

Learning from Detroit: Turbulent Urbanism in the 21st Century

A Proposal for a Michigan Meeting (Submitted January 11, 2013)

Abstract

Shrinking cities are often mistakenly portrayed as places of inexorable decline. There is no question that residents in cities like Detroit face many challenges in the aftermath of six decades of disinvestment, population loss, and service cutbacks. But not everything is gloomy, and Detroit is not alone. Although decline may have reached especially acute levels in Detroit, similar processes have occurred – and continue to occur – in other metropolitan areas around the world. The post-industrial landscape and social conditions in Detroit are thus exemplary of persistent patterns of decay and abandonment occurring in as many as one in six cities globally. No adequate social or economic theories exist to comprehend or grapple with these processes of decline. Yet, as the number of distressed cities continues to rise, the ethical importance of making these spaces livable is also rising – as is the array of innovative, grassroots strategies emerging to address, mitigate, and re-invigorate these distinctive urban spaces.

We propose a Michigan Meeting to bring the many vexing question related to distressed urbanism to the table in an interdisciplinary scholarly debate and policy discussion. What can scholars around the world learn from Detroit that can inform a theoretical, but also a practical, understanding of the turbulent post-industrial urbanism of the late 20th and early 21st centuries? Conversely, how does the experience of abandonment and decline elsewhere in North America, Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America help us understand the historically specific dynamics of abandonment and decline in Detroit? Decline in other cities emerged from different starting points and followed distinct trajectories, but the resulting physical environments and social stresses are remarkably similar. By focusing on Detroit as a paradigmatic example of ongoing global processes of urban decline, our aim is to begin developing a theoretical foundation and scholarly agenda for understanding the growing number of cities facing the acute distress that accompanies the dismantling of once-thriving industrial metropolises.

We would hold this Meeting in early May 2014. The three-day event will open with a day-long tour of Detroit followed by a two-day series of intensive panels and roundtable discussions. We expect around 150 people to attend. Alongside university faculty and graduate students, we will recruit 25 non-academic experts from the Detroit metropolitan region, as well as graduate students in urban studies programs in the areas, together with 15 invited panelists from other areas of the U.S. and Canada, and eight invited international visitors from Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, and South America.

The plan for this proposed Michigan Meeting emerges from on-going conversations among faculty from several LSA departments, Taubman College, the School of Social Work, and the Michigan Society of Fellows, along with Ph.D. students in these various programs. This proposal is being submitted by a working group, which includes Charlie Bright, Angela D. Dillard, Margaret Dewar, Larry Gant, Kimberley Kinder, Dana Kornberg, Martin Murray, June Thomas, and Ian Trivers. Their full CV's are in Appendix B. Additional support and endorsement of this proposal is provided by an equally interdisciplinary group of scholars who comprise our Advisory Committee. Their names and short bio's are included in Appendix A.

Proposal: Learning from Detroit: Turbulent Urbanism in the 21st Century

Detroit and its metropolitan region face enormous challenges at the beginning of the 21st Century. This is hardly news. The factors contributing to its distress are well known. A particularly nasty and historically specific conjuncture of disinvestment and deindustrialization, population shrinkage, white flight, job loss, deepening income inequality, small business failures, infrastructure collapse, public school closures, public transportation cutbacks, local government ineffectiveness, and enduring racial segregation constitute a partial but daunting list of intertwined challenges. The region as a whole, and especially its inner-ring suburbs, has suffered heavily from the spreading effects of these conditions. While this agonizing process of urban decline has been especially acute in Detroit, the city and its region are not alone. Similar processes have occurred – and are occurring – in other metropolitan areas around the world. Detroit has recently attracted considerable international attention among scholars and policy makers, not because it is exceptional, but because it exemplifies on a far larger scale the persisting experience of decline and abandonment now common to many urban areas elsewhere in the United States and around the world.

What can residents and scholars of other distressed cities learn from Detroit? What can Detroit learn from other cities in decline? These are the key questions prompting our proposed Michigan Meeting. What can we learn from Detroit that will inform a theoretical, but also a practical, understanding of *the turbulent post-industrial urbanism* of the late 20th and early 21st centuries? Conversely, how can the experience of decline in other cities nationally and internationally, many of which follow historically and situationally distinct trajectories towards similar ends, help us understand dynamics in Detroit?

We propose a Michigan Meeting to grapple, from an interdisciplinary perspective, with the global problem of urban decline by focusing on the paradigmatic example of Detroit. Our aim is to begin to develop a theoretical foundation and scholarly agenda for understanding cities in acute distress - not only the turbulent urbanism of decline that attends the dismantling of once-thriving industrial cities now undergoing wrenching processes of decay, and even collapse, but also the key pockets of resilience and resistance that recur and might point the way toward new possibilities of reinvention, revitalization, and renewal.

Context

A Michigan Meeting of this sort speaks directly to the commitment of the University to engage urgent, cross-disciplinary problems of global importance. Bringing together leading researchers from around the world and focusing attention on Detroit as an exemplary instance of urban decline will help to establish the University of Michigan as a leading center for understanding turbulent urbanism in the 21st century. Only by grappling with these questions can we build a solid platform from which to address theoretically and to engage practically the associated problems of decline and abandonment as well as the potential for creative and sustained renewal.

University of Michigan faculty, staff, and students have had a long and varied history of cooperative interaction with Detroit residents, business owners, nonprofit organizations, and government officials. These relationships have increased over the last 20 years and, today, most if not all schools and colleges engage with the city through a variety of initiatives. Faculty and

graduate students have a strong history of research on the city and the region.¹ These high levels of engagement, teaching, and research have not, however, coalesced in a way that might have significant impact on scholarship, pedagogy, or for that matter conditions in the city and the region. Instead, research initiatives and service-learning projects, while often beneficial, have tended to be individualistic, decentralized, and uncoordinated. By exploring the key questions of urban decline, both in Detroit and around the world, this Michigan Meeting would also advance principles and practices of engagement and partnership with community practitioners that could help our many disparate efforts come together in more lasting, meaningful, and coordinated ways, insuring that the whole of our work exceeds the sum of individual endeavors.

This plan for a Michigan Meeting builds on a recently successful interdisciplinary cluster hire in “Urban Studies: Social Inequality and the Prospects for Equity and Sustainability in Southeastern Michigan,” as well as on an ongoing series of public events exploring the possibilities of a Detroit “School” of urban. The cluster hiring process brought together faculty from Sociology, Afroamerican and African Studies, the Residential College, Urban and Regional Planning, and Social Work to think about how an interdisciplinary cluster of four new faculty with a research focus on southeast Michigan could advance the scholarship of urban studies around post-industrial environments, economic and demographic shrinkage, and urban decline. Similarly, the on-going Detroit School Series, a Rackham-funded Distinguished Faculty and Graduate Student Seminar, engaging faculty and students from various programs and departments on the Ann Arbor campus and beyond, involves lectures, seminars, and a Ph.D. student reading group focused on the question of whether a “Detroit School” of scholarly activity, centered on Detroit and the particular problems it presents, can advance urban theory and pose fresh questions for urban history and sociology. Over the past two decades, a cascade of scholarly texts on many aspects of Detroit’s transformation (a number of them authored by UM faculty) suggests an emergent, if still ‘chaotic,’ school of Detroit Studies that is perhaps now in need of defining narratives and conceptual frameworks.²

Our approach to a Michigan Meeting is two-fold. On one hand, we seek to bring scholars together with practitioners (including researchers, urban planners, city officials, economic developers, and community organizers) to discuss what Detroit and its metropolitan region have to teach cities worldwide about the turbulent urbanism of post-industrialism, population shrinkage, and resource decline, as well as how various sectors have attempted to respond to

¹ For instance, Sidney Fine, *Violence in the Model City: The Cavanagh Administration, Race Relations, and the Detroit Riot of 1967* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2007); June Manning Thomas, *Redevelopment and Race: Planning a Finer City in Postwar Detroit* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Sheldon Danziger, Reynolds Farley, and Harry Holzer. *Detroit Divided* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2000); Angela D. Dillard, *Faith in the City: Preaching Radical Social Change in Detroit* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007); Margaret Dewar and June Manning Thomas (eds.), *The City after Abandonment* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); and Andrew Herscher, *The Unreal Estate Guide to Detroit* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012).

² Examples, besides those noted previously, include Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); George Galster, *Driving Detroit: The Quest for Respect in the Motor City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Peter Eisinger, “The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class,” *Urban Affairs Review* 35,3 (2000), pp. 316-333; Janice L. Bockmeyer, “A Culture of Distrust: The Impact of Local Political Culture on Participation in the Detroit EZ,” *Urban Studies* 37,13 (2000), pp. 2417-2440; Heather Ann Thompson, *Whose Detroit: Politics, Labor, and Race in a Modern American City* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001).

these processes in ways both contentious and collaborative. On the other hand, we want to ask what other regions around the nation and the globe can teach us about the kinds of dynamics we observe in Detroit. To better understand both sides of this equation, we are proposing an inquiry-based, two-day gathering that would bring together scholars, policy-makers, and activists from Detroit, other U.S. cities, and selected sites in Central Europe, the former Soviet Union, Africa, Latin America, and Asia – wherever scholars are studying similar phenomena – to address questions, compare insights, discuss findings and build the base for a theoretically grounded scholarship on urban decline and post-industrial urban life.

Scholarship

Exploring the causes and conditions of decline, whether in Detroit or in other cities around the world facing a similar post-industrial future, will raise questions that older schools of urban studies are unable to address adequately. Major breakthroughs in urban studies have tended to occur when groups of scholars work together in loose association but with the purpose of developing a cumulative understanding of a particular geography. The “Chicago School,” arising from the work of scholars in the 1920s through the 1940s, produced research that became classics in urban geography, sociology, anthropology, as well as social work and urban planning. The scholars associated with this school did much of their primary research in Chicago, focusing on urban communities³ and cultural formations⁴ that they could study first-hand, assessing conditions door-to-door, and exploring neighborhoods to assemble empirical findings that underwrote powerful theoretical generalizations which came to shape urban scholarship for several generations.⁵ This work often had an activist component as well, as researchers collaborated with the social work of Jane Addams’ Hull House, using settlement house methodologies of urban research.⁶

By the 1980s, a new group of urban scholars emerged, centered in Los Angeles and concerned with the rise of megacities, suburban regional development, Pacific Rim economies, postmodern geographies, and “global city” growth models.⁷ As with the Chicago School, this group of scholars learned from a particular region, investigating concrete conditions, theorizing their findings, and staking a claim for a particular “Los Angeles School” of urban studies.⁸ Yet the distance between the experience of Detroit and L.A. is vast, and the generalizations coming out of a suburban-oriented, Pacific Rim focused model of burgeoning, but fragmented growth seem

³ Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and R. McKenzie, *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment* (Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 1925).

⁴ St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton, *The Black Metropolis* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1945)

⁵ Martin Bulmer, *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

⁶ Rima Schultz, *Hull-House Maps and Papers* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007).

⁷ Edward Soja, *Postmetropolis* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000); Allen J. Scott and Edward Soja (eds), *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the 20th Century* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1996); Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in L.A.* (New York: Verso, 1990); Jennifer Wolch, Manuel Pastor, and Peter Dreier (eds.), *Up Against the Sprawl: Public Policy and the Making of Southern California* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).

⁸ Michael J. Dear (ed.), *From Chicago to L.A.: Making Sense of Urban Theory* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002); Michael Dear, “Los Angeles and the Chicago School: Invitation to a Debate,” *City and Community* 1,1 (2002), pp. 5-32; Michael Dear, “The Los Angeles School of Urbanism: An Intellectual History,” *Urban Geography* 24,6 (2003), pp. 493-509; and Walter Nichols, “The Los Angeles School: Difference, Politics, City,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35,1 (2011), pp. 189–206.

inapplicable to Detroit and cities like it. Just as L.A. School scholars found the urban theory of the Chicago School an increasingly uncomfortable fit, so too does the scholarship of the L.A. school seem a poor fit for places like Detroit. For example, the kinds of policy interventions that were appropriate for “growth machines” and expanding metropolitan regions now seem ill-suited for cities and regions in conditions of long-term decline.

The scholarly literature contains considerable debate regarding the desirability of creating a distinct “school” of urban studies.⁹ But the prospects are intriguing. By bringing together an interdisciplinary group of scholars from around the world to explore the implications of abandonment in cities that were once at the forefront of industrial growth and expansion, a Michigan Meeting will contribute to a growing body of scholarly literature that can not only be useful for similarly distressed cities and regions around the world, but also serve, through an international dialogue, help clarify the potential, feasibility, and terrain of a possible “Detroit School” of urban studies.

Looking through the lens of Detroit at a global condition that confronts many regions around the world whose economies once relied on large-scale manufacturing as their source of growth and expansion, but now face decline and abandonment, opens up possibilities for a broadening of the field of urban studies and for new advances in urban theory. The political economy of urban growth and development has been well theorized,¹⁰ but scholarship on the processes generating urban decline remains thin and unsystematic.¹¹ To begin theorizing about cities in decline is to clarify and deepen our understanding of choices and challenges attending the long-term – and perhaps permanent – disassembling of cities and the infrastructure and cultural institutions that they once contained.

⁹ For a critique of the idea of “schools” and paradigms,” see Robert Beauregard, “Radical Uniqueness and the Flight from Urban Theory,” in Dennis Judd and Dick Simpson (eds.), *The City Revisited: Urban Theory from Chicago, Los Angeles, New York* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), pp. 186-202; and Michael Conzen and Richard Greene, “Introduction -- All the World is Not Los Angeles Nor Chicago: Paradigms, Schools, Archetypes, and the Urban Process,” *Urban Geography* 29,2 (2008), pp. 97-100. See responses by Michael Dear, Andrew Burridge, Andrew Marolt, Jacob Peters, and Mona Seymour, “Critical Responses to the Los Angeles School of Urbanism,” *Urban Geography* 29,2 (2008), pp. 101-112.

¹⁰ For example, Susan Fainstein, *The City Builders: Property Development in New York and London, 1980-2000* [2nd Revised Edition](Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2001); Jason Hackworth, *The Neoliberal City: Governance, Ideology, and Development in American Urbanism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2007); and John Logan and Harvey Molotch, *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

¹¹ While the field is underdeveloped, there is an emerging body of scholarly literature to build on. See, for example, Matthias Bernt, “Partnerships for Demolition: The Governance of Urban Renewal in East Germany’s Shrinking Cities,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33,3 (2009), pp. 754–769; Robert Beauregard, *Voices of Decline: The Postwar Fate of US Cities* (London: Blackwell, 2003); Robert Beauregard, “The Radical Break in Late Twentieth-Century,” *Area* 38,2 (2006), pp. 218-220; Robert Beauregard, “Urban Population Loss in Historical Perspective: United States, 1820 – 2000,” *Environment and Planning A* 41 (2008), pp. 514-528; M. Bontje, “Facing the Challenge of Shrinking Cities in East Germany: The Case of Leipzig,” *Geojournal*, 61,1 (2004), pp. 13-21; and Thorsten Wiechmann and Karina Pallagst, “Urban Shrinkage in Germany and the USA: A Comparison of Transformation Patterns and Local Strategies,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 36,2 (2012), pp. 261–280.

How to negotiate a post-industrial terrain and the new conditions of urban life in the 21st century is an intellectual and scholarly challenge that requires new approaches and new collaborations. For example:

* Trajectories of decline are not simply the reverse or opposite of trajectories of growth and expansion, as our binary terminology of expansion/contraction, sprawl/shrinkage, or growth/decay might seem to suggest. The disruptions caused by abandonment and neglect, for example, are difficult to anticipate both temporally and spatially because, unlike processes of growth, little planning controls their outcome. For socioeconomic, financial, and political reasons, decline is lumpy and nonlinear with unpredictable surges of abandonment and sudden thresholds of deepening disinvestment and concentrated poverty.¹² Theorizing processes of urban decline requires a different kind of conceptualization, arising from the desire to make urban spaces livable without the promise of growth. *How should we theorize processes of urban decline differently from the way we theorize processes of urban growth and expansion? How can we theorize the dynamics of decline in ways that enable us to assess their disruptive influences with empirical measures?*

* During periods of decline, policy-makers and urban planners need to understand how to govern without reliance on directive, supportive “growth coalitions” in the conventional sense. This means learning how to cope with abandonment and empty space, how to sustain infrastructure and service logistics on a shrinking tax base, how to maintain public education with declining state funding, and how to reframe urban citizenship rights in ways that make possible the kinds of changes necessitated by decline. Scholarly research on these issues remains in its infancy¹³ but here, clearly, context matters a great deal, especially since the resources available or absent in different places will vary. Key questions in this area abound. *How does the role of the state and its investment in the public sphere make a difference in what policy-makers can do? How does Detroit’s lack of an enduring urban regime of governance challenge the premises of regime theory, long a dominant perspective in urban politics? What kinds of collaboration between public sector institutions and private sector foundations, NGOs, and grass roots organizations, such as the Detroit Works Project, become possible or necessary? How does policy-making find consensus behind decline?*

* During a process of urban decline, many stakeholders working at different levels of engagement generate solutions and interventions that attempt to grapple with distress. But, we have little conceptual understanding of the many grass-roots and individual DIY (do-it-yourself) interventions that crop up in the context of urban turmoil and decline. These strategies emerge

¹² Thanks to George Galster for posing these issues at the Detroit School Series, Oct. 26, 2012.

¹³ Anthony Downs, “The Challenge of Our Declining Big Cities,” *Housing Policy Debate* 8,2 (1997), pp. 359-408; Anthony Downs A., (1999), “Some Realities about Sprawl and Urban Decline,” *Housing Policy Debate* 10,4 (1999), pp. 955-974; Sylvie Fol, “Urban Shrinkage and Socio-Spatial Disparities: Are the Remedies Worse than the Disease?” *Built Environment* 38,2 (2012), pp. 259-275; Jerry Webman, *Reviving the Industrial City: the Politics of Urban Renewal in Lyon and Birmingham* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1982); Justin B. Hollander, “Can a City Successfully Shrink? Evidence from Survey Data on Neighborhood Quality,” *Urban Affairs Review* 2011 47: 47,1 (2011), pp. 129-14; Justin Hollander, Karina Pallagst, Terry Schwarz, and Frank Popper, “Planning shrinking cities,” *Progress in Planning* 72,4 (2009), pp. 223–232; Joseph Schilling and Jonathan Logan, “Greening the Rust Belt: A Green Infrastructure Model for Right Sizing America’s Shrinking Cities,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 74,4 (2008), pp. 451–466; Chris Couch, J. Karecha, H. Nuissl, and D. Rink, “Decline and Sprawl: An Evolving Type of Urban Development – Observed in Liverpool and Leipzig,” *European Planning Studies* 13,1 (2005), pp. 117-136; and Brent Ryan, *Design After Decline: How America Rebuilds Shrinking Cities* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).

without particular coherence and they lack coordination, even when they become widely copied responses to urban distress, as for example in the proliferation of urban gardening.¹⁴ *How can such interventions be conceptually organized and meaningfully evaluated? Is there an interdisciplinary spectrum of analysis that might link, for example, forms of self-provisioning (“gardening angel” or metal strippers) with the informal economy or underworlds of crime and vigilantism? Do best practices emerge and, if so, under what conditions?*

* Finally, the industrial era has left legacies that pose obstacles and create opportunities for rethinking the urban condition in the post-industrial era. Path-dependent thinking hobbles the imagination, and the expectations of a previous era affect the morale and frames of reference for those grappling with new conditions. The industrial era created extreme inequality between labor and management, drove a wedge between factory workers and services workers, and exacerbated racial tensions, especially between African American and white residents in cities. These polarizations were challenged and, to some extent, ameliorated by trade union and civil rights movements in the middle decades of the 20th century. But as industrial decline and white flight have hardened disparities and deepened inequalities, these legacies of a Fordist regime persist and remedial movements are weakened. Policy-makers must now address enduring racial and class antagonisms in the context of persistent economic stagnation and shrinkage. Similarly, decades of industrial production have overtaxed the natural resources and polluted the city, degrading the habitat and the health of residents. These conditions constrain the ways metropolitan regions and distressed cities can adapt to changed economic circumstances or respond inventively to conditions of decline.¹⁵ *How do the expectations and legacies of the Fordist era influence responses to decline? How does the debris of industrialism and its legacies of racial and class conflict manifest itself in different settings and contexts? How might the new post-industrial terrains emerging in conditions of distress redress older social cleavages?*

Michigan Meeting Event Plan

To address questions of this kind, we propose a two-day Michigan Meeting, May 30-31, 2014, organized around a series of panels and roundtable discussions. It will be open to anyone who is willing to engage in the entire event, although we will ask for pre-registration to help us monitor capacity. We expect about 150 people to attend, including 25 non-university community partners from the Detroit metropolitan region; faculty from several Michigan universities; doctoral students; 15 invited panel participants from other areas of the U.S. and Canada; and eight invited international visitors from Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, and South America.

We plan to recruit participants by personal invitation (international and elsewhere in the U.S. and Canada), with a special emphasis on graduate students and faculty from the Ann Arbor campus as well as graduate students and faculty from other universities and colleges in the region who have done research related to Detroit; publicity in the *Record*, the *Ann Arbor Observer*, and on-line event sites; and e-mail announcements to lists reaching policymakers and community leaders in Detroit with personal invitations to selected individuals. We will create a website to provide information on the Meeting and a portal for registering. We have assembled lists that reach hundreds of graduate students for the Detroit School Series and will use these to invite

¹⁴ Mark Binelli, *Detroit City is the Place to Be: The Afterlife of an American Metropolis* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2012); John Gallagher, *Reimagining Detroit: Opportunities for Redefining an American City* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2010).

¹⁵ For an exposition of how these conditions create path dependence that limits future possibilities, see Galster, *Driving Detroit*; and Scott Martelle, *Detroit: A Biography* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 2012).

participation in the Meeting. Graduate students who lead the Detroit School Series will work to recruit other advanced students.

The Detroit School Series will provide an interdisciplinary way for many faculty and graduate students in the region to think about some issues related to the Meeting for the 18 months preceding it; part of our budget calls for a continuation of this important and enthusiastically received Seminar Series in 2013-2014 as a lead-in to the Meeting. The monthly sessions with visitors doing research related to cities like Detroit have attracted an average of 75 attendees of faculty and graduate students from U-M (including Flint and Dearborn campuses), Michigan State, Wayne State, and Marygrove. The Ph.D. students have also organized a reading group where students discuss books or articles visitors have written. Some of these students will be on the advisory committee for the Meeting; two have been directly involved in generating the present proposal.

Preparation for the Meeting

Before the Meeting we will ask participants from elsewhere and many of those attending from the U-M to submit written responses to questions intended to help frame discussions at the two-day Meeting. The content of the responses will help determine the topics of panel discussions during the Meeting. We intend these not as formal papers but rather as contemplative short essays addressing critical issues. Questions may include: How do you conceptualize urban decline? Where do you see it—that is, what kinds of cities exhibit this? What insight does the perspective of Detroit and other cities experiencing turbulent urbanism offer to a research agenda in your field? From the perspective of your work, what are the questions from which new research might strengthen policy and community-based efforts to address the challenges facing cities such as Detroit? What are the main sources of energy and creativity that activists, residents and policy-makers have at their disposal to address and combat issues related to decline? We will also invite participants to share articles, chapters, or papers they have written related to these issues. Meeting organizers will compile and circulate these statements to attendees prior to the meeting. The statements and the publications will be available to participants through a password-protected section of a website.

Pre-Meeting Detroit Day

For out-of-town guests, an optional day-long set of tours of Detroit will precede the two-day meeting in order to bring community leaders into the discussion and to provide exposure to the realities of Detroit as a way of focusing conversation in the meeting that follows. About 60 people will travel by bus from Ann Arbor to Detroit where they will join local experts and community leaders who will act as guides. The morning will include a large-group driving tour of various spaces of historical significance and of disinvestment and reinvention. Participants will visit established political centers and emerging social spaces such as the Quicken downtown properties, Belle Isle, the Ford Rouge plant, stadium and casino developments, the Ambassador Bridge, and neighborhoods surrounding these. After lunch, participants will break into four subgroups for specialized tours focusing on issues such as vacant property, social services, arts and culture, and community renewal. These thematic tours will provide opportunities to hear directly from residents and community leaders about the strategies they are developing to grapple with disinvestment and to capitalize on the opportunities that more vacancy offers. The Brightmoor Farmway, 555 Gallery, the Lower Eastside Action Plan, the Springwells Village

parks and greenways, and Capuchin bakery and urban farm are among sites that could be visited. The day will conclude with a reception in Detroit for participants and community partners.

Day One of the Meeting, May 30

Day One is devoted to situating the question of urban decline and reinvention theoretically, with a particular focus on placing Detroit and cities like it in a comparative historical and global perspective. We anticipate two or three panel discussions interspersed with or followed by small group working sessions in five or so breakout rooms. Panelists will discuss the similarities and differences among their various perspectives, identify central questions that they share, and take questions and comments from the audience. The panel discussions will be videotaped and made available online for others unable to attend. Dedicated note-takers will document and synthesize key ideas and themes as they arise. An evening dinner will facilitate further informal conversations about the day's proceedings in anticipation of more specialized conversations to follow the next day. We will attempt to make each of the assigned discussion groups diverse by disciplinary area, background, and if possible locale/ nationality. Each group will probably remain intact throughout the conference and we will appoint one or two faculty facilitators and one or two faculty or graduate student recorders for each group, all of whom will be available to help summarize materials and ideas generated after the conference ends.

Day Two of the Meeting, May 31

The second day will be similar to the first, except more focused on small-group discussions leading to working papers or a research/ activist agenda. Community leaders from Detroit will join panels and discussions groups to show how they have used research in the past, explain useful approaches to carrying out research, and point to questions where research could advance their work. The overarching approach for the day will focus on questions regarding how research can inform policy and community-based efforts to improve conditions in cities such as Detroit. The discussions will be organized around themes, such as empty land, property abandonment, institutional crisis, governance, food and water issues, public services, and the work of the arts in these contexts. Discussions will focus on the process as well as the content of such research. At the end of the day, a panel will synthesize the ideas that the discussions have produced.

The facilitators and recorders will meet the evening of the second day to develop a schedule and process for creating documents within the following week that reflect the findings/ discussions of their groups. These will form the first draft of one or several working papers. These papers will highlight key issues of importance, disagreement, and further research inquiry. They will explore what is, and is not, translatable in the experiences of decline in different contexts and how such differences and similarities affect strategies of response. Meeting organizers will compile and circulate these working papers among urban studies experts from many disciplines after the Meeting ends. Looking ahead we intend to explore further project and publication options, including devising new research proposal and funding grants, exploring special issues of academic journals along with an edited volume published by the University of Michigan Press. These papers will articulate and further develop the understanding gleaned from the two-day Meeting of what Detroit can teach us about the turbulent urbanism of the 21st century and of what other regions have to teach us about what we observe in Detroit.

Budget:

<u>Continuation of Detroit School Series for 2013-14</u>			
			\$5,000.00
<u>Staff</u>			
graduate student assistants			
	semester wages		\$ 5,888.00
	spring wages		\$ 5,920.00
	fringe benefits		\$ 452.88
<u>Tours of Detroit, May 29</u>			
4 15-person vans			\$ 800.00
1 bus			\$ 800.00
lunch for 60			\$ 720.00
maps and itineraries			\$ 60.00
reception in Detroit			\$ 2,500.00
<u>2-day meeting</u>			
<u>Catering</u>			
30-May			
continental breakfast @ Rackham for 150			\$ 1,875.00
lunch @ Rackham for 150			\$ 2,137.50
snacks @ Rackham for 150			\$ 450.00
reception			\$ 2,235.00
dinner served for 150			\$ 5,985.00
31-May			
continental breakfast @ Rackham for 150			\$ 1,875.00
lunch @ Rackham for 150			\$ 2,137.50
snacks @ Rackham for 150			\$ 450.00
reception			\$ 2,235.00
<u>Printed materials</u>			
name tags, signage, agenda, folders			\$ 520.00
posters for promotion, 40, color 12x18			\$ 70.00
<u>AV recording, Michigan Media</u>			\$5,624.00
<u>Participant costs</u>			
5 international participants from Europe, 3 from Europe, Asia, or Latin America			
air fare			\$12,500.00
hotel, 3 nights			\$ 3,240.00
ground travel			\$ 800.00
15 participants from US & Canada			
air fare			\$10,500.00
hotel			\$ 6,075.00
ground travel			\$ 1,500.00
25 Detroit area participants			
parking			\$ 400.00
mileage, 100 miles round trip, 2 days			\$ 2,750.00
Total			\$85,500.00

Budget Explanation:

Continuation of Detroit School Series: The Detroit School Series of seminars cost about \$7000 in 2012-13 for hosting, travel, and hotel for speakers and for refreshments and rooms for the seminars. The series will have a carryover of about \$2000 to pay for 2013-14 activities.

Staff: Two graduate student assistants to work on arrangements, graphic design, creation of a website. 2 students for 8 hours per week for 23 weeks, Sept. 2013-April 2014; 35 hours per week for 3 weeks, May 2014, @ \$16/hour. Eight additional graduate student assistants for the meeting days, 20 hours each, @ \$16/hour.

Pre-Meeting Detroit Trip & Tours:

15 person vans, about \$200 each for one day for tours in the afternoon to different locations.

Charter bus for travel from Ann Arbor to Detroit, to tour Detroit in the morning, and to return to Ann Arbor in the late afternoon.

Reception at a Detroit venue for tour participants, Detroiters involved in the Meeting, and selected other Detroit partners. See reception cost estimate for first day of Meeting.

Event:Catering:

Continental breakfast (“Royal” from University Catering) @\$12.50 per person.

Lunch (“Complete Deli Tray” from U Catering) @ \$14.25 per person.

Receptions. Estimate based on cheese, fruit, crudité and non-alcoholic beverages @ \$8 per person for 150. Alcohol estimated at one drink per person @ \$5.75, plus 20% for gratuity and transport fee, based on Michigan League quote.

Dinner served at the end of the first day of the meeting at Rackham, 4th floor (estimated based on U Catering), @ \$30 per person plus dessert @\$3. Alcohol estimated at one drink per person @ \$5.75, plus 20% for gratuity and transport fee, based on Michigan League quote.

Snacks estimated as choices of mix of nuts, chips & salsa, hummus & pita

AV recording, by Michigan Media. This assumes one camera and multiple mikes @ \$260 per hour plus \$248 for set-up for each session. Estimate 8 sessions with 14 hours of recording.

Printed materials:

Based on expenses for similar meetings.

Posters: About \$1:75 per sheet for color 12x18

Other publicity will be through web and e-mail.

Participant costs:8 international visitors

\$1000 air fare from Europe, \$2500 from Asia, Africa, South America.

Hotel @ \$135 per night for 3 nights.

15 domestic and Canadian participants from a distance who will participate in panels and submit answers to questions.

Air fare @ \$700 each

Hotel @ \$135 per night for 3 nights.

25 Detroit participants and others from elsewhere in the state

Parking @ \$8 per day for 2 days for 25 vehicles.

Mileage @\$.55 per mile, 100 miles, for 2 days for 25 vehicles.

Revenues: We will seek additional funds from the Senior Vice Provost and numerous departments, schools and colleges with a connection to the event, especially LSA, Social Work, the Ford School, and Taubman. We will ask Taubman College for in-kind AV recording. The Vacant Property Research Network has promised up to \$7000.

Appendix A

Advisory Committee Members & Short Bio

This Michigan Meeting proposal was devised by two groups: a “Working Group” that did the bulk of the conceptualizing and writing, and an “Advisory Group,” comprised of faculty from Michigan and from Wayne State who either agreed to consult with the Working Group, to actively review and comment on developing drafts, or who endorsed the ideal. We include their name and short bios in this section. Should this proposal be funded we would move immediately to re-engage this group and to recruit others, especially from Michigan State, Wayne State and Marygrove.

Crisca Bierwert

Crisca Bierwert is Associate Director and Coordinator of Multicultural Teaching and Learning at the University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. She has done cultural education and community development work for tribes in Michigan and Washington State, and she leads programs to promote diversity and social justice efforts at the University of Michigan. She also does research on student learning outcomes, supports interdisciplinary teaching, and provides multicultural training. She participates in university wide diversity initiatives, and she is on the Executive Committee of the University Diversity Council. She received her Ph.D. degree in cultural anthropology from the University of Washington, and her publications include work on environmental and social justice issues.

Len Deng

Lan Deng is an associate professor in the Urban and Regional Planning program at the University of Michigan. Her primary research and teaching interests are in the areas of housing, real estate and local public finance. She is particularly interested in examining how government actions affect housing and urban development and how to design effective affordable housing policy.

George Galster

George Galster earned his Ph.D. in Economics from M.I.T. and currently serves as the Clarence Hilberry Professor of Urban Affairs in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at Wayne State University, Detroit. He has published 118 peer-reviewed articles and 28 book chapters on topics ranging from metropolitan housing markets, racial discrimination and segregation, neighborhood dynamics, residential reinvestment, community lending and insurance patterns, neighborhood effects, and urban poverty. His eight authored, co-authored, and edited books include *Homeowners and Neighborhood Reinvestment*, 1987; *The Maze of Urban Housing Markets*, 1991; *The Metropolis in Black and White*, 1992; *Reality and Research: Social Science and American Urban Policy since 1960*, 1996; *Why NOT in My Back Yard?: The Neighborhood Impacts of Assisted Housing*, 2003; *Life in Poverty Neighborhoods*, 2005; *Frontiers of Quantifying Neighborhood Effects*, 2008; and *Driving Detroit: The Quest for Respect in the Motor City*, 2012.

Lorraine Gutierrez

Professor Lorraine Gutierrez has a joint appointment with the School of Social Work and Department of Psychology at the University of Michigan and is a faculty associate in American Culture. She is also the coordinator of the Detroit Initiative in Psychology. Her teaching and scholarship focus on multicultural and community organization practice and methods for multicultural education in higher education. She brings to her work community-based practice and research in multiethnic communities in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Detroit, and Seattle. Current projects include identifying methods for multicultural community-based research and practice, multicultural education for social work practice, and identifying effective methods for learning about social justice. She has published over 30 articles, chapters, or books on topics such as empowerment, multicultural practice, and women of color. Her contributions to undergraduate education have been recognized by the Arthur F. Thurnau Professorship. She is currently one of the editors of the *Journal of Community Practice*.

Harley Etienne

Harley Etienne is an Assistant Professor of Urban and Regional Planning. He teaches in the areas of urban community development, inner-city revitalization, neighborhood change, urban poverty, and qualitative research issues in planning. Etienne's research focuses primarily on the intersection of social institutions and their relationship to processes of urban neighborhood change. He is keenly interested in the role that colleges and universities play in contributing to neighborhood-level change and regional economic development. He recently released, *Pushing Back the Gates: Neighborhood Perspectives on University-Driven Change in West Philadelphia* on Temple University Press. His current projects include an examination of the role of land tenure policy and land rights in the post-earthquake recovery of Port-au-Prince Haiti and an edited volume, *Planning Atlanta: Ruins and Resurgence* which surveys the history of planning in that city. Prior to pursuing a Ph.D., Etienne worked in Philadelphia in the public policy and economic development sectors for Greater Philadelphia First (now merged with the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce) and the Pennsylvania Economy League where he worked on various policy issues including university-industry partnerships, K-12 school reform, health care access, and welfare policy. Just before coming to the University of Michigan, Etienne taught at the Georgia Institute of Technology in the School of City and Regional Planning and the School of Public Policy. He earned a B.A. in sociology from Morehouse College in Atlanta, a M.A. in Urban Studies from Temple University and a Ph.D. in City and Regional Planning from Cornell University.

Tiya Miles

Tiya Miles is Chair of the Department of Afroamerican and African Studies; Elsa Barkley Brown Collegiate Professor; and Professor of History, American Culture, Native American Studies and Women's Studies at the University of Michigan. She is the author of two prize-winning books, *Ties That Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom* (2005) and *The House on Diamond Hill: A Cherokee Plantation Story* (2010), and various articles on women's history and black and Native interrelated experience. She is co-editor, with Sharon P. Holland, of *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country* (2006). In 2011 she was named a MacArthur Foundation Fellow.

Desmond Patton

Dr. Patton's research is broadly focused on urban African American male development and identity. He is specifically interested in the mechanisms and processes underlying how African American adolescent males respond to community violence exposure and its impact on masculinity, friendship and schooling. His work takes into account how relationships between social networks, neighborhood conditions and social support impact how African-American males navigate violent neighborhoods and value school. As a qualitative researcher, Dr. Patton has interest in narrative and case-study based approaches to unpacking the lived experiences of urban African American males. His current research interests include: Urban African American male identity and development; Youth development programs; Youth violence prevention and reduction; Urban Education; and Community-academic collaboration.

Sarah Swider

Sarah Swider is an assistant professor of sociology at Wayne State University with a research focus on labor, gender, and global inequality, and migration. She is interested in understanding the role of immigrants and other precarious workers in reshaping urban spaces and building economies, especially in the informal sector. One of her current research projects focuses on the growing informal migrant workforce which has developed as part of China's integration into the global economy. She conducted extensive ethnographic field research in China delving into the lives and work of migrant construction workers showing how they are reconstructing the cities, both physically and socially. She reveals how most are working in the burgeoning informal economy, how they have become a stable fixture in China's cities and an important segment of China's working class, but only under the conditions of exclusion, insecurity and vulnerability.

Appendix B

Organizing Committee/Working Group Members

The following group of faculty members and graduate students comprised the “Working Group” for this Michigan Meeting proposal. Their full individual CV’s are included in this appendix.

Charlie Bright, Professor, Residential College and Department of History, LSA

Margaret Dewar, Professor, Urban & Regional Planning, Taubman College

Angela D. Dillard, Director, Residential College, Professor, Afroamerican & African Studies, LSA

Larry Gant, Professor, School of Social Work and School of Art & Design

Kimberley Kinder, Michigan Society of Fellows, Assistant Professor, Urban & Regional Planning, Taubman College

Dana Kornberg, Graduate Student, Department of Sociology, LSA and Urban and Regional Planning, Taubman College

Martin Murray, Professor of Afroamerican & African Studies and Urban & Regional Planning, Taubman College

June Thomas, Professor of Urban and Regional Planning, Taubman College

Ian Trivers, Graduate Student, Urban and Regional Planning, Taubman College