.org/cmsdocuments/AECF_FinalReport.pdf).
- Reddy, Chandan. “Asian Diasporas, Neoliberalism, and Family REVIEWING THE CASE FOR HOMOSEXUAL ASYLUM IN THE CONTEXT OF FAMILY RIGHTS.” *Social Text* 23, no. 3–4 84–85 (September 21, 2005): 101–119. doi:10.1215/01642472-23-3-4\_84-85-101.
- “Reminder: Walk the (Full) Beltline on 3/11/12!” *Atlanta Green Spaces: Putting More Forest in the City in a Forest*, March 4, 2012. <http://atlantagreenspaces.info/tag/angel-poventud/>.
- “Report: 4 Atlanta Streets Among Most Dangerous.” Accessed April 25, 2012. <http://www.wsbtv.com/news/news/report-4-atlanta-streets-among-most-dangerous/nFC5b/>.
- Reynoldstown Community Improvement League. “History of Reynoldstown.” *Reynoldstown.net*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.reynoldstown.net/pg/history-reynoldstown>.
- rivetonfire. “Comment on ‘Atlanta: Man Stakes out and Attacks Cabbagetown Graffiti Artists.’” *Live Journal*, July 3, 2008. <http://atlanta.livejournal.com/2939387.html#>.
- Roberts, Christine. “Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry ‘satanic’ Images.” *NY Daily News*, November 11, 2012. <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/atlanta-mural-painted-residents-decry-satanic-images-article-1.1200320>.
- Rosenfeld, Matthew. “Living Walls: Grey as the New Voice of Dissent in the City of Atlanta.” *Temporary Art Review*, January 28, 2013. <http://temporaryartreview.com/living-walls-grey-as-the-new-voice-of-dissent-in-the-city-of-atlanta/>.
- Rucker, Walter C., and James N. Upton. *Encyclopedia of American Race Riots*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 2007.
- Rushmore, RJ. “Roti Wall in Atlanta Illegally Buffed and Then Repaired.” *Vandalog--A Street Art Blog*, December 14, 2012. <http://blog.vandalog.com/2012/11/roti-wall-in-atlanta-illegally-buffed-and-then-repaired/>.
- Rutheiser, Charles. *Imagineering Atlanta: The Politics of Place in the City of Dreams*. London; New York: Verso, 1996.
- “Ryan Gravel’s Moment Wasn’t Conceiving the BeltLine, It Was When Others Embraced It.” *SaportaReport*, January 23, 2012. <http://saportareport.com/blog/2012/01/ryan-gravels-moment-wasnt-when-he-conceived-the-beltline-it-was-when-others-embraced-it/>.
- Rytter, Chantelle. “Comment on ‘With the Beltline, Atlanta Wants to Become a New City.’” *The Dirt*, July 31, 2013. <http://dirt.asla.org/2013/06/04/with-the-beltline-atlanta-wants-to-become-a-new-city/>.

- Sams, Douglas. "Atlanta Beltline Sues Andrew Realty Group Inc." *Atlanta Business Chronicle*, January 16, 2013. [http://www.bizjournals.com/atlanta/real\\_talk/2013/01/atlanta-beltline-sues-local-real.html](http://www.bizjournals.com/atlanta/real_talk/2013/01/atlanta-beltline-sues-local-real.html).
- . "Atlantic Station Will Become 'the Anti-Mall.'" *The Atlanta Business Chronicle*, February 11, 2011. <http://www.bizjournals.com/atlanta/print-edition/2011/02/11/atlantic-station-will-become-the.html>.
- "Save the BeltLine." *Resurgent Atlanta: Bringing Atlanta Back*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://resurgentatlanta.com/save-the-beltline/>.
- Schoolcraft, Lisa R. "Sea Change: Atlantic Station Rescue Succeeds." *Atlanta Business Chronicle*, November 25, 2011. <http://www.bizjournals.com/atlanta/print-edition/2011/11/25/sea-change-atlantic-station-rescue.html>.
- Shacham, Karen. "Art on the Beltline 2012." *Karen Shacham Photography*, September 14, 2012. [http://karenschacham.blogspot.com/2012\\_09\\_01\\_archive.html](http://karenschacham.blogspot.com/2012_09_01_archive.html).
- . "Karen Shacham Photography: Couples: Reimagined." *Karen Shacham Photography*, September 18, 2012. <http://karenschacham.blogspot.com/2012/08/couples-reimagined.html>.
- . "Statement: Couples." *Karen Shacham*. Accessed December 13, 2013. <http://karenschacham.com/>.
- Shalhoup, Mara. "Cabbagetown Graffiti Showdown." *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, July 16, 2008. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/cabbagetown-graffiti-showdown/Content?oid=1274360>.
- . "Losing the Farm." *Creative Loafing Atlanta*. December 9, 2004, sec. News Feature. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/losing-the-farm/Content?oid=1251436>.
- . "Whacko Attacks Graffiti Artists." *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, July 3, 2008. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2008/07/03/whacko-attacks-graffiti-artists>.
- Shapiro, Aaron. "The Tactics That Be: Contesting Tactical Urbanism in New Orleans." *The Urban Fringe: A Practicioners Blog, from the Berkeley Planning Journal*, May 14, 2013. <http://ced.berkeley.edu/bpj/2013/05/the-tactics-that-be-contesting-tactical-urbanism-in-new-orleans/>.
- Sholette, Gregory. "Authenticity Squared: REPOhistory Circulation, Anatomy of an Urban Art Project." *New Art Examiner* 27, no. 4 (December 1999): 20–23; 71–72.
- . *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture*. Pluto Press, 2010.
- . "Some Call It Art: From Imaginary Autonomy to Autonomous Collectivity." Accessed December 13, 2013. [http://www.gregorysholette.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/06\\_somecallit1.pdf](http://www.gregorysholette.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/06_somecallit1.pdf).
- Smith, Abby. "Authenticity and Affect: When Is a Watch Not a Watch?" *Library Trends* 52, no. 1 (Summer 2003): 171–182.
- Smith, N. "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy." *Antipode* 34, no. 3 (June 2002): 427–450.
- Smith, Neil. "Gentrification in Brief." *Enough Room For Space*. Accessed December 7, 2012. [http://www.enoughroomforspace.org/project\\_pages/view/198](http://www.enoughroomforspace.org/project_pages/view/198).

- . *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. Routledge, 1996.
- Smith, Neil, and Peter Williams. *Gentrification of the City*. Routledge, 2013.
- Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-And-Imagined Places*. Blackwell, 1996.
- Spivak, Caleb J. “Atlantic Station Responds to What Now Atlanta Reader’s Suggestions for Change.” *What Now Atlanta*, March 6, 2011. <http://www.whatnowatlanta.com/2011/03/06/atlantic-station-responds-to-what-now-atlanta-readers-suggestions-for-change/>.
- St. Mungos. *A Sporting Chance? Homelessness Experiences in Three Olympic Host Cities*, 2012. [www.mungos.org.uk/documents/8993](http://www.mungos.org.uk/documents/8993).
- Steffen, Charles G. “The Corporate Campaign against Homelessness: Class Power and Urban Governance in Neoliberal Atlanta, 1973–1988.” *Journal of Social History* 46, no. 1 (September 1, 2012): 170–196. doi:10.1093/jsh/shs031.
- Stern, Julie. “Leveraging Transit to Remake Suburbia - Urban Land Magazine.” Online Magazine for the Urban Land Institute. *Urban Land Magazine*, December 15, 2011. <http://urbanland.uli.org/economy-markets-trends/leveraging-transit-to-remake-suburbia/>.
- Stone, Staci. “Common Ground: Tour of Art on the BeltLine East.” *BurnAway*, June 8, 2010. <http://burnaway.org/common-ground-tour-of-art-on-the-beltline-east/>.
- Stuart, Gwynedd. “Beyond the Beating.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, March 8, 2012, sec. Cover Story. [http://clatl.com/gyrobase/beyond-the-beating/Content?oid=4964826&utm\\_source=iContact&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=Creative%20Loafing%20Atlanta&storyPage=3](http://clatl.com/gyrobase/beyond-the-beating/Content?oid=4964826&utm_source=iContact&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Creative%20Loafing%20Atlanta&storyPage=3).
- Sustainable Neighborhood Development Strategies, Inc. *Preservation of Pittsburgh Master Plan*. Neighborhood Master Plan Report. Atlanta, Georgia, April 2012.
- swampzoid. “Comment on ‘Discussing Graffiti in Krog Tunnel Comes to Fisticuffs in Atlanta.’” *Flickr: Atlanta*, July 3, 2008. <http://www.flickr.com/groups/atlanta/discuss/72157605957387475/>.
- “Tactical (New) Urbanism Comes of Age @ CNU 21.” *Better! Cities & Towns Online*, May 2013. <http://bettercities.net/article/tactical-new-urbanism-comes-age-cnu-21-19972>.
- Tauches, Karen. “Goodbye Green: Cabbagetown Imposes a New Paint-out Color.” *Burnaway*, May 4, 2010. <http://www.burnaway.org/2010/05/goodbye-green-cabbagetown-imposes-a-new-paint-out-color/>.
- Terry T. “Comment on ‘Community Outraged over French Artist’s ‘Satanic’ Mural of ‘Snakes’ Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It’.” *Daily Mail Online*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2231339/Living-Walls-Community-outraged-French-artist-Rotis-satanic-mural-paints-petition-save-it.html>.
- testa50. “Comment on ‘What’s Wrong with Atlantic Station? (Atlanta: Mall, Airport, Nightlife)’.” *City-Data Forum*, November 30, 2011. <http://www.city-data.com/forum/atlanta/1437765-whats-wrong-atlantic-station-18.html#post22130207>.

- “These Pictures Tell the Story of Art in Atlanta. At Least in Some Communities.” *Lady Nyo’s Weblog*. Accessed December 13, 2013. <http://ladynyo.wordpress.com/2010/06/02/arrogance-and-disconnect/>.
- Thrift, Nigel. “Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect.” *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86, no. 1 (March 1, 2004): 57–78. doi:10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00154.x.
- Tobin, Rachel. “Mark Toro, White Male, Seeks Diverse Twitter Followers.” *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, September 13, 2011, sec. Business. <http://www.ajc.com/news/business/mark-toro-white-male-seeks-diverse-twitter-followe/nQLmy/>.
- “Topic: Art or eyesore?..AJC Article Explores the Subject in Reynoldstown.” *EAV Buzz*. Accessed December 12, 2013. <http://www.eavbuzz.net/forum/off-leash/art-or-eyesore-ajc-article-explores-the-subject-in-reynoldstown/>.
- Travis, Jason. “Wonderroot Bridges Gap.” *Common Thread: Art, Culture & Making Change*, July 11, 2013. <http://commonthread.alternativeapparel.com/wonderroot-bridges-gap/>.
- Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, and Smith Dalia Architects. *Atlanta BeltLine Master Plan Subarea 2*. Atlanta BeltLine Master Planning. Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta City Council, March 16, 2009. [http://beltlineorg.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Atlanta-BeltLine\\_Subarea-4\\_Master-Plan.pdf](http://beltlineorg.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Atlanta-BeltLine_Subarea-4_Master-Plan.pdf).
- “Upscale Atlanta Apartments, Condos and Homes.” *Atlantic Station*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://www.atlanticstation.com/live>.
- Urbanism, Congress for the New. *Charter of The New Urbanism*. 1st ed. McGraw-Hill Professional, 1999.
- urbanistor. “Comment on ‘Leaders Say Atlantic Station Ripe For New Development.’” *Curbed Atlanta*, July 22, 2013. <http://atlanta.curbed.com/archives/2013/07/22/leaders-say-atlantic-station-ripe-for-new-development.php>.
- “Volunteer Programs.” *Atlanta BeltLine*. Accessed December 8, 2013. <http://beltline.org/programs/volunteer-programs/>.
- Von Hoffman, Alexander. *House by House, Block by Block: The Rebirth of America’s Urban Neighborhoods*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Voxpopuli. “Comment on ‘Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the “Anti-Mall!”’” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, February 12, 2011. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2011/02/11/atlantic-station-prepare-for-your-spellbinding-transformation-into-the-anti-mall>.
- . “Comment on ‘GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).’” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, December 11, 2012. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2012/12/11/gdot-crews-covering-up-roti-mural-near-pittsburgh-neighborhood>.
- Waclawek, Anna. *Graffiti and Street Art*. Thames & Hudson World of Art. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2011.
- Way to go pittsburgh! “Comment on ‘GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).’” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, December 12, 2012. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2012/12/11/gdot-crews-covering-up-roti-mural-near-pittsburgh>.

neighborhood.

“Weed and Seed Data Center.” *Community Capacity Development Office*, September 16, 2005. <http://www.weedandseed.info/docs/strategy.htm>.

Wenk, Amy. “TSPLOST: Beltline’s Father Sees Positives despite Defeat.” *Atlanta Business Chronicle*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://www.bizjournals.com/atlanta/print-edition/2012/08/03/beltnines-father-sees-positives.html>.

Wheatley, Thomas. “Atlanta’s Graffiti Task Force Begins Investigating, Removing Vandalism.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, May 5, 2011, sec. News Feature. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/atlantas-graffiti-task-force-begins-investigating-removing-vandalism/Content?oid=3161169>.

———. “Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the ‘Anti-Mall!’” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, February 11, 2011. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2011/02/11/atlantic-station-prepare-for-your-spellbinding-transformation-into-the-anti-mall>.

———. “Beltline Is No Home to Homeless.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/beltline-is-no-home-to-homeless/Content?oid=3925607>.

———. “Lafarge Puts Beltline Property near Glenwood Park on the Market.” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, February 2, 2011. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2011/02/02/lafarge-puts-beltline-property-near-glenwood-park-on-the-market>.

———. “Six Questions That Blow Our Mind about the City’s Anti-Graffiti Task Force.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, December 30, 2010, sec. A&E Feature. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/atlanta-proposes-graffiti-tagging-crackdown/Content?oid=2570520>.

———. “Southeast: Ready One of the Beltline’s Coolest Segments for Rail — and Art.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*, January 20, 2011. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/southeast-ready-one-of-the-beltnines-coolest-segments-for-rail-andmdash-and-art/Content?oid=2677343>.

———. “WonderRoot’s Public-Art Project for Beltline Kicks off at Eyedrum.” *Fresh Loaf: Creative Loafing Atlanta*, June 29, 2009. <http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2009/06/29/wonderroots-public-art-project-for-beltline-kicks-off-at-eyedrum>.

Wheatley, Thomas, and Debbie Michaud. “Living Walls Splits Community.” *Creative Loafing Atlanta*. November 14, 2012, sec. News Feature. <http://clatl.com/atlanta/living-walls-splits-community/Content?oid=6881308>.

World Commission on Environment and Development. *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press, 1988.

“Wylie Street Reconfiguration Project.” presented at the Wylie Street Reconfiguration Information Meeting, Trees Atlanta, June 10, 2013. <http://beltline.org/events/wylie-street-reconfiguration-information-meeting/>.

Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press, 1990.

Youngblood, Mtamanika, and Harold M. Barnette. “Atlanta’s Pittsburgh Neighborhood: Building the Sustainable Urban Community.” *Shelterforce: The Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Building* Winter 2010 (February 7, 2011).

[http://www.shelterforce.org/article/2108/atlantas\\_pittsburgh\\_neighborhood\\_building\\_the\\_sustainable\\_urban\\_community/P0/](http://www.shelterforce.org/article/2108/atlantas_pittsburgh_neighborhood_building_the_sustainable_urban_community/P0/).

Zimmerman, Jeffrey. "From Brew Town to Cool Town: Neoliberalism and the Creative City Development Strategy in Milwaukee." *Cities* 25, no. 4 (August 2008): 230–242. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2008.04.006.

Zipp, Samuel. *Manhattan Projects: The Rise and Fall of Urban Renewal in Cold War New York*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Zukin, Sharon. *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. New Brunswick, [NJ]: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup>Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 8.
- <sup>2</sup>Buntin, "UnSprawl Case Study: Glenwood Park, Atlanta, Georgia."
- <sup>3</sup>*American Makeover Episode 1*.
- <sup>4</sup>Buntin, "UnSprawl Case Study: Glenwood Park, Atlanta, Georgia."
- <sup>5</sup>Vanolo, "Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy," 5.
- <sup>6</sup>Buntin, "UnSprawl Case Study: Glenwood Park, Atlanta, Georgia."
- <sup>7</sup>Hatfield, "A Well-Tied Knot."
- <sup>8</sup>"Project History."
- <sup>9</sup>"Ryan Gravel Is Remaking Atlanta."
- <sup>10</sup>Carroll, "Atlanta BeltLine Origins: An Interview with Ryan Gravel."
- <sup>11</sup>"Ryan Gravel's Moment Wasn't Conceiving the BeltLine, It Was When Others Embraced It."
- <sup>12</sup>"CNU 18 Tours."
- <sup>13</sup>"Volunteer Programs."
- <sup>14</sup>Immergluck, "Large Redevelopment Initiatives, Housing Values and Gentrification: The Case of the Atlanta Beltline."
- <sup>15</sup>Sams, "Atlanta Beltline Sues Andrew Realty Group Inc."
- <sup>16</sup>"Reminder: Walk the (Full) Beltline on 3/11/12!"
- <sup>17</sup>Germon, "ThoughtMarker."
- <sup>18</sup>Green, "Are 'Suburban-Style' Shopping Centers Banished?"
- <sup>19</sup>"Beltline."
- <sup>20</sup>Gregson and Rose, "Taking Butler Elsewhere," 434.
- <sup>21</sup>Knox, *Cities and Design*, 3.
- <sup>22</sup>Thrift, "Intensities of Feeling."
- <sup>23</sup>Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 3.
- <sup>24</sup>*Ibid*, 16.
- <sup>25</sup>Zipp, *Manhattan Projects*, 12.
- <sup>26</sup>Hackworth and Smith, "The Changing State of Gentrification."
- <sup>27</sup>Hetzler, Medina, and Overfelt, "Gentrification, Displacement and New Urbanism: The Next Racial Project."
- <sup>28</sup>Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 270.
- <sup>29</sup>Baldwin, Standley, and Pratt, *Conversations With James Baldwin*, 42.
- <sup>30</sup>Fullilove, *Urban Alchemy Restoring Joy in America's Sorted-out Cities*, 46.
- <sup>31</sup>Holliman, "From Crackertown to Model City?"
- <sup>32</sup>Altshuler and Luberoff, *Mega-Projects*, 25.
- <sup>33</sup>Newman and Wyly, "Gentrification and Resistance in New York City."
- <sup>34</sup>Smith, "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy, 440."
- <sup>35</sup>Steffen, "The Corporate Campaign against Homelessness: Class Power and Urban Governance in Neoliberal Atlanta, 1973–1988."
- <sup>36</sup>Bullard, *The Black Metropolis in the Twenty-First Century*, 156.
- <sup>37</sup>Bullard, Johnson, and Torres, *Sprawl City*, 56.
- <sup>38</sup>*Ibid*, 59.
- <sup>39</sup>Smith, *The New Urban Frontier* 207, 222.
- <sup>40</sup>*Ibid*, 222.
- <sup>41</sup>Sholette, *Dark Matter*, 80.
- <sup>42</sup>Gustafson, "Displacement and the Racial State in Olympic Atlanta 1990–1996," 199.
- <sup>43</sup>St. Mungos, *A Sporting Chance? Homelessness Experiences in Three Olympic Host Cities*.
- <sup>44</sup>Gustafson, "Displacement and the Racial State in Olympic Atlanta 1990–1996."
- <sup>45</sup>Rutheiser, *Imagineering Atlanta*.
- <sup>46</sup>Smith, "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy," 430.
- <sup>47</sup>*Ibid*, 429.
- <sup>48</sup>*Ibid*, 437.
- <sup>49</sup>*Ibid*, 440.
- <sup>50</sup>*Ibid*, 443.
- <sup>51</sup>*Ibid*, 441.
- <sup>52</sup>Onyschuk, "Smart Growth: A Model for Toronto."

- <sup>53</sup>Howard, *Garden Cities of to-Morrow*; Wilson, *The City Beautiful Movement*.
- <sup>54</sup>Hirt and Zahm, *The Urban Wisdom of Jane Jacobs*, 220.
- <sup>55</sup>Brundtland, *Our Common Future*, 43.
- <sup>56</sup>Krueger and Buckingham, "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development."
- <sup>57</sup>Raco, "Sustainable Development, Rolled-out Neoliberalism and Sustainable Communities," 324.
- <sup>58</sup>Krueger and Buckingham, "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development," 487.
- <sup>59</sup>Ibid, 487.
- <sup>60</sup>Kushner, "Smart Growth, New Urbanism and Diversity," 62.
- <sup>61</sup>"Charter of the New Urbanism."
- <sup>62</sup>Bond and Thompson-Fawcett, "Public Participation and New Urbanism: A Conflicting Agenda?" 454.
- <sup>63</sup>Amin, "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space."
- <sup>64</sup>Kushner, "Smart Growth, New Urbanism and Diversity."
- <sup>65</sup>Amin, "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space."
- <sup>66</sup>Bond and Thompson-Fawcett, "Public Participation and New Urbanism: A Conflicting Agenda? 454".
- <sup>67</sup>Vanolo, "Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy," 6.
- <sup>68</sup>Gunder and Hillier, *Planning in Ten Words Or Less*, 83.
- <sup>69</sup>Lewis and Baldassare, "The Complexity of Public Attitudes Toward Compact Development," 219
- <sup>70</sup>Krueger and Buckingham, "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development," 487
- <sup>71</sup>Landry, *The Creative City*, xxi.
- <sup>72</sup>Krueger and Buckingham, "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development," 487
- <sup>73</sup>Smith, "Gentrification in Brief."
- <sup>74</sup>Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, 100; 176.
- <sup>75</sup>Ibid, 71.
- <sup>76</sup>Ibid, 166.
- <sup>77</sup>Ibid, 170.
- <sup>78</sup>Ibid, 177-178.
- <sup>79</sup>Krueger and Buckingham, "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development," 487.
- <sup>80</sup>Amin and Graham, "The Ordinary City," 415
- <sup>81</sup>Costa et al., "On 'creative Cities' Governance Models, 394"
- <sup>82</sup>Krueger and Buckingham, "Towards a 'Consensual' Urban Politics? Creative Planning, Urban Sustainability and Regional Development," 486
- <sup>83</sup>Ibid, 489.
- <sup>84</sup>Raco, "Sustainable Development, Rolled-out Neoliberalism and Sustainable Communities," 324; 329.
- <sup>85</sup>Gunder and Hillier, *Planning in Ten Words Or Less*, 83.
- <sup>86</sup>Markusen, "Urban Development and the Politics of a Creative Class," 7/
- <sup>87</sup>McRuer, "Crippling Queer Politics, or the Dangers of Neoliberalism."
- <sup>88</sup>Flint and Raco, *The Future of Sustainable Cities*, 30.
- <sup>89</sup>Vanolo, "Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy," 4.
- <sup>90</sup>Flint and Raco, *The Future of Sustainable Cities*, 324.
- <sup>91</sup>Peck, "Struggling with the Creative Class," 741.
- <sup>92</sup>Ibid, 760.
- <sup>93</sup>Zimmerman, "From Brew Town to Cool Town: Neoliberalism and the Creative City Development Strategy in Milwaukee," 233.
- <sup>94</sup>Vanolo, "Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy."
- <sup>95</sup>Brand, "Green Subjection: The Politics of Neoliberal Urban Environmental Management."
- <sup>96</sup>Banet-Weiser and Sturken, "Shepard Fairey and the New Cultural Entrepreneurship"; Peck, *Constructions of Neoliberal Reason*.
- <sup>97</sup>Rabinow and Rose, "Biopower Today," 197.
- <sup>98</sup>Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 136.
- <sup>99</sup>Ibid, 138.

- <sup>100</sup>Ibid, 139.
- <sup>101</sup>Ibid, 136.
- <sup>102</sup>Brand and Thomas, *Urban Environmentalism*, 93.
- <sup>103</sup>Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 250.
- <sup>104</sup>Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 139.
- <sup>105</sup>Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 250.
- <sup>106</sup>Hannah, "Biopower, Life and Left Politics," 1036.
- <sup>107</sup>Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 254.
- <sup>108</sup>Ibid, 256.
- <sup>109</sup>Rabinow and Rose, "Biopower Today," 197.
- <sup>110</sup>Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 126.
- <sup>111</sup>Penny, University College, and Development Planning Unit, *Insecure Spaces, Precarious Geographies*, 2.
- <sup>112</sup>Brenner, "What Is Critical Urban Theory?" 199.
- <sup>113</sup>Smith, "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy," 442.
- <sup>114</sup>Pasquinelli, "Can the New Urban Frontiers Be Sabotaged?"
- <sup>115</sup>Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 38-39.
- <sup>116</sup>Soja, *Thirdspace*, 146.
- <sup>117</sup>Dolan, "Space, Time and the Constitution of Subjectivity," 2.
- <sup>118</sup>Massey, *For Space*, 10.
- <sup>119</sup>Gregson and Rose, "Taking Butler Elsewhere," 447.
- <sup>120</sup>Massey, *For Space*, 61.
- <sup>121</sup>Ibid, 7.
- <sup>122</sup>Thrift, "Intensities of Feeling," 58.
- <sup>123</sup>Blackman, *Immaterial Bodies*, 22.
- <sup>124</sup>Deleuze, *Spinoza*, 128.
- <sup>125</sup>Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*, 36.
- <sup>126</sup>Ibid, 260.
- <sup>127</sup>Ngai, *Ugly Feelings*, 7; Anderson, "Affect and Biopower," 37.
- <sup>128</sup>Grossberg, *We Gotta Get Out of This Place*, 81.
- <sup>129</sup>Anderson, "Affect and Biopower," 30
- <sup>130</sup>Ibid, 38.
- <sup>131</sup>Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 143.
- <sup>132</sup>Anderson, "Affect and Biopower," 29.
- <sup>133</sup>Ibid, 31.
- <sup>134</sup>Ibid, 32.
- <sup>135</sup>Thrift, "Intensities of Feeling," 58.
- <sup>136</sup>Lees, "A Reappraisal of Gentrification: Towards a 'geography of Gentrification,'" 391.
- <sup>137</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 75.
- <sup>138</sup>Smith and Williams, *Gentrification of the City* 18-19.
- <sup>139</sup>i.e. Makagon, "Bring on the Shock Troops"; Davis, "Are Artists to Blame for Gentrification?"
- <sup>140</sup>Massey, *For Space*, 84.
- <sup>141</sup>Petty, "Atlantic Station Opens for Business."
- <sup>142</sup>Miller, "Evolution of a Brownfield."
- <sup>143</sup>"Atlantic Station FAQs."
- <sup>144</sup>Baird et al., *Frommer's USA*, 248.
- <sup>145</sup>"Atlantic Station and West Midtown (Westside)."
- <sup>146</sup>"Mentoring Masterminds."
- <sup>147</sup>"Atlanta Beltline, Inc. Names Brian M. Leary President and CEO."
- <sup>148</sup>Cochran, "Governmentality: The New Urbanism and the Creative Class within Atlanta, Georgia"; Kobler, "Best Repositioning of a Flagging Project: Atlantic Station Rights the Ship."
- <sup>149</sup>Sams, "Atlantic Station Will Become 'the Anti-Mall.'"
- <sup>150</sup>Schoolcraft, "Sea Change."
- <sup>151</sup>Spivak, "Atlantic Station Responds to What Now Atlanta Reader's Suggestions for Change."
- <sup>152</sup>Cochran, "Governmentality: The New Urbanism and the Creative Class within Atlanta, Georgia."
- <sup>153</sup>Deleuze, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 135.

- <sup>154</sup>Ibid, 129.
- <sup>155</sup>Lang and Miller, *Suburban Discipline*, 5.
- <sup>156</sup>Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, 233.
- <sup>157</sup>Ibid, 15.
- <sup>158</sup>Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck, *Suburban Nation*, xxiii.
- <sup>159</sup>Ibid, 133.
- <sup>160</sup>Ibid, xviii.
- <sup>161</sup>Ibid, 60-61.
- <sup>162</sup>Ibid, 97.
- <sup>163</sup>Ibid, xxii.
- <sup>164</sup>Amin, "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space."
- <sup>165</sup>Deleuze, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 129.
- <sup>166</sup>Boone, "Atlantic Station Wants You to Go Carless."
- <sup>167</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 172.
- <sup>168</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 198.
- <sup>169</sup>Ibid, 171.
- <sup>170</sup>Leary, "Atlantic Station: A Place to Live, Work and Play," 66.
- <sup>171</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 15.
- <sup>172</sup>Rutheiser, *Imagineering Atlanta*.
- <sup>173</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 19.
- <sup>174</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 141.
- <sup>175</sup>Ibid, 142.
- <sup>176</sup>Stern, "Leveraging Transit to Remake Suburbia."
- <sup>177</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 141.
- <sup>178</sup>Ibid, 177.
- <sup>179</sup>Ibid, 173.
- <sup>180</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 16.
- <sup>181</sup>Miller, "Evolution of a Brownfield."
- <sup>182</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 171.
- <sup>183</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 16.
- <sup>184</sup>Ibid, 16.
- <sup>185</sup>Ibid, 16.
- <sup>186</sup>Ibid, 16.
- <sup>187</sup>Ibid, 17.
- <sup>188</sup>Hankins and Powers, "The Disappearance of the State from 'Livable' Urban Spaces, 859-860"
- <sup>189</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 216.
- <sup>190</sup>Ibid, 197.
- <sup>191</sup>Ibid, 197.
- <sup>192</sup>Cornwell, "The Sexiest Address in Atlanta."
- <sup>193</sup>Leary, "Atlantic Station: A Place to Live, Work and Play," 84.
- <sup>194</sup>"About."
- <sup>195</sup>Petty, "Atlantic Station Opens for Business."
- <sup>196</sup>"About."
- <sup>197</sup>Leary, "Atlantic Station: A Place to Live, Work and Play," 84
- <sup>198</sup>Gogoi, "Bringing Community to the City."
- <sup>199</sup>Gumbrecht, "Cracking the Zip Code of Atlanta Cool."
- <sup>200</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 197-98.
- <sup>201</sup>Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 246.
- <sup>202</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 21.
- <sup>203</sup>Anderson, "Affect and Biopower," 34.
- <sup>204</sup>Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 246.
- <sup>205</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 22.
- <sup>206</sup>Ibid, 21.
- <sup>207</sup>Ibid, 17.
- <sup>208</sup>Ibid, 17.

- <sup>209</sup>Ibid, 19.
- <sup>210</sup>Ibid, 19.
- <sup>211</sup>Ibid, 18.
- <sup>212</sup>Ibid, 18.
- <sup>213</sup>“Portland, Oregon Once Again Tops Bicycling’s Rankings of America’s Best Cycling Cities.”
- <sup>214</sup>Leary, “Guido A. Binda Lecture: Latent Cityspace and the Opportunity Therein.”
- <sup>215</sup>Wheatley, “Beltline Is No Home to Homeless.”
- <sup>216</sup>Ibid, 18.
- <sup>217</sup>Ibid, 20.
- <sup>218</sup>Ibid, 19.
- <sup>219</sup>Pendered, “BeltLine’s Public Safety Upgrades First Suggested in 2007 Report from Tech’s Center for Quality Growth”; Cook, “Beltline Experiencing Crime.”
- <sup>220</sup>Ibid, 19.
- <sup>221</sup>“Atlanta BeltLine Overview.”
- <sup>222</sup>Pendered, “What’s in a Name?”
- <sup>223</sup>Ibid, 65.
- <sup>224</sup>Ibid, 66.
- <sup>225</sup>Ibid, 20.
- <sup>226</sup>Ibid, 65.
- <sup>227</sup>Hankins and Powers, “The Disappearance of the State from ‘Livable’ Urban Spaces,” 847.
- <sup>228</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>229</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>230</sup>Brianc, “Comment on ‘National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.’”
- <sup>231</sup>Green, “Atlantic Station Is Ready for an Evolution.”
- <sup>232</sup>Tobin, “Mark Toro, White Male, Seeks Diverse Twitter Followers”; Olenski, “Using Social Media to Engage an Audience | Social Media Today.”
- <sup>233</sup>Miller, “Evolution of a Brownfield.”
- <sup>234</sup>Cox, “Atlanta’s Atlantic Station: The Suburbs Come to the City.”
- <sup>235</sup>Nairobi, “Comment on ‘What’s Wrong with Atlantic Station? (Atlanta: Mall, Airport, Nightlife)’”; Wheatley, “Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the ‘Anti-Mall!’”; Keith F, “Comment on ‘National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station’”; clincher, “Comment on ‘Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the ‘Anti-Mall!’’”; guest #13, “Comment on ‘Leaders Say Atlantic Station Ripe For New Development’”; Erin, “Comment on ‘Atlantic Station Begins Metamorphosis as White House Black Market Closes’”; Spivak, “Atlantic Station Responds to What Now Atlanta Reader’s Suggestions for Change”; Dewan, “An Elaborate Arch, an Opaque Significance”; testa50, “Comment on ‘What’s Wrong with Atlantic Station? (Atlanta: Mall, Airport, Nightlife)’”; urbanistor, “Comment on ‘Leaders Say Atlantic Station Ripe For New Development’”; AnotherRick, “Comment on ‘National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station’”; malbeclover, “Comment on ‘Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the ‘Anti-Mall!’’”; guest #19, “Comment on ‘Leaders Say Atlantic Station Ripe For New Development.’”
- <sup>236</sup>Wheatley, “Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the ‘Anti-Mall!’”.
- <sup>237</sup>Hankins and Powers, “The Disappearance of the State from ‘Livable’ Urban Spaces,” 847.
- <sup>238</sup>Spivak, “Atlantic Station Responds to What Now Atlanta Reader’s Suggestions for Change.”
- <sup>239</sup>chantaljones, “What Can You Tell Me about ATLANTIC STATION? (Atlanta: Apartments, Lofts).”
- <sup>240</sup>Cochran, “Governmentality: The New Urbanism and the Creative Class within Atlanta, Georgia.”
- <sup>241</sup>Voxpopuli, “Comment on ‘Atlantic Station, Prepare for Your Spellbinding Transformation into the ‘Anti-Mall!’’”.
- <sup>242</sup>Spivak, “Atlantic Station Responds to What Now Atlanta Reader’s Suggestions for Change.”
- <sup>243</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>244</sup>AnotherRick, “Comment on ‘National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.’”
- <sup>245</sup>Marshall, “Comment on ‘National Chains Have Not Done Well at Atlantic Station.’”
- <sup>246</sup>Konrad, *Transporting Atlanta*, 118.
- <sup>247</sup>Wenk, “TSPLOST.”
- <sup>248</sup>Konrad, *Transporting Atlanta*, 112.
- <sup>249</sup>Ibid, 117.
- <sup>250</sup>Brown, “BeltLine Provides New Life to Railroad Tracks in Atlanta.”
- <sup>251</sup>Ebony B, “Comment on ‘Eastside BeltLine Trail.’”

- <sup>252</sup>Konrad, *Transporting Atlanta*, 119.
- <sup>253</sup>guest #5, “Comment on ‘Eastside Trail Stroll Anointed Top ATL Activity.’”
- <sup>254</sup>macomberjohnd, “Atlanta’s BeltLine.”
- <sup>255</sup>“Save the BeltLine.”
- <sup>256</sup>Konrad, *Transporting Atlanta*, 122.
- <sup>257</sup>Sams, “Atlantic Station Will Become ‘the Anti-Mall.’”
- <sup>258</sup>City of Atlanta Department of Planning and Community Development, “BeltLine Zoning Ordinance Presentation,” 19.
- <sup>259</sup>“Atlanta BeltLine to Receive \$18 Million Grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation.”
- <sup>260</sup>Rytter, “Comment on ‘With the Beltline, Atlanta Wants to Become a New City.’”
- <sup>261</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*.
- <sup>262</sup>Ibid, 71.
- <sup>263</sup>Kelbaugh, *Repairing the American Metropolis*, 174.
- <sup>264</sup>Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck, *Suburban Nation*, 6.
- <sup>265</sup>Ibid, 48.
- <sup>266</sup>Smith, “Authenticity and Affect: When Is a Watch Not a Watch?,” 173.
- <sup>267</sup>Green, “Does New Apartment Project Verify Atlantic Station Rebound?”.
- <sup>268</sup>Massey, *For Space*, 111.
- <sup>269</sup>*The Rise of the Creative Class and How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, 291.
- <sup>270</sup>Ibid, 182.
- <sup>271</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 201.
- <sup>272</sup>Hankins and Powers, “The Disappearance of the State from ‘Livable’ Urban Spaces,” 847
- <sup>273</sup>“Upscale Atlanta Apartments, Condos and Homes.”
- <sup>274</sup>Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 199.
- <sup>275</sup>Spivak, “Atlantic Station Responds to What Now Atlanta Reader’s Suggestions for Change.”
- <sup>276</sup>Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, 239.
- <sup>277</sup>Thrift, “Intensities of Feeling,” 58.
- <sup>278</sup>Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*, 35.
- <sup>279</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 45.
- <sup>280</sup>Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*, 35.
- <sup>281</sup>Ibid, 36.
- <sup>282</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*.
- <sup>283</sup>Ibid, 60.
- <sup>284</sup>Ibid, 62.
- <sup>285</sup>Fullilove, *Urban Alchemy Restoring Joy in America’s Sorted-out Cities*.
- <sup>286</sup>Anderson, “Affect and Biopower,” 32.
- <sup>287</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 75.
- <sup>288</sup>“Neighborhoods.”
- <sup>289</sup>Anderson, “Affect and Biopower,” 31.
- <sup>290</sup>Lampe, “Year Two of Art on the Beltline Comes to a Close.”
- <sup>291</sup>Carroll, “Atlanta BeltLine Origins: An Interview with Ryan Gravel.”
- <sup>292</sup>Kegley, “Art Installment Reminds Local CEO That Atlanta Is Going Places.”
- <sup>293</sup>Abernathy, “Graffiti.”
- <sup>294</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>295</sup>Kelling and Wilson, “Broken Windows.”
- <sup>296</sup>DeJesus, “The Painting Is On The Wall.”
- <sup>297</sup>Fotsch, *Watching the Traffic Go By*, 137.
- <sup>298</sup>Shalhoup, “Cabbagetown Graffiti Showdown.”
- <sup>299</sup>Crampton, “Cabbagetown, Atlanta: (Re)Placing Identity.”
- <sup>300</sup>Reynoldstown Community Improvement League, “History of Reynoldstown.”
- <sup>301</sup>Ibid.; Von Hoffman, *House by House, Block by Block*, 202-203.
- <sup>302</sup>Freeman, “The Triumph and Tragedy of the Cabbagetown Sound,” June 24, 2010; Freeman, “The Triumph and Tragedy of the Cabbagetown Sound,” June 30, 2010; Crampton, “Cabbagetown, Atlanta: (Re)Placing Identity.”
- <sup>303</sup>Crampton, “Cabbagetown, Atlanta: (Re)Placing Identity.”
- <sup>304</sup>Shalhoup, “Whacko Attacks Graffiti Artists | Atlanta News & Opinion Blog”; Shalhoup, “Cabbagetown Graffiti

- Showdown”; “Krog Tunnel Graffiti History”; “Flickr: Discussing Graffiti in Krog Tunnel Comes to Fisticuffs in Atlanta.”
- <sup>305</sup>Tauches, “Goodbye Green: Cabbagetown Imposes a New Paint-out Color.”
- <sup>306</sup>rivetonfire, “Comment on ‘Atlanta: Man Stakes out and Attacks Cabbagetown Graffiti Artists.’”
- <sup>307</sup>mateofiero, “Comment on ‘Discussing Graffiti in Krog Tunnel Comes to Fisticuffs in Atlanta.’”
- <sup>308</sup>swampzoid, “Comment on ‘Discussing Graffiti in Krog Tunnel Comes to Fisticuffs in Atlanta.’”
- <sup>309</sup>Tauches, “Goodbye Green: Cabbagetown Imposes a New Paint-out Color.”
- <sup>310</sup>For on thorough example, see Shalhoup, “Cabbagetown Graffiti Showdown.” For usage, see any of the commentary following any of the online discussions of the Cabbagetown wall listed here.
- <sup>311</sup>Meko, “THE SITE.”
- <sup>312</sup>“Artwork or Eyesore?; Neighborhood Debates Whether Wall Painting Defies or Encourages Graffiti”; “Topic: Art or eyesore?...AJC Article Explores the Subject in Reynoldstown.”
- <sup>313</sup>Tauches, “Goodbye Green: Cabbagetown Imposes a New Paint-out Color”; Meko, “THE SITE”; “Krog Tunnel Graffiti History.”
- <sup>314</sup>“Topic: Art or eyesore?...AJC Article Explores the Subject in Reynoldstown”; “Artwork or Eyesore?; Neighborhood Debates Whether Wall Painting Defies or Encourages Graffiti.”
- <sup>315</sup>figurama, “Reply #10 on ‘Art or eyesore?...AJC Article Explores the Subject in Reynoldstown.’”
- <sup>316</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 56.
- <sup>317</sup>Baudrillard, *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, 78.
- <sup>318</sup>*Ibid*, 76.
- <sup>319</sup>Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 200.
- <sup>320</sup>Shapiro, “The Tactics That Be.”
- <sup>321</sup>Courage, “The Global Phenomenon of Tactical Urbanism as an Indicator of New Forms of Citizenship,” 88.
- <sup>322</sup>*Ibid*, 88.
- <sup>323</sup>“Tactical (New) Urbanism Comes of Age @ CNU 21.”
- <sup>324</sup>Blakenship, “Living Walls Welcomes Global Street Artists, Thinkers to Atlanta.”
- <sup>325</sup>“November T3: Living Walls and Street Art+Public Space.”
- <sup>326</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 49.
- <sup>327</sup>*Ibid*, 51-2.
- <sup>328</sup>Kotanyi and Veneigem, “Basic Program of the Bureau of Unitary Urbanism,” 86.
- <sup>329</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 55-56.
- <sup>330</sup>Massey, *For Space*, 111.
- <sup>331</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 63.
- <sup>332</sup>Tauches, “Goodbye Green: Cabbagetown Imposes a New Paint-out Color.”
- <sup>333</sup>Michaud, “Art Sign the Beltline.”
- <sup>334</sup>Doig, “Stop Thinking Big.”
- <sup>335</sup>Wheatley, “WonderRoot’s Public-Art Project for Beltline Kicks off at Eyedrum.”
- <sup>336</sup>*Ibid*.
- <sup>337</sup>Travis, “Wonderroot Bridges Gap.”
- <sup>338</sup>Lampe, “Year Two of Art on the Beltline Comes to a Close.”
- <sup>339</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 73.
- <sup>340</sup>Gravel, “BeltLine - Atlanta: Design of Infrastructure as a Reflection of Public Policy,” 43.
- <sup>341</sup>ATL, “First Slice 11/19/13.”
- <sup>342</sup>Blau, “First Slice 11/19/13.”
- <sup>343</sup>“Atlantic Station and West Midtown (Westside).”
- <sup>344</sup>Reynoldstown Community Improvement League, “History of Reynoldstown.”
- <sup>345</sup>Keaton-Young, “Neighborhood.”
- <sup>346</sup>johnnyurban, “Comment on ‘Carroll Street Cafe.’”
- <sup>347</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 48.
- <sup>348</sup>Ecos Environmental Design et al., *Atlanta BeltLine Master Plan Subarea 4*, 4.
- <sup>349</sup>Anderson, “Affect and Biopower,” 34
- <sup>350</sup>“Interim Hiking Trails.”
- <sup>351</sup>Calculations taken from the listed works on the AAB's “Permanent Collection” site.
- <sup>352</sup>Massey, *For Space*, 152.
- <sup>353</sup>“Art on the Atlanta BeltLine.”

- <sup>354</sup>Meko, "Email to Sherah Faulkner."
- <sup>355</sup>Meko, "Idea."
- <sup>356</sup>Moore, "Art on the BeltLine Project Coexist Explores Issues of Gentrification."
- <sup>357</sup>Smith, "Gentrification in Brief."
- <sup>358</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 12-13.
- <sup>359</sup>Leary, "Guido A. Binda Lecture: Latent Cityspace and the Opportunity Therein."
- <sup>360</sup>Wheatley, "Beltline Is No Home to Homeless."
- <sup>361</sup>Gravel, "BeltLine - Atlanta: Design of Infrastructure as a Reflection of Public Policy," 57.
- <sup>362</sup>"Atlanta BeltLine to Receive \$18 Million Grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation."
- <sup>363</sup>Moore, "Art on the BeltLine Project Coexist Explores Issues of Gentrification."
- <sup>364</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 13.
- <sup>365</sup>Meko, "THE SITE."
- <sup>366</sup>Meko, "Idea."
- <sup>367</sup>Crampton, "Cabbagetown, Atlanta: (Re)Placing Identity."
- <sup>368</sup>Shalhoup, "Losing the Farm."
- <sup>369</sup>Meko, "Idea."
- <sup>370</sup>Meko, "THE SITE."
- <sup>371</sup>Waclawek, *Graffiti and Street Art*, 27.
- <sup>372</sup>"Topic: Art or eyesore?..AJC Article Explores the Subject in Reynoldstown."
- <sup>373</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 66.
- <sup>374</sup>*Ibid*, 45.
- <sup>375</sup>McPherson, "Notes on Community Service," 4.
- <sup>376</sup>Meko, "Idea."
- <sup>377</sup>Fox, "Artists Selected for 'Art on the BeltLine,' an Outdoor Show to Begin in May."
- <sup>378</sup>Stone, "Common Ground."
- <sup>379</sup>Moore, "Art on the BeltLine Project Coexist Explores Issues of Gentrification."
- <sup>380</sup>Atlanta BeltLine, *Lofts at Reynoldstown Crossing Section II - Project Narrative*.
- <sup>381</sup>See comment thread responding to "What Atlanta Graffiti Is Worth Saving?"
- <sup>382</sup>"Living Walls: Labrona, OverUnder and Gawd."
- <sup>383</sup>*Ibid*.
- <sup>384</sup>Lampe, "Year Two of Art on the Beltline Comes to a Close."
- <sup>385</sup>Reddy, "Asian Diasporas, Neoliberalism, and Family: Reviewing the Case for Homosexual Asylum in the Context of Family Rights," 117.
- <sup>386</sup>*Ibid*, 117.
- <sup>387</sup>Blakenship, "Living Walls Welcomes Global Street Artists, Thinkers to Atlanta."
- <sup>388</sup>"Loss Prevention Collective: Steel Fabric."
- <sup>389</sup>Lampe, "Year Two of Art on the Beltline Comes to a Close."
- <sup>390</sup>Kane, "Stencil Graffiti in Urban Waterscapes of Buenos Aires and Rosario, Argentina," 10.
- <sup>391</sup>Bednar, "Banksy: Graffiti Is Art."
- <sup>392</sup>"Wylie Street Reconfiguration Project."
- <sup>393</sup>Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 59.
- <sup>394</sup>*Ibid*, 45.
- <sup>395</sup>*Ibid*, 107.
- <sup>396</sup>Ahmed, "Happy Objects," 41.
- <sup>397</sup>Braun, "Biopolitics and the Molecularization of Life," 25
- <sup>398</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 52.
- <sup>399</sup>Kotanyi and Veneigem, "Basic Program of the Bureau of Unitary Urbanism," 87.
- <sup>400</sup>"Outcry Dooms 'Demonic' Atlanta Mural."
- <sup>401</sup>"Atlantans Paint Over 'Satanic' Mural : Durability Design News."
- <sup>402</sup>Jarvie, "The Limits of Commissioned Street Art."
- <sup>403</sup>Wheatley and Michaud, "Living Walls Splits Community."
- <sup>404</sup>Jarvie, "The Limits of Commissioned Street Art."
- <sup>405</sup>Dvalidze, "Street Art Mural Gets Vandalized by Community Members Without 'Permit.'"
- <sup>406</sup>Noble, "Save Roti's Mural in Southwest Atlanta."
- <sup>407</sup>Bentley, "Embattled Mural Prompts Question."

- <sup>408</sup>Wheatley and Michaud, “Living Walls Splits Community.”
- <sup>409</sup>Hall, “Neighborhood Vigilantes Paint over Living Walls Mural, Raising Questions of Permits and Public Art”; Roberts, “Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry ‘satanic’ Images.”
- <sup>410</sup>Galperina, “Roti’s Mural in Atlanta Buffed Again, Officially This Time.”
- <sup>411</sup>Murphy, “Tempers Flare over Wall Mural in Southwest Atlanta.”
- <sup>412</sup>Hicks, “Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part I.”
- <sup>413</sup>Brown, “Two Atlanta Murals Are Painted Over After Complaints.”
- <sup>414</sup>Bentley, “Embattled Mural Prompts Question.”
- <sup>415</sup>Hicks, “Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part I.”
- <sup>416</sup>Jarvie, “The Limits of Commissioned Street Art.”
- <sup>417</sup>Dvalidze, “Roti’s Trippy Crocodile Mural.”
- <sup>418</sup>Galperina, “Roti’s Mural in Atlanta Buffed Again, Officially This Time.”
- <sup>419</sup>Jarvie, “The Limits of Commissioned Street Art.”
- <sup>420</sup>Hicks, “Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part I.”
- <sup>421</sup>Jarvie, “The Limits of Commissioned Street Art.”
- <sup>422</sup>Golgowski, “Community Outraged over French Artist’s ‘Satanic’ Mural of ‘Snakes’ Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It.”
- <sup>423</sup>Bentley, “Embattled Mural Prompts Question.”
- <sup>424</sup>Green, “Mural Uproar Enough to Alter Living Walls’ Process.”
- <sup>425</sup>Wheatley and Michaud, “Living Walls Splits Community.”
- <sup>426</sup>Jarvie, “The Limits of Commissioned Street Art.”
- <sup>427</sup>Hicks, “Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part I.”
- <sup>428</sup>Murphy, “Tempers Flare over Wall Mural in Southwest Atlanta.”
- <sup>429</sup>Dvalidze, “Street Art Mural Gets Vandalized by Community Members Without ‘Permit.’”
- <sup>430</sup>Herrick, “More Controversy in Atlanta’s Living Walls Art Project.”
- <sup>431</sup>Bentley, “Embattled Mural Prompts Question.”
- <sup>432</sup>Rushmore, “Roti Wall in Atlanta Illegally Buffed and Then Repaired”; Brown, “Two Atlanta Murals Are Painted Over After Complaints.”
- <sup>433</sup>Hicks, “Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part I”; Hicks, “Living Walls and the Perils of Public Space, Part II”; Rosenfeld, “Living Walls.”
- <sup>434</sup>Michele, “Roti’s ‘Allegory of the Human City’ and Its Fate in Capitol View/Pittsburgh.”
- <sup>435</sup>NY in ATL, “Comment on ‘Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry ‘satanic’ Images.’”
- <sup>436</sup>Decariollion, “Comment on ‘Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry ‘satanic’ Images.’”
- <sup>437</sup>Terry T, “Comment on ‘Community Outraged over French Artist’s ‘Satanic’ Mural of ‘Snakes’ Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It’.”
- <sup>438</sup>Helen, “Comment on ‘Community Outraged over French Artist’s ‘Satanic’ Mural of ‘Snakes’ Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It’.”
- <sup>439</sup>hambamlamdam, “Comment on ‘Community Outraged over French Artist’s ‘Satanic’ Mural of ‘Snakes’ Commissioned by Nonprofit Paints over It after Petition Grows to Save It’.”
- <sup>440</sup>NY in ATL, “Comment on ‘Atlanta Mural Painted over as Residents Decry ‘satanic’ Images.’”
- <sup>441</sup>Voxpopuli, “Comment on ‘GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).’”
- <sup>442</sup>ChrisInmanPark, “Comment on ‘GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).’”; Kaczmariski, “Comment on ‘GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).’”; Way to go pittsburgh!, “Comment on ‘GDOT Crews Paint over Roti Mural near Pittsburgh Neighborhood (Update).’”
- <sup>443</sup>“Best Murals In Atlanta.”
- <sup>444</sup>A partial list of groups working in and initiatives that address Pittsburgh includes: Pittsburgh Community Improvement Association, Neighborhood Planning Unit V, Atlanta Empowerment Zone, Weed and Seed Programs, Land Bank Authority, Atlanta Development Authority, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Georgia Conservancy’s Blueprints, BeltLine Redevelopment Plan, BeltLine TAD, National Register of Historic Places, Pittsburgh Civic League, Ford Foundation, Dirty Truth Campaign, Sustainable Neighborhood Development Initiative, Salvation Army, Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership, The Enterprise Foundation, Center for Working Families. This list does not include private donors, occasional volunteer activities or any of the countless consulting firms hired to plan redevelopment in Pittsburgh. Emory University, Morehouse and Georgia Tech University have, for instance, all provided consulting at various points. Faith-based organizations would double this list.
- <sup>445</sup>Ferguson, “Pittsburgh Community History.”

- <sup>446</sup>Ibid.; Georgia Conservancy, *Pittsburgh: Proud History, Bright Future*; Youngblood and Barnette, “Atlanta’s Pittsburgh Neighborhood: Building the Sustainable Urban Community.”
- <sup>447</sup>“Report.”
- <sup>448</sup>Garrett, *Atlanta and Environs*; Rucker and Upton, *Encyclopedia of American Race Riots*.
- <sup>449</sup>Georgia Conservancy, *Pittsburgh: Proud History, Bright Future*, 6-7.
- <sup>450</sup>“About Pittsburgh Community.”
- <sup>451</sup>Holmes, “Stakeholders’ Perceptions of Risk for Gentrification in Atlanta’s Pittsburgh Neighborhood.”
- <sup>452</sup>“Weed and Seed Data Center.”
- <sup>453</sup>“Gentrification.”
- <sup>454</sup>Immergluck, “Large Redevelopment Initiatives, Housing Values and Gentrification: The Case of the Atlanta Beltline.”
- <sup>455</sup>Henry and Wheatley, “City of Blight.”
- <sup>456</sup>*Recovering Pittsburgh as a Proud Community of Working Families*.
- <sup>457</sup>Georgia Conservancy, *Pittsburgh: Proud History, Bright Future*.
- <sup>458</sup>“Our Neighborhoods: Pittsburgh.”
- <sup>459</sup>*Recovering Pittsburgh as a Proud Community of Working Families*.
- <sup>460</sup>*Pittsburgh Community Redevelopment Plan*.
- <sup>461</sup>*Recovering Pittsburgh as a Proud Community of Working Families*.
- <sup>462</sup>Allison, “A Question of Class.”
- <sup>463</sup>*Recovering Pittsburgh as a Proud Community of Working Families*; “Weed and Seed Data Center.”
- <sup>464</sup>Cruikshank, *The Will to Empower*, 72.
- <sup>465</sup>Ibid, 4.
- <sup>466</sup>Georgia Conservancy, *Pittsburgh: Proud History, Bright Future*.
- <sup>467</sup>*Pittsburgh Community Redevelopment Plan*.
- <sup>468</sup>*Preservation of Pittsburgh: Pre-Planning Community Engagement*.
- <sup>469</sup>Effron, “LaFarge Ready to Leave BeltLine?”
- <sup>470</sup>Wheatley, “Lafarge Puts Beltline Property near Glenwood Park on the Market.”
- <sup>471</sup>Effron, “LaFarge Ready to Leave BeltLine?”
- <sup>472</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>473</sup>Wheatley, “Southeast.”
- <sup>474</sup>Wheatley, “Lafarge Puts Beltline Property near Glenwood Park on the Market.”
- <sup>475</sup>Effron, “LaFarge Ready to Leave BeltLine?”
- <sup>476</sup>Wheatley, “Six Questions That Blow Our Mind about the City’s Anti-Graffiti Task Force”; Wheatley, “Atlanta’s Graffiti Task Force Begins Investigating, Removing Vandalism”; Shalhoup, “Cabbagetown Graffiti Showdown”; Shalhoup, “Whacko Attacks Graffiti Artists | Atlanta News & Opinion Blog”; Blakenship, “Living Walls Welcomes Global Street Artists, Thinkers to Atlanta.”
- <sup>477</sup>Wheatley, “Six Questions That Blow Our Mind about the City’s Anti-Graffiti Task Force.”
- <sup>478</sup>Wheatley and Michaud, “Living Walls Splits Community.”
- <sup>479</sup>Miles, *Art, Space and the City*, 64.
- <sup>480</sup>Wheatley, “Lafarge Puts Beltline Property near Glenwood Park on the Market.”
- <sup>481</sup>Reddy, “Asian Diasporas, Neoliberalism, and Family REVIEWING THE CASE FOR HOMOSEXUAL ASYLUM IN THE CONTEXT OF FAMILY RIGHTS.”
- <sup>482</sup>Murphy, “Tempers Flare over Wall Mural in Southwest Atlanta.”
- <sup>483</sup>Ecos Environmental Design et al., *Atlanta BeltLine Master Plan Subarea 4*, 3.
- <sup>484</sup>Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates and Smith Dalia Architects, *Atlanta BeltLine Master Plan Subarea 2*, 4.
- <sup>485</sup>Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates and Smith Dalia Architects, *Atlanta BeltLine Master Plan Subarea 2*, 29.
- <sup>486</sup>Ibid, 28.
- <sup>487</sup>Ibid, 73.
- <sup>488</sup>Ibid, 70.
- <sup>489</sup>Ibid, 73.
- <sup>490</sup>Ibid, 22.
- <sup>491</sup>Ibid, 29.
- <sup>492</sup>Ibid, 73.
- <sup>493</sup>“Mike Carpenter: Concrete Chess Table.”
- <sup>494</sup>“J. Richard Laupus & the Youth of Peoplestown, Mechanicsville, Summerhill, Pittsburgh & Adair Park: BeltLine Dreams.”

- <sup>495</sup>Deutsche, *Evictions*, 61.
- <sup>496</sup>Kwon, *One Place After Another*, 83.
- <sup>497</sup>Sholette, "Some Call It Art: From Imaginary Autonomy to Autonomous Collectivity," 6.
- <sup>498</sup>Kwon, "Public Art as Publicity."
- <sup>499</sup>Sholette, "Some Call It Art: From Imaginary Autonomy to Autonomous Collectivity," 7.
- <sup>500</sup>Sholette, "Authenticity Squared: REPOhistory Circulation, Anatomy of an Urban Art Project," 23.
- <sup>501</sup>Shacham, "Statement: Couples."
- <sup>502</sup>"Karen Shacham."
- <sup>503</sup>Shacham, "Karen Shacham Photography."
- <sup>504</sup>Shacham, "Art on the Beltline 2012."
- <sup>505</sup>"Karen Shacham and Mike Carpenter: Couples Reimagined."
- <sup>506</sup>Shacham, "Art on the Beltline 2012."
- <sup>507</sup>Sustainable Neighborhood Development Strategies, Inc., *Preservation of Pittsburgh Master Plan*, 11.
- <sup>508</sup>"Areseni Zeitsev: TiredOUT."
- <sup>509</sup>Dixon, "Tire Art Along Beltline Bugs Neighbors."
- <sup>510</sup>"These Pictures Tell the Story of Art in Atlanta. At Least in Some Communities."
- <sup>511</sup>Berowne, "Comment on 'These Pictures Tell the Story of Art in Atlanta. At Least in Some Communities.'"
- <sup>512</sup>"Beyond the Beating."
- <sup>513</sup>Dixon, "Tire Art Along Beltline Bugs Neighbors."
- <sup>514</sup>"Beltline, Bees and a Victory for Our Communities!"
- <sup>515</sup>Mittleman, "Beltline Tires."
- <sup>516</sup>Holmes, "Stakeholders' Perceptions of Risk for Gentrification in Atlanta's Pittsburgh Neighborhood," 17.
- <sup>517</sup>*Ibid*, 25-26.
- <sup>518</sup>*Ibid*, 32.
- <sup>519</sup>*Ibid*, 26.
- <sup>520</sup>*Ibid*, 31.
- <sup>521</sup>Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 256.
- <sup>522</sup>Pasquinelli, "Can the New Urban Frontiers Be Sabotaged?"
- <sup>523</sup>Ahmed, "Happy Objects," 41.
- <sup>524</sup>Pasquinelli, "Can the New Urban Frontiers Be Sabotaged?"
- <sup>525</sup>Holmes, "Stakeholders' Perceptions of Risk for Gentrification in Atlanta's Pittsburgh Neighborhood," 32.
- <sup>526</sup>*Ibid*, 29.