

The Rhetoric and Reality of Urban Policy in the Neoliberal City: Implications for Social Struggle in Over-the-Rhine, Cincinnati

Abstract

This paper explores the disparities between the ideological discourses and material outcomes of three key urban policies, contextually grounded within the neoliberalised social and institutional spaces of Over-the-Rhine, Cincinnati. Whilst the rhetoric of neoliberal doctrine presents an emancipatory urban imaginary based upon individual freedom and the beneficent role of free markets, the embedding of the policies discussed accentuate the political and economical disenfranchisement of the most marginalised neighbourhood inhabitants. Moreover, the ability of this group to politically mobilise against hostile neoliberalisation and gentrification is undermined by the facilitation of out-migration of stable low-income families and community leaders, and the reproduction of the negative, criminal and blighted aspects of Over-the-Rhine's environment. Neoliberalisation is seen to operate through material and discursive moments of social exclusion and in perpetuating socio-spatial structures which justify the continued implementation of repressive political and regulatory projects. In concluding, I suggest neoliberal hegemony may be undermined through exposing the ways in which it reproduces and exacerbates the phenomena it condemns.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article analyses the contextual embedding of three urban policies within the neoliberalising regulatory-institutional architecture and social spaces of the Cincinnati neighbourhood of Over-the-Rhine (OTR). I emphasise how two core – and interrelated – tenets of neoliberal ideology shape both the implementation of urban policy, and potential terrains of resistance for low-income urban inhabitants and grassroots community organisations. Firstly neoliberalism professes the ‘end of the social’, thus constructing the individual as responsible for their own material conditions (Gough, 2002; Trudeau and Cope, 2003) and secondly, the doctrine posits economic and developmental beneficence in open, competitive markets rather than in state-sponsored social service provision (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Harvey, 2005; Jessop, 2002).

In examining the ways in which these key urban policies shape Over-the-Rhine’s social and spatial structures, I have two main objectives. Firstly, by emphasising the disparity between policy rhetoric and the actual experience of urban inhabitants in the neoliberal city I wish to stress that neoliberalism is not an abstract amalgam of political-economic processes and imperatives enacted upon society, but an exclusionary set of exploitative – yet complex and contingent – material social relations (Gough, et al, 2006; Harvey, 2005). Furthermore, these social relations are premised upon ideological assumptions and spatial imaginaries which are of fundamental significance in shaping social, economic and political life in the city (Hackworth, 2007; Keil, 2002; Mitchell, 1997, 2003).

Secondly, I seek to explain how the grounding of urban policy within a wider project of gentrification and regulatory-institutional neoliberalisation in Over-the-Rhine / Cincinnati reveals a distinctly spatial strategy; one which aims to disperse concentrations of poverty from the inner city, yet perpetuates poverty’s visibility as a means to legitimise the implementation of

neoliberal urbanism (see Crump, 2002; Mitchell, 2003; Peck, 2006a; D. Wilson, 2007). Despite an emancipatory rhetoric, framed within a neoliberal discourse of commodification, market competition, individual utility and economic citizenship, the embedding of the urban policies discussed spatially fractures and disperses Over-the-Rhine's low-income population as a political constituency. This has a twofold ramification upon the contestation of neoliberal political and developmental projects being rolled out in Over-the-Rhine; (1) it displaces the social base of the neighbourhood's existing grassroots political organisations – the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement; and (2) the out-migration of stable low-income families and community leaders leaves behind a transient population viewed as accentuating the problems of crime and substance abuse in the neighbourhood. As David Wilson (2007) has argued, reproducing 'landscapes of fear' in the neoliberal city – often significantly racialised within the United States – supports the roll-out of repressive state strategies, punishing the urban poor and creating an environment amenable to capitalist investment and accumulation.

The article is organised as follows; firstly I situate my arguments within the recent literature surrounding neoliberal urbanism, reviewing critical geographic approaches that assert the significance of the urban scale in understanding processes of neoliberal re-regulation and contestation. Secondly I briefly outline the historical and political landscapes of Over-the-Rhine as the case study area, pointing to the significance of the neighbourhood's architecture and the re-articulation of the local governance regime. Thirdly, I unpack the discursive rhetoric and material realities the following urban policies introduced to Over-the-Rhine; (1) the restructuring of HUD's Section 8 voucher scheme; (2) Cincinnati City Council's 'Impaction Ordinance'; and (3) the designation of Over-the-Rhine as an 'Historic District' and 'Most Endangered Historic Place' by Cincinnati City Council and the National Trust respectively. In doing so, I pay particular

attention to the impacts of these policies upon neighbourhood inhabitants' and community groups' political and economic positions, and the increased alienation and hardship experienced by the neighbourhood's most vulnerable and marginalised inhabitants. Finally, I conclude by asserting the fundamental role of social exclusion within neoliberal hegemonic projects and offer some political implication which may be gleaned through the case study.

I base my arguments on a neighbourhood case study that has aimed to unveil the lived experience of marginalised urban dwellers under the political and economic imperatives of neoliberalism. This study draws on ethnographic research incorporating in-depth interviews (with neighbourhood organisations, community advocacy groups, real estate developers and local residents from a targeted cross-section of Over-the-Rhine's complex political and social infrastructure), participant observation and archival research (notably from local newspapers including the conservative *Cincinnati Enquirer*, left-wing *CityBeat*, and pro-business *Cincinnati Business Courier*), triangulated with quantitative statistics from the U.S. census and other sources.

2. CRITICAL GEOGRAPHIES OF NEOLIBERALISM

By the end of the twentieth century, neoliberalism had emerged from the political-economic and regulatory-institutional crisis of the 1970s and 1980s as the new regulatory orthodoxy (Jessop, 2000; Peck and Tickell, 2007) – as Peck and Tickell observe; “neoliberalism seems to be everywhere” (2002, p.380). Behind a pervasive rhetoric of inevitability and ‘there-is-no-alternative’ rationalisation, the discursive rolling out of neoliberalism continues “to naturalise globalisation and ‘the markets’ as out there, all-determining and irreversible forces, while equating neoliberalism with a market-assisted process of state withdrawal” (Peck, 2004, p.294).

Reacting against the construction of an all-encompassing and inevitable expansion of neoliberal capitalism, over the past decade critical geographers have done much to problematise the conceptualisation of neoliberalism as a universal hegemonic political-economic project. Geographic engagements have provocatively questioned discourses of unopposed, incontestable globalisation and the top-down imposition of the ‘Washington Consensus’ through the regulatory mechanisms of Peet’s (2003) ‘Unholy Trinity’ – the IMF, WTO and World Bank (Green and Huey, 2005; Harvey, 2005; Jessop, 2000, 2002; Radcliffe, 2005). Although states and monetary institutions at a number of geographical scales have introduced political and economic policies intended to extend market discipline, competition and commodification throughout all sectors of society (in order to remove barriers to open markets and obstacles to unrestricted capital accumulation) these processes are geographically contingent, and open to a multiplicity of contestations in articulations of statehood (Brenner, 2004; Keil, 2003), the economy (Gibson-Graham, 1996, 2006) and civil society (Gough, et al, 2006; Leitner, Peck, et al, 2007). Following such interventions, much critical research posits the apparent pervasiveness of neoliberal doctrine, ideology and practice, has not inevitably emerged from the collapse of the post-war Keynesian consensus. Rather, neoliberalism’s discursive and material dominance is reproduced through continual processes of contestation and reconstruction in the face of internal and external contradictions and crises (Leitner, Peck, et al, 2007; Peck, 2004).

2 (A). The Urbanisation of Neoliberalism

Neoliberal landscapes and social and spatial structures do not emerge uncontested, nor in comprehensive ‘end-states’, but are the result of a continual mediation of crisis arising in specific social, cultural, political and economic contexts (MacLeod and Goodwin, 1999; Peck and Tickell,

2002). Whilst critical geographers and social theorists influenced by regulation theory have posited the national state as the key scale and site of governance under the Keynesian-Fordist accumulation regime and mode of regulation (Brenner, 2004; Jessop, 2000; Lipietz, 2003), the far reaching political-economic implications in both scaling up, and scaling down state power have received particular attention following the emergence, and subsequent ascendancy of neoliberalism (Brenner, 1999; Hackworth, 2003; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Swyngedouw, 1997).

Acknowledging that institutions at the national scale continue to play a fundamentally important role in shaping the spatialities of contemporary capitalism (Brenner, 2004; Keil, 2003), recent theorisations of political-economic restructuring in advanced capitalist societies have increasingly engaged with the impact of neoliberalism on contemporary cities in order to move past the over-generalisation of neoliberalism, and its intertwining with constructions of globalisation (Brenner, 2004; Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Hubbard, 2004; N. Smith, 2002; Weber, 2002; D. Wilson, 2004a). Expanding such analysis of neoliberal re-regulation – one that is geographically sensitive to historically produced spaces and places – Brenner and Theodore developed the influential framework of ‘actually existing’ neoliberalism, which is;

intended to not only underscore the contradictory, destructive character of neoliberal policies, but also to highlight the ways in which neoliberal ideology systematically misrepresents the real effects of such policies upon the macroinstitutional structures and evolutionary trajectories of capitalism [and aims to] illuminate the complex and contested ways in which neoliberal restructuring strategies interact with pre-existing uses of space, institutional configurations, and constellations of socio-political power (2002, p.353, 361).

Although neoliberal projects are enacted within complex networks and across intertwined scales, Bob Jessop (2002, p.452) notes “it is in cities and city-regions that the various contradictions of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’ are expressed most saliently in everyday life”. The devolution of responsibility for social reproduction onto cities and city-regions, alongside the removal of local state’s authority to enact policy over their territorial administrative boundaries, limits the managerial capacity of urban governance regimes, engendering a shift towards entrepreneurialism, place marketing, increased inter-locality competition and significant re-articulations of urban networks (Kearns and Paddison, 2000; Martin, et al., 2003). Furthering these propositions, David Wilson (2004a) identifies four key concepts regarding the implementation and impact of neoliberal urban governance regimes in advanced capitalist countries. Firstly, they are historically and geographically specific. Secondly, they are culturally complex. Thirdly, the production and use of space facilitates the operation of neoliberal urban governance and finally, such projects are constantly evolving in relation to their spatio-temporal context.

Such approaches have significantly problematised the construction of neoliberalism as a ‘one-size-fits-all’ model for policy implementation and the neoliberal assumption that markets and states are diametrically opposed principles of social organisation. Furthermore, these geographic interventions reveal the importance of understanding the ideological grounding of neoliberal doctrine, its varied developmental tendencies, socio-political effects, and multiple contradictions (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). In engaging with such propositions, for example Hackworth and Moriah (2006) have examined social housing policy in Ontario to unpack the significance of understanding ‘ideal-type’ neoliberalism in the face of the locally-contingent variations. Crump (2002) deconstructs the neoliberal rationale behind ‘deconcentrating poverty’

through the demolition of public housing in the U.S. inner city, revealing the use of neoliberal spatial metaphors in disguising the political and economic processes producing urban poverty. Niedt (2006) further explored the significance of conservative and neoliberal ideology in garnishing popular support in the ‘revanchist suburbs’ for pro-gentrification coalitions in Maryland whilst Gough, et al. (2006) provide a provocative and enlightening analysis of poverty and social exclusion within neoliberal society. Such research illustrates that focusing on the urban as scale of analysis brings several advantages, making the lived experience under the imperatives of neoliberal capitalism more tangible, thus enabling focused accounts of policy implications on the ground (see Herod and Aguir, 2006; Hubbard, 2004; May et al., 2005) and opening up potential avenues of resistance (Gibson-Graham, 2006; Merrifield, 2002).

2 (B). Cities and the Contestation of Neoliberalism

Cities’ social and spatial structures are key arenas where neoliberalism’s contradictions and deficits are exposed (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Jessop 2002), but also where it’s potential ‘others’ are both conceived of and realised. Leitner, Sheppard, et al. (2007) attest that much existing research on neoliberalism, by focusing on the political-economic project itself, rather than its articulation within multiple and dynamic modes of oppositional and collaborative contestation, essentialises and theoretically reifies neoliberal practices, norms, ideals and discourses. Following this critique, Leitner, Peck, et al. (2007) further develop critical engagements with neoliberalism through forwarding an intellectual project which analytically ‘decentres’ the neoliberal project itself within contemporary urban processes. Articulations of neoliberalism are subsequently viewed as dynamically constructed by both the ideological

imperatives proffered by political-economic elites, and the multiple, complex and contradictory ways in which they are contested (Leitner, Sheppard, et al. 2007, Peck and Tickell, 2007).

Following this approach, whilst neoliberalism might appear ‘all over the place’, geography is of fundamental importance to understanding and contesting urban neoliberalism (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Leitner, Peck, et al. 2007). This geographical sensitivity is also a scalar sensitivity as understanding any local articulation of neoliberalism, “also means figuring out its relational and constitutive connections...a careful cross-referential mapping of the shifting political terrain; and relational analyses of those local conjunctures that together constitute the wider regime” (Leitner, Peck, et al. 2007, p.316). In examining this wider context, reconfigurations of governance and urban policy present new social, political and economic terrains in which resistance movements are situated and alternative strategies of contestation may emerge. Analytically decentring the focus of contemporary political-economic restructuring – from constructions of neoliberalism themselves to the active role contestation plays in producing and usurping geographically contingent regulatory structures, processes and discourses – opens the potential for progressive politics to materialise within the spaces and social structures of the contemporary ‘neoliberal city’, and interact across numerous scales despite the monumental nature of contesting neoliberalism’s hegemony.

This is certainly an engaging theoretical proposition and provides a dynamic framework to analyse the interrelationships between neoliberalisation and processes of contestation and resistance in contemporary cities over numerous geographical, empirical and scalar contexts. However, whilst I applaud the continuing politicised engagement with neoliberalism and the contestation of repressive political-economic restructuring, I argue that there is a need to sharpen our understanding of the material consequence of discursive and actualised neoliberalisation in

order to theorise how the roll-out of urbanised neoliberalism establishes its own discursive legitimacy through engaging and usurping resistance movements endemic to any hegemonic project.

As indicated by numerous critical and insightful political-economy studies, significant disparities exist between the goals of neoliberal ideology and their actual impact on markets and regime structures (Bourdieu, 1998; Brenner, 2004; Duménil and Lévy, 2005; Harvey, 2005; Macleod and Goodwin, 1999; Peck and Tickell, 1994, 1995). In this article, I methodologically and analytically explore such disconnections through employing a dialectical-materialist approach examining the reality of neoliberal urbanism and its discursive, rhetorical form in order to reveal the structural contradictions of the political-economic project produced within the specific historical and geographic context of Over-the-Rhine. This approach does not imply that the impact of neoliberalism on urban society is deliberately misrepresented, but rather implies its representation and ideological-discursive rhetoric conceal fundamentally exclusionary and exploitative social relations (Fine and Saad-Filho, 2004 pp.4-8). The neighbourhood case study I present, through engaging with Leitner, Peck, et al.'s (2007) problematising of contestation-neoliberalisation, highlights the ways in which geographically contingent neoliberalisms usurp the legitimacy of oppositional political institutions and alternative modes of urbanism; redefining political, economic and social terrains of resistance whilst (re)producing negative conditions validating the implementation of repressive, neoliberal politics.

3. GROUNDING NEOLIBERAL URBAN STRUCTURES IN OVER-THE-RHINE

In the following, I analyse the rhetoric and reality of three key urban policies introduced into Over-the-Rhine from a number of political institutions operating at multiple political and

geographic scales; firstly HUD's Section 8 housing allocation; secondly, Cincinnati City Council's 'Impactation Ordinance'; and thirdly the neighbourhood's designation as an 'Historic District' and 'Most Endangered Historic Place'. The policies discussed regulate Over-the-Rhine's housing stock and availability – thus shaping the neighbourhood's built environment – but furthermore actively shape its social structures, through exclusionary redefinitions of who's space the inner cities is (Table 1). Whilst these policies cannot be considered purely neoliberal in the *narrow sense* (although I argue both Section 8 restructuring, and certainly the Impactation Ordinance exhibit strong neoliberal rationales), their embedding in the place-specific context of Over-the-Rhine has operationalised them as an *integral* component of urban neoliberalisation within the neighbourhood (see Brenner, 2004).

Over-the-Rhine covers 300 acres of mixed-use commercial, industrial, institutional and residential zoned plots adjacently north of Downtown Cincinnati. The neighbourhood is historically and architecturally significant, yet is also a locus for many characteristics of inner city decay, including out-migration, disinvestment, urban blight and the image of an unsafe and unhealthy environment. Scheer and Ferdelman (2001) report that 70% of Over-the-Rhine's nineteenth century Italianate buildings were destroyed during the twentieth century, yet as local politicians and property developers rediscovered the neighbourhood's remaining architecture (left relatively intact), the built environment has become highlighted as a key commodity facilitating the drive to gentrify the district, questioning marginalised urban inhabitants right to city space (3CDC, 2006a; N. Smith, 2002; Weber, 2002).

The overall population of Over-the-Rhine has declined throughout the twentieth century, yet coinciding with this decline, the proportion of African-Americans in the area has grown through the 1960s and 70s, largely as a result of displacement from surrounding neighbourhoods

(Table 2). Whilst the emergence of gentrification in Over-the-Rhine introduces significant variations to the class and racial composition of residents, the neighbourhood's inhabitants are predominantly African-American, and tend to be younger and poorer than the rest of Cincinnati's metropolitan area (Cincinnati City Council, 2002, p.7). As such Over-the-Rhine represents certain universalities of the history of social change, urbanism, race and class in the American inner city, but also stands as a unique and extreme example of the contest surrounding urban space in the neoliberal city (Miller and Tucker, 1998; Smith and Feagin, 1995, D. Wilson 2007).

Gentrification, as an attempt to extract value from Over-the-Rhine, is contextually grounded and operationalised through a complex urban governance regime, the emergence of which has neither been haphazard, nor accidental as temporal and spatially specific issues of class and race polarised interests within the neighbourhood (Table 3). Responding to the poverty, homelessness, and neighbourhood decline experienced during deindustrialisation, local activists – led by-and-large by the charismatic Buddy Gray (until his murder in 1996) – mobilised as the 'Over-the-Rhine People's Movement', a collection of non-profit community organisations including the neighbourhood Community Council, in order to challenge and alleviate the neighbourhood's marginalisation and advocate on behalf of its politically and economically disenfranchised population. Within the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement, of particular relevance for this article is the position of the Race Street Tenant Organization Cooperative (ReSTOC¹), a neighbourhood non-profit affordable housing provider and advocacy organisation that shall be discussed in greater detail in the following.

¹ As of April 2006, ReSTOC merged with the Over-the-Rhine Housing Network to form the singular organisation 'Over-the-Rhine Community Housing'. However at the time this research project was conducted, the organisations were distinct and are discussed as such here.

Since the 1980s, key corporate interests and City politicians have viewed Over-the-Rhine as an increasingly significant asset for Downtown Cincinnati's regeneration. In 1984, City Councillor (and as of 2006, Cincinnati vice-Mayor), Jim Tarbell, brought together a small group of local businessmen and civic leaders to establish the Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce in order to provide an infrastructure that might facilitate capital investment and promote market-rate development. The neighbourhood Chamber subsequently spawned an offshoot body, the Over-the-Rhine Foundation and together these organisations present a separate, competing institutional neighbourhood infrastructure that challenges the position of the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement.

Of further significance in shaping the urban process in Over-the-Rhine, in July 2003, Cincinnati City Council formed, and subsequently devolved responsibility for the regeneration of the urban core – including Downtown and Over-the-Rhine – to the Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation (3CDC); a private, non-profit corporation whose administrative structure brings together CEOs and prominent members of Downtown Cincinnati's economic lynchpins. Not only do both Over-the-Rhine People's Movement and Chamber of Commerce claim 3CDC and City Hall utilise the neighbourhood Chamber as first port of call when discussing neighbourhood redevelopment plans (on the limited occasions such community interactions occur, see CityBeat 2004), as revealed by the composition of 3CDC's board and Over-the-Rhine working committee (3CDC, 2006b), this urban governance restructuring blatantly favours the interests of capital in Cincinnati, distancing Over-the-Rhine's existing low-income residents from neighbourhood decision-making processes and setting the context for implementation of the policies I shall now discuss.

4. CONTINGENT NEOLIBERAL URBANISM; SHAPING TERRAINS OF RESISTANCE

4 (A). Producing an Affordable Housing Market

The Section 8 Housing Program provides federally-funded financial aid for monthly rental payments on behalf of low-income families so that they can live in decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing. Participating families pay between 30% and 40% of their annual adjusted income for rent and utilities with the remaining portion of rent paid directly to the landlord through the Section 8 programme (Hamilton County Public Housing Agency, 2006). In 2000, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) restructured the allocation of Section 8 housing provision at the national scale from 20-30 year site-based certificates awarded to landlords to year-to-year contracts awarded to individual housing recipients in order to reduce concentrations of poverty from the United States' urban cores (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2005). In line with neoliberal rhetoric, the restructuring of Section 8 allocation frees individuals from the squalor of slum (ware)housing in the inner city, producing a market for Section 8 vouchers that provides recipients with the possibility of seeking better quality housing elsewhere in the city.

Over-the-Rhine was the locus for many buildings receiving long-term certificates in Cincinnati prior to Section 8 restructuring and the re-regulation of funding provision has significantly impacted the neighbourhood's social and political-economic landscape. Firstly, the shift from certificates for buildings to vouchers for individuals has restricted the development of the affordable housing sector in Over-the-Rhine, with several landlords opting out of subsidised housing provision, auctioning much off to market-rate developers (Cincinnati Post, 2003). The most prominent case involved the partial bankruptcy of Hart Realty who liquidated much of their affordable housing stock (Cincinnati Enquirer, 2001). As a result of selling off its capital assets,

Hart Realty maintained ownership of much of its high-end rental property in Over-the-Rhine and wider Cincinnati area whilst property auctions provided 3CDC and their associated private developers the opportunity to purchase many buildings previously operated as (low quality) subsidised housing.

Secondly, despite numerous low-income residents' affinity with- and desire to stay in- Over-the-Rhine, many within this community harbour ambitions to leave to the neighbourhood over personal safety concerns originating in the persistence of crime and urban blight (see D. Wilson, 2007). The restructuring of Section 8 voucher provision has facilitated and supported this desired out-migration. Significantly, local low-income advocates note a concerning trend in the demographic structure of the population leaving Over-the-Rhine; namely the predominant involvement of the most residentially stable and politically active lower-income residents. This leaves behind a concentration of transient inhabitants who are seen as reinforcing the material and discursive reproduction of Over-the-Rhine as a marginalised, ghettoised district. As a member of the Over-the-Rhine Contact Center explains;

The shift to individual vouchers makes it possible for you to go to other areas in Cincinnati, so a lot of people who have been able to take their vouchers have gone to North Avondale or other city neighbourhoods...Low-income community leaders who have a little more stability...[and] the most stable low-income families and moderate-income working families are leaving Over-the-Rhine and the lowest-income, most unstable families are unable to leave (Interview, Community organiser, Over-the-Rhine Contact Center).

Through asserting the benefits for the individual provided by the introduction a market for subsidised housing, HUD's restructuring of Section 8 allocation offers an emancipatory discourse; both 'freeing' individuals from slum conditions in the urban core and providing access to housing in more preferable neighbourhoods. However, in actuality, deconcentrating the poor from Over-the-Rhine has served to sever the material and psychological connections between low-income communities and social, geographical neighbourhood space in the central city (Crump, 2002; Goetz, 2003).

Furthermore, the free market provision of affordable housing has failed to provide better living conditions for voucher recipients. Whilst individuals are allowed to take their vouchers to any Cincinnati neighbourhood, these communities often lack adequate social service and public transport provision, and many landlords, residents and politicians in more-affluent districts are reluctant to accept Section 8 vouchers, refusing to let low-income classes into their communities (see Goetz, 2003). Hamilton County Commissioner Phil Heimlich compared the expansion of subsidised housing eligibility in Hamilton County, Ohio, to Godzilla, declaring "like a monster out of a Japanese horror film, [HUD] goes around swallowing up neighborhoods -- and there's nothing that local officials like me can do to stop it" (cited in CityBeat, 2004). Yet the termination of long-term contracts for subsidised housing places more power in the hands of Cincinnati's landlords; many of whom threatened to opt out of the Section 8 voucher scheme altogether if the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA) went through with proposed reductions in rents. The rent reduction was proposed as a solution to Federal cutbacks to CMHA of \$4 million (according to CMHA, HUD placed the reduction at \$837,000). CMHA argued that if the rental cuts were not enacted, it would have to remove Section 8 vouchers from 300 low income families, however, a Cincinnati landlord predicted 20% of units currently

accepting vouchers would opt out if the plans went through (Cincinnati Business Courier, 2005a; 2005b).

In conjunction with this disconcerting trend, the demographic shifts originating from the restructuring of Section 8 provision have negatively impacted upon the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement's ability to contest market-rate development in two ways. Firstly, their political position in the neighbourhood is undermined as (1) their political base is diminishing via the out-migration facilitated significantly by Section 8 restructuring; and (2) following the loss of a stable, politically active constituency, low-income advocacy organisations are discursively and materially linked with the reproduction of ghettoised socio-spatial structures in Over-the-Rhine. Secondly, the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement's claims of democratic legitimacy in the neighbourhood are usurped by the alternative, competing political-institutional infrastructure of the Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce and Foundation; institutions whose own claims of representative legitimacy are supported by their own growing social base of politically active gentrifiers and free-market development advocates offering an alternative vision for the future, discursively disconnected from existing criminality and deviancy, and backed by 3CDC and Cincinnati City Council.

Whilst HUD's national scale restructuring of Section 8 housing allocation seeks to benefit low-income individuals and families, within the specific social and spatial context of Over-the-Rhine, I argue it has served to disenfranchise the marginalised, low-income population it purports to assist. The discursive and material production, and subsequent treatment, of the urban poor under the imperatives of urban neoliberalism – socially constructed as of less value than consumers and homeowners (Goetz, 2003; Gough, 2002; Hubbard, 2004; Trudeau and Cope, 2003) – justifies their displacement from economically-attractive city districts in order to

facilitate capital accumulation and create a competitive advantage for the wider urban region (Merrifield, 2002; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Weber, 2002; J.W. Wilson, 1996). In Over-the-Rhine, rather than empowering low-income residents and improving their material living conditions, the spatial dispersion of this population increasingly marginalises the neighbourhood's already vulnerable inhabitants, negates the political position of the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement and supports the roll out of a neoliberal development strategies (Niedt, 2006; D. Wilson, 2007).

4 (B). Coercing Low-Income Advocacy Organisations

Whilst Section 8 restructuring has served to spatially disperse Over-the-Rhine's low-income political constituency, The Impaction Ordinance, passed in 2001 by Cincinnati City Council, blocks the City from awarding any of its \$25 million in housing subsidies to low-income projects unless 51% market-rate housing is incorporated, thus preventing the expansion of the affordable housing sector in Over-the-Rhine (CityBeat, 2001). As such, the Impaction Ordinance is a highly contentious and influential policy. Neighbourhood activists and realtors on both sides of the neighbourhood's economic divide have questioned the passing of the Impaction Ordinance as at once a reactionary measure after the race riots which swept through Over-the-Rhine during April 2001, and a targeted attack against ReSTOC's position in the neighbourhood (CityBeat, 2001). Indeed, the passing of the Impaction Ordinance has had a profound impact on ReSTOC, highlighting how geographically-specific social struggles, combined with shifting institutional terrains, facilitate the production of new socio-spatial imaginations of the urban poor and inner city which enable coercive political manoeuvring by the neoliberal state and accompanying governance regimes (Leitner, Peck, et al. 2007; Mayer, 2007; Miller, 2007; Sites, 2007; Swyngedouw, 2005).

ReSTOC had been accused of ‘land-banking’ and perpetuating a ‘super ghetto’ during a 1996 media campaign against Buddy Gray; (CityBeat, 2001; Quinlivan, 2002). In an attempt to move past this stigmatisation, the ill will generated by the April 2001 riots, and adapting to a new political landscape (in which ReSTOC is challenged by the Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce and faces increased political marginalisation by Cincinnati City Council), the current director of ReSTOC has shifted the institution’s perspective to, as he claims, act “like any other business”. This move to see the capital value of their holdings and cooperate with 3CDC has won him praise from market-rate development advocates and at several levels of government, leading him to be dubbed “ReSTOC’s new free-market face” (Cincinnati Business Courier, 2003) and “more entrepreneurial” (Jim Tarbell cited in Cincinnati Business Courier, 2003). Yet despite its ‘there is no alternative’ rationalisation by all parties, this shift in direction has not been voluntary. ReSTOC has been forced to change its modus operandi under increased pressure from the City, 3CDC, the challenge to their legitimacy presented by the neighbourhood Chamber of Commerce and their perceived role in perpetuating neighbourhood decline presented through the local media (see Quinlivan, 2002).

Exemplifying how ReSTOC’s position in Over-the-Rhine has been undermined, an employee points to Cincinnati City Council’s coercive political manoeuvring as the City withheld Federal funding promised to ReSTOC for several development projects;

We did our first sizeable low income tax credit programme; it involved six pretty, vacant historical buildings. We wanted to totally renovate them and turn them into affordable housing...The whole project was about \$4 million and \$770,000 came through Federal funds passed through the City. They based a whole lot of strings on the project based on the

perception that ReSTOC is part of the problem in Over-the-Rhine and not part of the solution. Some of the strings were; we had to sell some of our properties, we were not allowed to buy additional properties for 8 years – that we would work in cooperation with the City (Interview, Affordable housing advocate, ReSTOC).

After accepting the City's terms, ReSTOC was viewed in a more positive light; as then Cincinnati Mayor Charlie Luken declared “[ReSTOC is doing] much, much better...*But they still own way too much property...*We had to take them on” (cited in Cincinnati Business Courier, 2003 emphasis added). Yet this improved image has come at a price. Luken's claim regarding the amount of property ReSTOC owns in Over-the-Rhine raises an important spatial concern for low-income advocacy organisations. As several representatives from the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement commented during interviewing, their holdings in the built environment are the only reason why they are at the development table to begin with. With ReSTOC's holdings in the built environment the key asset in ensuring their involvement in neighbourhood political processes, Cincinnati City Council's attempt to undermine ReSTOC's presence is highly questionable – and decidedly political when considering both ReSTOC and local realtors have suggested approximately half of all Cincinnati's vacant buildings are located in Over-the-Rhine.

Additionally, ReSTOC could only manage to sell one of the buildings they were forced to place on the market. While one might conclude that the city simply overestimated demand for real estate, I think this would be too simple a conclusion. Instead, I suggest these events need to be understood as further steps by the City preparing the neighbourhood for future gentrification. Through cooperating with the City, and implicitly 3CDC, ReSTOC appears to consent to 3CDC's gentrifying, market-rate development neighbourhood plans, yet they have been coerced into this

position at the risk of losing their voice altogether. As such, ReSTOC's 'entrepreneurial' shift in direction exemplifies the mechanisms of coercion employed in within the zeitgeist of neoliberal urbanism; adding to 3CDC's legitimacy, framing affordable housing provision in the discourse of commodification and competition, whilst associating ReSTOC with the perpetuation of the neighbourhood's decline (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). As Peck (2006b) effectively argues in his ruthless criticism of Richard Florida's (2002) 'creative class' project, within the political framework of 'competitive states', localised class interests are subsumed, or marginalised within the logic and rhetoric of inter-local economic competition (Brenner, 2004; Harvey, 1989; Merrifield, 2002).

4 (C). Social Exclusion through Tenant Selection

Whilst the Impaction Ordinance has played a significant role in coercing ReSTOC into cooperating with 3CDC, it has also opened the possibility for an alternative approach to affordable housing provision in Over-the-Rhine that is gaining support in the real estate and development communities. In an attempt to regulate neighbourhood gentrification, several property developers are conceptualising affordable housing as a tool to ensure a mixed-income community in Over-the-Rhine in the future; a local real estate agent claiming; "affordable housing, when it's done right, is a great blight removal tool". This development principle tackles what a member of ReSTOC points to as a key problem facing affordable-housing advocacy groups;

There's high quality affordable housing and low-quality affordable housing and it's unfortunate...most people think government assisted housing [is] a bad thing because the buildings are not managed well, they

think the building is chaotic, that it brings down surrounding property values...we're trying to make the case that it can be done well and that it is actually needed (Interview, Affordable housing advocate, ReSTOC).

Using quality affordable housing to tackle blight follows the logic that capital for high-end condo development is not going to be invested in derelict and dangerous districts in Over-the-Rhine (Weber, 2002); however, property developers, using tax credits and grants available through preservation- and other- state funds (see below analysis of Historic District designation), will instead be in a position to develop a quality affordable housing product. The significance for private and market-rate development lies in the production of a quality low-income housing stock which will not drag down surrounding property values, but remove blight and social deviancy; thus providing a level of security for high-end developers.

Complying with the restrictions of the Impaction Ordinance, proponents pushing for the infusion of affordable housing elements with market-rate housing do not advocate more affordable housing, but for the renovation of Section 8 and low-income housing units in Over-the-Rhine, arguing that the problems associated with inner city decay lie with the density of poverty and affordable housing (Crump, 2002; Goetz, 2003). As a neighbourhood property developer explains;

When we talk about reduction of density, I'm not saying we've necessarily got to get people out of Over-the-Rhine, what I'm saying is we've got a 79 unit building here and it's only appropriate for 37 units. So instead of having 79 families in one building, you have 79 families in five buildings, that kind of reduction of density. And that does two things; it reduces the blight in that building, and because theoretically, you're

taking people from that building and doing world class jobs on five others, you reduce blight in six buildings (Interview, Property developer).

Using Low-Income Tax Credits to renovate properties legally ensures that for 30 years after full occupancy, the building is restricted for the low-income bracket. This provides low-income housing whose rents cannot increase inline with any future gentrification or rising property values in the neighbourhood, thus establishing the grounds for a mixed income community in Over-the-Rhine.

Advocates claim this affordable housing strategy does two things; (1) it decreases the density of poverty in Over-the-Rhine and (2) it allows a dramatic alteration in tenant selection criteria. Under the old structuring of Section 8, certificates allowed slumlords to warehouse as many people in their buildings as possible, maximising their profits but accepting “anything with a pulse...all your felons, all your people with drug and alcohol problems post rehab” (Interview, Property developer). Therefore, tenet selection criteria is redefined so that;

You can never have had a felony, you could never have had a drug misdemeanour, you could never have been evicted and you should be gainfully employed – even if this is Section 8 housing, if you have a full time job, then you go to the top of the waiting list. So 100% of people who we are leasing to are drug free, or at a minimum, have never been caught, they’ve never had a felony and they’ve never been evicted and they are employed (Interview, Property developer).

This approach provides an attractive solution to ensure Over-the-Rhine can still house low-income families into the future; improving the quality of affordable housing in Over-the-Rhine is certainly commendable, and seeking to remove criminal and deviant populations understandable.

However, I suggest the introduction of exclusionary tenant selection practices contrasts the emancipatory rhetoric behind (neoliberalised) housing policy, such as the freedom of choice that the restructuring of Section 8 certificates purports to provide (see Hackworth, 2007; Hackworth and Moriah, 2006; Newman and Ashton, 2004; Trudeau and Cope, 2003). Creating such a benchmark for tenant selection introduces a conception of citizenship sympathetic to neoliberal ideology through placing work, productive economic activity, at the heart of social inclusion (D. M. Smith, 2005, pp.17-38). Those who fail to live up to these criteria are denied access to higher-quality housing, pushed towards precarious employment (Theodore, 2003) and, if this new housing strategy is adopted widespread, displaced from Over-the-Rhine altogether. Therefore, the most marginalised, vulnerable neighbourhood inhabitants are held in a state of perpetual punishment, denying them access into civil [consumer] society (see Gough, et al, 2006; Hubbard, 2004) and furthermore, they provide a discursive imagining of the urban poor which neoliberals employ to demonise traditional low-income advocacy organisations, validating the implementation repressive urban policies.

4 (D). Historic Regulatory Codes and the Commodification of Space

Whereas the restructuring of Section 8 provision and the Impaction Ordinance lay the groundwork facilitating widespread gentrification in Over-the-Rhine, the neighbourhood's built environment is itself the commodity at the heart of the drive to gentrify the district (see N. Smith, 2002; Weber, 2002; D. Wilson, 2004b). As Over-the-Rhine is host to numerous architecturally significant Italianate buildings, the neighbourhood has been categorised by the National Trust and Cincinnati City Council as a historically important district. However, the 1983 designation of

Over-the-Rhine as a Historic District marked, for several low-income advocates, the beginning of a concerted gentrification project in the neighbourhood;

The [low-income] neighbourhood people organised against this because we knew that that was the beginning of a trend we had seen across the United States; that once a neighbourhood got declared an Historic District, it drew a lot of folks to say ‘oh, lets do this up, make the buildings fancy’ ...It was almost like the land became valuable to outside interests (Interview, Neighbourhood activist, Over-the-Rhine People’s Movement).

Whilst this feared gentrification has yet to fully take off, housing market experts point to Federal Historic Tax Credits and low-interest grants and loans available through the City as highly significant in facilitating both market-rate and affordable housing (re-)development. However, Historic District Status is a regulatory designation; regulations for housing upkeep and renovations render the maintenance of homes exceedingly expensive and place tremendous financial pressure on low-income homeowners, pressuring them to leave the neighbourhood.

During an interview, three elderly female African American homeowners claimed the economic pressure of “keeping things the way they were 100 years ago” was driving “elderly residents to the verge of homelessness”. Furthermore, they complained that damage is being caused to their properties from neighbouring vacant, deteriorating buildings, but as they would be liable to pay fines levied against them for historic code violations, they cannot report this. Compounding these economic difficulties, low-income home-owners lack both the time and financial means to take on Over-the-Rhine’s [absentee] slumlords through the courts. The desire amongst private-development advocates in Over-the-Rhine to promote home-ownership and

‘resident investment’ in the neighbourhood appears to miss low-income homeowners, who are left to feel powerless against landlords whose dilapidated buildings are often responsible for the deterioration of their own homes. Hence, Historic District status exacerbates the marginalisation and displacement of already vulnerable residents.

On the 10th May 2006, The National Trust for Historic Preservation placed Over-the-Rhine on its annual list of the nation's Top 11 Most Endangered Historic Places (Cincinnati Enquirer, 2006). This designation, unlike Historic District status, does not come with regulatory codes and instead acts to raise awareness of the significance of Over-the-Rhine’s built environment. Rather than coming attached with monies for redevelopment, the National Trust provide their expert assistance in securing loans and grants. As such, the proposal for ‘Most Endangered Historic Place’ status garnered support throughout the neighbourhood; the director of the Over-the-Rhine Foundation, Marge Hammelrath commented “Now it is time for people to realize we have a historic treasure that is equal to major battlefields or mountains... This is so important that we are acknowledged nationally” (cited in Cincinnati Enquirer, 2006). For Cincinnati Mayor Mark Mallory, the designation “is acknowledging the great assets we have in this community... It also puts us on notice that we have to take deliberate action to preserve this asset” (cited in Cincinnati Enquirer, 2006). The proposal itself was also drafted in cooperation with the Over-the-Rhine Community Council and would find popular support amongst residents (on both sides of the neighbourhood’s political-economic divide) who wish to see improvements to the neighbourhood’s physical infrastructure.

Placement on the Endangered Historic Places list certainly appears preferable to Historic District status insofar as it does not introduce regulatory economic pressures on low-income residents. However, it reflects a worrying trend in the neighbourhood; the elevation of the built

environment as a commodity over the users of Over-the-Rhine space (Weber, 2002). As a neighbourhood property developer commented when discussing their hopes for the future development of the neighbourhood; “well, you know Over-the-Rhine has been here for hundreds of years and it’s never committed a crime; it’s always been the people”. This discursive imagining neglects to accept that society and space in Over-the-Rhine have changed. An elderly interviewee told me the story of a friend who had erected a 10-foot fence to stop drug dealers stashing guns and drugs by her house and to stop people urinating in the street – but was forced to take it down as historic codes in the neighbourhood point out that Over-the-Rhine did not have 10-foot fences 100 years ago; “...but they didn’t have drug dealers 100 years ago; maybe a few people spitting tobacco, but things have changed” (Interview, Low-income resident). Yet further, a local real estate agent passionately condemned Over-the-Rhine’s land-banking property owners for jeopardising the physical infrastructure of the neighbourhood; “I mean, they aren’t doing anything illegal, they’re not like, taking people’s buildings away, but ...people have to board their buildings up, or re-model it. They *cannot* sit on an historic building and let it rot!”. Such reductionist abstractions of society and space overlook the importance of the wider, scalar historical-material social structures which culminate in the production of Over-the-Rhine’s contemporary geographies, and the reproduction of poverty and social exclusion in America’s cities. Over-the-Rhine’s present residents are reduced in the local media (notably the *Cincinnati Enquirer*) and popular consciousness to “a people broken by drug and alcohol abuse” (*Cincinnati Enquirer*, 2006). Over-the-Rhine is presented as built environment-come-commodity, not as a socio-spatial entity produced through distinct historical-geographic social relations. This presentation of the inner city and urban poor lies at the heart of exclusionary neoliberal ideology and policy prescription, warranting a revanchist solution against an underclass who have claimed

the most significant historical spaces in Cincinnati (Mitchell, 1997; Niedt, 2006; J. W. Wilson 1996).

5. CONCLUSION

In providing a dialectical-materialist reading, this article has engaged with Leitner, Peck et al.'s (2007) re-conceptualisation of the neoliberalisation-resistance problematic through analysing the neoliberalised embedding of key urban policies within the social and spatial structures of Over-the-Rhine, Cincinnati. The disparity between the rhetoric and reality of these urban policies illustrates that whilst, as Leitner, Peck, et al. attest, neoliberalisation is the contingent outcome of regulatory restructuring and modes of contestation, 'actually existing' neoliberal urbanism produces social and spatial structures which usurp potential terrains of resistance and contestation (see also Mayer, 2007; Sites, 2007; Swyngedouw, 2005). How the dialectical relationship between neoliberalisation and contestation becomes articulated is contingent upon the interactions between macro-scale political-economic restructuring, the pervasiveness of ideological discourses and imperatives, and the concrete situation of the local context.

The rolling out of neoliberalism in Over-the-Rhine has been significantly facilitated by material and discursive processes of social exclusion. However, the discourse framing urban policy implementation overlooks the historical-geographic production and embedding of social inequality, uneven development and spatial marginalisation. My analysis supports the assertion that the rhetoric of 'de-concentrating' poverty from contemporary inner cities is short-sighted, and disregards the nuanced, place-specific production of poverty itself (Crump, 2002; Goetz, 2003). Exclusionary discourses and practices, as exemplified in relation to Section 8

restructuring, affordable housing tenant selection and the depiction of neighbourhood residents in the media, perpetuate negative, criminal and blighted geographic imaginations and material socio-spatial structures that are utilised by those advocating market-rate development in Over-the-Rhine to support their own political-economic agendas. In the face of an ideological doctrine lauding the utility of the individual and beneficence of free markets, neoliberal urbanism is implicit in the reproduction of the phenomena it condemns. However, the significance of the emancipatory rhetoric of neoliberalism cannot be overlooked when examining the emergence and perpetuation of neoliberal hegemony as it provides a powerful discourse that at once demonises pre-existing/alternative modes of urbanism whilst forwarding a hyperbole of individualism, liberty and freedom.

Therefore, neoliberalisation, as Harvey has argued, must be seen as a “*political* project to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites” (2005, p.19 original emphasis). Neoliberal understandings and representations of the urban poor, and form and function of the inner city, do much to discursively naturalise this class project, as well as the mechanisms and outcomes of social exclusion. The combination of ideological rhetoric, political-economic restructuring and integral, neoliberalised policy implementation not only has dire consequences for the material living conditions of the most marginalised, vulnerable urban inhabitants, but also fundamentally redefines their potential terrains of resistance. This is illustrated, in particular, through the political position of the People’s Movement, who are systematically undermined by the out-migration of their traditional social base whilst their legitimacy as a representative political institution is increasingly usurped by the competing, antagonistic neighbourhood infrastructure embodied in the Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce and Foundation – with the support of power political-economic elites in the city.

Through the broad-scale shift towards urban neoliberalism, the Over-the-Rhine People's Movement have become (1) politically and economically marginalised through the local state withholding Federal funds and bypassing the People's Movement in favour of their competing institutional infrastructure; and (2) discursively demonised, along with the neighbourhood's (racialised) low-income population, as perpetuating Over-the-Rhine's decline.

Following this, the political implications for social movements struggling against neoliberalism emerging from Over-the-Rhine appear bleak. The locally nuanced roll-out of neoliberalism, introduction of competing neighbourhood institutions and the specific historical social, political and economic geographies of Over-the-Rhine have produced a political environment in which local resistance movements are coerced into collaboration with neoliberal agents or risk sacrificing their access to political processes altogether. However, the case of Over-the-Rhine does illustrate the contradictions within the neoliberal project. The success with which a neoliberal agenda has been forwarded in Over-the-Rhine not only highlights the problematic implementation and outcomes of social exclusion, but the importance of discursively attacking pre-existing modes of urbanism. As such, I posit that locally based social struggles against repressive neoliberalisation must utilise their own historical geographies in conjunction with a critical engagement with the causes of- and indeed necessity of- poverty and uneven development which lie at the heart of historical-materialist critiques of capitalism in order to challenge to neoliberalism's dominance (see Harvey, 1978; Peck and Tickell, 2002). Despite neoliberalism's present hegemony, as Leitner, Peck et al. (2007) suggest, it is not the only ideological, political-economic project that can redefine the conceptualisation of social relations in the contemporary metropolis.

In engaging with *place*-based studies exploring *place*-specific articulations of neoliberal urbanism, we must not lose sight of how re-articulations of the urban process reshape material social relations and the ability of social resistance to emerge in contemporary cities. However, by paying attention to the ways that neoliberalism is spatially grounded, reproduced and contested in particular spatial contexts, neoliberal capitalism's contradictions may be utilised to challenge material articulations of urban neoliberalisation and produce a more socially just urbanism.

REFERENCES

- 3CDC, 2006a, 3CDC “Over-the-Rhine overview”, Retrieved January 12, 2006, from Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation at www.3cdc.org
- 3CDC. 2006b, “Board of directors”, Retrieved January 12, 2006, from Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation at www.3cdc.org
- Bourdieu, P., 1998, *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. (Free Press, New York)
- Brenner, N., 1999, “Globalisation as reterritorialisation: The rescaling of urban governance in the European Union” *Urban Studies* **36**(3) 431-451
- Brenner, N., 2004, *New state spaces: Urban governance and the rescaling of statehood*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
- Brenner, N., and Theodore, N., 2002, “Cities and the geographies of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’” *Antipode* **34**(3) 349-379
- Cincinnati Business Courier*, 2003, “ReSTOC’s new free-market face” 21 November
- Cincinnati Business Courier*, 2005a, “Property owner may exit CMHA Section 8 program” 4 April
- Cincinnati Business Courier*, 2005b, “Section 8 rent drop worries some” 21 March
- Cincinnati City Council, 2002, *Over-the-Rhine comprehensive plan*, (Cincinnati Planning Department, Cincinnati)
- Cincinnati Enquirer*, 2001, “Denhart ready to sell 10 properties” 20 October
- Cincinnati Enquirer*, 2006, “Reviving Over-the-Rhine: ‘Endangered’ designation might save historic buildings” 11 May
- Cincinnati Post*, 2003, “Sale of 33 buildings could help spur OTR” 13 May
- CityBeat*, 2001, “The fight for Over-the-Rhine” 13 December
- CityBeat*, 2004, “Taking over the park” 14 July
- Crump, J., 2002, “Deconcentration by demolition: Public housing, poverty and urban policy” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **20**(5) 581-596
- Duménil, G., and Lévy, D., 2005, “The neoliberal (counter-) revolution”, in *Neoliberalism: A critical reader* Eds. A. Saad-Filho, and D. Johnston (Pluto Press, London) pp9-19

- Fine, B., and Saad-Filho, A., 2004, *Marx's Capital (4th edition)*. (Pluto Press: London)
- Florida, R., 2002, *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. (Basic Books, New York)
- Gibson-Graham, J-K., 1996, *The end of capitalism (as we know it)*. (Blackwell, London)
- Gibson-Graham, J-K., 2006, *Post-capitalist politics*. (Blackwell, London)
- Goetz, E. G., 2003, *Clearing the way: Deconcentrating the poor in urban America*. (Urban Institute Press, Washington, DC)
- Gough, J., 2002, "Neoliberalism and socialisation in the contemporary city: Opposites, complements and instabilities" *Antipode* **34**(3) 405-426
- Gough, J., Eisenschitz, A., and McCulloch, A., 2006, *Spaces of social exclusion*. (Padstow, Cornwall: TJ International Press)
- Green, B., and Huey, L., 2005, "The politics of economic restructuring: Class antagonism and the neoliberal agenda" *Critical Sociology*, **31**(4) 639-650
- Hackworth, J., 2003, "Public housing and the rescaling of regulation in the USA" *Environment and Planning A* **35**(3) 531-549
- Hackworth, J., 2007, *The neoliberal city: Governance, ideology and development in American urbanism*. (Cornell University Press, New York)
- Hackworth, J., and Moriah, A., 2006, "Neoliberalism, contingency and urban policy: The case of social housing in Ontario" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **30**(3) 510-527
- Hamilton County Public Housing Agency, 2006, "Section 8", Retrieved May 19, 2006, from HCPHA at www.hamilton-co.org/commdev/CommDevS8.htm.
- Harvey, D., 1978, "Urbanisation under capitalism: A framework for analysis" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, **2**(1) 101-131
- Harvey, D., 1989, "From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation of urban governance in late capitalism" *Geografiska Annaler B*, **71** 3-17
- Harvey, D., 2005, *A brief history of neoliberalism*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
- Herod, A., and Aguiar, L. L. M., 2006, "Introduction: Geographies of neoliberalism" *Antipode* **38**(3) 435-439
- Hubbard, P., 2004, "Revenge and injustice in the neoliberal city: Uncovering masculinist agendas" *Antipode* **36**(5) 665-686

Jessop, B., 2000, "The crisis of the national socio-temporal fix and the tendential ecological dominance of globalising capitalism" *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* **24**(2) 323-360

Jessop, B., 2002, "Liberalism, neoliberalism and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective" *Antipode* **34**(3) 452-472

Kearns, A. and Paddison, R., 2000, "New challenges for urban governance: Introduction to the review issue" *Urban Studies* **37**(5-6) 845-850.

Keil, R., 2002, "'Common-sense' neoliberalism: Progressive conservative urbanism in Toronto, Canada" *Antipode* **34**(3) 578-601

Keil, R., 2003, "Globalisation makes states: Perspectives on local governance in the age of the world city", in *State / Space: A reader* Eds. N. Brenner, B. Jessop, M. Jones, and G. MacLeod (Blackwell, Oxford) pp278-295

Leitner, H., Peck, J., and Sheppard, E. S., Eds, 2007, *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. (Guildford Press, New York)

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E. S., Sziarto, K., and Maringanti, A., 2007, "Contesting urban futures: Decentering neoliberalism", in *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. Eds. H. Leitner, J. Peck, and E. S. Sheppard, E. S. (Guildford Press, New York) pp1-25

Lipietz, A. 2003, "The national and the regional: Their autonomy vis-à-vis the capitalist world crisis", in *State / Space: A reader*. Eds. N. Brenner, B. Jessop, M. Jones and G. MacLeod (Blackwell, Oxford) pp239-255

Macleod, G., and Goodwin, M., 1999, "Space, scale and state strategy: Rethinking urban and regional governance" *Progress in Human Geography* **23**(4) 503-527

Martin, D., McCann, E. J. and Purcell, M., 2003, "Space, scale, governance, and representation: Contemporary geographical perspectives on urban politics and policy" *Journal of Urban Affairs* **25**(2) 113-121

May, J., Cloke, P., and Johnsen, S., 2005, "Re-phrasing neoliberalism: New Labour and Britain's crisis of street homelessness" *Antipode* **37**(4) 703-730

Mayer, M., 2007, "Contesting the neoliberalisation of urban governance", in *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. Eds. H. Leitner, J. Peck, and E. S. Sheppard, E. S. (Guildford Press, New York) pp90-115.

Merrifield, A., 2002, *Dialectical urbanism: Social struggles in the capitalist city*. (Monthly Review Press, New York)

- Miller, B., 2007, "Modes of governance, modes of resistance: Contesting neoliberalism in Calgary", in *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. Eds. H. Leitner, J. Peck, and E. S. Sheppard, E. S. (Guildford Press, New York) pp223-249.
- Miller, Z. L., and Tucker, B., 1998, *Changing plans for America's inner cities: Cincinnati's Over-the-Rhine and twentieth century urbanism*. (Ohio State University Press, Columbus)
- Mitchell, D., 1997, "The annihilation of space by law: The roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States" *Antipode* **29**(3) 303-335
- Mitchell, D., 2003, "The liberalisation of free speech: or, How protest in public space is silenced", Retrieved March 23, 2005 from Stanford Agora: An Online Journal of Legal Perspectives at <http://agora.stanford.edu/agora/volume4/mitchell.shtml>.
- Newman, K., and Ashton, P., 2004, "Neoliberal urban policy and new paths of neighbourhood change in the American city" *Environment & Planning A* **36**(7) 1151-1172
- Niedt, C., 2006, "Gentrification and the grassroots: Popular support for the revanchist suburb" *Journal of Urban Affairs* **28**(2) 99-120
- Peck, J., 2004, "Geography and public policy: Constructions of neoliberalism" *Progress in Human Geography* **28**(3) 392-405
- Peck, J., 2006a, "Liberating the city: Between New York and New Orleans" Paper presented at the McConnell Lecture, Miami University, Oxford, OH. (forthcoming in *Urban Geography*).
- Peck, J., 2006b, "Struggling with the creative class" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **29**(4), 740-770
- Peck, J., and Tickell, A., 1994, "Searching for a new institutional fix: The after-Fordist crisis, in global-local Disorder", in *Post-Fordism: A reader*. Ed. A. Amin (Blackwell, Cambridge) pp280-316
- Peck, J., and Tickell, A., 1995, "The social regulation of uneven development: 'Regulatory deficit', England's Southeast and the collapse of Thatcherism" *Environment & Planning A* **27**(1) 15-40
- Peck, J., and Tickell, A., 2002, "Neoliberalising space" *Antipode* **34**(3) 380-404
- Peck, J., and Tickell, A., 2007, "Conceptualising neoliberalism, Thinking Thatcherism" in Calgary", in *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. Eds. H. Leitner, J. Peck, and E. S. Sheppard, E. S. (Guildford Press, New York) pp26-50
- Peet, R., 2003, *Unholy trinity: The IMF, World Bank and WTO*. (Zed Books, New York)

- Quinlivan, L., 2002, "Channel 9 News I-Team special report (transcript): 'Visions of Vine Street'", Retrieved March 14, 2005 from Channel 9 WCPO at http://www.wcpo.com/wcpo/localshows/iteam/visionsofvine/1201_script.html.
- Radcliffe, S., 2005, "Neoliberalism as we know it, but not in the conditions of its own choosing: A commentary" *Environment and Planning A* **37**(2) 323-329
- Scheer, B. C., and Ferdelman, D., 2001, "Inner-city destruction and survival: the case of Over-the-Rhine, Cincinnati" *Urban Morphology* **5**(1) 15-27
- Sites, W., 2007, "Contesting the neoliberal city? Theories of neoliberalism and urban strategies of contestation", in *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. Eds. H. Leitner, J. Peck, and E. S. Sheppard, E. S. (Guildford Press, New York) pp116-138
- Smith, D. M., 2005, *On the margins of inclusion: Changing labour markets and social exclusion in London*. (The Policy Press: Bristol)
- Smith, M. P., and Feagin, J. R., Eds. 1995, *The bubbling cauldron: Race, ethnicity, and the urban crisis*. (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis)
- Smith, N., 2002, "New globalism, New urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy" *Antipode* **34**(3) 427-450
- Swyngedouw, E., 1997, "Neither global nor local: 'Glocalisation' and the politics of scale", in *Spaces of globalisation*. Ed. K. R. Cox (Guildford Press, New York) pp137-166
- Swyngedouw, E., 2005, "Governance innovation and the citizen: The Janus face of governance-beyond-the-state" *Urban Studies* **42**(11) 1991-2006
- Theodore, N., 2003, "Political economies of day labour: Regulation and restructuring of Chicago's contingent labour markets" *Urban Studies*, **40**(9) 1811-1828
- Trudeau, D., and Cope, M., 2003, "Labour and housing markets as public spaces: 'Personal responsibility' and the contradictions of welfare-reform policy" *Environment and Planning A* **35**(5) 779-798
- United States Census, 2006, "Cincinnati, OH, census data", Retrieved June 10, 2006, from United States Census Bureau at www.census.gov.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2005, "HUD Homepage", Retrieved July 1, 2005, from HUD at www.hud.org.
- Weber, R., 2002, "Extracting value from the city: Neoliberalism and urban redevelopment" *Antipode* **34**(3) 519-540
- Wilson, D., 2004a, "Toward a contingent neoliberalism" *Urban Geography* **25**(8) 771-783

Wilson, D., 2004b, "Making historical preservation in Chicago: Discourse and spatiality in neo-liberal times" *Space and Polity* **8**(1) 43-59

Wilson, D., 2007, *Cities and race: America's new Black ghetto*. (Routledge, New York)

Wilson, J. W., 1996, *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. (Alfred A. Knopf Inc, New York)

Table 1. Key policies shaping Over-the-Rhine’s built environment and social structures

Scale	Year	Policy (<i>Enacted by</i>)	Rhetoric	Reality under neoliberal urbanism
National	2000	Section 8 subsidised housing voucher restructuring (<i>HUD</i>)	Provides individuals with the choice of where to take their Section 8 vouchers, freeing them from slum ‘warehousing’ units in the urban core.	Results in out-migration of low-income residents and community leaders, reducing both the ability of this class to political mobilise and undermining the legitimacy of OTR’s low-income advocacy organisations.
City	2001	The Impaction Ordinance (<i>Cincinnati City Council</i>)	De-concentrates poverty and the concentration of subsidised housing units. Facilitates private housing development by regulating the growth of the affordable housing sector.	Acts as a lever to coerce affordable housing organisations. Through reducing affordable housing supply, landlords may set tenant selection criteria, excluding the most marginalised neighbourhood inhabitants. No regulations in place to maintain long-term affordability.
Local (OTR)	1983	Historic District Designation (<i>Cincinnati City Council</i>)	Preserving OTR’s historic architecture is vital in attracting investment into Cincinnati’s Downtown. Raises awareness of the neighbourhood as a potential site for investment.	Introduces fines for building violations that economically pressure low-income residents (significantly low-income homeowners) out of OTR. Privileges buildings as commodities and sources of accumulation over residents who themselves are demonised for producing neighbourhood decay.
	2006	Most Endangered Historic Place Designation (<i>National Trust</i>)		

Table 2. Over-the-Rhine population by race, and housing stock by tenure, Hamilton Co. census tracts 9-11, 16, 17^a

	1970	1980	1990	2000
POPULATION				
Total Population	15,025	11,914	9,572	7,638
Black Population	5,830	7,449	6,853	5,876
White Population	9,122	4,214	2,468	1,482
HOUSING				
Total Housing Units	8,365	7,312	5,655	5,261
Renter Occupied	6,359	5,338	4,122	3,454
Owner Occupied	299	220	158	140
Vacant	1,707	1,746	1,375	1,667

Sources: United States Census (2006), Cincinnati City Council (2002).

^a Whilst the decline in population and reduction in total housing stock points to a general out-migration from Over-the-Rhine, this is part accounted for by a de-concentration of low-income units within buildings combined with the presence of number of vacant condos which have been developed but not occupied. This represents a drive towards facilitating neighbourhood gentrification through the planning and development of housing units, but a drive that has failed to be matched by large-scale immigration.

Table 3. Over-the-Rhine’s political-regulatory landscape

Scale	State	Private, non-profit organisation	
<i>Advocacy</i>		<i>Low-income</i>	<i>Market-rate development</i>
National	U.S. Government		
State	Ohio Government		
City (~Centre*)	Cincinnati City Council		3CDC*
Local (OTR)	<i>OTR People’s Movement</i>		OTR Chamber of Commerce OTR Foundation
	OTR Community Council	ReSTOC OTR Housing Network Drop Inn (homeless) Center OTR Contact Center Peaslee Center	