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This thesis explores the intersections of art and urban redevelopment by evaluating the strategic uses of urban art forms in distressed neighborhoods of Philadelphia and Miami. Specifically, this thesis takes to task the trend of “artwashing” in which developers appropriate and aestheticize markers of urban decay in order to market real estate to consumers seeking an industrial chic backdrop. While most discussions of artwashing center on the upgrading of austere industrial buildings, I believe the term should also be applied to the appropriation of urban art forms for neighborhood rebranding purposes. In recent years, the commissioning of street art has become one of the most conspicuous tools utilized in the neoliberal reshaping of urban public space, yet scholarship on artwashing is sorely lacking. Focusing on Miami and Philadelphia, I posit that rather than igniting neighborhood change, artwashing simply reproduces and relocates existing power imbalances. Of course, some arts-based redevelopment strategies do have the capacity to bring about sustainable, equitable urban change. After analyzing approximately five hundred works of urban art throughout eight neighborhoods in Miami and Philadelphia, I came to the conclusion that there are three basic manifestations of artistically-informed urban regeneration: parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering. The following is an evaluation of the different motives, organizational structures, and outcomes that exist among these three expressions of artistically-informed urban regeneration, and how these disparities affect urban inequality.
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Chapter 1

If these walls could talk: urban art and inequality in Miami and Philadelphia

This thesis explores the intersections of public art and urban redevelopment by evaluating the strategic uses of urban art\(^1\) forms in distressed\(^2\) neighborhoods of Philadelphia and Miami. Specifically, this thesis takes to task the trend of “artwashing” in which developers appropriate and aestheticize markers of urban decay in order to market real estate to consumers seeking an industrial chic backdrop. Of course, “space is not just a passive backdrop to human behavior and social action, but is constantly produced and remade within complex relations of culture, power and difference” (Hubbard 2001: 51).

While most discussions of artwashing center on the rehabilitation of urban architecture, with New Brutalism and the revival of Balfron Tower\(^3\) at the forefront of these inquiries, I believe the term can also be applied to the appropriation of urban art for the sake of attracting a cosmopolitan clientele and consequently increasing property values.

In the broadest sense, artwashing consists of the appropriation of the edgy or bohemian symbolic capital of urban aesthetic forms, including, but not limited to, urban architecture and urban art, for economic gain. Artwashing is a process in which urban art is situated as a value-adding amenity with the capacity to increase property values and

---

\(^1\) Throughout this thesis, the term “urban art” is used as the broadest category of art found within urban areas. Although “street art” and “urban art” are often used interchangeably to reference this broad category, in this thesis “street art” is considered a subheading of “urban art.”

\(^2\) The terms “distressed” and “devalued” are used interchangeably to refer to communities characterized by low and impoverished income levels, a lack of viable economic opportunities, and accompanying social issues, like violence and drug crime. There are undeniable racial and ethnic components to this marginality. The term “disinvested” is used to capture the post-industrial decline of once booming industrial centers, in addition to the aforementioned aspects of “distressed” and “devalued” neighborhoods.

\(^3\) Balfron Tower is a large, concrete social housing development in East London that has been redeveloped to attract new, creative tenants, displacing the existing residents. Developers have capitalized on the industrial edge and gritty history of the structure to attract more aesthetically-discerning clients. For more information, see O’Sullivan 2014.
economically revive ailing urban neighborhoods. In this process, of course, there are winners and losers. Although some urban artists collaborate with developers in this process of artwashing, – under the auspices of gaining more exposure for their art or for art in general – many urban artists and other citizens are excluded from and/or displaced by this transformation.4 In recent years, the commissioning of street art by public and private actors has come to be one of the most conspicuous tools utilized in the neoliberal reshaping of urban public space, yet scholarship on artwashing is practically nonexistent. Even among new media sources, which are less encumbered by publishing lag times than academic papers, there is precious little probing of this rampant artwashing phenomenon. Given this dearth of material, there is no shortage of research questions to pose and answer; but hopefully, this exploratory research project will soon be one of many scholarly explorations of artwashing and arts-based urban regeneration more generally.

Focusing on Miami and Philadelphia, I posit that rather than igniting neighborhood change, artwashing simply reproduces and relocates existing power imbalances. Ever an optimist and believer in the transformative power of the arts, however, I believe that artistically-informed5 urban regeneration does have the potential to bring structural and inclusive change to devalued neighborhoods. Artistically-informed

---

4 Urban artists’ eagerness to promote art by any means necessary can be seen, for example, in the following statement by Shepard Fairey beginning at the 3:22 minute mark of the Right to Wynwood documentary: “I think that cynical people might think that the Goldmans want to bring art here because they own property and it’s going to raise the value. I don’t really care about that because I just want a platform for art, and I want to see more art; I’m happy about that” (Álvarez and Edgar 2014; my emphasis).

5 Although the processes that fall under this category are typically referred to as “arts-led urban regeneration,” I have opted to use the terms “artistically-informed urban regeneration” and “arts-based urban regeneration” as alternatives. The choice of the word led conjures a linear view of the connections between art and urban regeneration, while the terms “artistically-informed urban regeneration” and “arts-based urban regeneration” allow for a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the linkages between the two. Despite this distinction, I have chosen to use the term “arts-led urban regeneration” in my literature review (Chapter 2) in order to reflect the contributions of earlier scholars.
urban regeneration, then, should be conceptualized as a continuum with profit-driven
development at one end, and sustainable, structural change at the other; the following is
an assessment of the many shades of grey in between these poles as manifested by
various urban public art initiatives in Philadelphia and Miami.

As political scientist Paul Kantor thoughtfully points out, “the challenge for
comparative urban analysis is to achieve improved rigor, while remaining sensitive to the
urban context” (2005: 136). In order for a comparative urban analysis such as the one at
hand to be productive, it must balance the unique minutiae of one local context with a
clear and replicable methodology that allows for its application to other urban contexts,
thus laying the groundwork for the extrapolation of generalizable patterns. To achieve
specificity, I have chosen to explore three neighborhoods in Philadelphia and five in
Miami based on their designation as U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development (HUD) Empowerment Zones (EZs): the American Street, North Central,
and West Philadelphia EZs in Philadelphia; and the Allapattah, East Little Havana,
Model City,6 Overtown, and Wynwood EZs in Miami. Far from occurring parallel to, or
as a result of, neighborhood revitalization, urban public art is often one of the catalysts of
neighborhood change. While in many cases urban art has been appropriated, sanitized,
and then gated off from certain sectors of the community, these art forms can also act as
vehicles for empowerment and (re)negotiations of community identity. It is my firm
belief that the distribution of urban public art can provide a blueprint of urban inequality.

Within the EZ boundaries, urban artworks – specifically instances of graffiti,
street art, and mural arts – were useful benchmarks of neighborhood change because they

---

6 Model City is also known as Liberty City, but for the sake of consistency and concordance with official
City documents, I have chosen to use the name Model City.
provided a relatively concrete measure of cultural reinvestment in the distressed communities evaluated. While other neighborhood initiatives may take place behind closed doors or deal in gradual transformative processes, public art is by nature visible to both community insiders and outsiders; the observability of urban artworks makes them comparatively easier to identify and map than other markers of neighborhood change. Additionally, the degree to which urban art is encouraged, tolerated, or criminalized within and across specific neighborhoods reflects the power dynamics at play in urban public spaces. We must ask ourselves, for example, why graffiti is deemed “urban blight” in need of removal while street art – an outgrowth of the graffiti movement – adds value to properties, attracting a young, creative class and eventually new businesses. The close connection between street art and commerce is tied to the recent explosion of street art appreciation among the general population and in the mainstream media which has made artistically-informed urban regeneration all the more appealing to planners and policymakers. Though the birth of modern street art dates back to the 1980s, since the mid-2000s street art has garnered unprecedented international attention and overwhelming commercial success. It stands to reason, then, that the increased appeal and prevalence of street art has catapulted variations on artwashing to the top of urban agendas.

The spatial delineations of the EZs allowed me to work with manageably sized, easily identifiable physical boundaries as well as concrete cultural and political histories within otherwise sprawling and segregated cities. Additionally, this unit of analysis brought into focus the manner in which new urban redevelopment plays out at different spatial scales. In order to apply for EZ grants, local and state actors across the U.S. had to
identify their most distressed neighborhoods and present their comprehensive plans for change to federal actors in the HUD. Consequently, the EZ designations reflect an agreement among local, state, and federal actors about what constitutes a distressed neighborhood and what urban projects and policies are likely to lead to reinvestment. The use of EZs as a unit of analysis also makes this research relevant on a broader scale, since the specific urban conditions I observed within these unit areas allowed me to establish a general typology of the ways in which urban art is strategically used to catalyze community redevelopment, for better or for worse.

Based on the analysis of the primary data I collected in Philadelphia and Miami, I identified three basic types of artistically-informed urban regeneration which I have termed: parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering. The terms “paternalism” and “empowerment” have been used previously in literature related to community development ethics, predominantly pertaining to healthcare provision, but these terms – along with “parasitism” – can also be used to analyze artistically-informed urban regeneration efforts.

Julian Rappaport, a preeminent scholar in the field of community psychology, described paternalism as an “effort to parent the entire society by means of the noble ambition of extending the reach of services via catchment areas to the heretofore unreached” (1981: 11). Alternatively, he defined empowerment as “a process, a mechanism by which people, organizations, and communities gain mastery over their affairs” (Rappaport 1986: 122). While these characterizations ring true in the context of artistically-informed urban regeneration as well, my typology diverges from previous theoretical approximations to paternalism and empowerment in certain aspects. For
instance, some public health scholars contend that empowerment is not always a productive option for communities and individuals; public health scholar Robert Weissberg lists addiction and the “confinement and mandatory treatment for contagious disease carriers” among the cases in which paternalism may be preferable to unbounded empowerment and autonomy (1999: 97).

However, where urban development is concerned, this critique holds little weight. Space and the distribution of power, unlike mental and physical illnesses, are not natural, but socially constructed.\(^7\) In theory, then, there is no reason that a community or individual should not have “mastery over their affairs”; this fact has been tacitly recognized by even the federal government, as evidenced by the establishment of the HUD EZ initiative which provided disinvested communities with the financial means to chart their own course to revitalization (Rappaport 1986: 122). Despite the fact that the urban conditions in the EZs of Philadelphia and Miami are in many ways site-specific, the tripartite typology of parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering arts-based urban regeneration is useful for critically reflecting on the complex relationships between urban art and community (re)development across the globe.

\(^7\) Recall that, “space is not just a passive backdrop to human behavior and social action, but is constantly produced and remade within complex relations of culture, power and difference” (Hubbard 2001: 51).
Chapter 2

Urban art and commerce: ultimate odd couple or match made in heaven?

In order to explore the points of contact between public art and urban redevelopment, this thesis draws theoretical support from the fields of art criticism and art history as well as urban geography. To contextualize my findings, I provide a clear and concise taxonomy of the three types of urban art to be discussed: graffiti, street art, and mural arts. It is, of course, not an exhaustive taxonomy, since these categories are subject to interpretation and considerable overlap. Nonetheless, this simplified taxonomy facilitated the categorization of the urban artworks I encountered in my field surveys of the unit areas, which ultimately allowed patterns in the distribution of urban art to emerge.

The second half of this literature review brings into focus scholarly trends from within the interdisciplinary field of urban geography. Although some redevelopment strategies harness urban art forms in order to broaden and deepen community participation, urban art forms are disproportionately being exploited to generate unequal and unsustainable economic growth in historically distressed neighborhoods. Directly related to our understanding of these trends are: 1) the various manifestations of and discourses about gentrification, 2) the rise of territorial competitiveness and urban entrepreneurialism, 3) problematic conceptualizations of creativity in cities, and 4) different approaches to the management of public space. Critical geographer Neil Smith has asserted that, “the process of gentrification which initially emerged as a sporadic, quaint, and local anomaly in the housing market of some command-center cities, is now
thoroughly generalized as an urban strategy” (2002: 427). In light of the generalization of gentrification as an urban strategy, it is necessary to contextualize the related process of artwashing within the larger framework of globalized, neoliberal urbanism.

Off the wall: making sense of graffiti, street art, and murals

While graffiti, street art, and murals can all be classified as public art and urban art, they are distinct in their histories, geographies, aesthetics, and perceptions. Given these shared characteristics, it can be difficult to clearly define and distinguish these terms from one another. Of these three categories of public art, graffiti has historically garnered the most attention within academia and the sphere of urban policymaking. There has been considerably less scholarship on street art and modern murals, but this could also be due to the imprecise manner in which the terms graffiti, street art, and mural are interchanged. To avoid further conceptual stretching and loss of meaning, it is necessary to clarify how these three categories will be understood within the bounds of this thesis. In order to understand the distinct ways in which urban art forms are used at the service of community redevelopment, it is essential to distinguish between these three forms.

Additionally, to better contextualize urban art’s role in Philadelphia and Miami’s EZs, it is necessary to acknowledge that many of the artworks studied are located within ethnic enclaves. In both cities’ EZs, these enclaves are predominantly Latin American and Latino/a communities. Although in Philadelphia and Miami, Puerto Ricans and

---

8 While the term “ethnic” can be highly problematic, in this context it underscores the continued phenomenon of spatial segregation on the basis of race, language, culture, income, etc. in cities.
9 In this thesis, I distinguish between the terms “Latin American” and “Latino/a.” Here the term “Latin American” is used to refer to first-generation residents of the United States that were born in Latin America.
Cubans respectively are the most visible Latin American and Latino/a groups, the cities’ EZs are also home to people of Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Honduran, Mexican, and Guatemalan descent. As a result, it is important to situate the distinct historical and geographic origins of these art forms within the context of the physical and “imagined communities” from which they have evolved. For example, while the word “graffiti” in the Guatemalan context may conjure up images of ancient Mayan wall writings, the same word in the Salvadoran context may bring to mind both the subversive political graffiti of the 1970s onward and more recently the gang graffiti born out of post-civil war desperation (Hutson 2011; Petras 1987; Vogele 2003). Despite these ethnically distinct memories of urban art in their countries of origin, participation in, and visual consumption of, urban art by Latinos/as and Latin Americans has taken on new meaning. While in some places, namely in Allapattah and East Little Havana, urban art has been used as a way of asserting cultural difference and memorializing national folklore, in others, like the American Street EZ of Philadelphia, urban art forms have been utilized to build bridges across cultures. The cultural significance of urban art for communities of

and/or the Caribbean. Alternatively, the term “Latino/a” is used to describe the subsequent generations of U.S. residents and/or citizens of Latin American and/or Caribbean descent. Each of these terms is used in the broadest possible sense in order to capture the ethnic, racial, national, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity of these “groups.”

The term “imagined communities” comes from Benedict Anderson’s 1982 seminal book of the same title. This concept suggests that community – and on a larger scale, nation, – is constructed around perceptions of sameness rather than based on material borders or personal interactions with other members. I use the term here to refer to the manner in which Latin Americanness simultaneously transcends borders and is firmly tied to specific sites, depending on these perceptions of sameness.

Some attempts at building bridges through artwork in Philadelphia’s ASEZ include “Wings of Hope” at 2102 North Hancock Street, “Butterflies of the Caribbean” at 163 West Susquehanna Avenue, and “New Fire/Fuego Nuevo” at 223 West Girard Avenue. “Wings of Hope” was a less-than-successful attempt by the Mural Arts Program to bring an outsider – in this case Mexican muralist Alejandro Flores – to a predominantly Puerto Rican community in order to promote a sense of pan-Latin unity. “Butterflies of the Caribbean” reflects a similar, but much more widely accepted, endeavor to forge pan-Latin unity by bringing Cuban artist Salvador Gonzáles Escalona to collaborate with residents. Alternatively, “New Fire/Fuego Nuevo” represents an effort on the part of MAP and Mexican artist Cesar Viveros Herrera to showcase the blending of Mexican and U.S. cultures. For more information, consult Golden 2006.
color in the U.S. makes the trend of artwashing all the more sinister. Urban artworks, often sites of resistance and negotiation of identity for people kept on the periphery of citizenship on the basis of race, ethnicity, or class, are increasingly being appropriated for their “cool factor” by developers.

**Graffiti: prehistoric and post-industrial art form**

In almost every review of graffiti scholarship, authors begin by tracing the roots of graffiti as far back as “the Roman empire, the ancient Greeks, the Classical Mayan Empire and the 9th century Viking incursions into Ireland” (Carrington 2009: 411). Some go as far as claiming that graffiti is “the first example of human art” (Gastman and Neelon 2010: 20). The historical persistence of graffiti underscores its adaptive and archetypal nature, suggesting that where there is public urban space, there will be a struggle for control of the visual landscape. What has not remained the same throughout history, is the “who” and “why” of this art form. Graffiti scholarship includes inquiries into myriad types of graffiti, from hip-hop graffiti, to political graffiti, gang graffiti, prison graffiti, and “latrinalia.”

Though this wide array of graffiti types highlights the effectiveness of graffiti in disseminating messages of all kinds to diverse recipients, in the context of this thesis I am primarily concerned with hip-hop graffiti.

Modern hip-hop graffiti writing was born in the northeastern United States in the late 1960s, though there is some contention and confusion regarding which city initiated this movement. Most graffiti historians agree that Philadelphia graffiti artist Darryl

---

12 “Latrinalia” is the practice of writing on bathroom walls; for more information, see Dundes 1966.
McCray (Cornbread) was the forefather of modern hip-hop graffiti. However, in “the late 1960s and early 1970s, totally unaware of graffiti elsewhere, a generation of young New Yorkers began to write their street names…in ever-increasing volume” (Gastman and Neelon 2010: 20). In a sense, the New York graffiti movement emerged parallel to the Philadelphia graffiti scene, but New York writers’ achieved a greater degree of iconicity through their unignorable visual takeover of the subway system. What is clear about the origins of graffiti is that this art-vandalism hybrid was born out of the rampant political unrest and socioeconomic turmoil of the 1960s to 1980s. These decades in U.S. history, especially in the urban centers of the country, were marked by strained race relations, stagflation, and crime (Patterson 2005). The interconnectedness of race and poverty during this tense moment in U.S. history, made graffiti writing a primarily black coping mechanism and artistic expression. Nonetheless, Puerto Ricans also played in indispensable role in the development of the art form, and hip-hop culture more broadly (Flores 2000: 115-138).

Amidst this inhospitable and unequal urban environment, the earliest writers wielded their spray paint cans and felt-tip markers as tools of “everyday resistance” (Scott 1985). While some graffiti scholars go too far in romanticizing or politicizing graffiti writers’ intentions, graffiti writing is undoubtedly a carnivalesque act in which the city’s most dispossessed or disenchanted residents take ownership of the city and insert themselves into the public discourse. As Victoria Carrington astutely observes, graffiti writers “challenge presumptions of private ownership and corporate power, draw

13 See Gastman and Neelon 2010; Lewisohn 2008.
14 See Gastman and Neelon 2010; Lewisohn 2008.
15 See Des Forges 2011; Gastman and Neelon 2010; Lewisohn 2008.
our attention to the materiality and spatiality of the city, and act to create what [authors] Giddens and Beck have called narratives of the self” (2009: 422). Due to graffiti’s disruptive nature and encodedness, it evokes distaste and perplexity among private citizens and civic actors alike. It is no coincidence that graffiti continues to occur along racial and socioeconomic fault lines. In both Philadelphia and Miami, graffiti agglomerates at sites of urban disinvestment which double as racialized ghettos and ethnic enclaves. Hip-hop graffiti, at least in the U.S. context, is a marker of resilience through times and spaces of despair. Hip-hop graffiti’s roots in socioeconomic anguish makes the appropriation of its aesthetics for cosmopolitan purposes all the more unsettling.

Before delving into what separates graffiti from street art and murals, I would like to highlight the three main forms that graffiti takes since it factored into the analysis of my primary data. The first and most widely recognized manifestation of graffiti among graffiti writers, scholars, and the general public alike, is the “tag.” It is also the most rudimentary expression of graffiti as it consists of “stylized signatures, initials, nicknames or coded identities usually written in marker pen or spray-paint” (Des Forges 2011: ix). A “throw up,” alternatively, refers to a larger and slightly more complex graffiti writing technique. Typically, a throw up has just two dimensions and two colors; it consists of a simple, monochromatic base coat with a thick outline. Finally, the “piece,” short for masterpiece, as its name suggests, is the pinnacle of graffiti artistry. Pieces are larger, more elaborate, and more colorful than throw ups and tags. Additionally, they “often include backgrounds, designs, and characters” (Des Forges 2011: ix). All three of these subcategories, however, are similarly inaccessible to outsiders. These
manifestations of graffiti, especially the intricate piece, represent cryptic forms of communication intelligible primarily to members of the graffiti subculture. In short, the defining characteristics of graffiti are that it is: inaccessible to outsiders, predominantly text-based, and highly policed given associations with criminality and the racial/ethnic “Other.”

**Street art: the best of both worlds?**

While graffiti is relatively easy to discern and define, street art is a more amorphous category. The street art movement, also referred to as “post-graffiti,” is recognized as an outcropping of the graffiti movement. Part of what makes it so difficult to hone in on a clear definition of street art is that it has a more varied repertoire than graffiti. Although street art often makes use of the sprays and felt-tip markers used by graffiti artists, the term can also refer to “stencils, stickers, posters, acrylics applied with paintbrushes, airbrushes, chalk, charcoal, photograph-based collages, photocopies, mosaics, and on and on” (Bou 2005: 6). Despite the fact that street art is a mixed-media affair, for my research I focused mainly on paint-based street art. If both graffiti and street art can be paint-based art forms, however, how are we to tell them apart?

Carrington suggests that “urban text that includes colourful combinations of painted and/or spray-canned text and graphic is likely to be referred to as ‘street art’ to differentiate it from the autobiographical tags and random scrawl of graffiti” (2009: 413). Nonetheless, it is vital to recognize that graffiti is not “random scrawl,” but rather an encoded style of expression. The second step in problematizing this declaration is
recognizing that a mixture of “text and graphic” can be found in both street art and graffiti, especially in the case of graffiti pieces. What, then, is the distinction between the two?

There is considerable overlap between the two forms, but Bou seems to hint that the difference lies in the privilege that street art has come to enjoy. As Bou points out, certain street art practices represent “a clear departure from the pure ‘ephemeral and illegal’ essence of graffiti” (2005: 6). While graffiti has been condemned as criminal, undecipherable, and unsightly, – forcing its artists to operate clandestinely – street art is often celebrated as “gallery-quality.” Similarly, while many graffiti artists are self-taught, most street artists have some formal training in the visual arts. Street art retains the exotic grittiness of graffiti, but can still be easily decoded by the hegemonic Western consumer of culture. The aesthetic middle ground that street art occupies has allowed its creators not only to work without fear of arrest or erasure, but to even be sought out for commissioned work by private and public actors. In short, street art is street art because it is less disruptive to our notions of appropriate uses of public space, allowing it to be more readily assimilated into our existing definition of culture than graffiti. As a result, this urban art form is in many ways more cosmopolitan and commodifiable than murals or graffiti. In the context of urban redevelopment, the “commodifiability” of street art is of the utmost importance; the ease with which street art straddles grit and luxury makes it a useful tool in the transformation of disinvested neighborhoods into trendy art and design districts.
Muralist traditions and the deradicalization of collaboration

More and more, the term “street art murals” has been used to refer to larger-than-life street art projects that cover entire walls or buildings. My aim in this section of the chapter, however, is to disentangle these two similar but separate art forms. Like graffiti, mural arts have a long and storied history across the globe. In the U.S. context, art historian Francis V. O’Connor identifies two mural movements that emerged out of the 1960s and 1970s to inform modern mural making: the community mural movement and the postmodernist mural movement. I focus on the community mural movement, which began in 1965 and touted “the old but still effective idea of ‘art as a weapon’ in the battle for social justice” (O’Connor 2010: Chapter 37). This can be seen in the Philadelphia Mural Arts Program’s (MAP) emphasis on themes of restorative justice, environmental sustainability, and homelessness. In a country like the U.S., which has not engaged in truth and reconciliation processes despite centuries of human rights abuses, such visible indictments of social ills are an important gesture of recognition. Is this tradition of “art as a weapon,” however, little more than a gesture?

In reference to the MAP, O’Connor argues that “while certainly positive in their community outreach, racial and ethnic sensitivity, inclusiveness, overall good will and artistic merit…they seem over the years to have lost the radical bite and rough facture of the community movement” (O’Connor 2010: Chapter 37). This evaluation would seem to indicate that the gesture of recognition and visibilization falls short. If social justice intentions are indeed involved in the mural making process in Philadelphia and other U.S. cities, however, what can explain this neutralization and loss of a “radical bite”? Braun-
Reinitz and Weissman assert that as public and private actors fund more murals, they are increasingly in control of the subject matter and sanitize would-be social justice themes. Braun-Reinitz and Weissman state that, “These efforts all had strings attached that said in effect, ‘Nothing about violence, nothing critical, nothing politically left’” (Braun-Reinitz and Weissman 2009: xvii). That is to say, organizations like the MAP are pressured to compromise on their critical perspectives on U.S. and global society in order to receive funding. This is a microcosmic manifestation of the larger pattern of “democratic deficit”¹⁶ in neoliberal cities. Paradoxically, to be able to invest in art, which can have transformative effects on individuals and communities, organizations like the MAP must – to a certain extent – prioritize sponsors’ creative visions over those of the community. In spite of this trend toward neoliberalization within the muralist tradition, – which might seem to suggest that murals are experiencing hyper-commodification like some street art – murals remain distinct from street art in process and subject matter.

To echo Lucy Lippard, “No activist art has had more community support and long-term social impact than murals, a uniquely democratic public art form, highly visible and collaboratively executed. The process is empowering as the product” (Cockcroft and Weber 1998: xi; my emphasis). It is my contention that what separates

¹⁶ “Democratic deficit” is a conceptual contribution from Erik Swyngedouw, and is used to refer to the way in which transparency and accountability in urban planning and policy-making have been reduced by the increasing infiltration of private actors into a historically public realm. Hiding behind technical expertise or confidentiality requirements, these private actors either exclude, or only nominally include, the citizens affected by urban management decisions. “Democratic deficit” departs from an ideal of democracy, a concept which has been difficult to comprehensively define. In my approximations to democracy, I use the procedural minimum definition proposed by political scientists Philippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl. Schmitter and Karl suggest that, “Modern political democracy is a system of governance in which rulers are held accountable for their actions in the public realm by citizens, acting indirectly through the competition and cooperation of their elected representatives” (1991: 75). Central to our understanding of “democratic deficit,” then, is the requirement that rulers be held accountable by citizens, since the privatization of the public realm has resulted in an accountability deficiency.
murals from street art and graffiti is the greater number of collaborators involved. Of course, there are varying degrees of collaboration in the production of murals, since it may entail the physical participation of community members in the painting process or the simple act of sponsors communing with residents to find out what they would like to see painted in their neighborhoods.

Additionally, although there are no clearly defined or unanimously agreed upon parameters for differentiating murals from street art on the basis of content and style, I assert that murals have a stronger focus on folk art, figurative realism, bucolic landscapes, and social justice themes. Though some muralists are highly innovative, generally, muralism can be conceptualized as a more traditional art form. Street art, alternatively, could be theorized as being on the aesthetic cutting edge. While street art is often abstract and primarily concerned with aesthetics, muralism yearns – at least in theory – for utopian inclusivity. The styles and content favored in murals, makes them a highly accessible urban art form, and evidences this attention to inclusivity. Whether manifested through depictions of local heroes or distant tropical landscapes, murals, at least discursively, attempt to engage the widest audience possible.

Trends in urban studies: gentrification, urban entrepreneurialism, creative cities, and public space

Four themes from the field of critical urban studies are central to understanding the linkages between urban art forms and community redevelopment: 1) the various manifestations of, and discourses about, gentrification, 2) the rise of territorial
competitiveness and urban entrepreneurialism, 3) problematic conceptualizations of creativity in cities, and 4) different approaches to the management of public space.

A rose by any other name: the many faces/ phases of gentrification

There is certainly no shortage of scholarship on the topic of gentrification, as it is one of the more hotly debated subjects within the field of urban studies. Up until this point, I have used the term “gentrification” and more neutral-sounding, ambiguous terms such as “redevelopment,” “revitalization,” “reinvestment,” and “social mixing” somewhat interchangeably. However, at this juncture, it is necessary to unpack the nuances of these words and the processes they represent. Since gentrification has many and vague discursive manifestations, it is crucial to understand the evolution of gentrification research before we can make sense of the connections between public art and neighborhood revitalization.

In 1964, Ruth Glass introduced the term gentrification into our conceptual vocabulary, but in the several decades that followed scholars struggled to define it. Though historically gentrification research has been disproportionately centered in the U.S. and the United Kingdom, with the generalization of gentrification throughout the world,17 including the rapidly urbanizing Global South, gentrification has acquired even more complexity. To make sense of this simultaneously global and site-specific process, I employ a definition based on the procedural minimum conditions for gentrification set

17 Recall Neil Smith’s assertion that, “the process of gentrification which initially emerged as a sporadic, quaint, and local anomaly in the housing market of some command-center cities, is now thoroughly generalized as an urban strategy” (2002: 427).
forth by geographers Mark Davidson and Loretta Lees. These are: “1) reinvestment of capital; 2) social upgrading of locale by incoming high-income groups; 3) landscape change; and 4) direct or indirect displacement of low-income groups” (2005: 1170). These four interrelated harbingers of gentrification are present in Philadelphia and Miami to varying degrees, and this variance underscores the lopsided geography of redevelopment in the neighborhoods of focus.

In 2001, Smith, alongside Jason Hackworth, identified three main waves of gentrification which mimicked the ebbs and flows of global capital. While the first wave of gentrification – prior to 1973 – was sporadic in nature, by the 1980s, gentrification gained more traction, and spread to smaller, non-global cities in the U.S. and Western Europe. During the globally felt recession of the late 1980s to early 1990s, an ebb in capital flows led some scholars to believe that a “‘degentrification’ or reversal of the process was afoot” (Hackworth and Smith 2001: 467). However, since 1993, neighborhoods have seen the return of a post-recession, or third-wave, gentrification. This most recent iteration of gentrification departs from earlier waves in four ways. First, it is occurring in the inner-city as well as in neighborhoods outside the historical urban core. Second, the rescaling of urbanism in the wake of globalization has made larger developers major players in the gentrification process. Third, grassroots resistance efforts struggle to compete with the economic and political capital of the drivers of gentrification. Finally, the state has become increasingly involved in gentrification.

Although early forays into gentrification research focused more on the importance of economic capital, gentrification research has expanded to include evaluations of the role of cultural capital and aesthetics in the process of gentrification. One particularly
important subfield of gentrification research is that regarding arts-led urban regeneration. Scholars Stuart Cameron and Jon Coaffee identify three major stages in the arts-led urban regeneration cycle. The first stage is based in large part on the theoretical contributions of geographer David Ley and positions the urban artist as the agent of gentrification; this phase is primarily concerned with the “creation by artists of a milieu for the production of art” (Cameron and Coaffee 2005: 46). According to Ley, the urban artist – being “rich in cultural capital but poor in economic capital” – in search of low-cost housing resettles, aestheticizes, and thereby revalorizes neighborhoods blighted by urban decay (1996: 301). Ley argues that the urban artist catalyzes this process but is quickly followed by “such cultural producers as intellectuals and students, journalists and other media workers, and educators, to be followed by professionals with greater economic capital such as lawyers and medical practitioners, and finally by business people and capitalists” (2003: 2540). Ley was also aware, however, that this process of aestheticization laid the foundation for the eventual demise of this bohemian haven by allowing commerce and convention to become more at ease in formerly distressed neighborhoods.

The second model is most closely associated with Sharon Zukin’s *Loft Living*, in which she positions the urban artist not as the agent of aestheticization, but rather as the pawn of private interests, collaborating in the commodification of artistic production for “private consumption.” Cameron and Coaffee point out that “the period was characterized by the transformation of the role of the artist through commercial and state sponsorship and the artist’s effective incorporation into a professionalized middle class” (2005: 42). Both Ley and Zukin treat this new urban artist as a sell-out, staking claims of lost “authenticity” and integrity. While I understand this perspective, I find these
accusations somewhat overblown and misguided; it seems that these scholars and others who share their point of view would have the prototypical starving artist starve indefinitely for the sake of gritty authenticity, rather than accept the long-standing and necessarily evolving relationship between artists and patrons. This is indicative of a larger pattern within the field of gentrification research, in which a healthy and necessary wariness of gentrification sometimes verges on the glorification or exotification of living in poverty or quasi-poverty.

Intimately linked to the increasing participation of public actors and mega developers in post-recession gentrification, the final model of arts-led urban regeneration evidences a trend toward the creation of artistic amenities and physical infrastructure for “public consumption.” This is a departure from the respective “production” and “private consumption” ends of the first and second models of arts-led urban regeneration. Cameron and Coaffee note, for example, the manner in which urban planners and policymakers across the world have begun to recognize “the potential of art and culture as a tool of wide-scale urban renaissance, social inclusion and neighborhood renewal” (2005: 46). The bolstering of Bilbao’s symbolic capital after the construction of the Guggenheim Museum is undoubtedly the most iconic example of the third phase of arts-led urban regeneration. As critics such as Vicario and Martinez Monje have pointed out, citing the case of the Guggenheim museum in Bilbao, the creation of high-culture institutions has the potential to intensify urban inequality (2003); although this case is specific to Bilbao, the “Guggenheim effect” can be applied to cities worldwide involved in the quest for territorial competitiveness through cultural amenities and infrastructure. Since there is neither equitable access to these types of cultural institutions, nor are the
benefits these institutions bring universally enjoyed, power imbalances are cemented in the cities that opt for this kind of high-profile arts-led regeneration.

Urban art as comparative advantage: exploitation of urban art forms in the age of territorial competitiveness and urban entrepreneurialism

The recent trends toward territorial competitiveness and urban entrepreneurialism are undergirded by neoliberal ideas and policies which rose to prominence in light of growing disenchantment with Keynesian norms (Brenner and Wachsmuth 2012). By the 1970s, it had become painfully apparent that unlimited growth and indefinite development were far from guaranteed. As a result, from the 1980s onward, urban policy and planning has been driven by the notion of territorial competitiveness. The basic premise of territorial competitiveness is that in order to attract investment, cities and metropolitan regions must compete with one another, exploiting their existing comparative advantages or reimagining urban space in an innovative way (Brenner and Wachsmuth 2012). With the normativization of market-led development rhetoric, flashy, large-scale urban development projects (UDPs) have edged out comprehensive policy planning. This shift in planning and policy procedures is representative of the legacy of trickle-down economics. In theory, increased territorial competitiveness should improve socioeconomic conditions for all citizens. In practice, however, these projects all too often cater to elite-driven priorities and exacerbate the already uneven socioeconomic geography of cities and metropolitan regions.
Another manifestation of neoliberal urbanism is the “subordination of formal government structures to new institutions and agencies, often paralleled by a significant redistribution of policy-making powers, competencies, and responsibilities” (Swyngedouw 2002: 556). On the one hand, these new private actors boast increased efficiency and flexibility. On the other hand, the lack of accountability and transparency that has consequently crept into new urban governance procedures can be conceptualized as a “democratic deficit.” As Swyngedouw notes, “A veil of secrecy pre-empts criticism and discussion, and a highly selective leaking of information is justified on the grounds of commercial confidentiality and technical impartiality” (2002: 562). The increased cooperation of public and private actors has streamlined the process of, and strengthened the economic base for, UDP implementation and urban planning, but has also eclipsed and coopted alternative viewpoints and visions for our cities’ futures.

This is vital to understanding the gestation of urban art at all of its stages, because in many cases, citizens are excluded from participating in the remaking of the space they inhabit by technocratic private actors. In both “paternalistic” and “parasitic” models of arts-based community redevelopment, residents of disinvested neighborhoods are assumed to lack the expertise necessary to transform their environment. These practices have damaging effects on the long-term viability and transformational potential of revitalization efforts, since outside actors typically lack a comprehensive understanding of the scope of intersectional factors at play in devalued neighborhoods. Physical renovations of space alone are incapable of effecting sustainable, inclusive social and economic change.

18 Recall that accountability is an essential component of democracy as defined by Schmitter and Karl (1991).
Classism in the “creative” city: defining and commodifying cultural production

An increasingly popular strategy for bolstering territorial competitiveness has been the branding of cities as centers of creativity. The increasing dependence of planners and policymakers on what Richard Florida has termed “creative capital” to boost economic growth reflects a larger shift in the urban paradigm as knowledge-based economic systems continue to replace traditional industry; cities’ comparative importance, historically predicated on strong centers of industry and trade, is now tied to its value as “an arena for consumption, for entertainment, and for amenities” (Florida 2003: 16). Florida, in his seminal work on creative capital, suggests that there are three main links between creativity and economic growth: “technology,” “talent,” and “tolerance.” The main thrust of this argument is that in order for cities to thrive, they must attract highly educated, creative people, and be diverse and (technologically) innovative.

This celebration of creativity, however, has problematic classist and racist elements. For example, Florida’s metric for “talent” – a bachelor’s degree – not only provides a very narrow view of creative or intellectual ability, but is inextricably tied to structural social inequalities that reproduce educational attainment gaps on the basis of class, ethnicity, race, and gender. This constrictive metric, for instance, effectively excludes talented, but perhaps not formally educated, urban artists. Charles Landry, another pioneer and proponent of creative cities, echoes Florida’s views, asserting that “Cities have one crucial resource – their people. Human cleverness, desires, motivations, imagination and creativity are replacing location, natural resources and market access as
urban resources.” (2000: xii). This positioning of humans and their creative inclinations as resources to be manipulated in order to achieve prosperity is troubling but nonetheless crucial to understanding the ethos behind arts-based urban redevelopment strategies. Informed by the neoliberal paradigm, expressions of creativity are reduced to their potential economic value. This can be seen in the appropriation of urban art forms by capital-rich entities for their own economic gain – particularly at the expense of existing community members and smaller businesses – manifest in artwashing.

**The design and regulation of public space**

Since this research project is concerned with the dynamics of art in public spaces, it was absolutely essential to ground my analysis in scholarly investigations of the politics of public spaces. To start, different uses of, or behaviors within, public spaces are accepted, tolerated, or criminalized according to a complex set of implicit and explicit rules that is constantly in flux. Unacceptable and non-normative uses of public space are those that may offend one’s moral sensibilities or make one feel unsafe. In their discussion of safety and surveillance, Oc and Tiesdell make an important distinction between “incivilities” and “crimes” (1999). While crimes violate formally constituted laws, incivilities breach unspoken agreements about what behaviors are socially acceptable. Oc and Tiesdell establish four approaches to the management of crimes and incivilities in urban public space: the fortress, the panoptic, the regulatory, and the animated (1999). These distinct approaches to the management of public space serve to
contextualize the differentiated ways in which graffiti, street art, and murals are criminalized, tolerated, or encouraged.

The fortress approach is characterized primarily by formal surveillance and physical segregation achieved through walls, barriers, and gates (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 270-272). The panoptic approach also entails surveillance and exclusion of undesirables, but achieves this goal through the presence of police and security forces, as well as through covert surveillance systems (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 272-273). While these quasi-authoritarian practices may reduce – or at least displace – crimes and incivilities, these approaches could reduce people’s desire to spend time in the city center by creating a menacing atmosphere. Both of these approaches reflect the increasing privatization of public space, in which certain citizens – specifically capital-poor consumers or non-consumers – are restricted from particular uses of public space in order to protect private interests. This pattern can be seen in the museumification of urban artworks, even when their content is intended to engage the community. Physical barriers, as well as overt and covert surveillance practices, are used to protect certain urban artworks given their value as cultural and economic investments. If these artworks are not intended

Figure 2.1, “New Fire/Fuego Nuevo” mural at 223 West Girard Avenue in the American Street EZ of Philadelphia. Despite the fact that the mural’s subject matter seems to have inclusive or engaging intentions, – a blend of Mexican cultural symbols and Philadelphia icons – the surrounding fence creates an intimidating, unwelcoming effect. (All images are my own unless otherwise specified).
for the members of the communities in which they are located, however, for whom are they created and protected?

The regulatory approach is characterized by the management of public space through rule setting, namely spatial and temporal regulations (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 273-276). Although this approach has the potential to “promote a broadening of the sense of proprietorship and ‘ownership,’” the rule-setting process can quickly become undemocratic if the regulations about appropriate behaviors are being imposed by the most powerful citizens rather than consensually agreed upon by a majority of citizens (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 273). This is yet another reflection of the “democratic deficit” phenomenon elaborated by Swyngedouw (2002).19 Finally, the animated approach reasons that “‘peopled’ places are safer places” (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 276). That is to say, larger concentrations of people within public spaces create natural animation and natural surveillance. Natural surveillance, “provided by the general public going about their normal activities,” reduces opportunities for crime because would-be criminals are more likely to be seen, apprehended, or prevented (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 277).

“Peopling” urban communities that have been historically reputed as unsafe is a matter of creating a welcoming environment, with reasons to go to, and remain, there. The reasons to go and stay mentioned by Oc and Tiesdell revolve mainly around the consumption of amenities. Despite the fact that they may not directly generate revenue, sites of urban art that invite everyday use have the potential to naturally animate, and manage safety in, the areas surrounding these sites. Unsurprisingly, according to my findings, the most

---

19 Recall that “democratic deficit” is the decline of accountability – a central facet of democracy as proposed by Schmitter and Karl – and transparency in urban planning and policy-making due to the increased presence of private actors in a traditionally public realm.
“empowering” urban art initiatives occur in open spaces (O) where there are low physical and social barriers to entry. Could participatory urban art be an alternative to consumption and policing in making public space more secure?

**Synthesizing across disciplines**

There are three main linkages between the present state of public art in cities and current trends in urban planning and policy-making. First, ignited by the globalization of the neoliberal paradigm, economic competitiveness has become the top priority in both artistic production and urban redevelopment. This trend manifests itself in the increasing privatization of the urban planning and policymaking realm and the growing commodification of the arts. Second, the rescaling of urbanism has led to a diversification of actors involved in the arts and in urban redevelopment; more and more, the line between public and private actors is being eroded, creating a less transparent and democratic climate for artistic production and urban renewal. Finally, discourse about arts-led urban regeneration and creative cities has led artistic production and urban redevelopment to become closely associated with one another. The perceived viability of arts-led urban regeneration initiatives has increased the prevalence of the concerning practice of artwashing in distressed communities. Nonetheless, artistically-informed urban regeneration must not be conceptualized as a quick fix for city-specific social problems. There are at least three main manifestations of arts-based redevelopment – parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering – each with its own complex set of agents, motivations, organizational structures, and outcomes.
Chapter 3

A tale of two Living Cities: segregation and disinvestment in Miami and Philadelphia

Though Miami and Philadelphia are in many ways contextually distinct, the two cities also face similar obstacles. Despite the fact that Miami is a significantly smaller and younger city than Philadelphia, both cities have similarly worrisome rates of racial and ethnic segregation, labor force participation, and educational attainment which provide a point for comparison. For example, according to The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy’s Living Cities Census Series, Philadelphia ranked 92nd and Miami 94th out of the 100 largest U.S. cities in educational attainment rates. Additionally, Miami had the lowest levels of labor force participation both among the 23 Living Cities and 100 largest U.S. cities. Philadelphia was not too far behind, ranking 21st out of the 23 Living Cities and 97th out of the 100 largest U.S. cities. Both cities are also alarmingly segregated, with Miami ranking third among the 23 Living Cities in both degree of segregation between Hispanics and Blacks and degree of segregation between Blacks and Whites. Philadelphia, on the other hand, has the highest degree of segregation between Whites and Hispanics among the 23 Living Cities and the seventh-highest degree of segregation between Blacks and Whites. These

---

21 The 23 Living Cities represent the cities in which Living Cities, formerly the National Community Development Initiative, is active. Living Cities is a cross-sector coalition dedicated to improving “the economic well-being of low-income people,” and is made up of twenty two foundations and financial institutions, such as The Ford Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
racially and socioeconomically-informed statistics make the increasingly global trend toward artwashing all the more concerning; all too often urban art forms are exploited to spur community redevelopment strategies that do not redevelop neighborhoods, but rather reproduce, relocate, or even intensify existing systemic inequalities.

With these grim commonalities in mind, it should come as no surprise that neighborhoods in both Miami and Philadelphia have received special policy focus and economic assistance from various national, state, and local actors in both the private and public sectors. For the purpose of this paper, however, I will concentrate on both cities’ participation in the HUD EZs, a prong of the larger Community Renewal Initiative (CRI). The EZ designation allowed economically ailing communities to receive tax incentives and grant awards on the basis of four criteria: strategic visions for change, community-based partnerships, economic opportunities, and sustainable community development. Although the EZ designations for the participating 30 metropolitan areas expired in 2011, this initiative set into motion several ongoing urban redevelopment projects. Most importantly, from a methodological standpoint, these EZ designations allowed me to hone in on Miami and Philadelphia’s most distressed communities as well as the “best candidates” for radical revitalization. This tight geographic focus allowed me to more easily identify and map murals, graffiti, and street art throughout two otherwise large, spread out, and segregated cities.

It is worth mentioning my personal bias in the selection of Philadelphia and Miami as my cases for study; the former is my hometown, and the latter my place of residence for the past five years. Admittedly, my interest in this research topic was sparked by my belief that Miami communities could benefit from a Philadelphia-style
approach to public art. Having grown up with larger-than-life images of empowered people of color\textsuperscript{25} brought about by local Philadelphia artists, I was rather perplexed by Miami’s answer to urban art, especially in the Wynwood arts district. While street art in Wynwood is undeniably aesthetically pleasing, there is a palpable social tension in the air; the exclusivity of the neighborhood is perhaps best embodied by the private security guards who stand at the gate of The Wynwood Walls deciding who is fit to stroll its neatly manicured grass. Despite being critically aware of, and unsettled by, the socially irresponsible redevelopment afoot in Wynwood, I continue to be a loyal consumer of Wynwood amenities – overpriced cocktails, specialty coffees, pretentiously-sized tacos, and countless opportunities for flânerie. My positionality as both a consumer of the amenities afforded by artistically-informed urban regeneration and a critic of the more pernicious consequences of the process have made this investigation especially complex.

Furthermore, upon a closer examination of the politics of public art in Philadelphia and in light of recent public art-related developments in Miami, I was forced to reevaluate my simplistic, binary view of the cities’ urban art scenes. Though I am no longer suggesting that Miami adopt a more Philadelphian approach to urban art, this thesis does retain a prescriptive bent. It is my fervent conviction that the methodical documentation of urban art is vital to understanding power dynamics at local, national, and global scales. As a result, a greater commitment to documenting and studying urban creative manifestations is of high importance. This thesis is a testament to the fact that though there are obstacles to documenting and studying urban art, – high turnover rates,

\textsuperscript{25} Although the term “people of color” can be broadly applied to all ethnic and racial minorities living in predominantly white societies, here I use it to refer to the primarily black, Latino/a, and Latin American residents of Miami and Philadelphia EZs.
saturation, a legacy of poor documentation, encodedness, etc. – they are not insurmountable.

**Design and methodology**

This thesis is a variation-finding comparative urban analysis of Miami and Philadelphia, and as such it explores the differences in manifestations of urban art within and between the cities’ EZs in order to “establish a principle of variation in the character or intensity of [the] phenomenon by examining systematic differences between instances” (Tilly 1984: 82). To collect the primary data that drives this variation-finding comparison, I employed geographic survey methods. I combed the streets of each unit area virtually, in a private car, and on foot when possible for instances of street art, graffiti, and mural arts. As a precursor to my field research in East Little Havana, I also was privileged enough to be guided through the neighborhood by East Little Havana resident, cultural anthropologist, historian, and co-author A History of Little Havana, Corinna Moebius. Her insight into the state of public art in Little Havana was invaluable in unlocking some of the more encoded aspects of urban artworks there.

During the process of field mapping, I took notes about the characteristics of each urban artwork I encountered. In addition to recording these urban artworks’ location

---

26 As a young, female outsider conducting research in socially turbulent neighborhoods, it was necessary to take into account my own personal safety, which in many ways inhibited the carrying out of a uniform methodology. In Philadelphia, my vehicular explorations of the EZs were assisted by Thomas Sheldon. This male presence added to my personal comfort level, and allowed me to explore sites of urban art on foot, and in greater depth. In Miami, I did not have the same privilege of accompaniment. As a result, in Model City and parts of Overtown, I chose to forgo extensive exploration of urban art sites on foot, opting instead to identify and catalog urban artworks from my parked car. In Allapattah, East Little Havana, and Wynwood, I was able to move through the neighborhoods on foot with relative ease and comfort, though I still encountered an alarming amount of verbal harassment.
within the unit areas, I described each artwork according to: form, location type, and subject matter. When possible, I also cataloged the title of each artwork, as well as its creators and sponsors.

In my field notes related to form I categorized each artwork as an instance of graffiti, street art, or mural art. This distinction was crucial to my understanding of the linkages between urban art and inequality in distressed communities since each of these forms has a distinct rapport with the powers that be. Under the subheading of graffiti, I classified each instance or cluster as tags, throw ups, or pieces. This subcategorization also speaks to the links between public art and the uneven distribution of power in cities. For example, we can deduce that in neighborhoods where pieces are present, policing of aesthetics is less intense, either because of an absence of legitimate local authorities or an openness to the art form.

When describing the locations of urban art, I relied on the RICEPOTS land-use categories – residential, industrial, commercial, entertainment, public buildings, open space, transport, and services – to systematically assess these locations.27 Under the headings of residential, industrial, commercial, and open space land-use I added the following subheadings: vacant residential buildings (Rv), vacant industrial buildings (Iv), vacant commercial buildings (Cv), and overgrown and vacant lots (Ov). This classification allowed me to discern interesting patterns in the geographies of urban art dispersion. For example, street art clustered exclusively around centers of entertainment and commerce, while graffiti tended to agglomerate at sites of abandonment, – sites

---

corresponding to the “v” subheading – and murals at sites of services, public buildings, and open spaces.

Next, I established a concrete set of descriptors to classify the content of urban artworks according to the most frequently recurring visual themes: representations of people of color, historical figures, local pride, cultural icons, memorial/anti-violence, flora and fauna, and abstract. Within these categories, of course, there is considerable overlap. For example, the mural depicting Philadelphia black civil rights activist Cecil B. Moore and his family would fall under the categories “representations of people of color,” “historical figures,” and “local pride.” The process of compiling all of this data, the titles, forms, street addresses, latitudes, longitudes, land use categories, content descriptions, creators, sponsors, and completion dates of each urban artwork – underscored the serious obstacles to physically and digitally preserving these works of urban art. Urban artworks are undeniably rich resources that expose the unequal inner workings of cities, and as such deserve more and nuanced attention from policymakers, planners, and urban scholars alike.

---
28 This particular mural is located at 1448 North Bouvier Street in the North Central Empowerment Zone (NCEZ) of Philadelphia (39.976473, -75.164128).
Chapter 4

EZ does it: (grass)roots and culture in Philadelphia and Miami

Before diving into an assessment of the state of public art and urban redevelopment in Miami and Philadelphia neighborhoods, I will give an overview of the Empowerment Zone (EZ) program, an initiative that began in 1993 with the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, and was extended through December 2011 on the basis of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010. Philadelphia gained status as an EZ participant in 1994 as part of Round I of the competition, while Miami was granted its EZ designation in 1999 as part of Round II. Within the Community Renewal Initiative (CRI), EZs are understood as “areas of high poverty and unemployment that benefit from tax incentives provided to businesses in the boundary of the EZ.”29 This promotion of deregulation as a method for attracting firms to distressed neighborhoods is unremarkable in the age of urban competitiveness. What does set this initiative apart from other contestants in the race to the bottom, however, is its bottom-up rhetoric. An article published by the National Housing Institute stressed that in order for “a site to receive EZ/EC money, all those with a stake in the targeted communities must play a role in the effort, and the proposed plan must demonstrate that the participants have committed to work together toward long-term sustainable solutions.”30 This unusual marriage of grassroots community organization and federal funding is a perfect example of what Neil Smith called the “new concatenation of urban functions” (2002: 431). Smith, in his musings on the rescaling of urbanism in the wake of

29 Taken from HUD website: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/hudprograms/empowerment_zones
globalization, contends that the limits of the local, national, and global have become increasingly porous; urban planning and policy-making has, as a result of this constant shifting between scales, become a very “glocal” affair.

Nonetheless, the rigid and arbitrary boundaries of the EZs do not accurately reflect the porosity or real boundaries of cities. As Pitcoff points out, “In many cases, targeting efforts based on a geographic area is less important than building linkages and informal networks across borders.”31 This insight is of particular import to the Philadelphia and Miami contexts, because many of the EZs border one another yet function autonomously, without any dialogue or cohesion across this imagined border. Another critique of the EZ program is that the tract boundaries do not align with neighborhood boundaries. Instead, the borders cut awkwardly across neighborhoods, making appropriate spending and long-term interpersonal commitment to the EZ more complicated. Finally, information about EZs at both the federal and local level was frequently outdated, irregular, or insufficient. The disparities in information provided within and across the cities’ EZs made it relatively difficult to assess the projects in a systematic fashion.

**Philadelphia Empowerment Zones**

The disparities in information about cities’ EZs first became apparent to me when searching the City of Philadelphia Department of Commerce website for information about the American Street (ASEZ), North Central (NCEZ), and West Philadelphia EZs
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31 Ibid.
(WPEZ). In general, information was sorely lacking and lopsided, with a hyper focus, for example, on the ASEZ, and next to no information about the WPEZ. What the website lacked in text-based information, however, it made up for in clearly-defined and easily accessible maps of the EZs, a resource that was indispensable in the early phases of designing my research. To supplement the gaps in information provided by the city, I utilized the University of Pennsylvania’s Neighborhood Information System (NIS), a database with a variety of Philadelphia-specific interactive maps.\textsuperscript{32} In addition to using this resource to visualize the discrepancies among EZ boundaries and neighborhood lines, I made use of the database’s neighborhood-level demographic reports.

In the pages that follow, figures 3.1-3.3 underscore the counterintuitive nature of the boundaries of Philadelphia’s EZs. According to the NIS, for example, the ASEZ cuts across two historically distinct neighborhoods, West Kensington and Northern Liberties. Although

\textsuperscript{32} NIS Neighborhood Reports can be found at: http://nis.cml.upenn.edu/nbase/nbProfileRequest.asp

\textbf{Figure 3.1.} Map of the American Street Empowerment Zone (ASEZ) provided by the City of Philadelphia. The ASEZ encompasses the West Kensington and Northern Liberties neighborhoods. The inclusion of these historically and culturally distinct neighborhoods within a single EZ underscores the arbitrary nature of the boundaries, but also provides an interesting look into how communities relate (or do not relate to one another) despite the increasing porosity of cities.
Northern Liberties was also negatively affected by the economic disinvestment of the post-industrial decline, it has not had as turbulent a history as West Kensington. Most notably, the crumbling warehouses, abandoned brick row homes, and joblessness in West Kensington fueled drug-related crimes, prostitution, and gang violence. While both West Kensington and Northern Liberties have undergone concerted urban redevelopment efforts in recent years, the historical and cultural trajectories of the two neighborhoods are quite distinct. It seems only logical that West Kensington, the heart of Philadelphia’s Puerto Rican population and a formerly drug-addled neighborhood, and Northern Liberties, a rapidly gentrifying home base for students and young professionals, would have different needs and visions for the futures of their communities. Though this odd coupling likely allowed for what Pitcoff termed “building linkages and informal networks across borders,” it also almost certainly posed obstacles in making spending decisions and forging long-term interpersonal alliances within the EZ.33

A portion of Germantown Avenue and 6th Street forms the invisible border between the ASEZ and the NCEZ. Not unlike the ASEZ, the NCEZ’s unusually drawn boundaries do not correspond to neighborhood boundaries. The NCEZ, again based on information from the NIS, is comprised of the Hartranft, Poplar, and North Central neighborhoods. All three of these neighborhoods are historically black communities in which a respective 67.97%, 80.48%, and 93.8% of the population self-identified as African American in the 2000 U.S. Census. A struggle between working class communities of color and newer, more privileged residents – akin to the situation in Northern Liberties and West Kensington – occurs within these limits as Temple University students and faculty continue to reshape the surrounding neighborhoods’ geography. Consequently, a similar set of obstacles to unified decision-making and maintaining cross-community partnerships exists in the

34 Taken from NIS Neighborhood Reports: http://nis.cml.upenn.edu/nbase/nbProfileRequest.asp
NCEZ. What is even more interesting when examining the geography of the NCEZ, however, is the shared mile-long stretch of road that artificially separates it from the ASEZ. Could it be that the counterintuitive design of the EZs made it more difficult to invest money appropriately? In 1998, for instance, $150,000 worth of the NCEZ’s expenditures were audited. Sociologist Michael Bennett suggested that while criminal misappropriation of funds could be one explanation for spending discrepancies in Philadelphia and other EZ communities, zoning issues could also be partially responsible. He asserts that EZs “are so tightly defined that if you spent money on the company across the street it could be considered an irregularity.” This observation underscores the paradoxical paradigm of the EZ initiative in which there are simultaneously no stipulations and extremely inelastic bounds of participation.

That is not to say that inflexible borders are the only issue that EZs face. Unlike the other EZs, for instance, the WPEZ coincides neatly with the NIS-provided boundaries for the Mill Creek neighborhood. In spite of this spatial coherence, however, the WPEZ still faces challenges that can be applied to the broader EZ experience. Principally, the degree of accumulated disinvestment in the EZs combined with the complexity of the initiative make immediately observable results a practical impossibility. A departure from flash in the pan revitalization strategies of the past, the EZ initiative set into motion sustainable, structural change by chipping away at a host of interrelated phenomena like educational attainment gaps and joblessness. As stated in the HUD’s “Capturing Successes in Renewal Communities and Empowerment Zones” publication, “one of the
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36 Ibid.
EZ’s primary hurdles has been to manage the expectations of EZ stakeholders who want dramatic improvements in their communities” (163). There is also a generational element at play in the management of EZs; in 1997, in the second round of Community Trust Board (CTB) elections, an elections outreach worker from the WPEZ observed that, “People from the old school and younger people are clashing on ideologies. The younger group is more aggressive and wants things done right now and the older group is more into the system and wants to take things at a different pace.” Although the gradual and often faceless nature of the changes catalyzed by the EZ initiative has at times inspired impatience, disagreements, and disenchantment among residents, overall, the spillover from this program has brought

![Map of West Philadelphia Empowerment Zone](image)

Figure 3.3. Map of West Philadelphia Empowerment Zone provided by the City of Philadelphia. Although the WPEZ coincides with the boundaries of the existing Mill Creek neighborhood, the implementation of the EZ initiatives has been similarly marked by divisiveness. In this case, older residents (who have memories of Mill Creek before its decline) and younger residents (who have known only its hopelessness, and are desperate for change) clash over the best strategies for achieving economic growth and social stability.

---

38 It is difficult to attribute successes within the EZs directly to the initiative because of the variety of actors involved in the process of revitalization and the gaps in awareness about the program among the general population. For example, the relocation of businesses to EZs in order to take advantage of tax incentives provided by the initiative may appear to be an independent, and isolated phenomenon to an outsider.
increased stability to devalued Philadelphia neighborhoods and paved the way for greater civic participation.

**Trajectories of urban art in Philadelphia**

In official EZ documents, implementing arts and culture projects understandably ranks lower on the list of priorities than attracting and retaining businesses; creating jobs; providing better access to, and quality of, education; and improving housing conditions. Nonetheless, there is an unignorable link between aestheticization\(^{39}\) and these goals. Though in many cases aestheticization occurs in already resource-rich communities, it is also frequently used as a jumpstart for, or shortcut to, economic growth and/or political empowerment. Aestheticization has many incarnations, but for the purposes of this research project, the most important of these is urban art.\(^{40}\)

Philadelphia is no stranger to public art – “widely believed to have one of the largest public art collections in the country” – and uses its vast array of public art to market itself as a globally competitive and desirable city.\(^{41}\) Undoubtedly, the most prolific and highly regarded producer of public art in Philadelphia is the Mural Arts Program (MAP). In January 1984, exactly a decade before Philadelphia’s designation as an EZ community, the Philadelphia Anti-Graffiti Network (PAGN) was created in
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\(^{39}\) Although the government documents reviewed make use of the term *beautification*, I have chosen to speak instead about *aestheticization* because it encompasses a wider array of visual transformations. As is the case in some of the neighborhoods studied here, *aestheticization* often entails the pursuit of urban grit rather than normative beauty. The appeal of urban grit to capital-rich consumers is rooted in the cosmopolite’s exotifying fascination with poverty and urban decay.

\(^{40}\) To a lesser extent, trends in architectural design – particularly related to the way the shift toward low-rise public housing projects has changed cities’ geographies – are also important to my understanding of the complementary processes of aestheticization and economic revitalization.

\(^{41}\) Taken from Visit Philadelphia website: http://www.visitphilly.com/music-art/public-art/
response to rampant “property destruction” by graffiti writers.\textsuperscript{42} PAGN was created to remove and prevent these unsettling manifestations of “urban blight.” The MAP – led then and now by Jane Golden – began as a subgroup of the PAGN dedicated to preventing graffiti by, “reach[ing] out to graffiti writers and redirect[ing] their energies to constructive public art projects.”\textsuperscript{43} The discourse surrounding this “redirection of energy” contains troublingly infantilizing rhetoric and underscores the prevalence of policing urban art aesthetics.

Nonetheless, the MAP is an important social justice vehicle within the city because it tackles issues like restorative justice, environmental degradation, and homelessness that might otherwise be invisibilized. Additionally, the MAP has often been praised for demonstrating “respect for people who are largely excluded from government and traditional vehicles of public expression such as the mass media” (Golden 2002: 8). In his foreword to \textit{Philadelphia Murals and the Stories They Tell}, Timothy W. Drescher goes as far as to say that Philadelphia murals do not just “express community, but they also help create it…in spirit, not just location” (ibid). This notion of MAP as a place-making agent, is predicated on two aspects of its operating procedure.

First, the MAP places value on involving community members in the decision-making process, especially when it comes to choosing the murals’ content. In an interview with Jeff Deeney, Golden stated, “I spend four nights a week and most Saturdays at community meetings. All murals are the result of listening to the community in some way” (Golden 2002: 6). In the same interview, she notes:

\begin{quote}
Community work is hard. Sometimes the murals are lightning rods for issues about race, class, gentrification, crime and violence, and sometimes
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{42} Taken from MAP website: http://muralarts.org/about/history-and-overview

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
they bring the most divided people together. There are moments you feel that the projects won’t work and that people will never reach a consensus. And then, surprisingly, for the most part things work out. (2002: 6)

This slow, tedious trudge toward majority rule is certainly characteristic of democracy, but what happens when sponsors are thrown into the decision-making equation?

*Philadelphia Murals and the Stories They Tell* expresses the sentiment that in the early stages of planning a mural sponsored by foundations and corporations, emphasis is placed on “finding a good match between the funder and a community” (Golden 2002: 14). The presence of powerful private actors in the production of these historically collaborative and representational artworks exposes Philadelphia citizens to the risk of “democratic deficit.”

Second, the MAP works with disinvested communities to enliven a sense of community that has often been trampled by the negative effects of drug crimes, violence, homelessness, and mass incarceration. The MAP, rooted in a reverse “broken windows theory,” uses muralism as a pathway for animating distressed communities. By this logic, in the same way that “one unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares,” introducing public art into the visual landscape is a signal that a community has value (Kelling and Wilson 1982). This place-making begins with the cross-community dialogue and collaboration described in the above paragraph, not just in the decision-making process, but also in the physical production of the mural. The end result, in many cases, –

---

44 Recall that “democratic deficit” is the decline of accountability – a central facet of democracy as proposed by Schmitter and Karl – and transparency in urban planning and policy-making due to the increased presence of private actors in a traditionally public realm.

45 In a 1982 issue of *The Atlantic*, criminologist George L. Kelling and political scientist James Q. Wilson posited that “if a window in a building is broken and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken,” underscoring the sequential relationship between disorder and crime in communities.

46 Value, of course, is a highly ambiguous term. Here it is used to capture both economic and symbolic value as perceived by community members, and public and private actors alike.
at least according to the official discourse of the MAP – is a restored sense of pride in one’s community. This phenomenon underscores the overwhelming degree to which a community’s “value” – both economically and symbolically – is wrapped up in aesthetics.

The MAP, as the seasoned veteran of the organized Philadelphia urban art scene, has worked with other smaller urban art organizations in a variety of capacities throughout the cities. Of these many urban art sites and related organizations, I am particularly interested in highlighting the relationships between the MAP and the Village of Arts and Humanities, the Asociación de Puertorriqueños en Marcha (APM), the Cecil B. Moore permission wall, and the Philly Painting project because these initiatives are based in the city’s EZs. The Philly Painting project, a collaboration of massive scale between the MAP and Dutch street artists Haas & Hahn, dominates the visual landscape of the NCEZ’s main commercial business corridor. The Village of Arts and Humanities, or simply The Village, also operates out of the NCEZ, and is an excellent example of sustainable and empowering artistically-informed urban regeneration practice. Although the offices of the APM are not located within the ASEZ nor are their services primarily arts-related, the APM has been invaluable to the artistically-informed urban regeneration in West Kensington as well as in the visualization of the Latino/a experience through urban art.

Finally, unlike the rest of the entities mentioned here, the Cecil B. Moore permission wall in the ASEZ is not an organized initiative. Rather, it is a site of high graffiti density that writers flock to in order to hone their craft. Although many graffiti
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47 This is not an official name for the wall, but rather a description of the wall’s location at Cecil B. Moore Avenue and Fifth Street.
artists derive status or pleasure from creating “illegal” artwork, fear of apprehension often dictates that works of graffiti be completed quickly, making it difficult to create larger, more complex pieces. The consent of property owners, on the other hand, transforms permission walls into larger-than-life sketchbooks for emerging artists and seasoned writers alike. Although the tagline of a Philadelphia Weekly article claimed in 2007 that it was, “the last hurrah for an iconic North Philly graffiti spot that’s soon to be reclaimed by gentrification,” my survey of Cecil B. Moore Avenue and 5th Street, seemed to indicate that despite the arrival of a half-block of rehabilitated brick buildings for mixed-use, the wall was alive and well. In fact, it was at this site that I saw the most elaborate pieces that the city has to offer, perhaps indicating that graffiti decriminalization might be good for artistically-informed urban regeneration; even Golden herself, asserted, “…there should also be sites for permission walls – places open to a variety of expressions” (Deeney 6). Permission walls create an artistic milieu with low social and economic barriers to entry in which all are welcome to produce art. As a result, permission walls have the potential to animate communities instead of falling back on the panoptic and fortress approaches to creating safer cities. Perhaps, permission walls are a part of the solution to sustainably growing communities via the arts.

**Miami Neighborhood Development Zones**

Information about Miami’s EZs was more streamlined than that pertaining to Philadelphia’s EZs, but even more limited. In the spirit of urban entrepreneurialism, the City of Miami website markets each of its EZs unique characteristics as comparative
advantages. For example, the website highlights Overtown’s “historic role in the life of the City for decades, as a center of American black culture and commercial activity,” with no mention of the willful destruction of the same vibrant community during the 1960s in order to make way for I-95. In fact, there was so little information about Miami’s EZs that I adapted my unit of analysis to a different spatial designation: the Neighborhood Development Zone (NDZ). The NDZs were a logical substitution since the five EZs I had originally set out to research were included among the eight NDZs targeted by the City of Miami’s 2009-2013 Consolidated Plan (CP). For purposes of consistency between the Philadelphia and Miami cases, I chose to investigate urban art in only the NDZs that doubled as EZs, leaving out the Coconut Grove, Edison/Little River/Little Haiti, and West Little Havana neighborhoods.

Before turning to the organization of these NDZs, it is important to note that the difficulty in finding information about Miami’s EZs could be related to the controversy and confusion surrounding their operation. The Miami EZs came under scrutiny after accusations that EZ leaders had misreported their expenditures and results were launched by investigative journalists from The Miami Herald – a situation reminiscent of the goings on in the North Central EZ of Philadelphia in the late 1990s (Caraballo 2012). In

48 Of the construction of I-95 and consequent destruction of the vibrant Overtown community, urban historian Raymond A. Mohl writes, “Shifting the downtown expressway to the west now placed the route squarely through Miami’s large black residential district known as Overtown. The massive interchange, eventually taking up almost thirty square blocks, was slated to wipe out Overtown’s business district, the heart of black Miami, often considered by virtue of its many nightclubs and music venues to be ‘the Harlem of the South.’ Thirty years of racially driven local politics lay behind the Wilbur Smith expressway plan” (Mohl 2004: 683; my emphasis).

49 Taken from City of Miami Consolidated Plan 2009-2013:

50 Recall that in 1998, $150,000 worth of the NCEZ’s expenditures were audited.

51 Taken from City of Miami Consolidated Plan 2009-2013:
http://www.miamigov.com/economicdevelopment/pages/BusinessIncentives/EmpowermentZone.asp
2007, following this media firestorm, the EZs were reorganized; the EZs, “originally managed by the non-profit Miami-Dade Empowerment Trust (MDET)…later came under the jurisdiction of the Miami-Dade County Office of Community and Economic Development because of MDET’s [purported] mismanagement,” making Miami the “only [EZ] community to change its [Coordinating Responsible Authority] CoRA from a non-profit organization to a governmental entity” (Caraballo 2012: 92). This reorganization effectively curtailed the grassroots nature of the EZ initiative in Miami, restoring decision-making power regarding urban renewal initiatives to traditional public actors.

Like the EZ initiative, the NDZ program relies on geographic targeting to identify which Miami neighborhoods are most critically in need of financial incentives and funding. The NDZ program was introduced in the City of Miami in 2004 as an adaptation of the Community Revitalization District (CRD) geographic target areas espoused in the 1999-2004 CP. In response to the limitations of the CRDs, the NDZ program was calibrated to balance both broad and specific objectives of revitalization. To this end, the program was divided into NDZs and Model Blocks. The NDZs represent the most distressed neighborhoods in Miami, while the Model Blocks represent the subsections of these neighborhoods that show the most promise for revitalization. In the hopes that growth and stability in Model Blocks will spread through the rest of the NDZ, the City of Miami invests in areas in distressed neighborhoods with “a substantial workforce population, relatively good housing stock, and tangible opportunities for revitalization.”
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52 Ibid.
53 Ibid.
54 Idem page 37.
The Model Blocks within each NDZ are indicated with hatch marks in the following maps.

Unlike Philadelphia, where the ASEZ and NCEZ are on the opposite side of the city from the WPEZ, in Miami a sort of mega-EZ is formed by the five EZs. Even seven out of the eight NDZs are contiguous, with Coconut Grove being the only NDZ to fall outside this centralized hub of economic disinvestment. Despite being in close proximity to each other, each neighborhood is

Figure 3.4, Map of Allapattah Neighborhood Development Zone provided by the City of Miami. Urban artworks in the Allapattah NDZ are few and far between, but often depict Dominican and Caribbean cultural symbols. Given the neighborhood’s sizable Dominican and Dominican-American population, the main thrust of redevelopment in this NDZ has been centered around rebranding the neighborhood as Little Santo Domingo. In addition to Allapattah’s more folkloric artistic production, it has recently become home to a “grittier” form of urban art. With the increasing commercialization of Wynwood, urban artists have begun to seek out new neighborhoods. Allapattah has been one of the sites of spillover for artists pushed out of Wynwood by high rents, more intense policing,
culturally and historically unique, and these differences have set them on distinct pathways to artistically-informed urban regeneration.

Figure 3.5. Map of East Little Havana Neighborhood Development Zone provided by the City of Miami. With the increasing commercialization and visual saturation of Wynwood, urban artists have begun to seek out new neighborhoods. East Little Havana, like Allapattah, has been one of the sites of spillover for artists pushed out of Wynwood by high rents, more intense policing, and/or increasingly scarce wall space. East Little Havana is home to both culturally-specific urban art forms – particularly dependent on symbols of Cuban and Caribbean culture – and “grittier,” more abstract street art. This two-pronged approach to artistically-informed urban regeneration maximizes both the economic returns and the potential for the appropriation and silencing of marginalized groups.
Figure 3.6, Map of Model City Neighborhood Development Zone provided by the City of Miami. Model City, also known as Liberty City, is in many ways historically linked to the rise and eventual fall of Overtown’s vibrant black community. As early as the 1930s, white business leaders and developers were hatching “resettlement plans” to relocate black residents out of Overtown and into the Liberty Square public housing project to allow for the expansion of the downtown business district. Nonetheless, it was not until the “rapid growth of Dade County’s African American population between 1940 and 1960 added a special urgency to the need for new black housing” that these decades-old plans gained traction (Mohl 1995: 398). Finally, with the decimation of countless homes, businesses, and sites of community participation in Overtown to make way for expressway, the displaced residents were forced into Model City (Mohl 1995: 401). The dark history of these two communities has left them understandably setback socially and economically, yet they continue to linger at the bottom of the policy and planning agenda – at least until all other “valuable” frontiers have already been developed.
Figure 3.7. Map of Overtown Neighborhood Development Zone provided by the City of Miami. Overtown, once known as the “Harlem of the South” because of its vibrant black community and cultural milieu, began to decline in the 1960s with the construction of I-95, which effectively destroyed the neighborhood’s central business district and cut the community in half. As a result of the collapse of local businesses and flight of the middle class, unemployment, drug use, and violent crime took hold of the neighborhood, and continue to plague it to this day. Despite being home to internationally-renowned artist and former Overtown resident Purvis Young’s murals and a vibrant graffiti writing culture, Overtown, along with Model City, has experienced the least artistic reinvestment of the Miami NDZs.
Historically, Wynwood has been a working class residential area and warehouse district, first for white settlers, and later for Latin American and some Asian immigrants. By the mid-1950s, the neighborhood came to be known specifically as Little San Juan, but by the late 1970s, disinvestment led to unemployment, drug trafficking, and violent crime to spike. Since the mid-2000s, however, Wynwood has been strategically redeveloped and rebranded as an arts and entertainment district. Unlike Allapattah, and to a lesser extent East Little Havana, Wynwood’s urban art renaissance is not tied specifically to Latino/a and Latin American culture. Although many Latino/a and Latin American artists have left their mark on Wynwood’s walls, the content of these urban artworks tends toward abstract, “gallery-quality” street art. Despite being covered in urban art, Wynwood has ceased to be a site of art production and is now primarily a site of private and public consumption. With the overwhelming success of Wynwood’s bars and restaurants, even relatively capital-rich players in the arts industry like gallerists are struggling to stay solvent. As a result, urban artists and gallerists are increasingly seeking a new milieu for production.
Trajectories of urban art in Miami

In 2002, Miami Beach hosted its first annual Art Basel show, igniting a reimagining of Miami as an important cultural player on the global stage. In many ways, however, the endurance of stereotypes propagated by the likes of Scarface and Miami Vice continues to hinder Miami’s rebranding process. While the realities of Miami lie somewhere in between these two extremes of criminality and “refinement,” the economic and symbolic success of the Wynwood arts and entertainment district has lent more credibility to Miami’s claims of cultural cachet and global competitiveness. Although today there is practically no wall left unpainted, as recently as 2006, Wynwood was – at least aesthetically speaking – a disinvested post-industrial warehouse district par excellence. Despite the dominant discourse that Wynwood was devoid of culture prior to 2006 – exemplified in developer David Lombardi’s assertion that he “took chicken shit and made chicken salad” – Wynwood’s reincarnation as an arts and entertainment district is just one of many reinventions the neighborhood has undergone in just under a century (Álvarez and Edgar 2014; 0:36). In its relatively short history, Wynwood has been a working class residential area, an agglomeration of food and beverage industries, a garment district, a vibrant Puerto Rican enclave referred to as Little San Juan, a devalued neighborhood afflicted by unemployment and drug-related crime, and finally an arts district on the rise.55

Although urban artists were active in Wynwood long before the official rebranding of the neighborhood as an arts and entertainment district, Wynwood’s

---

reimagining can be conceptualized as the collective influence of gallerists, artists, and private developers. First, in 1987, a group of artists displaced by gentrification in Miami’s Coconut Grove neighborhood reclaimed the abandoned building that formerly housed the American Bakeries company as the Bakehouse Art Complex studio and exhibition space.\(^{56}\) This first phase fits nicely with the Cameron and Coaffee model in which artists set urban regeneration into motion by creating a “milieu for the production of art” (2005: 46). At the turn of the 21st century, gallerists like Brook Dorsch began to open up shop in the ailing warehouse district, effectively marking the second phase of artistically-informed regeneration, the commodification of art for “private consumption.”\(^{57}\)

Finally, in 2006, the late Tony Goldman of Goldman Properties – the “visionary” behind the revitalization of SoHo and Miami Beach – began buying properties in Wynwood in bulk. In order to, “activate abandoned streets with pedestrian activity, and through the arts and unique users, create a community where individuals of all backgrounds and demographics could participate and work, live, and play within its boundaries,” Goldman introduced upscale restaurants, cafes, bars and lounges into the neighborhood.\(^{58}\) However, his most iconic contribution to the neighborhood is The Wynwood Walls complex, an outdoor gallery of international street art, which has become the anchor institution for the arts in Wynwood. In theory, an open-air gallery, with artwork visible to all from the street, has the potential to break down the barriers to entry present in traditional, brick-and-mortar galleries. Unfortunately, in practice, The

\(^{56}\) Ibid.
Wynwood Walls and other developments in the neighborhood reproduce social exclusion.

Of course, Wynwood is not the only NDZ that has capitalized on the magnetism of urban art. There are also important arts-based urban transformations occurring in East Little Havana and Allapattah. Of the NDZs, Model City and Overtown remain artistically in the shadows where street art and mural arts are concerned. Though Overtown boasts artworks by internationally renowned muralist and former local resident Purvis Young, sustained commitments to the arts have been few and far between. Similarly, although Model City is home to a fair number of murals, it falls short of the artistic milieu necessary for regeneration. Of all of the NDZs surveyed, however, the most impressive displays of graffiti craftsmanship were located in Model City and Overtown. The quality of the “burners” I encountered in these two neighborhoods indicates that they have the artistic talent and creative desire necessary to become enclaves for the arts, but that historical legacies have played a role in the disinvestment and disrepute of these two neighborhoods.

Although East Little Havana has a more established artistic milieu than Allapattah, in both of these neighborhoods two distinct undercurrents of urban art have emerged. The first of these can be conceptualized as a culturally-specific urban art movement, while the second can be described as a boom in “grittier” street art. This first trend is part of the efforts to attract cultural tourism – from both outside and within Miami – by marketing these neighborhoods as Latin Quarters. Little Havana, as its name suggests, has played up on its Cuban and Latin American “flavor” for development

---

59 *Burners* are a subcategory of *pieces*. They are called *burners* because of the way their vibrant colors and intricate design make them pop, or *burn off*, the wall.
purposes since the mid-1960s, but Allapattah’s attempts at rebranding are just taking flight (Grenier and Moebi 2015). In Allapattah, community leaders and developers are beginning to capitalize on one of its comparative advantages: its Dominican population. Inspired by the successes of Little Havana, and more recently, Little Haiti, drivers of change in Allapattah are in the process of establishing the neighborhood as a Little Santo Domingo. These efforts are inextricably tied to public art, as these highly visible artworks are what mark these areas as culturally Latin American and Latino/a. With in-your-face visions of Afro-Latino/a musicians, Caribbean landscapes, and “trajes típicos,” these neighborhoods assert themselves as “authentic” and distinct from other Miami neighborhoods.

The second branch of urban art occurring in both East Little Havana and Allapattah is in many ways occurring in response to, and even in opposition to, the rapid redevelopment of Wynwood. Unable to afford the same rents as profitable, high-end restaurants, and/or in search of a less-saturated “canvas,” independent (street) artists have relocated to East Little Havana and, more recently, Allapattah. A recent article in *El Nuevo Herald* follows the movement of Puerto Rican artist Francisco De La Torre from Wynwood to what he calls the “Wild West” of Wynwood, Allapattah. In the same article, Alex Fernández-Casais, who followed De La Torre to the so-called Wild West, recalls, “Conocimos a Francisco en Wynwood. Él nos presentó la idea de ir ‘más alla del tren’. Wynwood se ha ido comercializando y decidimos venir a lo que era el Wynwood Wild West. Es más cool, underground y menos comercial” (Gómez 2015). This vicious cycle of the “cool” becoming commercial is a familiar trope within analyses of artistically-
informed urban regeneration. This begs the question, how can artistically-informed regeneration be carried out in a socially responsible and sustainable manner?
Chapter 5

After the paint dries: degrees of community engagement in arts-based urban regeneration initiatives

Based on the data compiled during my field surveys of the eight Empowerment Zones (EZs)/Neighborhood Development Zones (NDZs) in Philadelphia and Miami, I established a tripartite typology of artistically-informed urban regeneration, identifying the principal expressions of artistically-informed urban regeneration as parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering. During the course of my research, I was inundated with diverse and nuanced expressions of the interconnectedness of urban art and community revitalization, making it initially difficult to discern generalizable patterns. I was excessively focused, in the beginning stages of my analysis, on explaining variations in the quality and quantity of urban art through the differences in geographical and historical circumstances within and across EZs and cities. While there is a tendency for each of the three urban art forms discussed in this thesis to agglomerate in distinct location types, the segregation of these art forms is the result of carefully constructed approaches to urban redevelopment. It was not until I began to reflect on the logic and practices undergirding the individual urban art initiatives that I began to detect three overarching patterns. The three basic categories of artistically-informed urban regeneration strategies that emerged from these overarching patterns – parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering – have allowed me to discern what motivators, agents, organizational structures, and outcomes are most likely to drive profit-led and/or
temporary neighborhood change rather than the radical, sustainable reimagining of communities.

On an implicit level, I had long recognized that not all urban art is created equal. Some of the urban art that I encountered seemed hollow, — cloyingly cutesified representations of multiracial harmony, or caricaturized images of “exotic” people — while other artworks were fiercely compelling.

Some urban artworks were used to draw the eyes of passersby to businesses, some artworks made public services a focal point in the city’s geography, and others reminded people of the capricious will of capitalism, unapologetically pointing out abandoned homes and sites of industry.

Figure 4.1. Mural on the side wall of “Kuky Estilo” Barbershop at 3528 NW 17th Avenue in Allapattah, Miami. Although murals can be used to express ethnic and national pride, this particular mural presents a caricaturized and exotified view of “Dominicanness.” This mural aestheticizes the site without creating opportunities for citizenship beyond consumerism. Though Dominican cultural symbolism could theoretically be used to strengthen Allapattah’s “imagined community” of Dominicans and Dominican Americans, this use of Dominican cultural symbols reduces “Dominicanness” to decoration.

Figure 4.2. Image of vacant industrial building (Iv) located at intersection of Turner and Hancock streets in ASEZ, Philadelphia. The presence of tags, throw ups, and one example of street art at this site shows how underutilized spaces in disinvested neighborhoods become canvases for urban artistic expressions. Although graffiti often agglomerates at sites of abandonment, graffiti is not a causal factor in urban decay. Rather, graffiti may act as a visual indicator of low levels of investment, and consequently, policing. Nonetheless, graffiti may also occur in spaces where reinvestment and low levels, or different forms of, policing coexist, namely permission walls.
Despite the variations of urban art I came across in my research, there appeared to be two constants that united this broad genre: the need for economic capital and a desire to effect change. Art is often conceptualized among members of the general public as divorced from traditional capital, or even morally superior to capital; art can, however, in very limited circumstances, occur without personal funds and/or outside financial support. In the urban art world, the same is true; even the lowly tagger needs money for paint cans and pens to support the writing habit. The second quasi-universal truth of urban art is that it is imbued with a desire for change. Make no mistake, my use of “change” here, is a neutral one with no utopic illusions. Change, in this context, simply means a reimagining and reshaping of visible space. Although broadly speaking, this change is intended to bring “improvements,” there are a variety of intentions at play in this reimagining process, not all of them benevolent. Moreover, good intentions do not guarantee positive outcomes for communities and their members. In some ways, the tripartite typology elaborated here is an attempt to better track these intentions and the kinds of community change they are
likely to produce. An explicit framework of intentions, though it may not capture as much nuance, facilitates the critical evaluation of different arts-based urban redevelopment strategies.

To streamline analysis of arts-based urban redevelopment strategies, I have identified three main styles of artistically-informed urban regeneration – parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering – whose individual characteristics are enumerated in table 4.1. Based on a visual inspection of case content and surrounding urban conditions, and complemented by secondary research when available, I devised this preliminary classification. When explicit information related to the agents, motivators, organizational structures, and outcomes involved in the envisioning, creation, and maintenance of each urban art project was available, I used it to add richness and depth to my analysis. In order to adjudicate between instances of urban art and assign a label of parasitic, paternalistic, or empowering, however, I analyzed the artworks according to four main considerations:

1. Who is involved in the process of…
   a. conceptualization and initial decision-making?
   b. physical production?
   c. maintaining the artwork’s aesthetic value and link to the community?
2. Why are these agents involved in the gestation of urban art?
3. How is power distributed within the organizational structures of these projects?
4. What are the observed and/or projected consequences of this strategic use of urban art?

With these lines of inquiry in mind, I attempted to categorize each of the 488 instances of urban art cataloged according to these three types of artistically-informed community redevelopment. Although in many cases I was able to glean sufficient information about the artworks’ conceptualization and production processes – as well as about the post-
creation uses of these artistically enhanced sites – through primary and secondary research, in a number of cases this was not feasible. Given the disparities in the scholarly and policy-based attention paid to these artworks, serious inequities in the availability of information exist.

In order to combat these information gaps, I added the category “not enough information.” This category encapsulates urban artworks which, for any number of reasons, are of unknown provenance and could therefore not be soundly assimilated into the existing tripartite typology. The existence of this category serves to underscore the need for more comprehensive and consistent documentation of urban art processes at all stages of gestation. In addition to this category, I also chose to utilize the designation “non-strategic” to refer to urban art projects that did not demonstrate calculated attempts at community redevelopment. While many of the non-strategic artworks I cataloged could be considered most closely related to empowering forms of urban regeneration on the basis of involved agents and organizational structure, there was no evidence that these artworks were designed to foment, or resulted in, the broadening and deepening of community participation. Although this category is predominantly comprised of instances of graffiti, in some cases it included street art and murals. It is important, however, to consider the influence that the differentiated policing of aesthetics could have on this category of urban art. Perhaps the hyper-policing and disproportionate erasure of graffiti – the mainstay of this category – is what often prevents these artworks from being strategically used to sustain community redevelopment. Nonetheless, understanding which artworks do not fit the existing typology exposes and clarifies the priorities of the various actors involved in community redevelopment. On the one hand, graffiti and some
murals fall into disrepair or are actively erased, with little record of their existence being
preserved for posterity. Alternatively, street art and certain murals are extensively
maintained, – both physically and digitally – and celebrated. These disparities in urban
art production and preservation trace larger patterns of urban inequality.

This tripartite typology also allows for both broad and specific inquiries. To bring
into focus broad patterns, I analyzed the data collected in all eight EZs/NDZs, most
importantly the numbers and percentages of parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering
cases in each. However, to complement this broader analysis, I also honed in on specific
urban art initiatives within these neighborhoods in order to illustrate practically the
differences between parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering modes of urban
regeneration. While compiling and analyzing the data I gathered during my field surveys
helped me to identify overarching patterns, the analysis of individual cases allowed me to
explore my tripartite typology in a more nuanced manner. This micro-level focus can be
especially important in situations in which the same organization has sponsored more
than one type of arts-based urban regeneration project. For example, while the MAP’s
collaboration with internationally renowned street artists like Kenny Scharf and Shepard
Fairey60 in neighborhoods being primed for gentrification would fall under the category
of parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration, other initiatives would be more aptly
described as paternalistic or empowering. The Philly Painting project, for instance, – a
collaboration between the MAP and a number of other actors – is most closely aligned
with the motivating logic, organizational structures, and outcomes of paternalistic
artistically-informed urban regeneration. Finally, some MAP projects, like those carried

60 Given the international recognition attached to these artists’ brands, these high-capital investments are
typically reserved for neighborhoods that will become centers of upscale housing and retail.
out in conjunction with the Asociación de Puertorriqueños en Marcha (APM) to increase the visibility of the ASEZ’s Latino/a community, are most closely linked to empowering artistically-informed urban regeneration. My goal in typifying these artistically-informed development strategies is to make explicit the disparities between redevelopment models which have, until now, only been tacitly understood. Establishing this clear, albeit simplified, typology makes it possible to discern which elements of artistically-informed urban regeneration efforts hinder sustainable, equitable growth, and which ones advance it.

**Table 4.1, Typology of artistically-informed urban regeneration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parasitic</th>
<th>Paternalistic</th>
<th>Empowering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agents</strong></td>
<td>• Developers • Property owners • Artists</td>
<td>• Local government actors • Non-profit organizations • Companies attempting to bolster social responsibility reputation • Short-term volunteer groups • Select community members • Artists</td>
<td>• Community members • Non-profit organizations • Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>• Acquisition of economic and symbolic capital</td>
<td>• Feelings of guilt, pity, righteousness, superiority on part of non-community members</td>
<td>• Sense of self-determination • Desire for structural change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>• Vertical (top-down)</td>
<td>• Elements of horizontal and vertical (top-down)</td>
<td>• Horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary outcome</strong></td>
<td>• Appropriation and hyper-commoditization of urban art forms</td>
<td>• Cosmetic and/or fleeting “solutions” to structural issues</td>
<td>• Broadening and deepening of participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration

Parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration relies on a top-down organizational structure in which capital-rich entities impose their visions for neighborhood redevelopment onto devalued communities. Although this renewal strategy may have trickle-down undertones, it almost never benefits the “original” members of the community, who are more often than not excluded from new business opportunities and priced out of their places of residence. Furthermore, its top-down organizational structure ensures that only the wealthiest and most powerful stakeholders’ opinions are considered, while others’ are ignored or stifled. Since parasitic urban regeneration occurs with little to no input from the community, the agents involved in the stages of conceptualization and production of urban art are developers, property owners, and the artists that opt to collaborate with them, rather than the citizens themselves. Parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration, as its name suggests, involves a non-mutual symbiotic relationship between the aforementioned agents of change, and the existing residents and smaller businesses. These agents of change, particularly the developers, are reminiscent of parasites in the way that they extract and exploit the existing cultural legacies of a community for their own personal or commercial gain, at the expense of the community.

In cases of parasitic urban regeneration, while urban artworks’ aesthetic value may be carefully monitored and maintained, there is little regard for maintaining a link between the artworks and the community members whose visual landscape is transformed by them. The developers and property owners that drive this form of urban regeneration are interested in the gestation of urban art primarily as a source of profit,
while the artists that collaborate with them may be simply glad to gain exposure and recognition for their art. The developers and property owners involved manipulate the cultural capital of urban art in order to extract economic capital by attracting new businesses to aestheticizing areas, or making existing businesses more aesthetically appealing. In order to turn disinvested neighborhoods into trendy ones, these developers capitalize on “the storied history, the selective nostalgia, [and] the carefully sprinkled grit” of distressed neighborhoods, eventually displacing the very residents who lived that history and made those memories.61 In these cases, urban art’s importance is reduced to its potential to add value to property or make a business more competitive.

In a parallel process, urban art is used to transform the observers of these artworks into consumers. The interconnected processes of reinvestment, social upgrading, and landscape change in communities undergoing parasitic redevelopment combine to push out residents who cannot afford increasingly amenity-rich neighborhoods. As a result of this imbalance of power and the one-dimensional obsession with extracting profit, these artworks do not become sites of intensified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>8 (38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
<td>3 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artworks in Allapattah. Although there are only 21 total urban artworks within the boundaries of the Allapattah NDZ, Allapattah has the highest percentage (38.1) of any of the EZs/NDZs.

---

community participation. Instead, in neighborhoods subjected to parasitism, urban art forms undergo a process of appropriation and hyper-commodification. Of the EZs/NDzs I studied, Wynwood and Allapattah had the largest number and percentage of parasitic urban artworks respectively. Despite the fact that Allapattah had the fewest urban artworks of any of the neighborhoods, its urban art – as shown in Table 4.2 – was disproportionately parasitic, with 38.1% of the total artworks corresponding to this category.

On the other hand, the Wynwood NDZ had the highest number (23) of parasitic urban art projects of any neighborhood, as demonstrated in Table 4.3. The overrepresentation of parasitic urban art projects in these two recently redeveloped and redeveloping neighborhoods shows a preference for rapid growth, rather than long-term, sustainable development.

Since Wynwood leads the Miami NDzs in parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration initiatives, it seems only fitting to use examples from this neighborhood to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>22 (95.7)</td>
<td>1 (4.3)</td>
<td>23 (27.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>36 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>9 (64.3)</td>
<td>5 (35.7)</td>
<td>14 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artworks in Wynwood. Of the EZs/NDzs studied, Wynwood has the most instances of parasitic urban art (23). It has almost double the number of parasitic urban artworks as the American Street EZ, which has the second-highest number (12) of parasitic urban art projects, but which only makes up only 7.5% of the total share of urban artworks. This is especially noteworthy in light of the fact that urban art has been strategically used to drive redevelopment in Philadelphia since 1984 with the establishment of the MAP, while agents of change in Wynwood have only begun to rely on arts-based urban regeneration since the mid-2000s.
unpack the parasitic category. Although there are myriad urban artworks to choose from in the Wynwood neighborhood, I was particularly intrigued by an instance of street art titled “Grateful Dead” at 3100 North Miami Avenue. The project was a collaboration between Comras commercial real estate agency and artists NovaDead and Grim Team.62

Though Grim Team identifies as a graffiti crew, the artwork in question is primarily an instance of street art with some graffiti referents.63 The picture below captures some thought-provoking aspects of parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration.

This is an instance of street art, the most commercializable urban art form, commissioned by a real estate agency as part of Art Basel 2014. The property in question is a block of retail space currently available for lease through the Comras Company. This strategic use of urban art, far from seeking to boost community health and stability,

---

62 Informed by both a visual inspection of the artwork and the official Comras Company Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/ComrasCompany. Despite the fact that social media websites are not considered reliable sources, they often fill a digital preservation gap. The speed with which urban artworks appear and disappear makes them difficult to track via traditional academic resources.

63 Informed by the official Grim Team Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/grimteam.
serves simply to make a property holding more appealing to potential customers. Additionally, it is clearly that this site of urban art is fairly heavily policed. The signage that peppers the visual landscape warns passersby that this space is for paying customers only, not for everyday use by citizens. Even in the artwork’s content, – the Comras Company commercial logo – the neoliberal prerogative is present. This perfect storm of profit-driven artistic investment and hyper-regulation of would-be public space, makes this case an example of parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration.

Another useful example of parasitism in Wynwood is the replacement of a Miami-specific graffiti agglomeration with an abstract street art display on the back wall of the Bakehouse Art Complex (BAC). In December 2011, Aurelio Roman, Jr. organized the “Miami Graffiti History 80’s” (MGH 80) project to pay homage to, and memorialize the passing of, some of Miami’s most famous graffiti writers. Roman, Jr. – a graduate of neighboring Jose de Diego middle school – “used to illegally ‘draw’ on BAC’s walls when he was attending the middle school next door” (Sperber 2011). If this graffiti display – sanctioned by the BAC – was still in existence today, it would be classified as an empowering urban art initiative, because it was organized, envisioned, and created by local artists.

![Figure 4.5](image-url) **Figure 4.5.** “Miami Graffiti History 80’s” (MGH 80) project created in December 2011 and replaced in December 2014. Image courtesy of “Records” via Miami Graffiti image sharing website.
However, in December 2014, Sprite Brazil sent Mateu Velasco, Rafael Uzai, Marcelo Ment, and Bruno Big of the Brazilian Art Developers (BAD) collective to Miami to paint the very same back wall of the BAC. In an attempt to demonstrate its cultural relevance, sponsored this abstract street art project – pictured below – during last year’s Art Basel. In the press release regarding the project, marketing manager Renata Furlanetto insisted that, “Sprite é uma marca jovem e urbana, que sempre apostou no grafite como uma expressão autêntica dessa cultura. Por isso reunimos grandes nomes do grafite brasileiro para pintarem juntos em um ambiente democrático que representa muito bem tudo que Sprite acredita.” This statement exemplifies the corporate appropriation of urban art forms characteristic of artwashing. In order to reach a younger, trendier consumer base, Sprite has parasitically attempted to associate its

---


65 Ibid.
brand with the “urban” and “authentic.” In this case, not only was urban art used as a means to an economic end, but it also obscured a locally conceived and created artwork which paid tribute to the forebears of urban art in Miami. This imbalance of power – the acquisition of symbolic and economic capital at the expense of the host community – is characteristic of the parasitic type of artistically-informed urban regeneration.

**Paternalistic artistically-informed urban regeneration**

As the name insinuates, drivers of paternalistic urban regeneration often intentionally or unintentionally hem in the autonomy of community actors in order to protect community members’ supposed best interests. These condescending practices typically spring forth, not from a desire to appropriate a place’s “storied history,” but rather from a well-intentioned, yet presumptuous, effort to assuage the sting of classist and racist historical legacies. As a result, paternalistic regeneration efforts do not simply occur in a metropolis’s most economically disinvested communities, but in those areas with the most troubled histories and, consequently, the least symbolic capital. Of the neighborhoods studied, the most fertile grounds for paternalism would be West Kensington (ASEZ), Mill Creek (WPEZ), Overtown, and Model City. Each of these neighborhoods bore witness to the interrelated phenomena of economic collapse, middle-class flight, (both white and black) and a spike in illicit activity. The combination of these factors caused the perceived safety of each of these neighborhoods to plummet, leading to a vicious cycle in which lack of economic opportunities begot crime and vice versa.
Unlike parasitic artistically-informed urban regeneration, which prioritizes profits over people, paternalistic artistically-informed urban regeneration does have a greater focus on social issues. Nonetheless, paternalistic urban regeneration represents a superficial attempt at pacification rather than the confrontation, and radical reenvisioning of, problematic power structures. Instead, this particular prong of artistically-informed urban regeneration can be conceptualized as motivated by feelings of guilt, pity, righteousness, superiority, and self-congratulation. Predicated on a conscious or subconscious mentality of supremacy, paternalistic regeneration – much like its parasitic counterpart – is organized in a top-down manner. As such, this process is paradoxically framed as for the benefit of the community while limiting community members’ possibilities for participation. Although paternalistic artistically-informed urban regeneration projects typically boast some aspect of horizontal collaboration, distribution of power remains unequal, lending to a hybrid vertical-horizontal organizational structure. In contrast to parasitic urban regeneration strategies, paternalistic expressions of artistically-informed urban regeneration can bring actual or perceived benefits to residents of disinvested communities. The most commonly cited of these benefits is a renewed sense of pride and ownership following participatory beautification efforts, making it necessary to reflect on what will become of a neighborhood after the paint dries and eventually fades.

Although paternalistic urban regeneration efforts are a welcome alternative to parasitism and subsequent displacement, they have important limitations. I assert that the most concerning outcome of this style of urban regeneration is that cosmetic modifications are touted as solutions to structural problems. Though art does have the
potential to ignite change, arts-based change needs to occur with the support of complementary initiatives. Artistically-informed urban regeneration when not anchored by broader changes, especially changes in attitudes and power dynamics, becomes an empty gesture. Whether it is a half-hearted attempt to right historical wrongs or a mere opportunity to garner positive publicity, these types of flash-in-the-pan initiatives fail to provide the long-term commitment necessary to move disinvested communities forward.

The most interesting examples of paternalistic artistically-informed urban regeneration efforts I came across in my research are the Philly Painting project in the North Central EZ of Philadelphia, and Florida International University’s (FIU) “Tree of Life” mural project in the Model City NDZ of Miami. Again, my aim is not to vilify these initiatives, – which are not only well-intentioned, but frequently supported and lauded by community members – but rather to reflect critically on why they do not provide a foundation for sustainable and equitable change.

Completed in 2012, the Philly Painting project aimed to beautify the Germantown Avenue commercial corridor, one of the boundaries of the NCEZ. Dutch artists Jeroen Koolhaas and Dre Urhahn (Haas & Hahn), famous for their Favela Painting

Figure 4.7. Small portion of “Philly Painting” project brought about by Dutch street artists Haas & Hahn and MAP in NCEZ, Philadelphia. Image courtesy of Steve Weinik, MAP Staff Photographer.
projects in Rio de Janeiro, sought to implement a similarly large-scale artistic intervention using “swatches of ‘native’ color to transcend the architecture of the individual buildings, and lend uniformity to a lively but visually incoherent stretch of Germantown Avenue.” To do so, they collaborated with both private and public actors, as well as local community members. Despite this collaborative element, this project can best be understood as a hybrid horizontal-vertical organizational structure, characteristic of paternalistic regeneration efforts. For example, although the leaders of the project made an attempt to capitalize on the strip’s “native” colors and work alongside business owners, these local business owners were asked to choose from pre-selected color swatches. That is to say, community members were only trusted to make choices from a controlled list of options determined by the outside artists, demonstrative of an imbalance of power. Additionally, this project is paternalistic because it is motivated by a sense of righteousness and self-congratulation. In every material I encountered about the project, Haas & Hahn were framed as the innovative idea men, while the rest of the collaborators were relegated to the role of crew member. Finally, this project fits the criteria of paternalism because the outcomes are superficial fixes rather than structural solutions from within. In the less than three years since the project’s completion, the paint has already begun to fade, underscoring the fact that a fresh coat of paint alone cannot revitalize a neighborhood, no matter how much pride it initially inspires.

Similarly, FIU’s “Tree of Life” mural is an example of paternalistic artistically-informed urban regeneration. First, the rhetoric surrounding the project reveals an underlying logic of pity and a sense of superiority. In an FIU News article, Karen Cochrane paints a picture of a woe-begotten community – Model City – being pulled out of a decades-long slump by a team of bright, magnanimous college students. The discourse regarding this project is not one that paves the way for allyhood and empowerment, it is more akin to the dynamics of power between helpless victim and savior.

Certainly, Model City is a living testament to the long-term consequences of racism and segregation in U.S. society. Nonetheless, the residents are in no way dependent on outside actors to make their visions a reality, as evidenced, for example, by the success of the beautification efforts of the Miami Children’s Initiative (MCI). The second aspect that consigns this project to the category of paternalism is its
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68 Recall historical background from figure 3.6 or consult Mohl 1995 for more information.
69 See MCI’s website for more information: http://www.miamichildrensinitiative.org/mcisignaturesolutions_otherinitiatives.shtml
organizational structure; in spite of the participatory nature of the mural-making process, final decision-making power ultimately rested in the hands of the outside do-gooders. This lopsided power dynamic could be seen in the following anecdote – regarding the process of deciding the subject matter for the new mural – recounted by Nikita Ivory of the Liberty City Trust: “‘At first they wanted heroes. You know, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Jr. Let’s be honest…we already have lots of those murals. Jacek said, ‘Let’s do something different.’ And one of the kids said, ‘How about a tree?’ Jacek just took the idea and ran with it” (Cochrane 2013). It is not so much a question of the community’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the outcome, but rather the power dynamics at play in the imposition or importation of an outside vision. This phenomenon is in line with the concept of “democratic deficit.” Within this framework of new urban development, being invited to the decision-making table does not protect against the cooptation of alternative viewpoints by dominant actors. Finally, despite all of the feel-good self-congratulation, this project does not represent a movement toward sustainable change. It achieved the superficial goal of beautifying one wall in a disinvested neighborhood lacking in “landmarks and points of visual beauty,” but did not result in any outcomes that could lay the groundwork for equitable and sustainable economic and symbolic reinvestment (Cochrane 2013).

**Empowering artistically-informed urban regeneration**

Lastly, the “empowering” model of artistically-informed urban regeneration refers to redevelopment that is inclusive and self-sustaining. This type of regeneration is fleshed
out from within the disinvested communities themselves, with the priorities of the various members of those communities in mind. Much like the paternalistic mode of artistically-informed urban regeneration, empowering forms of urban regeneration are concentrated in the neighborhoods most deficient in symbolic and economic capital. It is from within this climate of weariness and frustration that a desire for profound structural change and self-determination surges forth. Unlike the other two models of artistically-informed urban regeneration, the empowering model is horizontal in organization, for better or for worse. Of course, the empowering model represents a much more democratic approach to urban redevelopment than the other two models. The downside, however, is that democracy is less efficient, since more perspectives need to be taken into consideration. The primary outcome of this type of urban regeneration effort is the broadening and deepening of participation, which, as I have already acknowledged, can come with a new set of obstacles, especially in the form of stalemates. Nonetheless, this form of artistically-informed urban regeneration is the most sustainable and equitable. It is these initiatives that tackle the most conceptually ambitious projects. For example, some of the Village of Arts and Humanities and APM’s artistic endeavors represent ongoing collaborative arts-based projects that entrust residents with the reimagining of their communities and engage them in acts of vernacular creativity.70

As stated in the introduction of this chapter, these sites of empowering vernacular creativity were overwhelmingly located in open spaces (O) repurposed as community
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70 Sociologist Tim Edensor argues that “notions of a creative class construct restrictions around who, what and where is considered ‘creative,’” and that “an understanding of vernacular and everyday landscapes of creativity honours the non-economic values and outcomes produced by alternative, marginal and quotidian creative practices, and has the potential to move us toward more holistic, diverse and socially inclusive creative city strategies” (2010: 1).
gardens and outdoor gathering spaces. As evidenced in table 4.11, almost seventy percent of the empowering manifestations of urban art I encountered occurred at sites categorized as open spaces.

**Table 4.11**, Linkages between land use and distribution of urban art (all neighborhoods)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Number of empowering initiatives</th>
<th>Percentage of empowering initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (R)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (I)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (C)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (P)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open (O)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (T)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is not to say, however, that open spaces necessarily beget empowering arts-led urban regeneration efforts. For instance, although Las Parcelas and Mill Creek
Community Garden in the Philadelphia EZs are both committed to food justice and inclusive community practices, David Lombardi’s “Magic Garden” on NW 29th Street in the Wynwood NDZ of Miami represents a case of exclusionary green space. Lombardi, one of the pioneers of the artwashing explosion in Wynwood, has simultaneously started to cash in on the symbolic capital of community gardening by renting out the “Magic Garden,” “a property…where he grows herbs, lettuce and has a gourmet food truck in collaboration with chef Buddy Devingo” (Danseyar 2014). Lombardi, not unlike developers worldwide driven by the market-oriented logics of neoliberal urbanism, has strategically appropriated urban art and “green” signifiers to make the process of gentrification less visible and more palatable.71

The Village and APM, however, stand out as cases in which urban art, environmental sustainability, innovative land use, and community building have been creatively blended without neoliberal objectives in mind. Although the Village is primarily an arts initiative and APM is mainly concerned with social services, both initiatives provide a wide array of services and a holistic approach to neighborhood well-being. Not only do these organizations create public works of art with the participation of local community members, but they weave them into the fabric of the community. For example, the APM not only engaged the West Kensington community in the creation of a mural at 6th and Diamond streets, but turned the site into an outdoor theater and gathering space. Similarly, the Village is known for its green gathering spaces that community members regularly descend upon for outdoor concerts, communal meals, and festivals.

71 Urban geographers Daniel Clement and Miguel Kanai (2015) have written more extensively about the manner in which greenwashing obscures racialized spatial injustices, focusing on the displacement of Detroit’s black residents to make way for innovative green spaces.
These initiatives focus on the unique strengths of their community members, rather than the limitations that generations of social inequality have brought, adding to the sentiment of self-determination.

This self-determination as well as the horizontal organizational structure characteristic of empowering artistically-informed urban regeneration are evident, for instance, in the Village’s mission statement. The organization’s philosophy is to “[transform] the experiences of the community into works of high artistic quality… [beginning] with a base of community involvement, which is explored and elicited as widely as possible.”

Unlike the paternalistic or parasitic initiatives, within these empowering models of artistically-informed urban regeneration there are more opportunities not just to contribute labor, but also ideas. Compared to their parasitic and paternalistic models of regeneration, the Village has placed a strong emphasis on community involvement and decision-making, which has led to a more authentic and meaningful process of urban regeneration.

Figure 5.1, Residents of the former NCEZ gather in the Meditation Garden of The Village of Arts and Humanities for October 2014’s “Drumming for Social Change” event, the closing night of the Amber Art & Design collective’s “The Village Table” project. During their residency, Amber Art’s members collected recipes from community members to fuel a series of healthy, culturally appropriate, and communal four-course dinners in the Village’s various outdoor art spaces. Image and information courtesy of Schwartz 2014.

---


73 Although community members may be formally included in the decision-making process of paternalistic or parasitic regeneration efforts, community members are more likely to have their ideas brushed aside or coopted. This is intimately tied to the technocratization of urban decision-making in which there is less transparency and accountability.
counterparts, these empowering arts-based urban regeneration initiatives are constantly adapting. Both organizations have demonstrated their long-term commitment to the communities by constantly broadening and deepening opportunities for participation, making art accessible to people of all walks of life. Throughout their decades of operation in North Philadelphia, APM and the Village have fused art with food, gardening, dance, music, and theater, to reach the widest audience possible.

These ever-evolving initiatives, born out of community collaboration and strengthened by a commitment to vernacular creativity, represent the nearest approximations to empowerment. In these rare cases – more often than not anchored by open spaces – there are low barriers to participation, providing urban dwellers the unique opportunity to be citizens rather than consumers. Of course, these programs are not perfectly horizontal in their organizational structures; the greatest shares of power continue to rest at the top of the pyramid with each organization’s directors and

Figure 5.2. “Art Factory” participants gathered at Las Parcelas, a space brought about by members of the APM, Grupo Motivos, Norris Square Neighborhood Project, and Philadelphia Horticultural Society. “Art Factory” is a program in which young people ages 14-20 hone their graphic design, dance, performance art, poetry, animation, drawing and audiovisual skills, while also gaining valuable information “about the administrative and entrepreneurial side of the arts” that can pave the way to a successful career. Image and information courtesy of Norris Square Neighborhood Project website: http://www.myneighborhoodproject.org/site/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=60&Itemid=66&lang=en
visionaries. Nonetheless, power is most evenly shared among agents within the empowering framework of urban regeneration. Additionally, the privilege of decision-making rests almost exclusively with those with long-term commitments to the community, instead of with outside developers or intruding do-gooders. It is important to note, however, the incursion of the neoliberal prerogative into this otherwise empowering utopia via strings-attached grant money that helps finance community arts programs like the aforementioned. Most importantly, these projects yearn for more than economic stability or surface-level community pride; truly empowering initiatives aim for the most holistic, intersectional answer to community well-being possible.

Of the three approaches to artistically-informed urban regeneration outlined here, the “empowering” model is certainly the most apt to ignite sustainable and equitable change. Nonetheless, I do not wish to suggest that the empowering model is without limitations, or that the other models do not have any redeeming qualities. This typology merely lays bare the motivations for, as well as organizational structures and outcomes of, different arts-based development strategies. It is with these distinctions in mind we can better reflect on the unequal distribution of wealth and power in cities.
Chapter 6

The ‘hood: just as good going as it was coming?

Neighborhoods are in constant flux, which is why assertions of “there goes the neighborhood” and “here comes the neighborhood” perennially abound. In recent years, arts-based urban regeneration strategies have become one of the primary vehicles of the perpetual expansion and resettling of the urban frontier. Although urban art has been a prominent feature of U.S. cities since at least the late 1960s, the recent global street art boom has transformed the relationship between art and power in cities. Dovetailing the globalization of gentrification and the privatization of public space, artwashing has become a disconcerting form of community revitalization. While artwashing – a subcategory of aestheticization – has so far been used almost exclusively to refer to the process by which austere industrial buildings are glamorized in order to attract a hip, creative class, it can also be used to understand the connections between urban art forms and redevelopment. Despite the growing reach of artwashing, the process by which the symbolic capital of urban aesthetics – in this case, urban art forms – is exploited because of its potential to add value to property, there have been hardly any scholarly treatments of the subject. As a preliminary attempt to bridge the gap between current urban realities and existing scholarship, this research project looks at both broad patterns of, and specific instances of, artistically-informed urban regeneration efforts.

Based on a systematic analysis of the form, content, and location of urban artworks located in Philadelphia’s EZs and Miami’s EZs/NDZs, I was able to discern intriguing patterns related to the intersections of aesthetics and power. Pinpointing some of Miami and Philadelphia’s most distressed neighborhoods based on their designations
as EZs and/or NDZs, I analyzed approximately five hundred instances of street art, graffiti, and murals. The quantity and density of urban art within even these small unit areas highlights the prevalence of arts-based urban renewal strategies. Although this study began as an attempt to showcase the irreconcilably different approaches to arts-based community redevelopment in Philadelphia and Miami, I discovered that the cities had more in common than I initially realized. Unfortunately, one of the things that unites these two cities is their similarly worrisome record on social inequality. For example, both cities have some of the highest rates of racial and ethnic segregation in the country, as well as some of the lowest rates of labor force participation and educational attainment. In both of these cities the intersections of class, race, and ethnicity make a critical analysis of urban redevelopment priorities especially imperative.

Upon analyzing the data and exploring specific initiatives in greater depth, I began to discern a tripartite typology. Based on the recurring patterns I observed, I established three general classifications of artistically-informed urban regeneration that could be used to explain the disparities in the results of these arts-based redevelopment projects. Each of these categories – parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering – has a distinct set of involved agents, motivators, organizational structures, and outcomes. The parasitic mode of redevelopment is motivated by a desire to extract maximum economic and symbolic capital from a neighborhood, typically at the expense of the “host” community. These redevelopment efforts are characterized by the imposition of a top-down organizational structure, and result in the appropriation and hyper-commodification of urban art forms. Of the neighborhoods studied, the Wynwood NDZ in Miami has the highest number and percentage of parasitic urban art projects. This statistic is especially
alarming considering that this most recent chapter in Wynwood’s development history only began in the late 2000s.

Alternatively, in the paternalistic model of artistically-informed urban regeneration, subconscious feelings of superiority, pity, guilt, and self-congratulation undergird the initiatives. These paternalistic redevelopment efforts have elements of horizontal collaboration, but in many ways remain vertical in power structure. These efforts can be conceptualized as Band-Aids on an open wound. Though the inclination to help address social issues is present, the solutions offered are fleeting and/or superficial, and thus unable to lay the foundation for sustainable and equitable change. This model would most closely fit the cases of the Philly Painting project and FIU’s “Tree of Life” mural project.

Finally, the empowering form of artistically-informed urban regeneration refers to those initiatives borne out of self-determination from within the distressed communities themselves. These artistically-informed urban regeneration efforts are horizontal in organization, allowing for a broadening and deepening of civic participation to occur. Although this is certainly the most sustainable and equitable option for arts-based redevelopment, it is not without its limitations, as empowering change can be slow, frustrating, and almost imperceptible.

This tripartite typology is useful because it explicitly names that which has previously only been tacitly understood. Nonetheless, this classification merely scratches the surface of all of the useful information there is to be gleaned from evaluating urban art forms. With artistically-informed urban regeneration strategies on the rise, more attention must be paid to cataloging and systematically analyzing urban art forms.
Whether it is a tag signaling abandonment and imminent decay or street art heralding a new, posh chapter in a neighborhood’s life, urban artworks are often the first signs of neighborhood change. As a result, it is fundamentally important to keep a close eye on the changes in the urban art landscape.
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### Appendix

Table 7.1, Numbers and percentages of urban artworks encountered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street art (%)</th>
<th>Mural (%)</th>
<th>Graffiti (%)</th>
<th>Total by neighborhood (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Street</td>
<td>11 (6.9)</td>
<td>89 (56.0)</td>
<td>59 (37.1)</td>
<td>159 (32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>49 (66.2)</td>
<td>25 (33.8)</td>
<td>74 (15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Philadelphia</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>38 (76.0)</td>
<td>12 (24.0)</td>
<td>50 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allapattah</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>14 (66.7)</td>
<td>7 (33.3)</td>
<td>21 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Little Havana</td>
<td>7 (15.9)</td>
<td>18 (40.9)</td>
<td>19 (43.2)</td>
<td>44 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model City</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>19 (63.3)</td>
<td>11 (36.7)</td>
<td>30 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtown</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>14 (53.8)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td>26 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynwood</td>
<td>69 (82.1)</td>
<td>6 (7.1)</td>
<td>9 (10.7)</td>
<td>84 (17.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by form</strong></td>
<td><strong>88 (18.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>247 (50.6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>153 (31.4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in ASEZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td><strong>12 (7.5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td><strong>23 (14.5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td><strong>16 (10.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>2 (4.2)</td>
<td>46 (95.8)</td>
<td><strong>48 (30.2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td><strong>60 (37.7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood total</td>
<td><strong>11 (6.9)</strong></td>
<td><strong>89 (56.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in NCEZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
<td><strong>3 (4.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>19 (100)</td>
<td><strong>19 (25.7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td><strong>11 (14.9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td><strong>15 (20.3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td><strong>26 (35.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood total</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in WPEZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>14 (27.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (35.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
<td>24 (47.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>12 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.5, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in Allapattah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>8 (38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
<td>3 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.6, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in East Little Havana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
<td>3 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>1 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>5 (27.8)</td>
<td>13 (72.2)</td>
<td>18 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
<td>21 (47.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in Model City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>12 (100)</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.8, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in Overtown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (100)</td>
<td>4 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
<td>5 (19.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>1 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (75.0)</td>
<td>4 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.9, Parasitic, paternalistic, and empowering urban artwork in Wynwood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street art</th>
<th>Mural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>22 (95.7)</td>
<td>1 (4.3)</td>
<td>23 (27.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>36 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>9 (64.3)</td>
<td>5 (35.7)</td>
<td>14 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>