N V P A

NEW VISIONS FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS
VOLUME 6, SPRING 2014

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
www.sppa.udel.edu/nvpa/home

Neoliberal Urbanism:
Socio-Spatial Fragmentation & Exclusion

Rachel Beatty
University of Delaware

This paper takes a critical approach to urbanism in the United States with a focus on how the socio-political ideology of neoliberalism influences our urban spaces. I review literature that addresses the role of neoliberalism in urban development and describe the ways that neoliberal urban development, as a governance and growth project, has negative consequences on our urban communities by fragmenting space and reinforcing and normalizing socio-economic disparity through exclusionary policies and projects. I advocate for greater attention to "actually existing neoliberalism" and its implications by contemporary policy-making professionals as they work to improve our urban spaces and the lives of the people who inhabit them.

"The creation of a new urban commons…requires that we roll back that huge wave of privatization that has been the mantra of a destructive neoliberalism. We must imagine a more inclusive city…based upon different political-economic practices" (Harvey, 2003, p. 432).

Introduction

Public policy influences the shape of our economic and social systems, public and private institutions and the spaces that make up our communities. They are designed, developed, and implemented for the purpose of achieving particular outcomes. Rightfully so, many policy-making professionals focus their research and analysis on one or more of the policy processes listed above. They seek to answer questions such as: What are the outcomes we intend to achieve? What policies should we implement in order to achieve them? How will we know if the policy is or is not working?

Equally important is intentional analysis of the assumptions and ideologies that inform our policy-making processes and outcomes, an analysis that is too often overlooked in the professional practice of policy making. By definition, the ideologies that structure thinking form the basis from which systems, institutions, and policies are created. Ideological paradigms also play an essential role in the production of unintended policy outcomes. In the development, analysis, and evaluation of public policy interventions we must take a careful look at how

Rachel Beatty is a graduate student at the University of Delaware working towards her Master of Arts degree in Urban Affairs and Public Policy. Since Fall 2012 Rachel has been working as a research assistant at the Homeless Planning Council of Delaware through the School of Public Policy and Administration's Center for Community Research and Service. Her primary academic and professional areas of interest include housing, homelessness, and community development.
Email: rbeatty@udel.edu

our economic, social, and political ideological paradigms help or hinder us in achieving our goals.

Katherine Hankins (2013) brings our attention to a 1997 French Film, Vive la Republique! in which a homeless man tells an instructive story to a political activist. This story illustrates why policy makers must pay attention to the ideological frameworks and governance systems within which they operate. In the film a homeless man tells an activist to imagine a world in which some people are born in prison and others are not. This is just the way things are. In the prison a food shortage occurs. The prisoners organize themselves into political parties, elect representatives, and seek to find solutions to the food shortage problem. The food shortage becomes all that anyone in the prison ever talks about. And this, the homeless man says, is the biggest problem of all. Because ultimately, if a solution to the food shortage is found, very little will have changed. People will be well-fed, but they will still be living in prison.

While this is not how Hankins mobilizes the metaphor, for the purpose of this paper it is instructive to think of the prison as the neoliberal ideology that frames our policy-making. Public policy makers, with a focus on solving social and economic problems, operate within the "prison" of the neoliberal ideological and governance frameworks. These frameworks must be addressed if we hope to create significant and lasting change through the activity of policy-making.

In this paper I take a critical, theoretical look at urbanism. I address the socio-political ideology of neoliberalism, particularly as it informs the socio-spatial landscape of cities in the United States. Neoliberal urbanism negatively impacts our communities in two primary ways, by fragmenting urban space and reinforcing and normalizing socio-economic disparity through exclusionary policies and projects.

Neoliberalism

A somewhat controversial term, "neoliberalism" has been mobilized in academia in a variety of disciplines. The term gained significant discursive momentum, mainly by its critics, in the 1980s and 1990s in response to the Reagan/Bush/Thatcher era of Western political rule. Neoliberalism is a sociopolitical ideology that advocates a strict adherence to the principles of the private, "free" market in order to guide and implement solutions to critical social problems (Lin, 2013). Neoliberalism is the primary hegemonic discourse that shapes political and economic processes, the governance of institutions, and the making of places and spaces. (Peck and Tickle 2002)

Hackworth (2007) conceptualizes neoliberalism as a revival of classic liberal thinking that embraces free market economic theory and promotes the values of individualism. Neoliberalism has as its objective the dismantling Keynesian state intervention, specifically in the provision of social welfare that was seen by Keynesians as necessary in a free market capitalist society. Essentially, neoliberalists are individualists who believe that a prosperous free market will enhance freedom, liberty, and prosperity for all persons (who are willing to work for it), thereby making the Keynesian social welfare state obsolete (Peck and Tickle, 2002). Gregory Squires (1991) expresses concern with the emerging prominence of "public-private partnerships." He described this emerging trend as a result of the American ethos of privatism, which he defined as "the belief in the supremacy of the private sector and market forces in nurturing development, with the public sector as a junior partner whose principle obligation is to facilitate private capital accumulation" (Squires, 1991, p. 119). Within this ideological framework, one of the primary functions of the public sector becomes the facilitation of economic growth in the private sector. Examples include devoting public resources and policies to the creation of business-friendly market conditions and focusing policy on the provision of market incentives rather than market regulations. More specifically, neoliberalism can be found in the deregulation of markets, state downsizing, public sector financial austerity, and the "reform" of public services and social welfare programs – often in ways that punish or reward individual behavior rather than respond to the structural conditions of inequity (Lyon-Callo, 2008; Bourgois, 2010).

Peck and Tickle (2002) provide a useful summary of the emergence of the neoliberal project. The first wave, called "roll-back" neoliberalism, occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Following the economic crisis of the 1970s, the Reagan administration began "rolling back" and dismantling what had been central (and argued to be failing) public sector institutions. Across the board social entitlement programs were de-funded, federal urban development funding was retracted, and the U.S. embarked on an aggressive campaign of deregulation and austerity across multiple sectors. Fueled by anti-government sentiment and political rhetoric, it was believed that marketized solutions were the answers to the country's social and economic problems (Peck and Tickle, 2002).

The second wave occurred from the early 1990s into the early 2000s as the Clinton administration embarked on "roll-out" neoliberalism. The deregulatory economic philosophy of neoliberalism had become the new normal and went largely uncontested. However, this wave was characterized by an aggressive re-structuring and re-making of institutions and policies in order to explicitly promote market-based solutions, public-private partnerships, free trade, and the accumulation of private capital (Peck and Tickle, 2002). At the same time, the ill social effects of roll-back neoliberalism were being felt across the U.S., most acutely by low-income households, communities, and marginalized groups. In response the "roll-out" era also focused on implementing new forms of social welfare intervention, resulting in the social welfare "reform" policies of the 1990s. These policies were largely aimed at promoting individualized responsibility for poverty, and were implemented to regulate, manage, reform, and discipline the poor, who had been (and were continuing to be) socially and economically marginalized by the neoliberal project (Peck and Tickle, 2002). It is important to emphasize the far-reaching global impacts of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is not a uniquely American phenomenon, or a uniquely Western one – although the West is the neoliberal project's ideological and structural "home base." The global reaches of neoliberal ideology and governance are immense. Peck and Tickle (2002) argue that neoliberalism can be thought of as an "operating framework," "ideological software," or "religion" that globally proselytizes "the virtues of free trade, flexible labor, and active individualism" (p. 381). This "religion" of neoliberalism "combines a commitment to the extension of markets and logics of competitiveness with a profound antipathy to all kinds of Keynesian and/or collectivist strategies" (p. 381). It has, they argue, become the global hegemonic mode of political and economic rationality.

One might have thought that the worldwide economic crash of 2008 would have led to the unraveling or re-thinking of neoliberalism as a dominant and uncontested paradigm. However, as of now it appears that the post-crisis era has led to an intensification of neoliberalism as the dominant political discourse and policy-making project as evidenced by the public sector's increasing reliance on fiscal austerity measures, the shrinking of political discursive space, and the amplified prevalence of anti-poor, anti-welfare rhetoric by political and media elites (Peck et. al., 2013). In fact, one of the oft-noted characteristics of the neoliberal agenda is its tendency to create situations of crisis, prompting policymakers to act in ways that further the neoliberal project. Peck, Brenner and Theodore (2013) describe neoliberalism's "remarkable adaptability – its Houdini-like ability not only to survive, but to gain further momentum through the exploitation of crisis conditions for which it is largely responsible" (p. 1091).

While economic and political elites attempt to deal with and resolve the social, environmental and economic costs of neoliberal re-structuring and policies, they fail to challenge the premises of the neoliberal project itself. Since the 2008 economic crisis, there have been some high-profile challenges to neoliberal hegemony, mainly in the form of public protest, such as the Occupy Wall Street movement and pro-union protests in the Midwest. The Zapatista autonomy movement in Chiapas Mexico, which began in the 1990s, is a well-known international example of a grassroots social movement directly challenging the global hegemonic model of neoliberal governance (Stahler-Sholk, 2007). These movements have exposed some of the weaknesses and contradictions inherent to the neoliberal project, but have yet to result in significant structural or policy changes at the national or global scales.

Neoliberalism is today's "common sense" discourse and political and economic ideology. It is the dominant and (largely) uncontested ideological paradigm. However, as a policy-making project neoliberalism

does not get played out in the same way everywhere. It is at the same time globally hegemonic with universal features, and variable in the local particularities of practice. Brenner and Theodore (2002) emphasize the need to pay attention to and understand "actually existing neoliberalism," the contextually embedded and locally particular ways that neoliberalism is constituted, manifested, and reinforced. In other words, neoliberalism is not only an intangible theoretical framework or intellectual tool for making sense of macro-level trends. It is manifested explicitly in local places, is developed and reinforced by political and economic actors, and results in policies, programs, and projects that are neoliberal in their both their design and their outcomes. This call for attention to "actually existing neoliberalism" demands that we learn to identify the various ways that the neoliberal project is acted out locally, in practice.

As economic, social, and cultural engines where the global, federal, state, and local collide, cities and their communities have been acutely affected and destabilized by the neoliberal project. In the following sections I locate neoliberalism in the context of urban development, and describe the fragmenting and exclusionary impacts of "actually existing neoliberalism" on our urban places and spaces.

Neoliberal Urban Development

Urban policies, strategies, governance, political structures, the organization of institutions, and the geographic and social character of our urban spaces have been "neoliberalized." However, it would be inaccurate to characterize cities as passive places. Not only does neoliberalism affect cities, but cities are spaces within which actors and institutional arrangements engage in neoliberal development activities. According to Brenner and Theodore (2002) "cities have become key institutional arenas in and through which neoliberalism is itself evolving" (p. 345). Our urban policies and development strategies reinforce and reproduce the neoliberal project.

Neoliberalism is not static; the neoliberal project evolves as it is reproduced in our urban spaces through the act of policymaking, governance, and development initiatives. "Cities, in other words, are not merely at the 'receiving end' of neoliberalization processes…processes of neoliberalization continue to be actively constituted (and contested) across a planetary system of urban(izing) regions" (Peck, Theodore, & Brenner, 2013, p. 1093).

The language "urban development" is often mobilized discursively by urban elites as a synonym for economic development. Peck and Tickle (2002) tell us that "[n]eoliberalism promotes and normalizes a 'growth first' approach to urban development, reconstituting social-welfarist arrangements as anticompetitive costs and rendering issues of redistribution and social investment as antagonistic to the overriding objectives of economic development" (p. 394). Under neoliberal urbanism the primary objective of urban development strategies is economic growth. Other urban problems either take a back seat to this priority, or it is believed that they will be ameliorated as a result.

Logan and Molotch (1987) have argued that cities serve as sites for growth and expansion for the wealthy elite. Cities are used as "growth machines" by place entrepreneurs, such as businessmen, landlords, developers, banks, and other corporations. These actors, who are referred to as "growth machine activists" promote growth as the primary value in urban development due to the financial benefits they gain from place-making activities (p. 113). Logan and Molotch (1987) are particularly concerned with the commodification of place in the modern U.S. city, and see real estate markets as governed by inequalities in wealth and power (p. 109). Essentially, urban development tends to be dominated by a growth-first ethos that gives primacy to the accumulation of capital.

In the neoliberal city, the public sector (federal, state, city, and municipal) facilitates and promotes the fragmentation of space through the creation of insular and isolated spaces in our urban and metropolitan geographies by private sector developers. "Cities no longer simply accommodate private development requests; they often act as the driving force of private redevelopment" (Mele, 2011, p. 419). These spaces often take the form of shopping districts, cultural centers, waterfronts, sports arenas, and luxury housing

developments designed to accumulate capital. According to Weber (2002), "neoliberal redevelopment policies amount to little more than property speculation and public giveaways to guide the place and pace of the speculative activity" (p. 537).

In this analysis of neoliberal urban development, I use Christopher Mele's straightforward (though somewhat simplified) definition of neoliberal urban development to refer to "…a set of governance practices and regulations intended to valorize cities as sites for capital accumulation…" (Mele, 2011, p. 414). The focus here is on two contingent socio-spatial impacts of neoliberal urban development – the fragmentation of space and the subsequent socio-spatial exclusion that are brought on by the prevalence of what Mele (2011) calls "enclave oriented development," the creation of insular and isolated spaces in our urban and metropolitan geographies (p. 415).

Socio-Spatial Fragmentation and Exclusion

Neoliberal urban development fragments and carves up space, thereby reinforcing and reproducing the socio-spatial exclusion of marginalized populations. Mele (2011) examines how roll-back and roll-out neoliberal urban development has impacted the geography of Chester, Pennsylvania. Mele describes Chester's fragmented landscape, highlighting the Harrah's Casino, soccer stadium, waste management facility, and Rivertown, a multi-million dollar office complex. Mele (2011) argues that "Chester's disjointed redevelopment landscape is best explained not as a result of haphazard or bad city planning, but as a result of two successive waves of neoliberal urbanism that favor exclusionary development" (p. 422).

The redeveloped spaces in Chester were designed for specific uses by specific people – mainly visitors from outside of the City. They are situated geographically in a way that literally carves up the landscape into enclaves, disrupting any opportunity for spatial or social cohesion across space. According to Mele, these enclaves also go largely unused by the local residents, nor have residents reaped notable economic spillover benefits. Chester remains physically dilapidated and its residents continue to experience racial isolation and urban poverty at high rates. "Its [Chester's] population is half its peak in the 1950s, and the majority of its residents (75.7 percent of the total population) come from black families whose annual incomes are far below the state's median level (Mele, 2011, p.425).

Not only have Chester's residents not benefited socio-economically from the redevelopment projects, they have actually been harmed by their exclusionary impacts (Mele 2011). Brenner and Theodore (2002) argue that neoliberal urban development projects exacerbate existing inequities and create new forms of inequity. "…[N]eoliberal projects of political-economic restructuring collide with the pre-existing sociospatial cleavages and, in turn, create new forms of inequality, political disenfranchisement, and economic immiseration" (Brenner and Theodore, 2002, p. 345).

Exclusionary spaces, such as Chester's casino, soccer stadium, and Rivertown developments, are designed for private use and consumption. They are carefully monitored and controlled by private security mechanisms to ensure their correct uses by the correct people. These spaces, and the public spaces adjacent to them, are policed to discourage nuisances such as loitering, hanging out, or social assembly by local residents. Rather than providing local economic benefits, or providing local residents with spaces for socializing or community-building, "enclave-oriented redevelopment reinforces and normalizes longstanding patterns of class exclusion and racial segregation" (Mele, 2011, p. 422). In other words, poor, primarily minority residents are excluded from engaging meaningfully with and within these spaces, further legitimizing their social and economic marginality.

Sharon Zukin, an urban sociologist, takes particular interest in the role that culture plays in the creation of exclusionary urban spaces. Zukin (1995) argues that culture is a powerful tool used by urban elites, developers, and place-makers to control urban space: "As a source of images and memories, it symbolizes 'who belongs' in specific places…[and] plays a leading role in urban development strategies…" (p. 350). She explains that culture is purposefully used by developers and public officials to court high-income shoppers,

visitors, and tourists to consume redeveloped urban locations and their goods. These spaces, while appearing open to the public, are culturally marketed to particular groups. Therefore, they culturally exclude others. Furthermore, Zukin points out that these redeveloped and gentrified spaces are often literally privatized. Many re-development sites are owned and/or managed by private development corporations and private security companies who carefully police and monitor them.

The City of Wilmington, Delaware, like many small distressed urban areas, has invested heavily in developing an upscale waterfront redevelopment project to attract business, tourism, shopping, and high-end real estate. In 1995 a Governor's task force created the Riverfront Development Corporation of Delaware (RDC). The RDC was established primarily with funding from the State of Delaware, with additional public sector contributions from the City of Wilmington and New Castle County. The RDC is governed by a private board of directors, and operates with the mission to "create economic vitality along the Brandywine and Christiana rivers…" (Riverfront Development Corporation, 2013). They intend to acquire site ownership along the rivers in Wilmington "through direct acquisition, long-term leases or in participation with private developers. [RDC] can act as developer, construction manager and leasing agent…" (Riverfront Development Corporation, 2013). As a place-based reinvestment strategy, Wilmington's Riverfront is performing well economically, as evidence by continued construction and new business arrivals.

Wilmington is a hub for financial and corporate activity. More than half of all publicly traded companies in the U.S. and 60% of Fortune 500 companies are incorporated in Wilmington, including industry giants like Google and Ford. Wilmington is also home to a strong banking industry: Bank of America, Chase, Capital One, Barclay's, Citibank, and others. The City is a nucleus for national and global financial activity, with money flowing in and out of its boundaries on a daily basis. However, a majority of the City's residents have not reaped the benefits of this private sector activity or the Riverfront redevelopment projects (Scruggs and Blumgart, 2013). According to 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate, the Area Median Income (AMI) for the City of Wilmington is $39,019, 34% lower than the AMI for the United States as a whole at $51,371. The poorest census tract reports a median household income of under $12,000. This census tract, home to the South Bridge neighborhood, is located directly adjacent to the upscale Riverfront development.

The privatization of urban space for the purpose of economic growth, through processes of public investment and private control, is commonplace in the neoliberal city (Mele, 2011). While economic benefits can result for particular people or industries, the outcome is a fragmented urban landscape that reinforces the space "between us and them, between security guards and criminals, between elites and ethnic groups" (Zukin, 195, p. 350).

> The normative ideal of a city as a space that accommodates social, class, racial, sexual, and gender differences is rendered untenable when urban landscapes are carved up into self-contained fragments that are designed for specific social groups and types of behaviors and not (many) others (Mele, 2011, p. 422).

While somewhat controversial, the concept of "urban revanchism" has also gained traction as discursive tool for understanding what drives socio-spatial fragmentation and exclusion in neoliberal cities. Revanchism is a French term that emerged in the late 1800s to describe a movement by a social or political group to reverse territorial losses, often following a war or social upheaval. Neil Smith (1996) defines urban revanchism as a class struggle (with racial overtones) that is manifested through "a reclaiming of the city and the defense of their privileges by the white middle class in reaction to the 'theft' of the city by deprived and deviant groups" (p. 212).

According to Smith (1996), the white middle class is plagued by fears of economic insecurity. They seek to take the city back from the undesirable underclass and improve the quality of life in cities for themselves. MacLeod (2002) describes the process as an attempt by urban governments to "recapitalize the

economic landscapes of their cities" (p. 602). And while these strategies may have been economically profitable and contributed to the capital viability of otherwise blighted city spaces, "the price of such speculative endeavor[s] has been a sharpening of socioeconomic inequalities alongside the institutional displacement and 'social exclusion' of 'certain marginalized groups'" (MacLeod, 2002, p. 602).

Low-income minority groups are excluded and unwanted forms of social deviancy are repressed and criminalized. For urban revanchists, social deviancy threatens their economic security and their investments in capital growth and consumption. As a result, urban development policies often become entangled with policing and crime policies, resulting in the routine criminalization, exclusion, and further marginalization of the poor. The practice of policing poverty is an illustration of "actually existing neoliberalism," a locally particular way that neoliberalism is manifested and reinforced in the urban environment to produce exclusionary outcomes.

The Policing of Poverty

An example of policing poverty is the criminalization of homelessness, an issue that homeless advocates have been paying particular attention to during the past few years. These policies are often initiated by urban elites and public officials, and are deployed as strategies to protect capital and economic investments in urban spaces. Cities, towns, and municipalities across the U.S. have passed strict nuisance ordinances (such as anti-loitering, anti-panhandling, and anti-lurking laws) and performed sweeps of homeless sleeping areas. These ordinances, coupled with increased police patrol, target persons experiencing homelessness for performing life-sustaining activities such as sitting, sleeping, and eating in public places, necessary activities that persons experiencing homelessness often have no choice but to perform in public space. Persons experiencing homelessness are fined, arrested, and sometimes incarcerated for violating these nuisance ordinances (National Law Center on Poverty and Homelessness 2011).

In the City of Wilmington, Mayor Dennis P. Williams made it clear that his new Downtown policing strategy will increase police presence and target of nuisance violations such as panhandling and loitering in the City's central business district in order to protect the economic engine of the City. At a press conference in October 2013, Mayor Williams said, "To restore our vibrant downtown community, the City must enforce laws against panhandling, loitering, and disorderly conduct" (The City of Wilmington, Delaware, 2013). When persons experiencing homelessness are incarcerated for nuisance violations it becomes increasingly difficult for them to access the housing and services they need, and contributes to recidivism back into homelessness and the criminal justice system. First, it saddles them with criminal records, making it more difficult for them to access housing and employment. Secondly, incarceration disrupts their access to essential services. That person may miss work, lose their public benefits (depending on length of incarceration), lose important vital documents (state ID, social security card, etc.), or miss important appointments for housing, benefits or other vital services (National Law Center on Poverty and Homelessness, 2011). All of these consequences prolong a person's experience of homelessness, aggravating the very problem that policy-makers seek to address.

In 2010 the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) and the Department of Justice (DOJ) issued a report called "Searching Out Solutions: Constructive Alternatives to the Criminalization of Homelessness." This report officially recognizes for the first time that in addition to possible violations under the U.S. Constitution the criminalization of homelessness may implicate our human rights treaty obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the United States ratified in 1992. The policing of poverty is as a set of institutionalized urban policies that serves primarily to protect the economic interests of urban elites, providing a tangible example of "actually existing neoliberalism." As an urban policing policy in the neoliberal city, the criminalization of homelessness aggravates the very problem it attempts to address.

The criminalization of homelessness is also motivated by the urban revanchist need to suppress unpleasant social and economic deviance, such as loitering and panhandling. These policies are supported

ideologically and discursively by the neoliberal tendency to vilify and individualize the experience of poverty. Rather than tackle the overwhelming and complex challenge of urban poverty, policy makers employ this crisis-oriented tool to reduce the visibility of urban poverty in economically valuable spaces. It is a strategy for policing the "adherence to the economic logic of market-led growth…and securing that growth and defending it from disorder and disruption" (Samara, 2010, p. 199). The primacy of capital accumulation and economic growth, the ideological vilification of poverty, and urban revanchism are instructive frameworks for understanding the impetus for which policy makers implement punitive and exclusionary urban development policies, such as the policing of poverty, in the neoliberal city.

Conclusion

Policy-making in the era of neoliberalism is contradictory and paradoxical. The neoliberal urban project, in which policy-makers participate, aggravates and intensifies the very challenges that policy-makers are frantically working to resolve. As actors embedded in the neoliberal city, policy-makers design and implement urban policies that reinforce and reinvent the neoliberal project in their efforts to improve the socio-economic conditions of cities and their residents.

For example, for decades (mainly since the early 1990s) policy-makers have been aggressively employing strategies to develop inclusive, mixed-income, mixed-race neighborhoods – in other words, to undo the socio-spatial pattern of racially segregated neighborhoods and concentrated poverty, or in other words, socio-spatial exclusion. At the same time, the public sector significantly reduced its role in the provision of affordable housing. The public sector now relies primarily on private market mechanisms to provide housing for poor American households, with the public sector as a subsidizing or incentivizing agent (Hackworth 2007). In 2014 our urban communities continue to be highly disparate in terms of socio-economic wellbeing and ethnic composition, largely as a result of the neoliberal restructuring of the political-economy and its socio-spatial consequences (Lipman, 2008). The challenges facing urban policymakers are significant.

Policy-makers who are dedicated to solving some our most pressing urban problems must be able to recognize that the challenges they seek to resolve are located within, and products of, a complex network of local and global neoliberal arrangements. They must not only recognize the ideological and paradigmatic features of neoliberalism, but also be able to identify the concrete arrangements through which neoliberalism is actively manifested. They must be able to see cities as spaces of "actually existing neoliberalism." They must also be able to untangle the shifting web of actors and arrangements, and re-imagine alternative approaches within (or outside of) the hegemonic system is itself. These are not simple or straightforward tasks. And, they must be able to do all of this while operating in a system that is intensely competitive, anxiety-inducing, and crisis-oriented. As a result of these conditions, "…policymakers [often] deepen [their] degree of reliance on the very same policy portfolio that was responsible for so much of the predicament in the first place. Remaking hegemony under such conditions is a manifestly challenging task…" (Peck, Theodore, & Brenner, 2013, p. 1097).

However, there are opportunities for policy makers to be impactful. Policy makers may have the influence necessary to alter the trajectory of neoliberal projects in their communities. Unfortunately, while incremental policy shifts may secure some short-term benefits for those being marginalized, incrementalism is not a sufficient approach for altering the trajectory of our socio-spatial urban landscape in significant and lasting ways. Any "remaking" of hegemony will require strategic engagement with "actually existing neoliberalism" and deliberate challenges to its discursive and ideological power.

References

Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the Geographies of 'Actually Existing Neoliberalism.' *Antipode*, 34 (3), 341 – 347.

Bourgois, P. (2010). Useless Suffering: The War on Homeless Drug Addicts. In H. Gusterson and C. Besteman (Eds.), *The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do About It* (pp. 238-254). University of California Press.

Hackworth, J. (2007). *The Neoliberal City: Governance, Ideology, and Development in American Urbanism*. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Hankins, K. (2013). Housing Policy Possibilities in the Prison of Property Relations: A Commentary. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research,* 15 (2), 119-122.

Harvey, D. (2003). The Right to the City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27 (4), 939-941.

Logan, J. & Molotch, H. (1987). The City as a Growth Machine. In J. Lin and C. Mele (Eds.), *The Urban Sociology Reader,* (2nd ed.) (pp. 109-117). New York: Routledge.

Lipman, P. (2008). Mixed-Income Schools and Housing: Advancing the Neoliberal Urban Agenda. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23 (2), 119 – 134.

Lyon-Callo, V. (2008). *Inequality, Poverty, and Neoliberal Governance.* Higher Education University of Toronto Press Incorporated.

MacLeod, G. (2002). From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a 'Revanchist City'? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance. *Antipode*, 34 (3), 602 – 624.

Mele, C. (2011). Casinos, Prisons, Incinerators, and Other Fragments of Neoliberal Urban Development. *Social Science History*, 35 (3), 423-452.

National Law Center on Poverty and Homelessness. (2012). *Human Right to Housing Report Card.*

National Law Center on Poverty and Homelessness. (2011). *Criminalizing Crisis Report: The Criminalization of Homelessness in U.S. Cities.*

Peck, J., Theodore, N., & and Brenner, N. (2013). Neoliberal Urbanism Redux? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37 (3), 1091-1099.

Peck, J. & and Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode*, 34 (3), 380-404.

Riverfront Development Corporation. (2013, December 9). *About the Riverfront Development Corporation.* Retrieved from http://www.riverfrontwilm.com.

Samara, T. R. (2010). Policing Development: Urban Renewal and Neo-liberal Security Strategy. *Urban Studies*, 47 (1), 197-214.

Scruggs, G. & Blumgart, J. (2013). Fortune 500 Companies, A Central Location, and Low Taxes Can't Fix Wilmington. *Forefront,* 1 (84), 1-8.

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

Squires, G. (1991). Partnership and the Pursuit of the Private City. In M. Gottdiener and C. Pickvance (Eds.), *Urban Life in Transition* (pp. 1-12). Newbury Park, London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stahler-Sholk, R. (2007). "Resisting Neoliberal Homogenization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement." *Latin American Perspectives*, 34 (2), 48-63.

The City of Wilmington Delaware. (2013, October 15). *Mayor Williams and Chief Dunning Announce New Police Deployment Plan for Downtown Wilmington.* Retrieved from http://wilmingtonde.gov/residents/news.php?newsID=1142

United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2012). *Searching Out Solutions: Constructive Alternatives to the Criminalization of Homelessness.*

Weber, R. (2002). "Extracting Value From the City: Neoliberalism and Urban Redevelopment." *Antipode*, 34 (3), 519-540.

Zukin, S. (1995). Whose Culture? Whose City? In J. Lin and C. Mele (Eds.), *The Urban Sociology Reader,* (2nd ed.) (pp. 349-357). New York: Routledge.