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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Spaces of Possibility: Cultural Planning, Racial Formation and Resistance in Santa Ana, California

By

Carolina S. Sarmiento

PhD in Planning, Policy and Design

University of California, Irvine, 2014

Professor Rodolfo Torres, Co-Chair

Professor Victoria A. Beard, Co-Chair

It is within the everyday political and economic context that we can understand the structural limits of cultural development while also recognizing the power and resistance of low-income communities of color. This dissertation explores the possibilities for urban planners to develop cultural spaces that can help address questions of inequality and uneven development. This ethnography deepens our understanding of how low income communities of color shape and articulate their experiences in the creative city. I posed the following three questions: 1) How cultural and artist practices take shape within low income communities of color that live and work in creative cities and how in turn, communities of color shape these practices? 2) How creative development processes integrate low income communities of color at the everyday level and more specifically, impact their access to a) valuable property b) political influence and c) cultural spaces? And 3) how low income communities of color participate, resist and transform the process of cultural development?
This ethnography includes in-depth interviews and participant observation to understand the complexities and nuances behind cultural development in low income communities of color. I interviewed residents, businessmen, private urban planners, property owners and developers and conducted hundreds of hours of participant observation in city council meetings, planning meetings, community actions and cultural spaces. I use data from government sources, such as the city charter, city budgets, general and specific plans and permits, to understand the historic role of the state in regulating these spaces and the people who work within them. The findings contradict market based assumptions around the survival of certain cultural spaces and introduce significant tactics of actors involved in cultural production. Community members involved in the development of cultural spaces have the possibility of restructuring relationships to develop everyday solidarities and address the uneven forms of integration that currently exist. However, these tactics of resistance and solidarity can be interdependent with strategies of displacement. Furthermore, these relationships take place at different scales that extend beyond the local and extend into regional and transnational realities.
Chapter 1:

**Introduction**

Art and culture are important features of community life that have intrinsic values and instrumental roles with associated benefits (McCarthy et al 2004). Intrinsic values include benefits that “enrich people’s lives” such as an expanded capacity for communal meaning, captivation, pleasure, cognitive growth and empathy (McCarthy et al 2004). Urban planning efforts have largely pushed for the instrumental role of the arts and culture in providing economic and community benefits through “culture-lead development” or “cultural development” (Landry 2000; Florida 2003; 2005; 2008). Benefits, both intrinsic and instrumental, accrue unevenly to individuals and the public (McCarthy et al 2004). Many cultural planning attempts 1) fail to include working class communities in planning and cultural spaces (Cameron & Coaffee, 2005; Sharp, Pollock, & Paddison, 2005; Miles, 2005; Porter, 2007; Lees, 2003; Rodriguez et al 2003); 2) foster uneven development (Vicario & Monje, 2003; Zukin 1989; 1995; Smith 1996; Lees 2000) and 3) threaten and displace low income communities of color (Rosentein, 2011).

Furthermore, certain rights associated with cultural spaces have a much harder time surviving. Previous urban planning research has documented the significance of cultural spaces in fostering a collective and critical memory, collective action, and public cultures (Harvey 2000; Zukin 1995; Giroux & Trend, 1992; Mitchell D. , 2000; Low 2000; Baker 1994; Soja 1989; Kohn, 2003). Although there are many cases in which the city government intervenes to protect cultural spaces, research has demonstrated the inadequacy of the market in satisfying cultural, economic, and democratic rights (Molnar
1996; Purcell 2008) and the systematic destruction of public democratic spaces (Davis 1990; Caldeira 2000; Banerjee 2001).

Communities are not powerless victims to these losses. Even in the most extreme of circumstances, the soul of these communities can persist (Bollens, 2012). There are many cases where communities organize to create, control and defend existing cultural spaces (Hartman, Keating, & Richard, 1982). The task for planners is thus to pull together cultural planning alternatives that are rooted in the present opportunities but at the same time point toward new cultural spaces that foster ‘the possibility of alternatives’ (De Sousa Santos, 2005; De Sousa Santos, 2006).

This dissertation explores the possibilities for urban planners to develop cultural spaces that can help address questions of inequality and uneven development. I define cultural spaces as physical places where people come together to produce what they consider culture and art through relations that extend beyond the physical place. Gramsci and Lefebvre have helped us understand urban culture as a field to contest inequalities and alienation and thus, a space of possibilities. There is an important distinction between possibilities and opportunities. According to David Harvey (2003: 939), the “right to the city is not merely a right of access to what already exists, but a right to change it after our heart’s desire.” This distinction marks the difference: possibilities refer to the hope and power necessary to build and create those alternative urban worlds, and not simply the opportunities to what already exist. Although there are different “heart’s desires” in every
community, the question remains what power community members hold both at the individual and collective level to make those desires' a reality.

This dissertation examines the on-the-ground actors who come together to develop and maintain cultural spaces in order to better understand the power low income communities of color have to shape and articulate their experience in the creative city. More specifically, these everyday actors include the property owner, business owner, and the different workers who come together to produce and maintain the space. This dissertation is based on the assumption that individuals’ 1) access to cultural resources 2) access to property and 3) political influence and decision making power help shape the possibilities of lower income peoples of color to shape their Rights to the City.

My working premise is that while labor and capital reorganize spatially at a global scale, creating transnational solidarities and socio-spatial relations that overlap global and local conditions, local actors including municipal governments, developers, organizations, residents, artists, etc. also organize to shape their conditions at the local and transnational scale. Actors who come together in cultural spaces develop relationships, collective identities and cultural practices that are tied to interests in land, property, the local market and other material and cultural resources. Like capital interests, working class²

¹ Not all desires promote democratic ideals or represent equitable values. Please see more on the local trap (Purcell, 2006) and Mike Davis (1992) on fortress cities on how communities of elites can also organize around their own “heart’s desires.”
² I use working class interchangeably with low income to include students, low income artists, workers and others that are low income. The Marxist view is that the working class is everyone who does not own the means of production. Some refinements separate out the professional classes, the petite bourgeoisie (like small shop owners), students, and the so-called “lumpen proletariat” of Marx. Despite this important literature, the aim of this research was not defining the working class per se. At the same time, I considered it important to use class to note its implications of class in this work but not to contribute to this expansive literature that debates the boundaries of the definition of the term.
communities create cultural spaces where they build solidarities that help defend their material and symbolic interests. At the same time, the conditions necessary to develop these politics interrelate with the politics of development that are already in place. Cultural development works in a contested landscape that refers to the shifting alliances of property owners, the city, business owners, residents, workers and artists. Individuals can fit more than one category. Unlike the strict binary between factory owner and worker3, the contested landscape contains many interrelated and shifting relationships between actors. Urban planning and policy play an important role in contested cities, which in turn have a magnitude of impact (Bollens, 1998) on the community and these everyday relationships.

This research uses an “everyday framework” and emphasizes the interdependent relationships that exist within many of the cultural spaces. Combining theories of production of culture, politics of space and racial formation helps us examine the everyday relationships, conventions, habits, and practices around cultural planning and development. Theories of cultural production allow us to include the relationships and conventions that come together to learn and make art and culture in these spaces. These relationships go beyond the artist as the sole creator. Similarly, different actors form relationships within the space that extend beyond the physical building itself. This includes relations of solidarity as well as relations of domination and oppression.

Instead of moving “beyond” or “past” race, this research examines cultural spaces as racialized projects where the meaning of race takes different shapes. Racial formation is a process that takes place in a specific time and place and is constantly challenged by

---

3 In Rick Ed ward’s book, Contested Terrain (Edwards, 1979) he examines worker versus owners/capitalists strategies in the production sphere.
political struggle. Processes of racial formation are central to cultural planning strategies in low income communities of color. My theory is that actors involved in the establishment of cultural spaces in low income communities of color not only help shape what it means to be Mexican in the creative city, but distinguish between the different experiences of Mexican, documented, first and second generation, etc. At the same time, this opens the possibility for these same actors to rearticulate what it means to be Mexican, undocumented, etc. in the city and develop different solidarities via the development of cultural spaces. I examine the everyday practices, tactics and strategies that help create and extinguish possibilities.

Instead of integration and participation, I propose a theory of transformational relationships of solidarity. In order to examine the everyday relations and practices of cultural development, I conducted an ethnography that took place from 2008 to 2013 in Downtown Santa Ana, California a battleground of gentrification, immigrant rights and the development of cultural and art districts. The research focuses on Downtown Santa Ana, a historic downtown where Mexican businesses are currently facing gentrification. Gentrifying forces are made up of a combination of private and public entities including private developers, banks, the city government, new and some existing businesses and incoming residents and consumers as well as some existing residents. Areas in Downtown Santa Ana include the Civic Center, Artist Village and Fiesta Marketplace, all of which are home to a variety of galleries, community centers, restaurants, bridal shops, and bars where people come together. In order to further understand how low income communities of color shape and articulate their experience the creative city, I observed and interviewed the
individuals who worked in different types of cultural space and were involved in the
everyday happenings.

In order to compare my findings in Santa Ana, Oakland, California serves as a
lesser case study. Oakland presents us with a creative proposal in a different political and
demographic setting. West Oakland is home to a history of black cultural movements that
has also received some recent public and private reinvestment in the arts and culture. The
investment in the area of study came through private developers investing in urban
development but partnering with community organizers to create a black cultural district.
Funding has also come through grants to nonprofits in the area in order to support the
development of grassroots community development projects. Although the West Oakland
case study is largely under examined in comparison to the ethnography in Santa Ana, it
serves as a tool of social imagination (Mills, 1959) that helps us understand how different
struggles in communities of color relate to one another. Both low income communities of
color represent the cross current of actors and interests that shape the political economy of
cultural planning.

**Problem and Significance**

This research shifts cultural planning research in three ways. First, the research moves
beyond professional elite artists and complicates the established categories of artist and
worker. It focuses on the relationships among a range of local actors who come together in
the development of cultural spaces in low income communities of color at the everyday
level. Actors cross categories between workers, business owners, immigrant, artists,
property owner etc. Studying community development in a community of color requires
incorporating a racial formation lens into the analysis. This includes understanding how the meaning of race changes and how actors use and understand concepts of diversity, multiculturalism, art and culture as part of larger strategies and tactics of cultural development.

Second, this research challenges the use of “marginalization” to describe low income communities of color who are exploited and alienated in their working and living conditions. Most of the work that incorporates working class communities often focuses on either forms of community development (Alvarez, 2005; Goldbard, 2006) or exclusion. Instead this work considers the existing forms of integration, including the significant role of working class communities in the division of labor in the creative city. Workers in these spaces, no matter if they are artists, organizers, or janitors, are in some way “integrated” in the production of cultural products, the production of these spaces and the relationships within them. For example, Valle and Torres (2000) use the Mexican restaurant case to illustrate how immigrant labor in Los Angeles sustains the “creative class” and these significant economic and cultural spaces. Workers provide different forms of support and take part in a division of labor that is bifurcated on color and class lines.

Third, this research considers socio-spatial relations and strategies, including scale and networks, in addition to place, to understand the different relations of cultural production and the governing alliances that shape the economic and political landscape. Progressive planning research demonstrates how the grassroots organize alliances to defend low income interests against progrowth coalitions and influence local politics (Mollenkopf J. H.,

---

1 Integration does not necessarily imply equal economic or political relations. Integration can refer to often exploitative relationships and conditions from which capital interests can profit. For a critique on “integration” models see Friedmann 2002.
The Contested City, 1983; Logan & Molotch, 1987; Mollenkopf J. , 1981). Community actors not only organize locally, but also use networks, scales and places that transcend nation-state boundaries to strategically manage access to property, territory and to advance certain symbolic, political and material interests (Sarmiento & Beard, 2013; Born & Purcell, 2006). This approach focuses on the interdependencies and interrelationships among institutions, governing coalitions and alliances that can result in the uneven distribution of economic, organizational, and cultural resources at different scales.

**Methodology**

In order to help state and community based planners develop and sustain cultural spaces that can address questions of inequality, this ethnography deepens our understanding of how low income communities of color shape and articulate what it means to experience the creative city. I argue that the everyday relationships between property owners, business men and women, residents, those individuals who come together everyday in the space help determine the cultural development of the larger community and city. I posed the following three questions to delve deeper into the everyday practices within each space and the larger cultural development of the area.

1) **How cultural and artist practices take shape within low income communities of color that live and work in creative cities and how in turn, communities of color shape these practices?**

2) **How creative development processes integrate low income communities of color at the everyday level and more specifically, impact their a) access to valuable property b) access to political influence and c) access to cultural spaces?**
3) **How low income communities of color participate, resist and transform the process of cultural development?**

I theorized that 1) cultural production includes learning art and cultural practices that become an important part of the experience of low income communities of color but also a way to understand how individuals articulate their own place in society; 2) cultural development impacts the access of low income communities to both public and private property, creating an opportunity and a barrier to the development of cultural spaces that represent the interests of low income communities of color; and 3) everyday relationships within and between actors in different cultural spaces shift and transform often, making tactics and strategies of resistance and displacement interdependent with one another.

**It is within the everyday political and economic context of the development of these spaces that we can understand the structural limits of cultural development while also recognizing the power and resistance of low-income communities of color who are not passive victims to these changes. This ethnography includes in-depth interviews and participant observation to understand the complexities and nuances behind cultural development. Respondents represent distinct, opposing, and often overlapping roles. I interviewed residents, businessmen, private urban planners, property owners and developers and conducted hundreds of hours of participant observation in city council meetings, planning meetings, community actions and cultural spaces. I use data from government sources, such as the city charter, city budgets, general and specific plans and permits, to understand the historic role of the state in regulating these spaces and the people who work within them.**


Structure of Dissertation

The dissertation is broken down into eight chapters that present my conceptual framework, methodology and findings. The first four chapters, including this introduction, provide the theoretical and contextual foundation of the research. In order to study cultural spaces in communities of color, I combine theories of cultural production, the politics of space and racial formation theory. The production of culture perspective introduces important concepts that include conventions, everyday relations, and ultimately, ideology. I use racial formation theory as a way to understand cultural spaces as racialized projects. This combined framework helps us understand the production of cultural spaces as racialized projects that help shape what it means to be Mexican, black, immigrant, etc in the city.

Chapter Three presents the methodology and explains the “extended case method” (Burawoy, et al., 1991) as a strategy to “reconstruct” and improve existing theories. Chapter Four presents the socio-historic context of the case studies and begins to formulate how low income communities’ access to property historically shapes the cultural landscape of the city. It focuses on Santa Ana as the primary case study and illustrates the ever-present history of displacement, loss and removal. Through forms of regulation that include the destruction of immigrant enclaves in downtown Santa Ana and the current Homeland Security policy that partners law enforcement with Immigration Control and Enforcement, communities of color in Santa Ana have historically been pushed out and removed from certain areas.

Today in Santa Ana, property owners, businessmen and women and city officials solidify their interests by creating alliances to push a specific cultural and economic vision of development. In order to make this vision a reality, they form a Property Business
Improvement District (PBID) that can then regulate the reinvestment and development of cultural spaces, and the types of cultural production within each space. The formation of this new entity represents the economic, political and legal support that comes together to push a certain vision with better and worse outcomes for the City of Santa Ana.

The City of Santa Ana changes its regulation in accordance to certain visions of cultural development and supports these changes through legal reforms, changes in the charter, funding and permit processes. The research shows that alliances between developers and the state can create barriers to political participation in the planning process and access to cultural spaces and property. These barriers to political participation and unequal political influence also impact the ability of certain cultural spaces to survive. Political participation, funding and permits are examples of city support for certain visions for the city that come together in the development of certain cultural spaces and the destruction of others.

The following three chapters, Chapters Five through Chapter Seven present the findings and conclusions of the dissertation. Using both cultural production and racial formation theory to examine the conventions of cultural production and present cultural spaces as racial projects, Chapter Five explores the character of immigrant working class experiences in the creative city at the everyday level. As stated by previous research, working relations and division of labor within each cultural space reflect the larger economic restructuring of the city. The economic, cultural and political place of working class communities in the creative economy depends on their race and ethnicity (e.g. language) in addition to education and skills. Differences between being first and second generation immigrants also impact individual’s mobility, access and solidarities. The
production of culture in each space through conventions and everyday experiences overlaps with state and local policy as well. Where and how individuals learn art and cultural practices become important places and practices to experience economic and racial inequality often perpetrated by policies around youth, culture and immigration. The opportunity to practice, develop and teach art and cultural skills on one’s own terms can become an unconventional practice that has its own challenges and risks.

As we study everyday practices and conventions of workers in the production of culture, Chapter Six examines the different actors that come together in the development of cultural spaces and how they “incorporate” the existing community of color. These actors include property owners who form part of a property business improvement district (PBID) and exhibit practices around “diversity” and “difference” that help politically build these new cultural spaces and discourses of social mixing. Alliances develop strategies that 1) help reteach the past, the present and the future 2) change the formal and legal forms of regulation of cultural production and 3) normalize the forms of displacement as part of a hegemonic discourse around the market and progress. The strategies help property owners and business owners transform the development process and gain access to property and investment.

Chapter Seven delves deeper into these strategic alliances and focuses on community-based responses and alternatives to these processes. Chapter Seven uses the concepts of tactics and strategies to distinguish between the often oppositional but interdependent relations of people with power and those without power. Community responses and tactics of resistance include attempts to adapt and align themselves to the changes, create alternative funding sources, and build political power. Alliances form to
break down social and physical barriers to certain land and property through organized political action. The state plays an important role in regulating these alliances and development processes. However, the state does not work in a neutral capacity, but rather can take sides and forms part of certain groups and strategies. Certain cultural spaces struggle to keep up with the new economic, cultural and political vision pushed by alliances that have more political and economic power. Rather than overt working class consciousness, however, everyday cultures of solidarity help push these alliances forward. These solidarities and grassroots tactics are not isolated but rather can often overlap with strategies of displacement and gentrification. This complicates the divisions between actors and alliances.

Chapter Eight reviews some of the dissertation’s major findings regarding cultural development as a project of racial formation and resistance in low income communities of color. Focusing on Santa Ana and using comparative data on West Oakland, I identify how both working communities and developers activate socio-spatial strategies and tactics such as scale, time and place. In the West Oakland case, the development of an artist district in conjunction with the revival of cultural spaces centered in the black community represents overlapping alliances between community and developers that were not evident in Santa Ana. At the same time, while developers invest in a cultural space for the local black community, other cultural spaces must fend for themselves to represent local cultural movements based and everyday needs of the surrounding neighborhoods. The case study gives us important insights on the rate and timing of investment on the periphery of the creative city. These cases, one ethnography and a lesser case study, provide some social imagination to this research and help us understand how these struggles relate to one
another. On one hand, these cultural developments represent people of color’s collective history and struggle to build lasting cultural institutions. On the other hand, they represent the economic, political future of existing low income communities of color and their Right to the City.

This empirical and theoretical work contributes to cultural and community based planning. Planners, both state and community based, have a role in shaping where and how these cultural spaces develop and nurturing their contributions that go beyond the economic. The struggles for justice and struggles for Rights to the City in low income communities of color intersect in cultural spaces. Furthermore, urban planners need to develop a racial lens to understand development as a racialized project and cultural spaces as places where individuals learn conventions of inequality, race relations and the division of labor. At the same time, they are also spaces where working class community can reclaim their own identity and re-make what it means. Relationships between property owners, workers, artists, business men and women and the residents determine the role each cultural space will play in the cultural development of the larger community and city.

Understanding strategies and tactics helps us go beyond individual forms of agency and understand the collective economic and political power of alliances and solidarities. Strategies and tactics serve to negotiate distinct relations to the state and other institutions. Place, networks, territory, and scale are examples of such socio-spatial strategies that are used by both capital and working class communities in defending their own interests. These tactics and strategies can also make drawing lines between alliances sometimes a blurry and difficult task. These interdependent alliances complicate the relationships between important planning concepts like diversity and inequality; collaboration and
cooptation; integration and exploitation; opportunity and possibility. The role of the urban planner is to help differentiate between these concepts in both theory and practice.
Chapter 2:

A Framework for Investigating Cultural Planning in Low Income Communities of Color as Spaces of Possibility

Cultural planning has many different definitions around the world and depending on different sectors (Curson, Evans, Foord, & Shaw, 2007). Planners and policy-makers consider cultural planning in terms of arts and cultural amenities facilities, strategic processes for arts participation, visions for economic development, community benefits, cultural rights, as well as in terms of the culture of planning itself (Evans 2001). Most recently, cities have focused much of their cultural planning efforts on “creative city” policies. These types of policies promote “culture-led development” and a city’s “cultural” and creative characteristics to develop local economies and revitalization efforts (Landry 2000; Florida 2003, 2005, 2008; Bianchini, Fisher, Montgomery, & Worpole, 1988). This chapter reviews some of the contributions, concerns, and tensions around cultural planning and creative city efforts, and presents an alternative framework to investigate the experiences of low-income communities of color in the creative city. The goal is to identify how low income communities of color shape cultural development in the face of creative development, globalization, capital mobility, and neoliberal policies. Rather than focusing on the seemingly inexorable direction of global capital, this research examines the development of spaces of possibilities where the economic and ideological effects of these shifts do not make communities powerless.

This section of the dissertation serves as a theoretical overview and points to some of the “reconstruction” (Burawoy, et al., 1991) of cultural development and creative city theories necessary to better understand cultural planning in low income communities of
color and the possibility of planning more equitable cultural projects in the context of globalization. Through this analysis we can see gaps in the literature that leave us with important questions about 1) the role, experience and power of low income communities of color in the development of cultural spaces, 2) the relationship between cultural development to processes of racial formation and inequality and 3) the possibilities of creative pro-working and pro-immigrant cultural planning initiatives. Furthermore, using theories of cultural production, the politics of space and racial formation help fill in some of those gaps and provide the necessary everyday framework to explore the possibilities that might exist for more equitable cultural planning.

**Cultural Planning, Economic Restructuring and Capital Mobility**

The transformation of global structures and relationships that govern the capitalist political economy has had important impacts on how local actors are making decisions around cultural planning. The restructuring of cities involves increased specialization and capital mobility that correspond to relationships with other cities and regions in a global system (Rodriguez & Feagin, 1986; Sassen, the Global City: New York, London, Tokyo, 2001). “Far from being a “natural” process, specialization is grounded in the political economy of development” (Rodriguez & Feagin, 1986, p. 215). Political and economic actions of the international business elite undergird each case of specialization.

Global capitalism has transformed the everyday life of low income communities where many workers experience detrimental and degraded working conditions (Ross & Trachte, 1983; Sassen, 1990). As stated by Curran and Hanson (2005: 464), “though the logic is global, the outcomes are local.” The interplay of global and local forces produces a
new set of socio-spatial inequalities at the local scale (Aranpoglou, 2012). The current economic restructuring of the economy has left workers with flexible and temporary employment, making the organization of the labor force increasingly difficult. Linked with these effects of global economic restructuring and integration are forces of immigration and the rise of so called minorities as political actors who are changing the faces of cities and our ideas of cultural diversity (Sandercock, Towards Cosmopolis, 1998).

The assumption is often that local actors stand powerless in the face of globalization and neoliberal policies. The reality is that the local economy, while linked with global processes is highly dependent on the actions of local actors, such as the municipal government, urban planners, the private sector, and community organizations. National governments as well as local private actors and governments continue to play a significant role in producing urban sociospatial outcomes (Fainstein, 2001; Brenner, 2004; DeFilippis, 2004). Local success, while dependent on the global environment, is still intimately linked to the local (Curran & Hanson, 2005; Ross & Trachte, 1983; DeFilippis, 2004).

One of the ways that cities respond to the global restructuring of the economy and increased capital mobility, is by specializing themselves to compete with other cities. As capital becomes more mobile there is the need to bring in new capital and keep existing capital and anchor it to local infrastructure (DeFilippis, 2004; Kantor & and David, 1988, p. 229). Localities compete with one another for supra-local investment while promoting local economic development aims. The decline in federal funding for municipal governments and the shift in priorities from social services to economic growth heightens the competition between cities. As neoliberal frameworks increasingly shape policy priorities, public investments go towards economic development and market oriented
growth for elite consumption (Peterson, 1981; DeFilippis, 2004; Logan & Molotch, 1987; Brenner & Theodore, 2002). Municipal governments absorb the risks and losses associated with capital investment (DeFilippis, 2004, p. 31) while communities witness the erosion of traditional welfare rights (Mayer M., 2000). Furthermore, cities increasingly prioritize their image and the regulation of public space and often enact punitive and repressive policies as part of attracting capital (Mayer M., 2000).

Cultural planning and cultural development become ways to manage creativity in order to maximize competiveness and “anchor” capital locally. This can take several interrelated approaches. Cultural economies focus on the clustering effects for the exchange of knowledge and information. Much of the urban planning scholarship on cultural industries, like the film and music industry, demonstrate how important information and knowledge is shared in the production of commodities (Scott A., 2006). The growth of significant cultural industries like Hollywood demonstrates the different types of businesses, workers, and corporations that come together to produce what is the film industry. In this sense, the cultural economy represents the dialectic relationships between the industry and everyday connections that the industry depends on and also reproduces. Allen Scott considers the “inequalities in the cities where new-economy sectors have flourished, and especially in major metropolitan areas, in regards to incomes and access to the amenities of urban space at large” (Scott A., 2006, p. 4). Creative city approaches most often focus on the role and needs of well-paid, qualified workers.

The creative city approach is in part an attempt to specialize, market, and rebrand cities through the investment in artist spaces, cultural districts, and flagship cultural centers.
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1 Mayer (2006) links these processes to the rise of urban social movements.
Cultural amenities serve as marketing and branding tools promoting economic growth (Florida, 2005; Bianchini, Fisher, Montgomery, & Worpole, 1988; Lloyd, 2002; Lloyd, 2005; Lloyd & Nichols Clark, 2001; Zukin, 1995). In this way, they can become significant anchors for capital in cultural economies by creating nodes of consumption for both residents and tourists (Evans & G.L., 2003; Grodach & Loukaitou-Sideris, 2007). Studies also show the contributions of cultural spaces in improving the productivity of noncultural industries at the local level (Markusen & Schrock, 2006; Markusen & King, 2003). Professional artists and artist centers also contribute to the economy and help develop anchors (Markusen & Johnson, 2006; Markusen 2006).

This investment in cultural development is in part an attempt to compete, but also to revitalize certain communities through increased property rates and new investment. New zoning codes, rezoning initiatives, district designations, and noise policies are part of regulating old and new cultural spaces. The treatment of businesses has an impact on how and what businesses start and grow. Economic growth is not a guarantee for every business nor for every community. These cultural investments can be somewhat of a risk, which, as mentioned earlier, has largely been transferred over to municipalities (Stern & Seifert, 2010). The local government enables the private market to rapidly change rents (Swyngedouw, Moulart, & Rodriguez, 2002), which has often forced out small businesses and local ownership (Hoffman, 2003). Capital reappropriates old spaces through strategies that both “command and annihilate space” (Brenner, 1999, p. 437).

Through a sort of “self-fulfilling prophecy” (Angotti, 2003, p. 1) the city proceeds to end certain economic sectors by doing away with certain zoning protections promoting a specific market. A more in depth investigation of revitalization efforts through retail, shows
that close relationship between the retail sector changes and the neighborhood. Although some kinds of investment in retail can lead to further private development, “none of this activity indicates that there is a much broader impact on the well-being of the surrounding community” (Chapple & Jacobus, 2009, p. 60). Often times this type of revitalization could be shifting economic activity between places. City cultural agencies that do not consciously incorporate the needs of the existing community can threaten the cultural life of the neighborhood (Rosenstein, 2011). At the same time, there are many forms of neighborhood change (Chapple & Jacobus, 2009) and different types of cultural development have different levels of neighborhood change (Grodach, Foster, & Murdoch, 2013). Still these studies stick to categories of professional artist and art sectors. Further research is necessary to find ways in which the burden of revitalization does not lay on a city’s low income residents and how cultural development that takes place outside of these formal sectors is affected.

Cultural Planning and Communities of Color

The reinvestment in ethnic areas that were once abandoned due to white flight and the Fordist economy that helped build the suburbs, becomes a staging ground for the reinvestment in cultural development projects. Cultural development is an attempt to “rebalance the type of uneven urban spatial development characteristic of Fordism and symbolized by the social isolation and concentrated poverty of the racial ghetto” (Hoffman, 2003, p. 295). In this political and economic context, cultural planning projects have a range of economic and social consequences on low income communities of color (Curran and Hanson 2005). On one end, we have community development goals of diversity and
empowerment through the distribution of cultural resources. On the other end, critical research on cultural development leads to findings of cultural led displacement, gentrification and uneven development. Cities that have managed to attract a large creative class also see a concurrent rise in income inequality (Donegan & Lowe, 2008; Florida 2005). Despite these two extremes, there are different types of cultural planning projects and investments that take place simultaneously and are not mutually exclusive: bottom up approaches based on community based initiatives and top down approaches including state actors; local and transnational cultural movements; and private and public cultural manifestations.

Cultural ecology and community development approaches include cultural practices broadly to include cultural vitality, community participation and empowerment both in and out of formal arts programs and arts organizations (Jackson, 2006; Alvarez 2005). Many community development and cultural ecology studies examine creativity as “ordinary” and something that can be found in everyday spaces (Alvarez, 2005). In this perspective, culture and arts training does not only take place in formal institutions but can also happen in private spaces that are not conventionally defined as art venues. For example, this approach examines the relationships between formally incorporated and informal arts organizations (Alvarez, 2005).

This research takes us to art spaces previously considered non artistic spaces that host significant practices for democratic and civic participation. Also considered “participatory arts” (Wali, Severson, & Longoni, 2002; Jackson, 2006; Alvarez, 2005), this includes part of the “nonprofit sector” and the “community sector” (Markusen A. , 2006). These forms of expression are incorporated and organized informally (Peters & Joni Maya,
and “find expression in groups that seek to play an active role in the public sphere as independent cultural catalysts” (Alvarez 2005, 9). Participatory arts are described as “expansive, entrepreneurial, resilient, and adaptive, while at the same time highly idiosyncratic, dispersed and ephemeral” (Alvarez, 2005, p. 9). This research speaks to values of empowerment, quality of life, and equity by recognizing the value of community representation, participation, and cultural vitality.

These studies document how neighborhoods and governments at different scales create systems of cultural production and artist ecosystems (Markusen, Gilmore, Johnson, Levi, & Martinez, 2006; Alvarez, There’s Nothing Informal About It: Participatory Arts Within the Cultural Ecology of Silicon Valley, 2005; Stern M. J., 2010; Jackson M. R.-G., 2006). The ecological model focuses on the interdependencies among different actors including the nonprofit, commercial and community sector, instead of their individual contributions (Stern & Seifert, January 2007, p. 2). This approach studies the administrative mechanisms and organizational dynamics that structure both formal and informal creative expression. These studies have been central in understanding the potential for smaller scale, dispersed cultural development (Borrup, 2006) and “natural cultural districts” that evolve “organically” where participants, producers and consumers locate near one another (Stern and Seifert 2007, p 2). These findings challenge previous studies in that they prefer minimal clustering and dispersion as to the concentrated cultural industries. Although city governments are learning to value the contributions of informal arts districts, including benefits for formal art districts, “their attempts (if any) to preserve them remain clumsy at best” (Chapple, Jackson, & Martin, 2010).
Although research on participatory arts and arts ecology do consider some of the politics of cultural planning, the arts, and development, it does not usually consider race as a factor that shapes the cultural ecology and thus, the survival of certain cultural projects and communities. More specifically, in this perspective, equity refers to cultural and economic distribution, and does not address the uneven and negative repercussions this type of culture led development can have specifically on low income communities of color. Although not always the case, cultural spaces can help advance capital interests at the cost of displacement and disinvestment of certain communities (Zukin 1989; Cameron and Coaffee 2005). Furthermore, as cities grow in creative class strategies, inequality rises - a reflection of creative class consumption and increased demand for services like housekeeping, gardening, food preparation and janitorial services that typically are low wage labor (Donegan & Lowe, 2008).

There is an important mention of two additional actors “who deserve mention as...potential protagonists in the local arts ecology” (Markusen 2006, 13). These actors include artist unions and the local built environment industry. This mention is significant in that it includes actors that are often left out in the discussion of cultural production, but also strategies of coalition and alliance building that can influence the direction of development and public policy. Donegan and Lowe (2008) demonstrate how unions, living wage coalitions, and skill and career advancement opportunities for immigrant workers are effective strategies to address earnings inequality in the creative city. Additionally, progressive planning research shows how the organization of neighborhoods also respond
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6 The “politics of naming” for example, that includes branding, marketing and even destroying. As folklorist Jim Griffith examines the “politics of naming” and states that folklorists use the term “art” not to refer to a specific class of objects but rather “to that aspect of any object that goes beyond the strictly utilitarian and which is intended to give pleasure to maker, viewer, or both” (Griffith, 1988).
to downtown development strategies and can reclaim funds and spaces for political participation (Clavel, 1986). This dissertation research addresses some of these alliances and solidarities in the everyday practices of producing and developing cultural spaces.

Cultural Production and the Politics of Space

The ‘production of culture’ perspective helps us analyze the management and control of art, creativity, and culture specific to this moment of economic crisis. Arts and cultural production are a set of coordinated activities, relationships, and networks produced as a result of material and social conditions (Becker, 1982). Therefore, creativity is not a product of complete anonymity and commodified production, and is much more complex than individual artistic sensibility. Rather, creativity is mobilized and channeled in many specialized but complementary ways (DiMaggio, 1977; DiMaggio & Hirsch, 1976). Becker (1982) highlights the work of supporters who include other workers, not necessarily the “artist,” who help produce art, and in this case, cultural products.

Cultural products are made through cooperation and by referring to conventions, habits, and relationships that are embodied through practices and that result from collective action. Conventions “dictate the form in which materials and abstractions will be combined and suggest the appropriate dimensions of a work,” (Becker, 1982, p. 29), such as the proper length of a performance, the proper size and shape of paintings. Cultural products include art, film, theatre, poetry, dance, and music that may or may not be sold. In this research, they also include products that working class communities, and especially communities of color, often do not identify as “art” or that have been denied the term (Jackson M. R.-G., 2006; Alvarez, There’s Nothing Informal About It: Participatory Arts...
Within the Cultural Ecology of Silicon Valley, 2005). Cultural products are both material and symbolic resources. For example, costumes, books, and educational materials can be used and sold but also produce different meanings and value that are not material.

While conventions make collective activity simpler and less costly in time, energy, and other resources, they also make unconventional work close to impossible by making it more costly and difficult (Becker, 1982, p. 35). Unconventional work is not impossible, but it is also often not a choice, and possibly anti-hegemonic. Unconventional work requires greater effort in devising alternative ways in obtaining resources and conceptualizing relationships. Conventions can ultimately change if people can gather greater resources to produce this work based on these new types of relationships. Waves of contestatory music such as the punk movement (Hebdige, 1979; Muggleton & Winzierl, 2003) in the 70s and 80s shifted the conventions of music production and distribution. Conventions that counter mainstream ideas can also have deathly consequences. Victor Jara, Chile’s most popular and revolutionary composer and singer, was killed by the Pinochet regime in a sports stadium due to his revolutionary message that challenged the established relations of power.

I use “culture” to refer to both cultural resources (symbolic and material) and the relationships that people produce everyday, which shape who they are (Bourdieu 1993; Trend 1992; De Certeau, 1984; Lefebvre 1996). Individuals produce cultural products and resources as well relationships that continue to exist outside of the cultural space. Cultural spaces are the physical places where people coordinate their activities to produce what they identify as art and culture. Cultural spaces help provide social infrastructure of
understanding and expectations that influence people’s behavior, their presentations, and their own conceptions of their work – art or nonart (Bourdieu 1993; Becker 1982).

Cultural spaces are not “ideologically innocent” (Trend 1992: 53; Gramsci, 1996; Freire 1993). These spaces are historically strategic sites that monopolize popular memory, politics and collective action (Kohn, 2003; Habermas 1991). Conventions regulate the relations within these spaces, such as those between artists and audience (Becker 1982:29), and integrate them within the processes of acculturation in different realms of daily life. Each cultural space is a demonstration of how culture is organized, who is authorized to speak about particular forms of culture, what culture is considered acceptable and worthy of valorization, and what forms of culture are considered invalid and unworthy of public esteem (Jackson, 2006; Alvarez, 2005). Cultural spaces can take part in a political process through which citizens are socialized to recognize and validate state power.

Gramsci (1996; Lefebvre 1995, 2003, 2004) viewed urban culture not as a field of disintegration but as a terrain in which to contest inequalities and alienation (Aranpoglou, 2012). Cultural spaces are therefore contradictory sites of struggle through which people produce different subject positions, knowledge, and values. Like art worlds, cultural spaces have connections to those worlds from which they want to distinguish themselves. Overlapping boundaries can vary to the degree to which they are independent, and operate in relative freedom from interference by other groups. Furthermore, spaces are not fixed, static or closed, despite their physical nature, but rather they are embedded in broader sets of social and spatial relations used to advance different interests (Becker, 1982; Brenner, Jessop, Smith, 1994; Massey, 1984; Jessop et al 2008). Cultural production may not occur all at the same place, but rather is interconnected to communities in different places.
Different actors with a range of interests develop cultural spaces while contributing to the development of places and territories at different scales.

**Everyday Solidarities and Progressive Planning**

Cultural spaces form part of people’s everyday experiences in cities shaped by overlapping and shifting local and global relations. Literature on neoliberalization and global-cities has made great advancements in understanding how communities build transnational solidarities and social movements as labor and capital reorganize spatially (Friedmann, 1986; Smith 1984; Sassen 2000; Brenner & Theodore, 2002; Taylor 1997). By solidarities I refer to the different alliances and coalitions that individuals create to defend their material and symbolic interests through collective action that may or may not revolve around worker solidarity or class consciousness (Fantasia, 1988). These relations contain a range of components and practices that can take the shape of tactical activities, organizational forms, and institutional arrangements (Fantasia 1988). Social movements help develop alternative public spaces in the interests of working class communities and reveal the significance of the city in urban struggles (Mollenkopf 1988; Piven and Cloward 1977; Gould 1995; Melucci 1989; McAdam et al 2001; Katzenelson 1981; Castells 1983; Nicholls 2008; McAdam 1982; Diani 2005).

Most of the globalization and social movements literature focuses on collective forms of actively contentious politics with the purpose of achieving political goals. Globalization and social movement literature however, often fail to include a micro level analysis of culture and working class communities’ everyday realities (for a critique see Ley 2004). The everyday conditions necessary to build solidarity around collective action are
largely left unexamined. This research uses the framework of “everyday” to examine how capitalist purposes and working class needs influence the development of cultural spaces. It is inspired by work based on “groups submerged in everyday life” (Melucci, 1989, p. 6) who invent and experience movements that question, challenge, and transform the dominant codes of everyday life (Beard, 2003; Guarnizo, 1997; Miraftab 2009).

Everyday socio-spatial tactics and strategies both shape unequal spatial relations and help form new alternative spaces struggling for democratic alternatives. Michel de Certeau explores the city from its totality to the details of the everyday experience of the city. He presents the Foucaultian terms of strategies and tactics to distinguish those mechanisms such as urban zoning and enclaves, from the actions of those who lack power (De Certeau 1984). Much of this literature separates the dominated from the appropriated everyday spaces (See Table 1) (Scott J. C., 1990). On one hand, “dominated spaces” exhibit the disciplinary and dominating potential of power relations. On the other hand, people reinvent social and alternative coping and survival mechanisms for underprivileged populations in spaces of insurgent citizenship or “appropriated spaces” (Scott 1998; Holston 1998).

This division is exemplified through strategies and tactics. According to de Certeau, strategies are “actions which, thanks to the establishment of a place of power (the property of a proper), elaborate the theoretical places (systems and totalizing discourses) capable of articulating and ensemble of physical places in which forces are distributed” (De Certeau 1984: 38). Just like strategies are organized by the postulation of power, “tactics are determined by the absence of power” (De Certeau 1984). He argues that no strategy is
totalitarian and that subversion is always possible but limited. In addition, De Certeau assigns space as a tool of strategies and time as base to the spontaneity of tactics.

Table 1: Strategies and Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dominated (Strategy) (Scott 1990)</th>
<th>Appropriated (Tactic) (Alinsky 1971; Scott 1998)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>Insurgent (Holston 2008; Holston and Appadurai 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced by who?</td>
<td>Capital interests</td>
<td>Produced by “everyday” people (Scott, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Experimentation, revise, gradual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Accumulation</td>
<td>Those at hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Radical and Covert (Beard 2002; 2003; Miraftab 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These classifications of dominated and appropriated spaces are useful in discerning the use of space and time in the development of power. However, rather than examining (Catungal, Leslie, & Hii, 2009) these categories as separate, I emphasize their interdependent and contested character. Both radical and mainstream, counter-hegemonic and hegemonic discourse can take shape as part of everyday life and form part of a “contested terrain” (Hayden, 1996, p. 320). Relationships can be both disciplinary and resistant in spaces like a museum, the household or the factory (Ong 1987; Rofel 2009).
Hierarchies within appropriated spaces and those tactics to break such established forms of power need to be explored, as well as those strategies that are meant to promote forms of equality and openness. Tactics and strategies do not work isolated from one another, but can exist and be reproduced through the same spaces. Sociospatial strategies of time, place and scale are part of both capitalist purposes and survival tactics. Tactics exist within larger neoliberal strategies that build an environment that serves its own capitalist purposes and needs for a certain period of time. Time, place, flexibility, and informality become sociospatial tools for both capitalist purposes and for workers’ subsistence strategies (Sarmiento 2002).

Place and place-making are examples of both tactics and strategies that can make certain histories visible and invisible (Hayden, 1996). Place becomes a socio-spatial tactic that communities use to develop identities that lend themselves to a consciousness of solidarity (Haymes, 1995). At the same time, mainstream place-making practices can dismantle the living spaces and communities of color –through landlords, politicians, banks, and corporations. Place-making can also displace sectors that help create social and economic diversity (Catungal, Leslie, & Hii, 2009). Place becomes part of the strategy to erase collective memory of a city and naturalize the development of an ideology that purports to “humanize” or “beautify” the environment. This type of place-making can become a strategy to obscure the role of conflict, domination, and resistance, trivializing the everyday struggle. “Social conflict is recast as artistic spectacle, danger as ambience” (Smith, 1992: 77). Place-making can be a threat to collective identity by withdrawing access to physical spaces and the built environment.
Finally, the question that remains is whether tactics of resistance or those everyday subtle anti-hegemonic forms that may be not be observable but that are employed over time (Scott J. C., Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Resistance, 1985) can be transformational. How, what and when can tactics of resistance transform the relationships in which they are embedded? What unconventional lasting relationships can evolve from the possibilities that cultural planning projects create? This dissertation research leaves room for the possibility of radical spaces’ or the development of a “popular public sphere” where working class communities can build relationships of solidarity (Kohn 2003).

Cultural Spaces as Racialized Projects

Cultural spaces help shape what race means and help connect those meanings and practices to people’s everyday experiences. In urban planning history, culture and race take on different meanings with important symbolic as well as social and political dimensions. Debates about the built environment, culture, arts, communities of color, and history take place in a contested terrain where the meaning of race, gender, and class shift and transform. In many communities of color, urban development “resonates with a long, bitter history of resentment over perceived economic colonization by white outsiders” (Hoffman 2003, 293). At the same time, cultural planning becomes a tool through which some public agencies attempt to address issues of racial inequality. There is also a type of “revalorization” of what is ethnic and “black” through a commodification of culture linked to marketing as well as liberal and progressive values. Cultural areas such as Harlem and
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1 I use Kohn’s definition of Radical democratic spaces, “political sites outside of the state where the disenfranchised generate power” (Kohn 2003: 7).
New Orleans face commercial gentrification where black culture becomes part of a larger marketing package.

Urban planning scholarship has most often depended on theories of integration, incorporation, multiculturalism, and diversity asserted by the postmodernist critique of modernist narratives. These perspectives largely come from reactions to sociospatial inequalities of segregation, urban renewal, and disinvestment and recognizing the active involvement of urban planning in the destruction of communities of color (Hayden 1996; Sandercock, 1998; Thomas, 1996) Acknowledging this past often also involves a re-established value for the contributions of communities of color and diversity and the recognition that cities have largely failed on this promise (Amin 2002; Fainstein, 2005; Sandercock 2003). This diversity refers to an increased representation of different people, ethnicities, and classes in the physical environment, and in public and private culture. This scholarship surfaces common themes including immigration, changing households, gender, and the struggles over new identities and citizenships in an urban setting (Hayden, 1996, p. 9).

Urban planning scholars have long-championed diversity and a multiplicity of ethnic and racial backgrounds as a planning goal and standard, including its potential conflicts and contestations. Diversity can reach multiple national, ethnic, gender, race, and class identities that can sometimes conflict. Young and Sandercock link diversity to questions of justice. Young accepts the social and spatial differentiation of groups, as long as the “interfusion of groups” occurs and diverse activities draw different communities.

According to Fainstein (2005) diversity has many meanings. It can refer to varied physical design, building types, mix of uses and structures, expanded public realm, social programs and a multiple social groupings, ethnicities and classes.
together (Young, 1990). Diversity in many ways becomes linked to providing spaces for the interaction of groups from different social backgrounds (Lofland 1998; Young, 1990) where ‘eyes on the street’ (Jacobs, 1961) and a mix of economic social and cultural relationships contribute to both individual and collective benefits.

Beyond the positive economic development impacts of diversity of firms and industries, urban planners have also highlighted positive impacts of a diversity of people in powering creativity, innovation, and city growth. Jane Jacobs referred to the dissonance caused by diversity that created everyday unexpected encounters for individuals. These encounters inspired by social diversity would promote innovation and creativity that could lead to increased physical and economic productivity. According to Florida, “All else being equal, more open and diverse places are likely to attract greater numbers of talented and creative people—the sort of people who power innovation and growth” (Florida 2003: 11). Young and more recently Florida made the link between diversity, creativity and tolerance for “underappreciated” groups. According to Florida, tolerance is defined as “openness, inclusiveness, and diversity to all ethnicities, races, and walks of life” (Florida, 2003). Tolerance to difference in diverse environments was part of fomenting creativity and economic growth.

Urban planners have sought to build socially inclusive plans that recognize social diversity and communal space that is very different than state plans and urban design (Hayden, 1996). Planning and policy efforts thus promote multiplicity as a principle of urban inclusion, civic acceptance, and the right of the many to public space. The multicultural and diversity perspective delivered on certain promises of representation. The perspective of integration and incorporation central to the multiculturalism approach goes
as far as understanding the ethnic similarities and differences between groups and the representation necessary to reflect the changing demographics. These theories have helped shape solutions that aim for increased opportunities (job creation, services, and training, for example) and political integration (democratic representation). However, the link between increased diversity and the just city is complicated at best (Fainstein 2005). Scholars suggest that a focus on diversity as a standard principle for planning distracts us from goals of equity and justice. Even Florida explicitly states that while creativity favors diversity, it is still the “diversity of elites, limited to highly educated, creative people. Even though the rise of the creative class has opened up new avenues of advancement for women and members of ethnic minorities, its existence has certainly failed to put an end to long-standing divisions of race and gender (Florida, 2002, p. 80). Inequality is rising at every scale and not being addressed even as diversity may increase. Creative economies also lead to an increase in flexibility, informality and a growing service sector, dependent on a racially bifurcated division of labor (Valle & Torres, 2000; Leslie and Catungal 2012). The arguments for diversity often lose sight of the continued importance of economic structure and the relations of production (Fainstein 2005) as well as the social effects such as anxiety and fear, produced by increased inequality (Amin, 2008; Massey 2005; Low, 2001; Davis, 1990; Caldeira, 2000).

Finally, some multiculturalism has been labeled part of ‘bourgeois urbanism’—strategies that use everyday experiences and even subcultural practices as forms of capitalist urbanization shaped by the elite and new middle class (Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005, p. 671). These forms of bourgeois urbanism include black and brown gentrification that complicate and sometimes mask the different agendas and interests within communities of
color (Boyd, 2005; Drake, Cayton, & Wilson, 1993). Urban theorists have also questioned the merits of planning communities with the goal of diversity on the basis that planners create inauthentic cities or “illustrations of life” rather than life itself (Sennet 1992; Zukin, 2010). Spatial symbolism and zoning used to increase diversity have become instrumental in separating different groups (Lofland, 1998) as well as creating ‘visible’ and ‘edible’ forms of ethnicity (Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005). This connection between diversity, creativity, and economic growth has helped facilitate the commodification of difference, making the value of difference another amenity, a brand used to lure workers and firms to the city (Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005). Furthermore, sociopolitical and subcultural movements are absorbed into city-branding exercises and ‘creative city’ approaches that reduce the substance of political spaces to “superficial and marketable conception of cultural diversity” (Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005, p. 672). City branding exercises and ‘creative city’ endeavors in economic development dominate political spaces, opened up by some oppositional diverse movements, and at the same time reduce their substance to a superficial and marketable conception of cultural diversity (Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005, p. 672).

Racial formation theory helps us go beyond integration, multiculturalism, and diversity approaches to understand the relationship between race and other forms of inequalities, differences, and oppression. This shifts the discussion away from a focus on ethnicities and group identities, and toward a framework that understands how racial differences that are “unstable,” “decentralized,” and constantly being transformed shape ideas of multiculturalism, diversity, and tolerance. Race is not something that you can “get over” or “overcome,” but rather is a “complex of social meaning constantly being
transformed by political struggle” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 55). Race is not a problem or “misconception left over from the past,” but rather is fundamental in structuring the social world today.

Racial formation is the “sociohistorical processes by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 55). As part of racial formation theory, race is both social structure and cultural representation. Cultural planning is thus part of racial formation as it forms part of “reorganizing and redistributing resources along particular racial lines” in specific historic moments (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 56). Cultural spaces are projects that represent and organize communities in specific historic moments. In this way cultural spaces are racial projects that connect what race means in practice as well as the way in which social structure and everyday experiences are organized based on those meanings. Through cultural spaces and cultural production, we comprehend what race means and how it helps explain our surroundings. Race becomes common sense and a part of the evolution of the hegemony that shapes individual and collective understandings of the way in which society is organized and ruled.

Understanding cultural spaces as racialized projects allow us to locate race in a specific social and historical context. Furthermore, it helps examine how racial projects interact and take place through processes and not simply through individual or single moments. In this research, it helps us examine the changing role of communities of color in processes of gentrification, displacement, and commodification of their own culture and community, making race a central and complex portion of the dynamics taking place. For example, in examining the criminalization of communities of color and heightened discrimination by the police, understanding how both individuals (and spaces) who are
defined as black, Mexican, immigrant, and understanding how these meanings that change over time matter.

Conclusion

This chapter presents a framework to examine how communities of color shape the development of cultural spaces in the face of globalization, capital mobility and neoliberal policies. Research on cultural planning has demonstrated how cultural projects can be used as tools to manage creativity and maximize competitiveness, and can be used to revitalize and reinvest in disinvested communities. Cultural and community development approaches have made important advances by including community vitality, participation and quality of life measures to broaden the scope of cultural planning goals and standards.

This framework reconstructs previous cultural planning theories to both consider the structural limitations and the possibilities of developing transformative unconventional relationships within cultural spaces. Combining production of culture, politics of space and racial formation theories helps us to examine the everyday relationships, conventions, habits, and practices around cultural planning and development. In order to examine these relationships and understand how capitalist purposes and working class needs influence the development of cultural spaces, this research uses an “everyday framework” and emphasizes the interdependent and contested character of all cultural spaces.

Tactics and strategies are part of both radical and mainstream discourses and take part in everyday life and in each space. This requires analysis of tactics and strategies that use everyday cultural experiences as part of capitalist urbanization, shaped by the elite or ‘bourgeois urbanism’ (Goonwardena 2005). Racial formation theory helps us go beyond
integration, multiculturalism, and diversity approaches to understand the relationship between race and other forms of inequalities, differences, and oppression. Cultural planning helps shape what race means and helps connect those meanings and practices to people’s everyday experiences. Understanding cultural spaces as racialized projects allow us to locate race in a specific social and historical context and locate where the meaning of race is changing and transformed.

The ultimate goal of this project is to see what tactics of resistance can last and transform the relationships in which they are embedded. This dissertation research leaves room for exploring the possibility of communities developing radical spaces and a popular public sphere were working individuals build relationships of solidarity (Kohn 2003), and actively producing their own history, collective memory and vision for their future, “the possibility of a qualitatively different, post capitalist society” (Goonewardena and Kipfer 2005: 676).
Chapter 3

Methodology: Studying Cultural Planning, Power and Resistance

This ethnography deepens our understanding of how low income communities of color shape and articulate their experiences in the creative city. I examined the everyday relationships that take place within cultural spaces in low-income communities of color through participant observation and conducted interviews with property owners, businesses men women, residents, workers who come into each cultural space. Cultural spaces are the physical places where people coordinate their activities to produce what they identify as cultural through relationships that refer to conventions and habits embodied in practices of collective action.

The production of space brings together everyday social and capitalist relations and practices (Lefebvre, 1991) that extend well beyond the physical place. My premise is that by examining the everyday relationships between property owners, business men and women, and residents who come together everyday in cultural spaces, we can better understand how low income communities shape the creative city and cultural developments. I posed the following three questions to delve deeper into the everyday practices within each space and the larger cultural development of the area.

1) How cultural and artist practices take shape within low income communities of color that live and work in creative cities and how in turn, communities of color shape these practices?

2) How creative development processes integrate low income communities of color at the everyday level and more specifically, impact property
owners, merchants and residents’ a) access to valuable property b) access to political influence and c) access to cultural spaces?

3) How low income communities of color participate, resist and transform the development of cultural spaces?

Using theories of cultural production, racial formation, and the politics of space, I propose that 1) cultural production including learning art and cultural practices become an important part of the experience of low income communities of color as well as a way to understand how individuals articulate their own place in society. Therefore, artists, residents, workers also deemed as “uncreatives” both experience the creative city and transform it by rearticulating their own position in the city. 2) Cultural development practices, including security, investment, marketing, and renting practices, impacts the access of low income communities to both public and private property, creating an opportunity and a barrier to the development of cultural spaces that represent the interests of low income communities of color. Decision-making around these practices often lies in the hands of larger property owners and the city officials. 3) Everyday relationships within and between cultural spaces shift and transform making tactics and strategies of resistance and displacement interdependent with one another. The strategies of property owners overlap with those of residents, merchants, etc.

In order to explore these arguments and help reconstruct cultural planning and community development theories, I depended on collecting data through a variety of methods. This included interviewing respondents on their everyday practices and relations in cultural spaces, and gathering data through participant observation and archival documents. As part of this work capturing the everyday experiences of low income
communities of color, I interviewed over fifty semi-structured interviews and conducted hours of participant observation in several cultural spaces. My second argument required information from property owners and business men and women who I interviewed in order to understand their perspective on cultural development. This question focused on those businesses and property owners who could invest in the development of the area. Finally, in order to capture different responses and forms of participation within cultural development and planning, I included the interviews with the workers, property owners and business men and women as well as participant observation to demonstrate the different manifestations that took place outside of individual cultural spaces. I use archival data to demonstrate the ways in which city council, private developers regulate cultural spaces through funding, permits, and policy that impact the development and destruction of certain cultural spaces.

There is evidence for these arguments and methods in previous cultural planning research. Critical research using surveys and in depth interviews focus on structural issues of race and inequality in the process of cultural development. These studies show how in some cases, arts-anchored economies (including coffee shops and boutiques) result in exclusions based on race and class, displacement and inequality (Zukin, 1995; Shaw & Sullivan, 2011; Deutsche & Ryan, 1984; Ley, 2003; Smith, 1996; Zukin, Trujillo, Frase, Jackson, Recuber, & Walker, 2009; Lees, 2003; Zukin, 2009). Beyond a mere “carnival mask” (Harvey 1988), cultural planning contributes to the transformation of low income communities for the urban middle class (Ley 2003; Zukin 1982; Shaw and Sullivan 2011), and often works to legitimize the displacement of these communities (Desutshe and Ryan 1984).
Although some of this work takes an interpretive lens (Shaw and Sullivan 2011), most of this work takes a political-economic or semiotic approach to understand how neighborhoods and cities produce racial exclusions and inequality (Deneer, 2007; Mele, 2000; Zukin & Costa, 2004; Valle & Torres, 2000). The power of place is not a mere reflection of our incomes and tastes, as market theories often suggests. Rather, places also “shape our ability to earn income in the first place (Swanstrom, Peter, & Mollenkopf, 2002). This work often highlights the structural limits of place and development and can fail to recognize the power and resistance of low-income communities of color who are not passive victims.

Other work, both qualitative and quantitative, highlights both the progressive and oppressive characteristics of cultural development and the small opening for critique that this contradictions helps create (Harvey, 2002). This research demonstrates how underrepresented communities often participate in unincorporated or “informal” arts and venues that are important spaces for cultural development, social organization, immigrant integration and resistance (Zukin, 2009; Alvarez, 2005; Peterson, 1996; De Alba, 1998; Peterson, 1996; Deyhle, 1995). This research pushes the limits of studying cultural spaces under the artistic banner and expands the range of actors as artists. Finally, some authors have also explored the duality of many of these forms of cultural production that highlight their contested nature and the different group competing for different interests (Gotham, 2005; Rinaldo, 2002; Davila, 2004; Pratt, 2011).

This dissertation examines the relationships that evolve within these cultural spaces and locates them within the structural context within which they form. Such an analysis highlights the relationships between cultural development and the economic and political
structure within which they exist and that in turn, they help shape. When we only examine
the internal relationships within cultural spaces, tactics of resistance are hardly visible. It is
only when we study the interrelationships between different political forces, that these
tactics of resistance become comprehensible. Processes of racial formation, immigration,
gentrification and displacement create the “boundaries of possibility” of cultural planning,
through everyday practices around learning art, marketing, security, renting and selling
property in low income communities of color. The methods and framework I have chosen
explicitly address the questions of how larger structural forces shape the everyday
experiences of community members, while those everyday realities simultaneously
influence those structures.

**Ethnography of Cultural Planning**

This research is based on eight years of ethnographic data in Santa Ana, California, a
largely Mexican immigrant community, and a lesser case study of cultural planning in a
largely Black community in West, Oakland, California. This study documents the changes
that led to both the development of new cultural spaces and the destruction of others and
responds to urban planning research that often misses the constant struggle and resistance
of low-income communities of color to defend and build their own cultural spaces. This
qualitative project does not capture the rates of increased property value or increased
consumption rates, but rather shows how different actors organize to get access, defend
their investments and their potential gains from each cultural space. This project does not
show if a developer actually increases property value by developing cultural spaces. It does,

---

1 Leslie Salzinger uses this term to describe a group of Latino immigrants who are doing
domestic work and their occupation strategies (1991:142)
however, capture the ways in which property owners increase their power by creating certain alliances that impact working class communities’ access to specific cultural spaces. This shaping and reshaping of the culture of Santa Ana and the role individuals played in building the economic and political power of space lead to my initial iterations of the study.

An ethnography “studies people in their own time and space, in their own everyday lives” and uses participant observation to juxtapose “how people act but also how they understand and experience those acts” (Burawoy, et al., 1991, p. 2). Data collection techniques include direct, first hand observation of daily behavior, including participant observation, conversations with different levels of formality, in-depth interviewing and extensive field notes. There are several critiques of traditional ethnographies. Participant observation can sometimes produce a detailed descriptive account that has little relevance or “significance” beyond the immediate example or case study. Another critique refers to the “level of analysis” that is said to be inherently micro and ahistorical as it is confined to the short term and limited in geography. It can also romanticize “the local” and ignore the global mobility of people and capital flows (Appadurai 1990; Peters in Gupta and Ferguson 1997). Several methodological responses of these critiques include ethnomethodology (Feldman 1995), the interpretive case method (Geertz, 1973) and grounded theory (Glaser, Strauss, & Anselm, 1967). In these examples, theorizing emerges directly from the data.

In order to overcome these limitations, I used a strategy called the “extended case method” (Burawoy, et al., 1991) to examine how external forces shape social situations. This theory is not the grounded theory school. The extended case study does not realize
theorizing from the ground up”, but through the “reconstruction”—rather than deconstruction—and improvement of existing theory (Burawoy, et al., 1991). Instead of searching for abstract laws or formal theory, the extended case study seeks historically specific causality. Significance here refers to “societal significance” or what the case tells us about society as a whole rather than about the population of similar cases (Burawoy 1991: 281). The level of analysis of an extended case study takes the social situation as the point of empirical examination but works to understand how wider structures, such as racial formation and globalization, help shape those micro situations.

I chose to focus on cultural spaces to broaden the discussion around cultural planning and development. Research shows that working class communities and especially communities of color, often refuse to identify a product as “art” or have been denied the term (Jackson M. R-G., 2006; Jackson, Herranz, & Kabwasa-Green, 2003). Cultural products produced by and in communities of color are often seen as everyday materials and cultural spaces in communities of color are often not considered cultural or art spaces. In order to include non-conventional places of cultural production I include spaces where cooperative activity may be carried on in the name of art or other functions around religion, social justice or tradition, for example.

In doing so, I hope to let the problematic character of “culture” “art” and “space” permeate the analysis and avoid taking too seriously the standards of those who make the conventional definitions of art for a society. This also allows me to analyze the advantages and alliances that the honorific title of “art” brings as well as the members of a society who
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control the application of the term art, so not everyone is in a position to have the advantages associated with it. Furthermore, I argue that internal organizational relationships account for only part of the creation—and destruction—of cultural spaces. Rather, it is within the political and economic context of the development of these spaces that we can understand the research questions posed above. Starting with cultural spaces, helps us examine the social relations that help create these spaces, but also how the larger context also shape these relationships and spaces.

When you expand the idea of cultural spaces, every city the size of Santa Ana, has hundreds if not thousands of cultural spaces that range from bars where workers congregate to churches that serve as community gathering places. Although economic and cultural shifts take place throughout Santa Ana, I had to limit my geography due to time and viability and decided to begin in Downtown Santa Ana. For the purpose of the study I decided to focus on three areas in Downtown Santa Ana that I refer to as the Downtown core: Artist Village, Civic Center and Fiesta Marketplace. These three areas encompass hundreds of cultural spaces as well as significant capital and working class interests.

Artist Village includes the arts district made up of art galleries, restaurants and art residencies. This area includes the arts district that most closely represents the “creative city” proposal in urban planning literature that the City of Santa Ana officially sponsored and promoted starting in the late 1980s. The Civic Center area includes the Reagan Federal Building, restaurants, and coffee shops; and Fiesta Marketplace includes Fourth Street, a historic Mexican Downtown, including bridal shops, shoe stores, theatres,

---


11 There are over one hundred cultural organizations that have a relationship with these spaces. This includes organizations that use the space to hold meetings, do fundraisers, work, etc. Some of these organizations were also included in the study.
restaurants etc. These divisions in Downtown Santa Ana are recent, and not meant to draw strict boundaries but rather identify the location of certain properties and investments.

At the early stages of my research, I began documenting some of the cultural spaces including many of those identified through discussions with key artists, activists, and community leaders as well the promotional materials produced by the city and art institutions. I came up with 99 cultural and art organizations in just this central area (Please see Appendix for Table of 99 cultural organizations). This number was too high for in depth case studies and still did not include many of the other formal but “non art” cultural spaces that exist in downtown. This list did include some organizations that do cultural work in cultural spaces but do not have an actual space of their own and may float between locations. Forty-eight of the spaces on the list were studios and galleries and only three included the dozens of bridal shops, which certainly did not represent the majority of cultural spaces in Santa Ana. The list did not include many of the vacant spaces or other properties that were once active.

The Downtown Core includes cultural spaces that are bars, community centers, restaurants, dance studios, galleries, bridal shops, theatres, shoe stores and bookstores. The rates of occupancy, permits and the types of cultural practices and production that take place in each space are determined in part by the City’s regulations. Cultural spaces also vary depending on the communities served. This was determined by how many of their customers speak Spanish, or if the majority is immigrant or Anglo. The distinction between art and non-art space is also important, as this label can also represent the values promoted by the city government around cultural development. Most importantly, the changes in
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12 It does include cultural spaces that were previously used for different purposes, for example, a theatre that was transformed into a music venue.
Downtown Santa Ana were taking place so fast, that many spaces were closing and opening as time passed.

I chose to delve into twelve spaces and allow the relationships and networks within the space snowball into more interviews and spaces. Concerned with a representativeness that was based on gaining in-depth understanding on the individuals working in different types of cultural spaces, I drew a smaller geographic boundary that would help limit the number of spaces. I focused on choosing four cultural spaces from each of the three areas that were central to the cultural development taking place and represented a range of different uses: Fiesta Marketplace, Artist Village and the Civic Center. This helped me include different types of uses and eliminate those spaces that I had overrepresented in my list such as galleries that were mostly concentrated in the Artist District. These areas are not contained and in no way isolated. They actually overlap and as the project went one, some grew more than others. I then employed a stratified purposive sample to ensure certain characteristics of each spaces were included. Sampling for the following characteristics was crucial to understanding the range of uses, perspectives and meanings for individuals working in each space.

Use of space: this refers to the different types of cultural practices and forms of cultural production that takes place that also depend on the type of space, the rates of occupancy, zoning, permits and other requirements established by the city government. For example, a bar and a bookstore are cultural spaces that both promote cultural gatherings but one requires an alcohol permit while the other does not limiting the type of individuals who have access to the space. I included a bakery since I had not initially included any bakery in my list.
**Immigrant Population Served:** In my examination of each cultural space, I also distinguished those where the immigrant population came in as clients and customers (not the owner or renter). This gave me a first look how ethnicity, race and class help shape cultural spaces and the people who visit them. Although first generation and second generation immigrants are not necessarily distinguishable, the language being spoken provided an important part of the description. This analysis looked at the primary language spoken and being used for signage, names, menus, etc. It was important to include spaces where Spanish was not the primary language and see the relationships within those spaces as well.

**Art and “non-art”:** In order to include non conventional places of cultural production I included spaces where cooperative activity may be carried out in the name of art (traditionally this includes dance, art, music, theatre) or under some other definition, for example religion or social justice. For example, this would include a bridal shop that produces Quinceañera dresses for a significant cultural celebration in the Mexican community.
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13 There were no spaces in Downtown that primarily spoke Vietnamese or another language other than Spanish or English. However, expanding the geography of the study towards west Santa Ana would have included many of these other immigrant cultural spaces.
Table 2: Twelve Cultural Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Spanish Primary Language</th>
<th>art/nonart</th>
<th>sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fiesta Marketplace</td>
<td>barbershop</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>nonart</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fiesta Marketplace</td>
<td>bridal shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nonart</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fiesta Marketplace</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>art</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fiesta marketplace</td>
<td>bakery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nonart</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Artist Village</td>
<td>galleries/bar</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>art</td>
<td>nonprofit/commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Artist Village</td>
<td>coffeshop/gallery/lofts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>art</td>
<td>nonprofit/commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Artist Village</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>art</td>
<td>nonprofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Artist Village</td>
<td>vintage shop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>nonart</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>coffeeshop</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>nonart</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>cultural center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>art/nonart</td>
<td>nonprofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>fashion/design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>art</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>bar /restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nonart</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to choose between cultural spaces with similar characteristics for example a bridal shops in Fiesta market or a gallery in the artist Village, I would choose according to the cultural spaces that I had access to through other respondents and previously established relationships. It is important to note that these are characteristics at the beginning of the study. During the length of the research process relationships, owners, uses and language changed for many of the cultural spaces when the businesses closed. For example, at the end of the study only two out of the original five cultural spaces spoke Spanish as the primary language.

---

I removed the names considering the confidentiality of the respondents.
The twelve cultural spaces studied included businesses such as restaurants, cafes and bars; community centers, theatres and galleries. These spaces gave me a point of entry to begin conducting interviews and participant observation. They provided me with a place to observe more in depth and recruit more participants for both formal and informal interviews. Each respondent worked, owned, or participated in these spaces. The participant observations in these spaces then led me to other cultural spaces, and actions in city council chambers, public streets, promenades and people’s homes. For example, the study includes both private and public spaces such as festivals and marches that take place in promenades and the public right of way.
Interviews, Stories and Counter Stories

My research design included interviewing the property owner, business owner/executive director and a worker or staff person. Several of these actors worked in multiple cultural spaces but had different roles. One property owner could own several cultural spaces, and business owners and artists could form alliances that shared spaces. In some cases, the business owner was the property owner, or the staff person was also the business owner. The business owner was usually not hard to determine, making their availability the most difficult challenge.

In the case of the staff person, I usually asked the business or property owner if it was all right and he or she would introduce me to someone I could interview. In other cases, I introduced myself to a person at the counter, knew a person who worked there or was introduced by another worker in a different space. The most difficult person to gain access to was the property owner. In some cases I interviewed the property manager when the property owner was absent. As the research progressed, I found that only five owners owned the twelve spaces, all of whom were white males and formed part of the property business improvement district. In order to include perspectives from different property owners, I interview another six property owners outside of my initial twelve. These property owners represented smaller property owners who were also business owners and ranged in ethnicities. This included one Korean, three Mexican, and two White property owners who were also business owners.

The power of different actors and their stories often depends on the alliances, regimes, coalitions and forms of collective action in which they take part. These regimes are both formal and informal arrangements of public and private actors that work together.
to make decisions (Stone 1987). This research includes these powerful urban regimes as well as the actors who resist these regimes by building their own alliances. However, in order to go beyond strict divisions between private, state and community actors, this study also examines the interdependencies that exist within these different relationships. This includes capturing routine economic development decisions that cover a broad range of decision-makers and understanding to what degree different actors participate and dominate the process, their motivations and their strategies.

**Business owners:** Businesses play an important role within local economic policy. They can be part of the local regimes and “growth machine” (Stone, 1989; Logan & Molotch, 1987) and have the power to dictate and control local officials (Mills 1956). Experts such as Lindblom argue that there are ideological, structural and systemic explanations (1977) that explain the privileged position of business. Stone explains how there is a systemic bias toward business (Stone, 1980). According to Elkin, city officials will naturally gravitate toward building alliances with businessmen because of the structural features and mutual interests that define a city’s political economy (Elkin 1987). These analyses of businesses fail however to distinguish among the demographic area they find themselves; whether if they are property owners or renters; the ethnicity of the owners, the types of business, the community being serviced and their political influence. They may or may not be the owners of the actual property and may be renters of commercial property. Businesses can be threatened by actions of local government who can create a hostile environment (Curran and Hanson 2005). In the case of Santa Ana, businesses clearly represent different levels of economic and political. Businesses can organize to protect overlapping interests. Business associations and business improvement districts or BIDs are two examples.
Workers in cultural spaces: Cultural production includes many distinct workers, including the artists, the painters but also the janitors and the cooks. Therefore, this study includes individuals in each space who may receive wages or volunteer such as those who teach classes, clean, DJ, perform, organize, etc.. Some workers organize collectively; for example, some janitors are organized in Justice for Janitors in Santa Ana. Some artists have recently organized themselves into the Artists Village Alliance of Santa Ana (Arellano, 2010). Many individuals working in cultural production may or may not identify themselves as artists or work as professional artists. This may include residents who live in Santa Ana and sometimes organize in neighborhood associations and transnational communities. This also includes some music and cultural movements that cross international borders.

**Property owners:** Property owners can be both private and public entities who own cultural spaces and may or may not be business owners. In the case of Santa Ana, the City is one of the largest property owners. Property owners play particular roles in growth and antigrowth coalitions. They may or may not be interested in larger development. It is important to distinguish between property owners and businesses owners as well as owner-occupied businesses and those property owners who profit from leasing out their property. In certain areas, like Santa Ana, property owners have organized Property Business Improvement Districts to consolidate a vision for property owners.

**Private planning consultants:** An important actor who played a significant role in the development of the space but not necessarily an employee or worker, are the private
planning consultants. They are not part of a cultural space per se, but they represent various interests. In the case of Santa Ana, private planning consultants most often represented private businesses, property owners and developers in the planning process.

Non-profit leaders: these are individuals who represent the interests of non-profit organizations, or 501C-3s. Often form part of collectives and coalitions. Cultural nonprofits have a huge stake in city and state cultural planning. They lobby for state or local arts and cultural budgets, bonding bills. Yet outside of the flagship organizations, this dominant constituency for cultural policy including small nonprofits and universities understands little about the intersection with urban development and planning (Dempster 2004). At the same time, important coalition building takes place around other forms of community benefits that have made important strides in the struggles over Rights to the City (Baxamusa, 2008).

These structured and semi-structured interviews, conducted in Spanish and English, were coded according to different research questions and made up part of the analysis. In order to answer the research question 1, I asked workers about their history, where they learned their skills and how and their experiences working in certain cultural spaces. For question 2, I would ask similar questions to business and property owners to try and understand their own perspective on cultural development, their relationships and  

---

15 Museums, orchestra halls, artist centers, theatres and community arts facilities (Gray and Kilburn 2000; Heilbrun and Gray 1993; Wyszormirski 1999) function both as for-profit and nonprofits. Several studies (Alvarez 2005, Jackson, Herranz and Kabwasa Green 2003; Peters and Cherbo 1998; Peterson 1996, Wali, Severson and Longoni 2002; Walker, Jackson and Rosenstein 2003) have written about the legitimacy of community-based artists that bridge across class and culture, its changing character and its service to the communities and individuals. These groups are rarely engaged in city cultural policy and from most advocacy organizing efforts. However, their work is deeply affected by these actions.
challenges. For question 3, I focused on businesses, property owners and residents/workers within each space to find the interrelated stories that demonstrated the interconnections to one another.

Semi-structured interviews included these topics:

1) History of the worker, owner, respondent
2) History of the space (time and place it was purchased, why the business/organization came to Santa Ana, owner, name etc.)
3) Relations within the workplace ideology and citizenship questions)
4) People served: how often, when, why, who?
5) Access
6) Organizational models of sustainability
7) Networks and Alliances, networks, collaborations
8) Relationships with the city and neighborhood and space
9) Relationships with the city and individual
10) Future of the worker
11) Future of the Space

The difference between topic 1 and 2, 8 and 9, and 10 and 11 is the individual versus the space: the history of the individual versus the history of the space and the relationship of the individual and the community versus how the space is perceived or received by the community. For example, sometimes, being the executive director was a temporary goal while the cultural space could remain for years into the future. Access refers to the experience of the individual accessing this space, other spaces in the city, and their perceptions on the people who also come and don’t come into the space. Organizational
models of sustainability included the different financial and organizational ways in which its members organized each space.

**Participant Observation**

Through participant observation, different stories came together to capture the experiences and the relations actors build through the development of cultural spaces. I observed at each cultural space during business hours, events, meetings, performances, rehearsals, exhibits, and opening and closing time. I also observed and participated in city council meetings, public festivals, art walks and protests that took place in public settings. My observation ranged from full participant to complete observer and was both conducted in public and private settings.

Participant observation, together with secondary interviews of different respondents and archival data, was part of triangulating the data that I collected. The advantage of participant observation was that I also could capture not only what people said but then also how people acted and how others around them experienced those acts. I could compare what people said in their interview to what they actually did. Participation observation required hundreds of hours of field notes that are then also coded and analyzed according to the research questions and theoretical framework. In this way, I could both understand through my own participation but also explain these situations and concerns through theoretical and empirical analysis. Far from a neutral outsider, my participant observation was my distinguishing feature that both made me part of the world I was studying but also separated me from that world as I searched for understanding and causal explanations. I use participant observation to understand the institutional context
and social structure that “shapes and distorts” the everyday world of the respondents, and are in turn, are also shaped and transformed (Burawoy, et al., 1991, p. 6).

Could get lots of participant observation from government officials: this includes actors who represent the state, planners, city council members, the police, and city workers. Some local governments have adopted cultural plans, have included cultural components in their master plans, have public arts programming, and have commissioned public art and support cultural events. In some cases, dedicated taxes support publicly owned arts facilities like museums and performing arts centers (MPAC 2007). Cultural tax districts can raise funds from property, sales, and cigarette taxes and then designate it for cultural planning (Markusen and Gadwa 2009). This is not the case in Santa Ana or West Oakland. However, in both cases the state uses zoning, redevelopment, infrastructure provision, taxes and various community and economic development funds to develop and regulate cultural spaces.

Archival Data

I included archival data as part of the investigation. These data helps us answer all three questions by laying out 1) the socio-historic antecedents that have shaped the current cultural and political landscape of Santa Ana and its residents; 2) document previous city council decisions on the regulation of cultural spaces, including funding, permits, and land use regulations, and 3) document the ownership of downtown Santa Ana and the different forms of private investment. Archival data serves to better understand the official and dominant narrative around cultural policy and planning. City council minutes record
planning decisions and some community contestation (although much of this takes place outside of city-sponsored forums). Different forms of state regulation and decisions on permits, including land use, alcohol, and conditional use, impact decision making processes around cultural development. City charters, budgets and specific plans present the state’s forms of regulation. Furthermore, they present a formal and official narrative of the physical landscape and the city’s goals.

Various types of government forms aside from the budget also formed an important component of this data. Federal funds that the city distributes such as Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and funding for Empowerment and Enterprise Zones within the selected areas served as evidence of city-sponsored projects. Through a freedom on information act, I was able to gather CDBG funding records from 1991-2012, the approximate years when much of the development of downtown Santa Ana took place. Budgetary data also served as evidence of City’s priorities, both economically and politically. These data were evidently not available for all the cultural spaces because not all cultural spaces had accessed these funds. However, it is an important part of the story of development of some of the spaces.

There is certainly historic research on Santa Ana that I present in the following chapter, mostly from the 1980s and on. A significant contribution to this research however is a USC masters thesis in social work by Helen Walker written in 1928. This research does not only provide historic context but also provides us with the experiences of Mexican immigrants in Downtown Santa Ana that transcend time. Through interviews and surveys, this research provides the historic and cultural realities of the Mexican community during
that era and in many cases, the white racist and patronizing attitudes that continue to shape contemporary experiences in the creative city.

The West Oakland case study took a very distinct process in terms of scope and depth. West Oakland was identified as a historic cultural center for African Americans facing increased investment. However, unlike Santa Ana, there was a cultural district proposed by black community organizers that brought my attention to this area. This case study also involved interviews, participant observation and archival research. Five cultural spaces served as a primary focus of the West Oakland case study.

The analytic generalizability of this research comes from its depth in capturing the experiences of low income Mexican immigrants in a creative city. This is distinct from the aim of generalizability of quantitative research. Instead I focus on the overall lessons learned from the people living and working Santa Ana that communities in other places can learn from.

**Behind the Research Curtain**

A little over five years ago in 2008, I began systematically collecting data for this study. However, the study’s groundwork begins much earlier. I was born and raised in Santa Ana and participate in many cultural spaces as well as many local anti-gentrification movements. Growing up I experienced the contradictions of living in a Mexican city and facing anti-immigrant propositions such as Proposition 187 and propositions to end bilingual education. Both my parents have been activists around these issues. As an urban planner, dancer and community organizer I began making observations around the way art and
culture were part of urban development in Downtown Santa Ana. I volunteer with an organization in the study and have actively organized against the gentrification of the area.

My experiences certainly influence my research. Personal contacts and relationships were certainly important contributions to this research. At the same time, going beyond my own contacts was necessary to fully understand the relationships that shape my community and capture the differing opinions of actors who have stood on the opposite side of me in certain community struggles. Individuals on my committee and I were concerned that some people would not want to speak to me, knowing my own political stance in the community. To my surprise, this was not the case. Property owners, who stood on the other side of the political spectrum, most often spoke to me willingly and stated their “wish” to give me “their side” of the story. The research actually provided an opportunity that did not previously exist.

My political participation and role in the community could also influence my findings and the validity of my research. I included precautions in my methodology and included respondents who represented different political, cultural and economic interests than my own. For example, for property owners, I included owners who were both for and against the property business improvement district. Furthermore, I used a protocol for my semi-structured interviews aimed to capture the perspective of the respondent no matter our own political leanings. Interviews were recorded, confidential and respondents could have a copy of the recording if they wished. Another way I checked my research findings included using three distinct methods: interviews, participant observation and archival data. In this way I could enhance the validity of my research results. So for example, I could
confirm something a respondent stated that happened at a city council meeting through my own fieldnotes that I took while I was present at the city council meeting.

Separating the researcher and the organizer in me was as complex as trying to separate the many identities that most Chicanas carry everyday: Chicana, Mexicana, academic, teacher, student and United Statesian. Being a researcher and academic was the most new to me. While a doctoral program often alienates and separates you from your community in the course of the first years, the research often takes you back to the community and you are forced to deal with the contradictions in practice and in theory. This can be an important political act where the practice of listening, questioning, documenting and analyzing is also a form of building power. Being a researcher and having the university affiliation gave me the access and power to ask, document, ask again and go into certain spaces that I never would have had before—in my own community. There is power that comes with access, documentation, analysis and knowledge. However, the real power of this knowledge lies in its distribution, discussion and debate—the true “test” of its “significance” and its “validity.” This part of the research is still to be seen.
Chapter 4

Santa Ana Historic and Political Context: Land, Loss and Alliance Building

The cultural development of Downtown Santa Ana links to a history of loss, discrimination, as well as resistance and resilience. This chapter examines the historic and current forms in which individuals create alliances to “produce, reproduce, or contest daily practices, public policies, and movements” (Woods, 1998, p. 86). Property, both public and private, is simultaneously a point of contention and a means of solidifying certain cultural practices and alliances. At different scales, residents, city council members, and property owners can shape the development of their property while also limiting others’ access to it. This chapter demonstrates the historic overlaps between land, culture, immigration and how these alliances shape the creation and destruction of Santa Ana’s cultural spaces.

Santa Ana, like most cities, changes depending on the time of day, place, and historical moment, but also depending on if you live, visit, or work there. If you visit Downtown Santa Ana today, you will see businesses that appeal and target Latino immigrant customers. All down Fourth Street you can find a concentration of bridal stores that sell Quinceañera and bridal gowns, and baptismal dresses, all traditional wear for significant cultural celebrations in the Mexican community. You can also find Mexican restaurants and vendors who sell mangos with chile on the street corner. On certain streets you can still find botanicas and even wedding chapels. Santa Ana is beyond being an ethnic enclave, or a geographic concentration of an ethnic community. Rather it is a young Mexican city. Of its over 320,000 residents, 78.2% of Santa Ana’s population (Census 2010) identified as Hispanic (10.5% identified as Asian) and 49.5% of the population is
foreign born (compared to 27.2% foreign born in California, Census 2010). Of that foreign born population, 71% is of Mexican decent (Census 2010). The median age is young, 33.5 years (American Community Survey, 2008), and 30.7% of the population is below the age of 18, making Santa Ana a city of young people born in the United States and in Mexico.

![Bridal shop on Fourth Street included in the study, 2013](image)

If you visit Santa Ana on the first Saturday evening of the month and cross from 4th Street over to 2nd Street, you will see hundreds of people walking on the promenade and visiting various galleries, restaurants, and bars. You will hit the Artists Village where several galleries display modern art that faces out into the street. One gallery has artist housing above its galleries that are open for visitors to come and see special exhibits organized for this first weekend of the month. This gathering of visitors, residents, and artists around these gallery spaces is called Art Walk, and serves as a monthly event where new restaurants and bars also profit from these new consumers.
What you will not see in Downtown Santa Ana if you visit today, is a carrousel that for about two decades was a gathering space on Fourth Street in an area called Fiesta Marketplace. Mostly Mexican working class families originally paid 25 cents per child (which later rose to 50 cents) to ride the carrousel. Visitors today will no longer see a kiosk with a “Plaza Fiesta, Calle Cuatro” sign that used to be next to the carrousel on Fourth Street. This was a place where organizations and business owners would host community celebrations, bringing together families for events like Mothers Day, Día del Niño (Children’s Day), Día de Reyes (three wise men) and Día de Muertos (Day of the Dead). These two cultural spaces were gone in 2011. In that single year that the carrousel disappeared so did many of the “Fiesta Marketplace” banners that once hung in this area, and several businesses were replaced. For example, a Mexican seafood restaurant was replaced with an avant guard food establishment. As one respondent stated, “la fiesta se acabó” or the “fiesta is over.” During this time, Fiesta Marketplace represented some of the threats that small business owners felt throughout the Downtown. In this case, the threat became evident because of the loss of several cultural spaces.
Figure 3: The Carrousel on Fourth Street. City of Santa Ana website, 2010

Figure 4: Plaza Fiesta. Photography by Olinka Huerta 2010
Santa Ana is a mid-sized city searching to survive economically through creative proposals that are highly dependent on cultural consumption, the service sector, and new construction. Unlike many other immigrant cities, Santa Ana currently has an all Latino city council, and has had a Mexican mayor since 1986. There is a great need to research the degree to which minority population benefit from the election of people of color (Kraus & Swanstrom, 2001). In the case of Santa Ana, city council member have helped develop distinct yet juxtaposed cultural development projects that seek to transform Santa Ana and are surrounded by historic neighborhoods (See Figure 5).

FIGURE 5: MAP OF SURROUNDING BARRIOS, LOGAN AND LACY

Fiesta Marketplace, like the Artists Village, was a development project set to revitalize the downtown area in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The City of Santa Ana
sponsored both Fiesta Marketplace and the Artist Village around the same historic moment but with very distinct visions. Fiesta Marketplace was an attempt to develop a business and cultural center for the Mexican establishments that had long helped economically sustain Santa Ana’s downtown. It originated in 1985 with the purpose of funding general improvements of Fourth Street (Grand Jury Report 2012). Funding sources for the improvements included the US Department of Housing and Urban Development as well as tax-exempt bonds. Artist Village was a creative economic development proposal in the 90s with a different vision to help create an artist district through the opening of new art galleries, studios, restaurants and bars. This area was creative in the sense that it was meant to draw new consumers to the area through art and culture led development. The city in collaboration with the new artists in the area began First Saturday Artwalks to bring in a new crowd to buy art and visit the new establishments. Funds included a variety of sources including Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and redevelopment grants. Today it includes housing for art students from Cal State Fullerton, art galleries, restaurants, bars, and office space. Despite their proximity, the Artist Village has continued to expand, while Fiesta Marketplace is seeing its last remnants. The Artist Village has brought in more businesses that promote the area, especially at night. On the other hand, Fiesta has been replaced by a new vision called the “East End.”

In order to better understand the capacity and constraints of low-income communities of color as they shape cultural development, it is important to demonstrate the different alliances around land and property and political power that help determine the life and death of each development. Without separating the cultural representations from the historic, economic, and political aspect of these spaces, I outline the alliances that
consolidate visions, funding, policy, and access to land, property, and resources. The findings contradict market based theories that assume that the survival of certain cultural spaces depends on the demand and supply of certain products and services. Instead, this chapters shows how different actors come together around economic, political, and cultural visions that extend and limit the possibilities of the working class immigrant community in the creative city.

**History of Loss and Removal**

This account of cultural development and planning in Santa Ana is concerned as much with the future of the region as it is with its past. This means considering past and future rights of low income communities of color to shape their cities, as well as those forces that systematically work to disempower them (Woods, 1998).

Current gentrification processes overlap with other current and historic conditions of immigrant communities. Santa Ana is a transnational city, or what Friedman defines as “cities that harbor a large number of foreign residents –legal and illegal, short term and long term, heavily endowed with “human capital” as well as “simple labor” (Friedman, 2002; Sarmiento 2002). Changes in migration trends and growing transnational patterns have created communities of migrant populations who continuously are not picked up by Census data (Morales and Bonilla, 1993; Menjivar, 2000). While the rates of Mexican born immigration has reached a near standstill, immigration in California continues to grow from 26.2% in 2000 to 27% in 2012 (Krogstad & Keegan, May 14, 2014). Urban planning literature depicts a difficulty in “accommodating immigrants” in the planning process (Harwood and Myers 2002) while also highlighting the significance of their role in shaping
community based planning and public policy in Santa Ana (Gonzalez, Sarmiento, Urzua, & Luevano, 2012; Harwood & Myers, 2002).

Orange County has been the center of anti-immigrant controversies such as Proposition 187\(^{16}\) and anti-immigrant organizations such as the Minutemen. Mexican immigrants living in Santa Ana have historically faced deportation and coerced emigration (often under armed guard): in the 1930s with the Mexican Repatriation Program; in the 1940s during the Red Scare; again in 1954 during Operation Wetback\(^{17}\); during immigration raids in the 1980s in Santa Ana and most currently in 2008\(^{18}\). In 2008, the city council partnered with Immigration Customs and Enforcement (ICE) from Homeland Security. The City of Santa Ana and the Santa Ana Police Department permitted the ICE detention facility to be in the Santa Ana City Jail where detainees are held while awaiting deportation. Through the program of Secure Communities, 4,736 individuals have been “removed and returned” from Orange County (US Immigration Customs and Enforcement, 2011). A 2013 report by the Center on Juvenile Criminal Justice (CJCJ) found that 43% of youth deported in California were from Orange County, compared to 2% from Los Angeles.

The contentious removal of immigrants fomented by racist attitudes and backed by state action and profit margins that depend on cheap labor, has long been present in Santa Ana. Different forms of removal have been used to push immigrant and working

\(^{16}\) Proposition 187 was a ballot initiative in California in 1994. Also known as Save Our State (SOS) it proposed to prohibit undocumented immigrants from public services including health care and public education (Smith & Tarallo, 1995) (Armbruster, Geron, & Bonacich, 1995)

\(^{17}\) In 1954, Operation Wetback is launched and the government rounds up Mexicans, both documented and undocumented, housing them in camps before shipping them back to Mexico

\(^{18}\) Deportations during President Obama’s administration have hit record highs.
communities out of the City of Santa Ana since its founding in 1869. During the 1880s, the
Chinese immigrant community built up their businesses and homes, which thrived for
more than twenty years in the downtown area. Santa Ana was in part made up of Chinese
immigrants who had come to build the railroads and work the grape and celery fields in
Santa Ana. This community of immigrants developed a commercial center where they had
businesses and shopping areas. According to Patricia Lin, “the land had become much too
valuable and the people wanted to develop it where there was just a bunch of shacks” (Los
Angeles Times 1993). In May 25th, 1906, the city council decided to burn down the
Chinatown and justified the act by stating that there was a case of leprosy that was never
found. The City government of Santa Ana used fire, like many other cities in the United
States, to run out the Chinese working community.”

Despite the historic removal and separation of communities, the immigrant
community continues to culturally and economically sustain Santa Ana’s Downtown and
the surrounding barrios of Logan and Lacy. These spaces reflect a community’s resilience
while also being a product of the discriminatory and racist state and private practices. By
resilience I refer to the community’s ability to withstand economic and cultural shocks and
rebuild itself when necessary. This social organization of immigrant communities in these
spaces goes back to the origins of the City of Santa Ana. Helen Walker, a white woman

19 Downtown Santa Ana was also the sight of the last lynching in 1892 of a Mexican, Francisco
Torres, and the attempt of the state to establish white hegemony. Torres, described as a “low type
of the Mexican race, evidently more Indian than white” represented the ideology of race used to
justify Indian removal and extermination policies (Haas 1995). Torres was dragged out of the jail
and hung by a mob. Torres was taken out of the jail where he awaited for the judge to decide on
changing the case to another court. He was hung by a mob and the crowd hung a sign that stated
“Change of Venue” Above his dead body (Haas 1995).
obtaining her masters in sociology in the late 1920s describes the Logan barrio in her thesis as a center of cultural production:

“There is a Nixtamalia (stores that sells corn flour), where Americans as well as Mexicans come to buy tamales, enchiladas, or tortillas; a candy shop down an alley where delicious “dulce calabasas” (Squash candy) may be bought; a potter sells handmade ollas, bean jugs and jars, made in his own yard” (Walker H., 1928, p. xx).

Barrios such as Logan are historic spaces of cultural production that link culture, community and economic sustainability, shaped in part by racism and discriminatory practices.

Those who had power over land and access to it could help dictate the development of the barrio. Even before the 1920s, where the Mexican community settled was determined in part by rents and access to property that was shaped by discriminatory practices. Another one of Walker’s respondents explains:

“The Mexicans went down to there to live because the rents were cheap. Then, too, there was a terrible feeling among the white people in Santa Ana at that time. They did not like to live near the Mexican people. A white man would let his house stand vacant all of the time before he would rent it to a Mexican, even if the Mexican and his family were clean and could pay the rent. So whether or not the Mexican people wanted to live in a district by themselves, they had to. There was no other place they could get a house to live in” (Respondent in Walker 1928: xviii).
Race relations were part of property relations, which in turn shaped the barrio. These were not just individual forms of behavior but rather the state often protected and even developed these forms of racism. The segregation of neighborhoods, schools and theatres for example represented state sanctioned policies and discriminatory practices against low income communities of color.

Cultural spaces such as theatres, schools, and barrios are historically places where rights are practiced or denied at the everyday level. The movie houses, theatres, schools, and neighborhoods that continue to be significant cultural spaces in Santa Ana are no exception. These everyday forms of rights and citizenship can be just as important as official citizenship. A respondent in the 1920s provides a critique of citizenship in Santa Ana during the 1920s:

“What is the advantage? We cannot go around wearing our citizenship papers on our sleeves. If we did, that would make no difference. We would still have to go upstairs in the movie houses, live in the low parts of town, send our children to the old and ugly schools. We are still Mexicans, you see, because we look differently from the Americans (from Walker 1928: 7).”

Legal status in the country was only part of determining one’s experiences in the city. The regulation regarding where Mexicans lived, attended school, and sat in a theatre helped dictate what it meant to be Mexican with or without citizenship.

---

20 Mexican schools in Santa Ana were also institutionalized forms of racism and segregation. According to Walker, “there was no attempt to segregate children in the American districts on the basis on nationality.” However, if the children were thought to not understand the English language they could not attend the American school in the city. Segregation was then based on both language and nationality since many Mexicans spoke Spanish in the home and were considered inferior.
The role of state planning and “official land-use policies implied, and often enforced, an absence of rights to such” (Haas 1995: 168). The historic relationship between land, race, culture, and citizenship is central in understanding how communities of color shaped urban spaces.

**Consolidation of Property and Politics**

The opportunity to shape the urban environment is aided or impeded by historical, cultural, social and political modes of inclusion and exclusion (Schaller & Modan, 2005, p. 396; Banerjee 2001; Lowry 1998). According to previous research, characteristics of immigration status, property ownership, class, cultural alignments, and tenure status influence the ways in which individuals can assert their claim to space (Schaller & Modan, 2005, p. 395; Katznelson, 1981; Lowenstein, 1989). While Disneyland continues their major $1.1 billion makeover of the California Adventure theme park, Santa Ana has the highest unemployment rates in Orange County at 15.1% (compared to 9% in Orange County) according to the California Employment Development Department, 11/09. In the areas of poverty, income level, crowded housing, unemployment, dependency, and education, Santa Ana was rated first in its Urban Hardship Index (Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government; Montiel, Nathan, & Write, 2004). The percent of people below the poverty line from 2006-2010 was 17.9%, compared to 13% percent in the larger Orange County area (United States Census Bureau, 2010). Santa Ana has 13,028 persons per square mile, the highest ratio of persons per square mile in Orange County (State of California, 2009; City of Santa Ana Consolidated Plan 2010) and the highest population
density per housing unit: 4.6 vs. 2.8 New York and 2.6 Los Angeles (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

In Downtown Santa Ana, the presence and use of space by the Mexican community is visibly apparent; however, the development of cultural spaces over the past twenty-five years is evidence of the alliances between developers and the City that help shape these possibilities for communities of color. For example, Fiesta Marketplace was the result of property and business owners working together to build this concept around a Mexican marketplace. These alliances build political strategies that go beyond individual economic and political power and instead build collective power among a group of people with certain interests. In the history of Santa Ana, groups and interests shift, making these alliances strategic and flexible. Ownership, for example, is complicated. Limited liability corporations (LLCs) often involve more than one owner who shares a percentage of the property. The creation of LLCs is an economic and legal relationship concerning a specific piece of property. Each LLC includes individuals who own a range of properties and a certain percentage of each property; some who own many other properties and some who only own that single piece.

This relationship is significant in consolidating political and economic interests and resources, as well as bringing together a vision for the parcel. For example, in 1985, the Fiesta Marketplace, LLC was formed and entered into an agreement with the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Santa Ana in a plan to revitalize the east end of Fourth Street. The LLC brought together existing property owners including Allan Fainbarg and Irving Chase as managing general partners, along with and two smaller Latino

\[\text{Footnote: The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Santa Ana was dissolved as of February 1, 2012, per Assembly Bill X1 26 (AB 26) (Oversight Board, City of Santa Ana website 2014)}\]
business owners, Robert Escalante and Jose Ceballos, as limited partners. Initially the
individual property owners within the site included eight property owners: Allan Fainbarg
and Irving Chase, John Isaacson, Jose Ceballos, Raymond Rangel, Robert Benitez, Jesus
Galvan, and Robert Escalante. This agreement with the LLC included the sale of city
property that included the following: three parcels for $228,640, a theatre named the Yost
for $50,000; and the former “Ritz Hotel” for $120,000. This group was largely responsible
for investing in the Fiesta Marketplace vision.

Today, the original owners of Fiesta Marketplace have a different interest in the
downtown area. Not including any of the Fiesta Marketplace, LLC, each property has a
very unequal amount of property to shape their vision.

**TABLE 3: Fiesta Marketplace Original Owners and their Property Today**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>LAND (Year Purchased)</th>
<th>NET WORTH (last improvement)</th>
<th>YEAR PURCHASED</th>
<th>LAST IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEBALLOS</td>
<td>$87,206</td>
<td>$284,633</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$106,576</td>
<td>$368,257</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCALANTE</td>
<td>$51,132</td>
<td>$90,704</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$146,808</td>
<td>$148,440</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$148,462</td>
<td>$244,924</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGEL</td>
<td>$103,702</td>
<td>$2,565,937</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASE AND FAINBARG</td>
<td>$62,121</td>
<td>$374,647</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$268,674</td>
<td>$925,603</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$71,262</td>
<td>$184,128</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$188,410</td>
<td>$238,235</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$92,757</td>
<td>$96,631</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$214,523</td>
<td>$429,035</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75,010</td>
<td>$112,502</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table includes the original property owners included in the Fiesta Marketplace LLC. It does not include the property that forms part of the LLC itself because of the many changes in name, percentage of ownership etc. The current status of the owners included in the Fiesta Marketplace LLC was not corroborated by more than one source in this study.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$21,847</td>
<td>$40,943</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$311,100</td>
<td>$1,147,500</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows not only the different properties, but also shows the years they were purchased and the last year an improvement was made to the property. Outside of Fiesta Marketplace properties, only one property owner made improvements to their establishment after 1989. It is important to note the involvement of the city in this area as property owners and developers as well.\(^{23}\) In just the downtown area covered in the study, the City of Santa Ana (including what was formerly the Community Redevelopment Agency) owned twenty parcels.

Having access to purchase, develop or even rent property in Downtown Santa Ana was a big part of determining the future of that area, or even the ability to influence that future. This was the case for both property owners and renters. While some businesses and organizations took the usual route and called a realtor to see the space, other businesses and organizations were invited in. For example, in the cultural district examined in this study, an art organization was recruited to relocate to Santa Ana. In this case, it meant the City of Santa Ana was seeking certain art establishments that would fit the vision for the future of an artist district in the early 1990s. This founding artist explains how one of the visionaries of the artist district came to their event to propose their relocation to a certain building in the core of Downtown Santa Ana.

“So, then at one of our events out over [at their previous location] he said that ‘I’m promoting this idea of the artist village.’ He’d come across this building he thought we’d be interested in. And so we looked at it, and it was

---

\(^{23}\) The issue has emerged most recently with the development of a high end farmers market where the City of Santa Ana is a partial owner.
this just this building ...completely rundown, abandoned, the roof caved in, there’s 3 million pigeons living in it. You go inside its like a hazmat scene. You take you life into your hands just breathing inside there...So I told him, ‘we’re basically an artist run non-profit gallery’, I said ‘essentially, looking at real-estate, we don’t have two nickels to rub together’...The story from there was that the City of Santa Ana redevelopment agency, was uh, I guess it was the city council. I don’t know how all the details worked. I think it was called community development block grants, CDBG money, which is really re-granted HUD money. From what I understand HUD will give the city a chunk of money for some aspect of urban development. Then the city council can decide who is given what. So I never filled out a grant in my life. I had never even seen a grant application. I didn’t know what they were. I heard about that, [and thought] ‘oh those are for intellectual people that’s not for me.’ Anyhow, so I filled this thing, I had no idea how does one evaluate a run down old building when I barely know how to spell the word real-estate.”

With the help of the City of Santa Ana, the members of this gallery went into figuring out how much the building was worth. This was the first time they applied for CDBG money and asked for around $78,000. Instead, the City granted them $283,000 for that first year. According to the respondent “And that was because all these people got together and figured out sort of really understood what was involved and wanted to support the idea because it would help the city have, you know, a really more vital downtown area.”
There are several different types of CDBG funding generally used for services and capital investments. The grants that this contemporary arts space received were both social service and capital grants. As the visionary of the Artist district said, “there was a great difference between services/programming and capital grants.” Capital grants gave access to permanent property whereas service funds were project based. CDBG funding for this contemporary arts space helped (Schaller & Modan, 2005) renovate the space. Today, the contemporary arts space continues to pay only $1 a year.

Determining the allocation of public funds for each development is also a complicated endeavor. During my own observations of city council meetings, even council members asked if public funds were used for certain actions, such as removing the Fiesta Marketplace sign and the carrousel on Fourth Street. In interviews, respondents indicated their own confusion regarding where the money actually came from to develop their own cultural space. Community Development Block Grants and Enterprise Zone\(^n\) funds were significant factors in the development of downtown. According to the CDBG records obtained from the city, from 1991 to 2013, over $2,680,300 CDBG funds for social services and historic preservation were invested in the Artist Village in just four cultural spaces. However, interviews demonstrate that city redevelopment funds allocated for these developments were much greater. A neighboring art center also included in the study received $1.9 million for the project (Dubin, 1997). Although some CDBG funds were used to help develop a theatre group that moved into the space in 1997, determining

\(^{24}\) Since January 1999, HUD assigned Enterprise Zone (EZ) status to a 3.9 square mile area in Santa Ana. From then to 2009, the City of Santa Ana used up to $140 million tax exempt, EZ facility bonds for qualified businesses. In 2008, June 8, 2008 the City of Santa Ana received a 15-year Enterprise Zone (EZ) designation. The Santa Ana EZ encompasses 16 square miles. The Enterprise Zones ended in January of 2014.
exactly where the rest of the million dollar funds came from was not possible for this project. Although the City and its agencies are accountable for these funds, tracking all the different funds tapped for a development project often requires an interview with those decision-makers that can point to where the funds came from.

**Funding a Vision for Downtown Santa Ana**

One of the most recent alliances to shape the development and vision of Downtown Santa Ana was a property business improvement District (PBID) created in 2008. The PBID filed as a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation organized under the California Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporation Law, making it exempt from Federal Income Tax. BIDs have been used throughout the country as economic development strategies to revitalize both downtown and residential neighborhoods. The idea is that a PBID can more efficiently revitalize the area than the city or individual businesses by levying fees on local commercial properties and transforming urban space as a cultural commodity (Schaller & Modan, 2005). BIDs can have significant impacts through the delivery services including marketing, policy advocacy, maintenance and security (Mitchell, 2001).

The PBID in Santa Ana was an alliance that technically represented the interests of all the properties within the established boundaries. BID scholarship has demonstrated how once established, the BID board of directors prioritize property owners’ interests, and rule out different forms of citizenship and public participation that are central in shaping the public sphere (Schaller & Modan, 2005). In Santa Ana, the establishment of the PBID

---

25 Under Section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code
not only prioritized property value as political representation, but also included the city as one of the largest property owners involved in the process.

The voting process to establish PBIDs was based on the assessed value of the properties, not on individual or “one man-one vote” rule. On December 1, 2008 the following voting tabulations were reported:

Table 4: Tabulated PBID Votes and Their Assessed Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ballots</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>% Total Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Support</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$301,510</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$203,556</td>
<td>40.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$505,066</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only twenty-five percent of the ballots had been returned. Although the ballots in almost doubled and the supporters of the CMD (Commercial Management District) were a minority, the latter controlled the majority of the assessed value. On December 15, 2008, the clerk of the City Council “certified” the voting results. (Orange County Grand Jury, 2011-2012). Almost ten months after the votes were certified, on September 17, 2009, the PBID announced the results of the vote and the establishment of the CMD. In November of 2009, the property owners received their first assessments in the newly established CMD.

In order to establish the PBID, the City of Santa Ana City Council had to amend the Municipal Code to allow for the establishments of CMDs and allow a different voting and disestablishment process. On July 7, 2008, the City of Santa Ana City Council added Article XX to Chapter 13 of the Municipal Code allowing for the establishment of CMDs. There were two large distinctions between this ordinance and state law around CMDs.
While the state law required “preformation petition” at 50%, the ordinance set this at 30% of the proposed district value. The ordinance also increased the life span of the CMD to 10 years, compared to the state law that limits the life span of CMDs to five years, with renewals of 10-year periods. One month after this change in the municipal code, on August 5, 2008, the PBID filed Articles of Incorporation with the Secretary of State, with the intention of becoming the nonprofit organization that would manage the proceeds from the new CMD. On April 21, 2009, the Santa Ana City Council authorized the execution of an agreement with the CMDs non-profit corporation.

The Corporation was incorporated in August 2008 and commenced operation in July 2009 (Notes of Financial Statements 2010), with the purpose of “enhancing and improving Santa Ana’s central business district” according to an interview with the executive director. The PBID annual reports stated that the commercial management district (CMD) encompassed “281 parcels equaling 40,000 linear feet of street frontage, 4.3 million sq. ft. of land and 3.1 million sq. ft. of buildings” (Annual report 2010). Their assessments were based on a flat parcel fee, a street frontage fee, a land area fee, and a building area fee. Like most other BIDs, many of the services focused investments in security and cleanliness supplemented by public services like street cleaning, police, and urban design (Houstoun, 1997; Mallet, 1994; Schaller & Modan, 2005). In addition, the PBID was responsible for business outreach and development, business attraction, marketing, branding, networking and press” to package and sell Downtown Santa Ana.

Some property owners, having worked for generations in Downtown Santa Ana, complained that they could not afford the high tax assessments and feared that they would be driven out of business. In interviews, some businesses reported their tax assessment
doubled and tripled their property taxes. On average, properties' financial burdens doubled as a result (Grand Jury Report 2012). Some business owners also complained that services such as security only took care of certain areas, focusing on the new developments. Despite the significant surcharge, these businesses explained how the majority of the proceeds of the assessment benefitted a particular clientele who came in the evening to visit the nighttime establishments. On the other hand, these new establishments like bars and restaurants came to life with the support of the PBID. During city council meetings, new businesses publically stated how the PBIDs’ support was part of their relocation to Santa Ana.

![Image of three property owners under threat of displacement working to disestablish the PBID](image)

**Figure 6:** Three property owners under threat of displacement working to disestablish the PBID

The PBID funds complemented a range of different forms of funding for the development of cultural spaces. Other forms of funding came through economic development funds. In 2008, for example, the City initiated the “Fourth Street Façade Program” and allocated $1,250,000 for improvements that included building fronts with a supposed limitation of $75,000 per storefront. This money only went to three property
owners, the majority going to the Fiesta Marketplace developers now, East End Developers.

Table 5: Allocation of Fourth Street Façade Program Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owners</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM Theater LP (West End Theatre)</td>
<td>$63,814.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumm &amp; Livingston Investments (Pacific Building)</td>
<td>$110,191.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiesta Marketplace Partners (S &amp; A Properties)</td>
<td>$765,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Jury Report 2012

There were many other public and formal complaints around the way the city formed the district, counted the ballots, assessed taxes, and the way in which the nonprofit administered the funds. The city council had a vested interest in the outcome of the process, and voted. Their vote constituted 38% of the votes needed to establish the district (Grand Jury Report 201226). In addition, the clerk’s office tabulated the votes, and some parties alleged there was a lack of impartiality and that it was not consistent with the Government Code. Businesses and property owners organized and collected considerably more than the minimum number of petitions required to disestablish the assessment district. However, the district had eliminated this disestablishment procedure.

In addition to the process of establishing the PBID, the representation on the board of directors favored property owners. From 2009-2010, the board of directors was comprised of 17 individuals. All but one represented property owners and five were Latino/a. The merchant representative was one of those Latinas. In 2011-2012, there were

---

26 On July of 2011, the merchants filed a request with the Orange County Grand Jury to conduct an investigation of the Community Management District or PBID.
18 board members: two latinos/as, again, one of whom was one of the three merchant representatives on the board of directors (2010/2011 Annual Report). In addition, there were standing representatives from the Santa Ana Police Department and the Fire Department. Although there were separate merchant’s association meetings, some of the merchant’s complained about them being during the day when most of them were working.

Conclusion

When the Santa Ana Police Department aligned with the city and developers’ new vision, a Santa Ana PBID representative publically described this point in time as “a tipping point” for Santa Ana. By updating the city’s dance regulations and recognizing “the unique entertainment venues within the City” (PBID newsletter 2010), this alliance between private developers, the city council and the police department was the push necessary to promote a specific cultural and economic plan. However, this tipping point is not a single moment in time but rather is a sociohistorical process that leads up to these alliances in Santa Ana.

Rather than solely focusing on the statistics and demographics of the city to describe the context of this research, this chapter began by addressing the racialized production of space in Santa Ana. From the barrios to the current development of downtown, these historic sites of cultural production are shaped by characteristics of race, class, and the relationship to the state. Developing a deeper understanding of the area of study requires

---

27 The City staff recommended that the chapter on Dancing now be changed to Entertainment that would cover a broad range of entertainment offerings. The entertainment permit would expand the possibilities for establishments that include music and dance. This would regulate any venue that would have live entertainment on a regular basis. The proposed revisions to the municipal code for dance, entertainment and alcohol would make the police department even more involved in the regulation of cultural spaces.
examining the historic roles of the state, private property owners, businesses and workers in shaping the cultural spaces that exist today.

These contemporary realities are at the surface of deep layers of reoccurring experiences of loss, displacement and removal, evident in the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe, and most recently in the deportation of thousands of individuals from the county. This experience of displacement overlaps with the current process of gentrification, the destruction of significant cultural symbols, and the increased rates of deportation. This history brings up significant questions around citizenship, access to everyday spaces, and the right to shape our cities.

This alliance largely depends on the Santa Ana City Council voting along with the interests of certain property owners when forming the PBID, and then allowing for a process that prioritized the assessed value instead of number of votes. City Council’s approval of the political participatory process both legitimizes the procedure and disempowers the larger community of residents, business owners, and small property owners. Using the municipality to change state level requirements concentrated the political power at the local scale in this case. However, the localization of the process did not equate to an increased benefit for all local property owners or businesses, much less residents. The right of small businesses to democratically participate in a democratic process was curtailed. The way public money has been channeled to a select few areas, and the way in which only a select few exercised financial and political control both contradict the idea of a free market determining the success and failure of certain cultural projects.

The city council and private property owners played an active role in giving certain individuals access to properties and development funds. Through matching different
property owners, businesses, and art organizations with funding including CDBG, redevelopment, and tax assessments, the city helped consolidate political and economic resources with specific visions for the city. Differentiating between programming and capital finance is significant in figuring the role of the city in supporting the development and sustainability of cultural spaces. While many cultural organizations received CDBG funds for example, only specific capital funds helped purchase and develop property. Furthermore, only the city and large property owners could make $1 rents possible for cultural spaces. Distribution of permits, grants, and funding helped regulate not only the production of cultural spaces but also who had access and opportunity to develop property, and thereby shape the surrounding culture.

Despite this “tipping point” where the cultural and economic transformation appears to be inexorable, the Mexican immigrant community continues to organize and practice their own cultural manifestations throughout Santa Ana. As history also shows, forms of cultural and economic resistance continue to build in the immigrant and working community despite fires and forced removal. Today, cultural celebrations such as \textit{dia de muertos} and the day of the Virgen of Guadalupe are visible manifestations that take place both publically and privately. Transnational communities cross, negotiate political and economic boundaries, and represent grassroots cultural planning efforts. The border and transnationalism influence both the everyday realities and the art and culture produced as part of these experiences (Alvarez, 2008). The following chapter presents findings that demonstrate how immigrant low income communities develop local workers as artists, while also experiencing these everyday contradictions.
Chapter 5

The Character of Working People’s Experiences in the Creative City

“I walk into the coffee shop to do an interview with Sergio, a local poet. It’s about
2:30 in the afternoon. Oil paintings pack the walls, mismatched chairs and tables fill
the room, and vintage rugs take up the empty spaces on both the floor and the
walls. Long, sheer curtains cover the wall-high windows like veils. A sign at the
counter states “friends don’t let friends go to Starbucks,” and flyers promoting yoga
classes and performances in the area fill the rest of the counter space. A small
chalkboard displays the schedule of weekly performances at the space, including
open mic night and some acoustic shows. The waiters are all white young women,
except one young man who is Mexican American and happens to be the manager
as well. I’ve spoken to him before. He speaks a little Spanish. In the back, I can see
a group of young Mexican immigrant men in the kitchen. The tops of their heads
peak out from behind every once in while. One of those cooks is Sergio, the poet
I’m looking for. I saw him do an powerful performance at a community center one
block away” (Fieldnotes, September 2011).

The heart of the creative city lies in cultural spaces such as the one described above. This
coffee shop opened in 1999 in the center of the Artist Village on 2nd Street in Santa Ana,
California. Several art galleries and housing for artists surrounding the coffee shop opened that
same year, forming the physical, economic and symbolic center of the artist district in Santa Ana.
Placed next to one another, individuals can stroll from the coffee shop and visit galleries and
restaurants. The city council and staff recognize this area as the center of cultural production
developed to bring artists to Santa Ana, increase foot traffic, property value and taxes.
Each cultural space brings together many jobs, from the performer who plays the guitar, to the janitor who cleans the building. Different individuals have access to specific employment opportunities and learn practices and conventions that pertain to each job. In order to understand how low income communities of color shape and articulate their position in the creative city, this chapter examines the everyday experiences of thirty five individuals working in cultural spaces in Santa Ana. It sets out to answer the first set of questions of the dissertation: what are the experiences of the working class who participate in these cultural spaces, particularly the Mexican immigrant community? How do everyday relations and conventions of cultural production influence workers’ economic and political ‘place’ in the city and vice versa? I argue that where people learn, work and practice their art and cultural skills influences the ‘place’ of the worker in each cultural space and in the larger city. Race, immigration, and age are play a role in determining
this ‘place’ while the individual also uses these processes of learning art as opportunities to rearticulate and resist this position. Working class immigrant artists learn their art and connect it to their communities, how they need and find and are discriminated again vis-à-vis spaces, and how they, with the help of their communities and fellow artists, resist. The findings rely on participant observation in each cultural space, as well as thirty-five interviews with workers. This includes observing everyday interactions, performances, art shows and festivals in each cultural space.

As researchers concerned with ethnic and racial arts participation focus on cultural assets and increased opportunities, this chapter focuses on the formation of artists in low income communities. Far from marginalized, the Mexican working class has integral roles in different cultural spaces—even where they appear to be invisible. The workers I interviewed were working class Latinos and the majority were of Mexican descent. All the names are changed. They identified themselves as Mexican, Mexican American, Hispanic, Peruvian, Colombian, Latino, Chicano/Chicana, and Indigenous. They were either first or second generation. For many, Santa Ana was the first or second stop after migrating to the United States. Lower income communities of color participated in different spaces as workers and artists. Respondents were poets, painters, housekeepers, dancers, gardeners, photographers, DJs, cooks, singers, busboys, waiters, social workers, graphic designers and janitors. Each person worked in one or more cultural space but structural inequalities largely shaped their visibility and mobility between spaces.

The following sections present the findings, the analysis, the conclusions and recommendations. Through relations of cultural production that goes beyond borders, individuals

---

The dissertation research includes other respondents and data, but this chapter focuses on the workers’ responses and experiences.
learn and practice art and working skills. What, where, and how people learn also shapes how individuals see themselves in relationship to others. These data helps us understand how Mexican immigrant artists learn and how their cross-border and community experiences distinguish them from other creative workers. Workers learn about their own social and class position in society but also contest these meanings through cultures of solidarity that can also develop.

The ‘Place’ of the Worker

Sergio came out from behind the counter when he had the chance. He’s a young Mexican man in his early twenties with short brown hair and has a friendly smile. He knelt down beside the table to touch base with me and set up an interview after work because he was not able to get the time off work at that moment. We met later on for an interview where he described his work at the coffee shop. “I’m a cook there, and didn’t know half of the things I know. It’s been hard. Your mind goes through hell working in the kitchen for 8 hours. It’s 35 hours, they do that same old same old, nothing’s changed. But they didn’t ask me for my papers, they need workers.” The “same old, same old” he was referring to was how the employment kept him below the 40 hours of work per week that would require full time benefits. He also explained how “one white girl got fired because she couldn’t hang.” The work was exhausting. However, he continued to work there because the establishment did not ask for legal status or a social security number. This opened the door for undocumented workers like himself to apply there. He recognized that some individuals with more job opportunities would not opt for that type of labor. Sergio was born in Mexico, but lived most of his life in the United States and spoke English perfectly. He did most of his schooling in California. However, his undocumented status limited his ability to choose or move to another job. As the research on participatory arts shows, cultural production often takes place outside of formal
art and creative spaces. Sergio’s paid wages came from his work in the kitchen as a cook—a cultural space recognized by the City—while he would perform for free where and when he had the opportunity.

The table below shows many of the service jobs that exist in the creative city. Most of the occupations listed are overwhelmingly not in the creative service industries. This table is not meant to solely include creative occupations (Markusen, Wassall, DeNatale, & Cohen, 2008) but rather show the types of service industry jobs necessary for these creative occupations to exist. Research shows that inequality increases with many creative initiatives through a growing service industry in which we expect the same highly racialized division of labor. As creative city initiatives push for creative employment, most people of color in Santa Ana, Anaheim and Irvine area are in the “noncreative” jobs. This table shows both some employment opportunities in the creative city, and also demonstrates the highly racialized division of labor and the low number of people of color as professional artists.
Census 2000

Sergio’s role in this particular cultural space was in the back, in the kitchen. Waiters would go in and out bringing and taking food orders. During his shift, Sergio would go into the kitchen, and would come out to eat his lunch and then go back to working where he could not be seen. He learned how to work long hours preparing the different orders. Despite the high percentage of Hispanics living in Santa Ana (78%), there is still a strong case of bifurcation along racial lines, especially in spaces that are racially mixed. The low numbers of Hispanic photographers and
writers are in contrast to the high rates of dishwashers and cooks. In the coffee shop described above, not all the individuals working in the kitchen were Mexican immigrants. However, all the Mexican immigrants working there worked in the kitchen. Like Zukin’s study on restaurants in New York (1995), the “place” for immigrant workers was in “the back.” The division of labor within the space confined certain individual’s visibility and economic mobility.

Despite the racially bifurcated division of labor, the coffee shop on Second Street in the Artist Village appears to be more racially diverse than the cultural spaces just a couple blocks away on Fourth Street. The coffee shop includes Mexican immigrant workers in the kitchen, a Mexican American manager, white waitresses and a diverse group of customers of all ages and ethnicities. In comparison, other cultural spaces in Downtown appear to be almost all Mexican workers and customers and mostly all Spanish speakers. Downtown Santa Ana is home to many bridal shops that serve as centers of cultural production for Mexican girls’ Quinceañeras, or their 15th birthday celebration.

“As you come in to this bridal shop, you meet individuals at the door passing out flyers in Spanish, promoting hair salons, banquet halls, and jewelry shops. The window displays are packed with mannequins dressed in fluorescent pink, leopard, green, and gold gowns for 14 year old girls preparing for their Quinceañera. A young girl comes in with her older brother and her mother. They’re all speaking in Spanish and have come to try on a dress. A young Mexican woman comes up to me and asks me in Spanish if I need any help. A Mexican middle-aged woman comes out from the back to receive the young girl and her family. She’s been in the back doing alterations.” Fieldnotes, August 2011, Tuesday, 5:15 pm, Downtown Santa Ana.
One woman working here explained to me, “There are Mexican women here who are expert
dressmakers and can design and make you any dress you want. Women here do the counter, the
alterations, the ordering and sometimes the sewing. Yes, the store is actually run by a Korean
woman, but we do everything in here.” Although a Korean business person owned the store,
Mexican workers ran the shop’s daily operations.

The “place” of Mexican immigrant women workers was to talk to customers, interact in the
front of the store, in addition to making the dresses in the back. Although there was a set division
of labor and definitely some differences between those who could sew, there was more mobility
within the space. Women walked from the back of the store to the front. There were no men in
the space and everyone was speaking Spanish throughout—both customers and workers.

The cultural space and the “place” of Mexican workers went beyond the actual physical
building. As you walked out of the space, in addition to the workers passing out flyers, you walked
past other businesses involved in the production of the *Quinceañera* tradition. Families planning
a *Quinceañera* can find a place to get their hair done, find a photographer, and buy the *medallita*
or jewelry for the occasion. “Mexican” or “Latino” cultural spaces also included restaurants, coffee
shops, barbershops and cultural centers. Mexican-run restaurants included in the study had
Mexican waiters and bartenders, both immigrant and first generation. Here the waitresses received
customers in Spanish. Both immigrant and US born Mexican workers were in the “front”, and
signs were in Spanish and English.

Generational and legal status impact working relations within each cultural space. However,
the culture of each space, the visibility of workers and the language spoken in each business
depend on many other factors. Mexican immigrant, Korean, White, Mexican American business
owners exist in Downtown Santa Ana and race and cultural relations are very nuanced. It is necessary to distinguish between first and second generation immigrants as well as the primary language used by customers and staff in each space. In the last five years, when many of the existing businesses were closing, two Mexican American owners opened two separate cultural spaces, a barbershop (opened in 2011) and coffee shop (opened in 2008). Both owners are sons of immigrants, and both had clear memories of spending time in Downtown Santa Ana in their youth. Although the owners were Mexican American, these cultural spaces serve a diverse clientele, outside of the Mexican working community. Their customers varied in ethnicity, race and age and included youth, elderly, Mexican, Asian and white customers. In both of these businesses, the majority of the workers were of Mexican descent, young and working in the front of the store or very visible to the customers. However, business was mostly done in English and conversations with clients were mostly in English. Signs in the business were in English or bilingual.

Learning as a Transnational Practice

Respondents’ experiences learning the arts often linked to transnational practices and forms of cultural production. Sergio was like many workers whose first introduction to art and music took place in various institutions in two different countries. Respondents’ artistic education, for example, was part of a transnational experience that took place in both Mexico and the United States, in both private and public spaces. Learning art and culture was part of a family’s own migration history.

Paola is a young female musician who was born in the United States but went back to live in Mexico when she was still a girl. Paola explained that as a young girl, “My mother and father sing and I grew up in the kitchen listening to them sing. My uncles play. They play the guitar...they
liked to sing songs and so I would sing since I was little. That was my first experience with music.”

When asked where she learned, her response was that this is an everyday experience from Mexico.

A little over half of the respondents (54%) received some form of artistic education and formation in Mexico. This included art classes in public schools and formal training in art institutions. Most respondents did not obtain an art school certificate, and learned their art skills either at home or in elementary school in Mexico. Dancing, poetry and music were common in Mother’s Day celebrations and other holidays in Mexico.

In Mexico, Paola took music classes in her school after having lived in the United States. Playing music was already a familiar practice. She recalls:

“When I returned to Mexico, they had the school band that had a small orchestra, and my sister already played violin, and so she would study, but I think we would do that (play music) because we already saw my uncles and family do music, so when they asked me, I said ‘sure, if my sister already plays, why can’t I?’ So I started playing in the orchestra when I was 7 years old. That’s where I learned to read music.”

Learning to play music, paint and dance was often part of the educational curriculum in Mexico and respondents grew up with art as part of everyday life, in conjunction with family experiences.

Sergio, like Paola and other respondents, experienced public education both in Mexico and the United States. According to Sergio, although he never received formal art training, he learned about poetry and self expression in his English and writing classes. More than half of the respondents did receive some sort of art education like Paola. After
living and studying in Mexico, Sergio moved to the United States, which also meant being
placed in special programs because he was an immigrant child. Sergio explained,

“When I got back from Mexico, my English was kind of messed up and they
wanted to show me how to write grammar. I couldn’t write sentences together. So
they put me in an EL (English Learner) class and they would put basic words
together. But I could read, and so they told me I didn’t belong in that class.
Another teacher, she was amazing, she gave me an award. They would say you
don’t know, but I did know. The other teachers taught me.”

English Learner programs in the Santa Ana Unified School District are responsible for teaching
English and bilingual programs where students take additional English classes and receive
specialized instruction in other courses. In 2012, however, local media, parents, educators and
community members reported that many students remain classified as English learners even
though they are fluent in English (Leal, 2012). Being an English learner can sometimes prevent
individuals from enrolling in Advanced Placement courses and other college-preparation classes.
These students are not always immigrants, but are often designated English Learners because their
parents are immigrants and speak limited English. Sergio felt that certain teachers who did not
believe in him held him back while other teachers recognized his abilities.

Cultural production was both part of learning a skill and learning what it meant to be
Mexican and working class. Paola joined the band when she moved back to Santa Ana. She started
noticing differences between the Mexican schools and the white schools when they began traveling
outside of Santa Ana. Paola explained,
“At school they would let us take our instrument home because I didn’t have my own instrument. When we started going to competitions in junior high in Newport Beach, Orange, cities outside of Santa Ana, I saw that they were much better. They were all white and they were much better than us. Then I found out they all had their own instruments and lots of them had private classes.”

Differences in class and race were evident in access to cultural resources, such as instruments and classes. Respondents distinguished communities such as Newport Beach, and Orange as “outside of Santa Ana”. Learning and performing was part of a larger process of forming one’s own conception of race and class. This often took place while learning at school, or as Sergio explained, “everything we learn, we learn at school.” Learning art was tied to their experience as an immigrant, a person of color or a Santa Ana resident.

Access to Professional Art Institutions

Art education was a common experience for those who had lived in Mexico, but this did not mean that they had attended a formal art institution. Only one respondent, Miguel, had studied in a world-renowned art institution in Mexico City, La Esmeralda. He had first come to the United States on a student visa that sponsored his artistic education. Miguel worked as a professional artist and painter here in the United States. Due to higher rents and management decisions, he was forced to move his gallery several times. At the time of this research, he had found a businessman who was sponsoring his new gallery space.

For other respondents there were significant barriers that made the process of entering formal art institutions in the United States difficult. Monica, a dancer, explained:
“I didn’t start dancing until I was 19 years old. That’s old for a dancer, but I didn’t have a chance to start before that...I actually started dancing by mistake, a little bit. I had friends who went to St Josephs (a ballet school) in junior high school. I would always watch them in awe. I never thought it was something that I could do given our economic background. I just never really liked asking my mom for things in general. Trying to pursue something like that I just didn’t want to hurt her feelings, and have to put her in a position where she had to turn us down from possibly pursing something we liked to do.”

The economic barriers to buying the materials for class, such as the proper attire, made dance classes initially unreachable. After high school she started working at a gym where she had access to free dance classes, and from there she met someone who explained how she could also take classes at the community college. She later received her degree in dance. The economic realities linked to the immigrant experience, cannot be separated.

Class and immigrant segregation were barriers to art and cultural education in the United States. In another case, Rosa, a Mexican immigrant mother who worked at a cultural center wanted to enroll her daughter in Santa Ana’s art school. While the cultural center provided dance classes, the art school was a public charter school that provided professional artistic training while also providing some of the highest rate junior high and high school education. It moved to Santa Ana in 2000 and U.S. News ranked it as one of the best high schools in the United States (2010). Unlike the school where Sergio attended that comprised of nearly 50% English Learners, this art school reported 0% English Learners in the school and ranked third in Orange County high schools (News, 2010). To serve as a comparison, the closest high school is about one mile away. About 82% of students received free and reduced-price lunch, an indicator of a school’s socioeconomics.
Less than 10% of the art high school’s student body received free and reduced-price meals.

Students could audition to come in at 7th grade and would then go through high school while obtaining professional artistic development.

Rosa was highly involved in her children’s education and attended the school’s open house. When she told me about the open house, she said it was all in English and there was no translation or presentation in Spanish. I called and arranged for a meeting with the school’s community liaison who spoke Spanish. Rosa, along with a group of 6 Mexican immigrant women that included Paola, three other mothers and one young woman who went with her little sister, went to get more information about the school and speak to the school representative. “She never even got up to shake our hand,” one of the mothers told me. “The entire process is on the computer and some of us don’t even have an email or know how to use it.” One of the mothers had created an email account so she could receive information but didn’t know how to check it. She had to go to her husband’s employment to be able to use the computer. The representative often responded that the information they were asking for was on the computer. When one of the mothers asked if she could have a hard copy of some of the information that was not yet available, the representative said she would have to come back and pick it up. When the mother asked how she would know when it was ready. The representative told her she would have to come the school and check occasionally to see if the information was available. She also added that she—the mother—needed to be more involved in her child’s education.

When I asked one of the women about her feelings about her experience, she said, “I have to be appreciative for her meeting with us. She was the only one who took the time to help us.” However, for other women who attended the meeting, the visit exacerbated the challenges of being accepted into the school. One woman told me she felt offended when she was told she had to be
more involved in her child’s education. “Why else would I be there?” she asked me. Despite the access to information, the school’s campus, and direct communication with the school’s representative, the technological barriers to obtaining information were great.

In addition to the technological and language barriers, students’ level of artistic development made it difficult for them to compete. The audition process for 7th graders with very little formal art experience was a huge barrier. Despite the application encouraging “students with a passionate interest in the arts” to apply, a certain level of dance, drawing, painting and singing was necessary to compete with the other children from throughout Orange County and even the Inland Empire. Students and parents did not know how to prepare an art portfolio and many of them had only received amateur training in smaller community based organizations. Finally, a huge barrier was the question of legal status in the country. Although the school was “tuition-free, donation-dependent” and a “public charter school,” it was not clear if undocumented families could attend the school of the arts. Each student required a social security number to continue filling out and online application, making it difficult for individuals without legal status in the country to apply.

Swimming with sharks: Negotiating Available Space in the Creative City

Many workers learned art practices outside of formal art and educational institutions and still faced certain barriers to gathering and practicing. Public space including streets, sidewalks and public schools were often used to practice and learn skills. School lunch areas, parks and the street were common places for both practice and performance. Adrian, a poet and gardener stated:

“When I got to junior high, I had some neighborhood friends who were also rapping and rhyming and so we made a crew. We would meet up at the park and
we would share our pieces. By the time we got to high school it was a big thing.

Thirty to forty, fifty people in a circle who would battle each other.”

Everyday experiences in public spaces, walking, practicing and playing were important moments for workers trying to get to and from work, play or home. These moments however, were part of the larger political and cultural environment. One young man, Adrian, would practice and perform at a local cultural center included in the study. He described his experience leaving the cultural space.

“I remember when I was still in high school, I remember how there was an ICE (Immigration Customs and Enforcement) van parked right in front of (the cultural center), and ah I remember not wanting to come out for a couple of hours. I remember calling a couple of friends, ‘hey, there’s an ICE van outside of (the cultural center)” – parked. A van parked in front of [the cultural center]! And I didn’t want to come out you know...I thought should I leave through the back, what should I do? I don’t know. But yeah, it was...that was the first experience like, of feeling like why is it that they’re parked out there? Are they trying to send a message? Are they trying to tell us something? After that they would post up there ‘cause the federal building was right there so they would do it consistently maybe once a week in the morning, so I got used to it. So I was able to walk in front of an ICE vehicle right in front of (the cultural space) and whenever it was just there it was like a shark-- when you think of people swimming with sharks maybe that’s what it’s like. It can change your life forever if it touches you or something...it’s a weird dynamic. It’s a weird feeling.”
Adrian would practice, perform and teach at this community center. In addition to limiting employment possibilities as was the case with Sergio, being undocumented makes moving from place to place more difficult. Despite living here for more than half of their lives, very few were able to obtain legal status. One respondent who was a Dreamer explained, “People tell us to get in line, but what line are they talking about? There is no line! There is no path to citizenship.” Many of those who did have ‘papers’ obtained them through marriage or through their parents who had obtained their legal status in 1986 with the passage of IRCA.

Not having documents also made access to certain new cultural spaces more difficult. The presence of ICE in Santa Ana took place as many of the cultural spaces changed and replaced old ones. Many of the new cultural spaces were bars and did not accept the Mexican consulate identification, an official identification recognized by the Mexican government. This made performing or even entering these new cultural spaces impossible for individuals without the proper identification. This issue gained increased attention when some musicians from Los Angeles were denied entrance to a Santa Ana bar when they showed their matricula as proof of their age (San Roman, 2011). Until the confusion around using matriculas as official forms of identification is settled, many individuals living in Santa Ana will not have access to these new spaces.

The opening of these new cultural spaces overlapped the arrival of ICE in Santa Ana and increased deportations. Sergio described his own experience going through a deportation hearing

---

*Even with the passing of DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals), on June 15th 2012, which allowed some of the respondents consideration of deferred action for a period of two years (subject to renewal and eligibility for work authorization), this policy does not provide a path to legal citizenship or lawful status (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services 2013).*

*Matriculas are personal identification cards issued by Mexican consulates in the U.S. that Mexican nationals can obtain by presenting copies of either a birth certificate or passport, coupled with an additional form of identification, plus utility bills to prove place of residency.*
as part of learning how to draw and write poetry. Immigrants who are in the process of deportation are kept in holding cells in the Santa Ana jail. He said, “I got sent to the one in Santa Ana. There’s a holding cell, where you’re locked up for 23 hours a day, and I was in almost 2 months and a half, in a 6x8 cell. They don’t see your face. You’re a paper. All you can do is draw, paint or read.” This is where he practiced, wrote and also learned from the other inmates. Afterward he was sent to Miraloma.

“Then I got to see men like Vega who got deported to Tijuana, and the way they could make art, the way they would take a piece of a paper into like a poster looking image, or something so small and they would blow up things and do it twice the size. This was in Miraloma...That’s where I met real strong people, and I learned a bunch of things about la frontera (the border).”

Sergio spent seven months at this immigration camp, after his time in a holding cell in Santa Ana. Immigration, deportation and the border were all part of experiencing the meaning of being Mexican and the meaning of learning and practicing an art.

Being undocumented becomes a reality for the entire family even when only one person does not have legal status. Elizabeth, a Mexican graphic designer living in Santa Ana could only do informal jobs in design because she did not have a work permit. She had a degree in journalism from Mexico and had worked professionally doing news on television. She was living in the United States with a tourist visa and had to return to Mexico to continue to renew it. Despite her domestic partnership with a US citizen, she could not get married because gay couples still do not have the right to wed their life-long partners (at the time of the interview). Her partner explained, “This has been very difficult for us because we’re three times a minority. We’re Mexican. We’re women and we’re gay. It’s kind of like ‘no more please.’ If I were a man I could marry her.”
Having legal status, however, did not make respondents immune to exclusion or to being criminalized. Young Mexican men had a difficult time gathering even at school. “Actually, the vice principles would try to shut us down...so if we hung out with more than 3 or 4 people, they could put us on gang terms.” Another poet stated, “They would take us to a room during lunch and they would take your fingerprints and picture and put you in a book and then they told you were on gang terms. The high school police was there.” Gang terms meant you could be tried as a gang member if ever facing any legal charges in court. Being on gang terms could have serious repercussions on youth, and especially if the youth was undocumented.

The police particularly targeted youth who practiced certain types of cultural expression. Some forms of expression were illegal or the individuals did not have the permits do it. One graffiti artist explains, “Once the law came across and people came across and people got taken in-- then you start realizing, the only fun thing I can do, and you’re censored. I haven’t been caught in the act.” This criminalization was part of learning and experiencing art and what it meant to be young and Mexican in Santa Ana.

Punk shows are another common example. Finding a space to host shows is always difficult. Shows were central in community organizing efforts because young people of color gather. Local youth hosted shows at one cultural center where they often receive police visits despite the different forms of collective action and governance that the youth organizers enacted.
During one show in 2010, when a young man showed up drunk, the young organizers escorted him outside of the space. While his friends found him a ride to take him home, the police showed up and started to hassle the group. The young man began making a fuss and the police decided to take him in. When he resisted, the police tased him outside of the center while the show was still going on. The young organizers came to aide the young man but some of them were not documented and risked getting deported if and when arrested. The state both criminalized this form of art, and could deport individuals with no legal documentation—a high price to pay for a cultural manifestation. The youth paid a high price for being drunk in public.
Making Temporary Space

The struggles to “make space” for working class expressions were evident throughout the City’s streets, schools, parks and centers. Sandra was a young woman who ran her own gallery space, bringing in artists and musicians to Santa Ana. She had been pushed out of two different buildings and was now using different spaces to put on community events. According to Sandra, she had “The need to feel like I fit into something, but if it wasn’t there I would need it to make it. But low and behold it was a lot of people who kind of fit into that space…it’s a big community and we need space to come together and do shows. So it was for me to find a space, and it ended up being a lot of people finding the space.” These cultural spaces differentiated their projects as those “meant something” and would “make people feel included or feel part of”—also as a response to feeling excluded in other spaces. Sandra’s own struggle to “make space” serves as an example of the common search for a type of incorporation that breaks with a racially bifurcated division of labor and challenges the limited ‘place’ of Mexican immigrant workers in cultural spaces.

In a gallery space about a block away, Sandra began organizing art exhibits and shows, bringing local artists and artists from throughout Latin America. Sandra was born in Santa Ana and developed her first gallery space in Santa Ana in 2004 outside of the artist district. Musicians, painters, community organizers and residents would gather at her gallery space. Her first gallery closed due to the lack of a parking permit, the rise in rent, and difficulties in obtaining a permit to sell food. Her second gallery closed when the building owners moved and did not allow her to continue to use the building. In 2012, after having lost two of her own gallery spaces, Sandra and her partner began to use a specific gallery in the Artist District. This gallery was one of the first galleries the City subsidized as part of developing the Artist District in Downtown Santa Ana. Sandra continued her work in bringing Mexican artists and bands to Santa Ana.
Although she no longer had her own gallery space to let other groups use, she made it a point to represent local artists and residents when she participated in these gallery spaces.

“Every time I do a show here, they’re cool about it. They basically leave us alone. It’s not like they’re asking me “what are you doing...?” nothing like that, except that things slip out of their mouths when I’m at board meetings, that they shouldn’t say and that they realize when I’m sitting there that they said it and its almost like you know I’m like, “say it! Go ahead” but they don’t want to have that dialogue. It’s almost like they fear us but then they don’t care about us.”

Sandra felt that her presence would not only influence the types of events and the audience, but her participation also changed the dynamics of the meetings by affecting what was said during board meetings. Sandra explained for example how more families would come into the space when she and her partner would organize events there, but certain gallery members in the meeting were concerned about strollers. Families walking in with strollers would break the functionality of the space and perhaps cause an accident and damage some of the art. A different demographic would make the exhibit unconventional—not because of the art or the space, but because of the audience.

From working at non-profit organizations to creating their own exhibits, each respondent took an active role in developing a space for expression—in both public and private places, and formal and informal arrangements. Andres, a young poet and hip hop artist, was accustomed to being targeted at school for his music. The group he worked with had grown to a large group of poets rhyming to music. Administrators did not allow the groups to meet anymore during lunch and prohibited bringing boom boxes to school, making it difficult to play their music. Andres was
one of those poets looking for a place to continue to practice, and explained how they found support within the same educational system that often discriminated against them.

“Among the administrators, they would break us up and tell us that we couldn’t bring our boom boxes. We used to bring our boom box, stuff like that but there was this teacher, he was older man and *ya estaba viejito* and he opened up his room and he let us use his sound system. He was white and he would just open up. He was all ‘I don’t care what you all say and what you all do, just don’t mess up the place.’ He just opened it up and just sat there and listened. He would never get involved, never tell us anything, interfere. He was almost not there. He just let things happen, let things be said. And that’s where it all happened. We would play our instrumentals.”

Andres would then bring music and the youth would bring their boom boxes to the classroom. The classroom became that space where youth could actively produce culture safe from criminalization and discrimination. Andres’ surprise would come from an unlikely ally, a teacher and older white man in the high school.

Sergio had also experienced both discrimination and some support in school. From the onset of his educational experience in the United States, some teachers used poetry as a way to get him to write, while others doubted his capabilities. Sergio got through school barely having enough for his educational materials, much less for extracurricular activities including his poetry. He met a teacher however that was very supportive in helping him organize a poetry club in his high school. Sergio would show up with poetry written by the group and then the teacher would help get copies so they could distribute them at school. “My professor backed me up. He told me ‘my wife works at Kinkos, if you want to put this thing together. We’ll pitch in money.’ We would make hundreds
of stacks and we would distribute. Like $30 and we would make hundreds of stacks and we would just give them out.” Finding moral and economic support within the high school was a huge help to distribute the poetry within and outside the institutions. The promotion of a poetry club in his school also represented a safe space where youth could express themselves.

Making space involved bringing together the interlocking networks necessary to produce certain cultural practices. This sometimes included using some of the same cultural spaces that were gentrifying the area. The relationship to the “new” Santa Ana was both an experience of inequality and one of “opportunity,” depending on many different factors. There were examples where individuals running cultural spaces that did not have predominantly Mexican customers gave certain respondents the opportunity to perform, organize, or speak in “the front” where they were more visible. One young Chicana had an agreement with the business owner to spin one night a week. This bar was one of the first bars to open as part of the Artist scene. She had permission to spin whatever she wanted once a week in a space that was not associated with the surrounding Mexican immigrant community.

“My friends showed up and asked me what I was going to start off with and I said, maybe some Tigres del Norte, but they didn’t believe me! but I played that! and it was almost like a shock and then orale! because we can’t deny who we are there, here, down the street. We can’t deny it! And it’s in us. And it was that shock factor that I like to give. And I almost feel like I’m the only one who can get away with that. And that’s chingon. I may not have these crazy skills but I like to offer that shock. And that, ‘don’t forget this! Its right here, I can see it, don’t even try ‘cause we’re here!’ It, it’s that nostalgia connected to our roots.”
Being in the front was part of becoming more visible and allowing her sentiments to shape the atmosphere in the space. Playing certain music made her experience as a Chicana more evident in a largely non-Latino space. The music brought visibility to her person, her community and her experiences. The act of playing Mexican music in this space was also a call to the Mexican community to remember a common history and culture. Playing *Los Tigres del Norte*, a famous Mexican Norteño band, was both a call to visibility and a call to the Mexican audience to recognize their own presence. Although the result was temporary, she inserted the Mexican community’s identity and struggle into the space. She made the internalized denial of that history present within the space.

In these cultural spaces, an individuals’ presence was part of representing the larger Mexican working class community, although it was not always intentional and much less permanent. In the case above, the DJ continued to play in this bar for a year but then left to start playing more at other cultural spaces where the Mexican immigrant working community gathered.

It is important to note that in both of these cases, Sandra and the young Chicana DJ spoke English and were born in the United States. In both of the new spaces, English was the primary language spoken in meetings and also in the actual events. In the case of the gallery, board members held meetings in English (a gallery and a bar/gallery). Despite the large subsidy by the City, the gallery provided little support other than lending the space. Sandra’s gallery exhibits and shows in Downtown were about once a year.

Some respondents would take advantage of the Art Walk to sell their work. Vendors like jewelry makers would take advantage of the Art Walk to sell their merchandise. Some of the new cultural spaces would provide spaces to perform. The coffee shop where Sergio worked was a central stop during Art Walk. Open mic took place once a month at this coffee shop. Every week
Sergio worked in the coffee shop packed with singers, musicians and songwriters and a full audience to listen. Sergio, however, only worked as a cook and never participated in this coffee shop as a poet. Some respondents chose not to participate in certain cultural spaces for several reasons.

“Nah, I never performed there. I don’t like it. The art there is very different, more mainstream. Few guys go and talk about what we talk about.” The “we” Sergio referred to were the poets he usually performed with. Andres, another poet, explained who this “we” was in his perspective, “Mainly with people who had the same perspective as mine, but mainly if anything it’s ‘cause we’re from the same social class because none of us have money.” For many of the respondents, the production of art and culture is part of a reflection of their realities, including the inequalities experienced as Chicano and immigrant youth.

Performing the art was part of the production of the art itself. It was part of getting feedback, improving skills, and also getting a sense of validation that their experiences were real and shared. One respondent summed up this idea that was shared by many respondent about their work:

“[Art is] a reflection of what someone sees or feels, their society, their reality, and then takes it and transforms it into something, in different ways, whatever medium you have, literature, music or whatever way you have to interpret what it is that you are living or that someone else is living, and then someone identifies with that.”

For Sergio this was also the case. His poetry spoke to the reality he lived and distinguished him from others with different types of opportunities. Sergio explained further, “We’re on survival mode...It wasn’t like oh I lost my Beamer and I’m going to downgrade to a Honda, nothing like that. What we had to deal with, it was more like “fuck, my mom is getting kicked out and evicted,
where the fuck am I going to go?...That’s just the reality that we got.” I heard Sergio’s poems. One was about his grandfather in Mexico who had passed away and Sergio was not able to return to Mexico because of his undocumented status.

Adrian shared similar sentiments through his poetry. He explains in the following quote.

“My first pieces were very much, I was talking about the neighborhood, the gangs, sometimes it’s about the violence, rhyming about what you see around you...I started talking about my mom working all day, two jobs, just to feed me and my brother in one room. And I couldn’t come home ‘cause someone would complain. They would always tell you this isn’t your house. You couldn’t use their food, how that led to me to hanging out with the friends I used to hang out with. The way we felt and how we felt things, our conditions.”

Those common experiences included personal evictions from their homes, and were also part of a larger experience of community displacement.

Not visiting certain cultural spaces was an act of solidarity with individuals who shared these similar experiences of displacement. Adrian explained, “When they displace our neighborhood, our friends, our parents and then tell us ‘oh we also bought this theatre down the street, I know you may be a little upset for about what happened here, but you can borrow it for free maybe once a year. Look it, it’s a really nice place. You can have really nice events here...’ That’s disrespectful. They think they’re going to appease us.” “Us” referred to the displaced communities but also referred to the common social, economic, and political experiences of the working class, the indignant and the displaced.

Sergio explained that having new communities coming in was not a negative aspect in itself, but that there were mechanisms that made certain spaces exclusive. “We got everyone going in,
diversity builds up. At the same time it’s still kind of exclusive. Well, you have to have cash to be there. It’s not a free show.” In some cases, being able to consume made the difference between those that could and could not participate. Not everyone had the same opinion in this matter. In one interview, the respondent felt attacked by people in the community when he would defend performing in the new cultural spaces. This musician explained, “For the first time we have places where we can perform, and white people aren’t scared of coming to visit Santa Ana...” When I asked him if he had played in this theatre that Andres referred to he answered “No, I’ve never played there. But I would like to be able to perform there—that doesn’t make me a sellout!” Another jewelry maker used the art walk as an important place to sell his work to the “white people who have more money.” Individuals figured these new spaces were important places to start selling their art and having new communities recognize their music, art and jewelry.

When talking about the changes taking place in Downtown, the City itself became part of this reflection and a place for practice and expression while also encapsulating existing inequalities. One young graffiti artist explained, “I grew up to love this city... I did graffiti for a while and that was one of my favorite things to do. It got the message across—We live here and we got to have pride for it. We felt we were the ones running the street. A lot of people tear it apart, they go to their nice homes and we’re still here.” Individuals painted their questions of survival, expression and resistance throughout the City’s walls despite the disenfranchisement and criminalization of their activities.

Learning a Practice of Space, Place and Power

The ‘place’ of the worker in the creative city where culture and art lead economic development projects, is a position that workers learn, reproduce and also contest. This work places the
experiences of working class immigrant families participating in Santa Ana’s changing downtown at the center of the discussion around the creative city. These findings show that 1) creative proposals include lower income communities of color in an unequal division of labor and limited economic, social and spatial mobility, 2) that the learning of art and culture in itself is part of the racialization process linked to the immigrant experience and 3) this process is also challenged, contested, and transformed by the immigrant community itself. These findings present a number of problems with the conceptualizations that present tolerance, diversity, and multiculturalism as making good economic sense (Florida 2003, Donagan and Morrow 2003: 13). Introducing racial formation theory to questions of diversity and multiculturalism problematize how cultural production is a way through which workers learn and experience what it means to be Mexican, undocumented, immigrant, etc. These findings link to important questions of rights to the city and citizenship. They also highlight the significant role of the state in establishing policies that work towards building just cities that can guarantee the safety and collective self-expression of its workers.

Division of Labor and Racialized Poverty

Examining different workers’ experiences within each cultural space, one finds that the Mexican immigrant community is far from being “left out” or “excluded” from artist developments or cultural production. In contrast to the idea of exclusion and marginalization, the findings reveal that ‘the place’ of the worker is at the center of developing artist districts and sustaining cultural production. The type of inclusion, however, does not provide equal access to cultural resources, space, or the same guarantees of safety in employment and mobility. Relationships of cultural production shed light on how this “inclusion” in the creative city is part of experiencing inequality.
The neoliberal market profits from the assumption that the multicultural city is an equal and harmonious one, when in reality, the everyday experience of people of color suggest otherwise. Creative proposals must consider forms of racialized poverty as tied to the diversity of the city (McCann, 2007; Kazemipur & Halli, 2000). As evidenced in previous research, there is a strong correlation between inequality and creativity (Florida 2012) as it increasingly depends upon a growing service and informal sector. In the data, we see Santa Ana’s highly racially bifurcated division of labor within the creative sector. These findings add to previous research that shows that although racial minorities participate in the creative city, they are “proportionately concentrated in lower paying service class jobs and face economic and structural barriers to entry into other types of positions” (Parker, 2008, p 208; Raush 2009). Like global research on labor markets in Canada and Los Angeles, Santa Ana’s data shows that the low end jobs in the labor market are held by people of color (Sassen, 2001; Morales & Bonilla, 1993). The foreign born represent diversity in the creative city, but the creative economy does not represent growing economic success across the board.

Going beyond the notion of “exclusion” requires “finding” the workers who are low income and people of color in each cultural space. This has different levels of difficulty depending on the space. The Mexican immigrant community plays many different paid and unpaid roles in cultural spaces that range from DJ to cook, some jobs much more visible than others. “Finding” the place of the worker reveals the different spatial relations within the space. Working in the back of the space gives less visibility to both the worker and the actual labor: for example, cooks who work in the back. Other forms of participation in some of the spaces were temporary in nature: for example, the hosting of a show or an exhibit. Immigrant labor in cultural spaces often lacks
visibility, is temporary, flexible and displaced but is sometimes made more visible and moved the front of the space.

In contrast to the experience of Sergio, many of the new chefs who work in some of the recently opened restaurants are more highly visible. In these cases, the contributions, talents and labor of white cooks shape the experience of the customers and are visibly recognized. For the opening of one of the new restaurants on 4th street that replaced a Mexican seafood restaurant, the local newspaper presented the new star chef. In this case, this white chef’s “kitchen talents and career trajectory” take a front spot in the media and in the restaurant. The caption on the picture reads, “Gentrification never tasted so good” (Goei, 2012). Propelled by media giants and corporate powers behind the Food Network, this chef tells a different story of opportunity than Hugo’s and Rosa’s.

**Mobility, Safety and Citizenship**

The experiences of Mexican immigrant workers reveal how barriers to economic and spatial mobility work in the creative city. Research shows that racialized and gendered lenses filter perceptions and create barriers to mobility in the workforce (Parker 2008:214). Building on this literature, these research findings show that limited visibility, access and mobility within and between cultural spaces mark both economic and social inequality. Racialized poverty prohibits economic mobility but also limits spatial and social mobility. Thus, “uneven geographies of mobility” (Leslie and Catungal 2012) in the creative city are not just economic, but also social and political.

Understanding these uneven geographies of mobility requires a transnational perspective. When examining the everyday experiences of Mexican immigrant workers, relationships of
cultural production go back and forth, crossing the border between the United States and Mexico. Many respondents first learn art and cultural practices in Mexico and may go back and forth. Migration to the United States, and more specifically to Santa Ana, is determined in part by both local and transnational networks (Sarmiento, 2002; Miron, Xavier, & Aguirre, 1998; Smith & Guarnizo, 2006).

The nation state, through its political borders, institutions and discourses impact the everyday life of low income communities of color and their opportunities in the creative city. Beginning with the reality of being an immigrant, undocumented, or “illegal,” the opportunities that much of the creative city literature promotes is beyond the reach of many residents of Santa Ana. In addition to a lower income level, living in the United States without legal status is a constant challenge to one’s job security, safety from deportation, and guaranteed civil rights and liberties. The role of the state in defending safety and access to cultural spaces, both private and public, is part of securing the rights of Mexican immigrant workers in the creative city. However, the state has not provided any of these guarantees for working class Mexican immigrant workers – as is evident in failed immigration reform and President Obama’s current deportation rates that exceed any previous presidency (ICE 2012). The state’s policies reproduce discourses around “illegals” and “criminals” through its policies.

Creative city proposals most often do not account for these overlapping political realities, and can sometimes exacerbate the negative consequences for lower income communities of color. In the creative city, workers’ free agency does not negate the power of the state to criminalize, and may only guarantee certain individual’s rights to access and opportunities. Assuming a post-racial and post-national construction of a “creative free agent” is at best problematic (Leslie and Catungal 2012: 115). Lower income communities of color are met with economic and political barriers
overlapped with gentrification and further criminalization in the creative city. Deportations, combined with the loss of significant cultural spaces and symbols, build on the historic loss and removal experienced by generations of Mexican immigrants in Santa Ana. Safety and permanence is not a guarantee; rather, historic loss and displacement are common realities.

The creative city promotes the development of new cultural spaces that contribute to the vision of creativity. However, a large percent of the population of Santa Ana cannot participate in certain new cultural establishments due to lack of a California license. Not having legal status prohibits access to some of the new establishments such as bars. This creates a socially and economically segregated city, despite the close proximity of spaces and large foreign-born presence. While this applies to anyone who does not have a license, this policy is set in a city where a huge portion of the population cannot legally obtain a license. An entire population living within the city does not have permission to enter some of the spaces that are promoted as the new vision for the city. The strategies of securitization (Mitchell 2003) associated with neoliberal transformations combine with immigration policy at the local and federal level and make the creative city a space of uneven mobility.

The safety of and investment in lower income youth of color is particularly compromised. As the creative city pushes to develop new cultural spaces, the problem of discrimination by the Santa Ana Police Department is evident in the experiences of youth practicing particular types of music, such as punk and hip hop. Consequences far exceed just consequences for undocumented youth. Adrian, like many others, learn to “swim with sharks” as they have to face the risk of deportation matched with the criminalization of both immigration and police enforcement. His safety walking out of a cultural space is compromised because he does not have legal status in the country. On another front, his participation in the hip hop scene on school grounds makes him a
target for being put on gang terms. Gang injunctions overlap with immigration policy at the local and federal level. His meeting at the park to practice poetry also puts him at risk of police harassment. These political strategies that target youth of color do not exist in isolation but rather overlap with other policies and processes that result in a city of limited opportunities for communities of color that work to sustain cultural spaces.

Music and poetry create collective forms of expression that garner strength as more individuals identify with each other and relate to one another’s stories. However, access and a different sort of state violence impact individual and collective forms of expression. Both Adrian’s legal status in the country and the fact that he is a lower income young man of color compromises his rights to participate in the creative city. Lack of certain technical, cultural resources also creates barriers to entry, as was the case with the local art school. In addition to the rising rates of inequality in creative cities, other researchers not the “alarming criminalization of racial difference in creative city spaces” and “the amenities and benefits of the creative city are geared towards particular ethno-racial groups and not others” (Leslie and Catungal 2012: 119). Being safe in the city is not a guarantee, nor is individual or collective forms of expression. On one hand, cultural spaces are not safe from discrimination, criminalization and state violence. On the other hand, criminalization creates barriers to collective expression and opportunities to develop and create new cultural spaces that reflect collective forms of expression.

Normalization and Resistance as Everyday Practices

The Mexican immigrant community both accepts and challenges their ‘place’ in the creative city. Conventions in each cultural space help reproduce the spatial, political and economic ‘place’ of workers in the creative city. The normalization of ‘place’ includes those who do what and
where, as well as who belong and those who do not. Respondents referred to their working conditions as the “same old, same old” – a normalization of the long hours back in the kitchen. These relationships were routine and generally accepted and practiced but there was also resistance to these everyday realities. In workers’ responses there is both an acceptance and a refusal of common sense understandings that the hegemonic order imposes. Individuals negotiate and challenge their relationship to the state, starting with the decision to cross the border and immigrate. Learning how to “swim with sharks” is a constant negotiation of safety in the city. The city becomes a place that both shapes and helps individuals contest dominant representations of their political, spatial and economic ‘place.’

There is an individual and collective process of experiencing racialized poverty, discrimination, invisibility, displacement and criminalization. Many respondents expressed how the production of art, music and cultural practices revealed a common ground or solidarity between individuals with similar economic and political experiences. The experience of practicing art and culture helped create an awareness of race, class, inequality and difference—a consciousness that builds cultures of solidarity. I do not mean solidarity in the sense of working class consciousness that can often limit consciousness regarding attitudes of combativeness and moments of crisis. “Cultures of solidarity” refers to “a cultural expression that arises within the wider culture, yet which is emergent in its embodiments of oppositional practices and meanings” (Fantasia 1988: 17). These cultures of solidarity help us consider a wide range of cultural practices that can arise from hegemonic culture but still represent something oppositional and independent. Individuals express this solidarity when they identify with those other individuals who share similar experiences. The process of sharing material, content, and subject matter with others helps builds these solidarities around learning.
Individuals challenged this collective invisibility by bringing the Santa Ana community into a cultural space, i.e. a person of color on the board of directors, being a Chicana DJ, or making a ‘place’ for the lower income community of color where there was none. When DJ Monica plays Mexican norteño music in a bar that does not usually cater to a Mexican immigrant crowd, she surfaces a collective memory that goes beyond her own individual visibility. The music creates a new culture within the space, even if it is temporary. The presence and visibility of an individual has power when it influences the decisions being made including what products are sold, what music is played and what cultures are being promoted. However, this visibility does not necessarily change power structures. This physical presence does not always impact who has the ability to shape decisions within each space. DJ Monica for example, did not have the power to change the policy of the bar that does not accept the *matricula* as official identification. While her presence shapes the space and challenges the ‘place’ of the worker in that space, the temporary nature of her presence does not transform the relationships within the space. This is where the findings show us that the ‘place’ of the worker is determined by everyday conventions but cannot be transformed in one day, one event or one place, but rather has to create and sustain transformative relationships in the long term where power shifts. Transformative relationships must address the same forms of inequality and discrimination that reproduce the invisibility of certain populations.

Cultures of solidarity take a different shape when a group acts collectively. Whom individuals identify with and collectively act with matters. As a response to the alienation felt in certain spaces, respondents use cultures of solidarity to push through certain institutional barriers. When Rosa did not have access to the art institution, she organized women she believed were also excluded to come take advantage of the opportunity. The presence of Rosa at the art school pushed the school to provide a one on one meeting with different Mexican immigrant women.
Although the school did not change any policy, there was a push that changed the people who were present at the school. While the simple visibility challenges conventions, this type of solidarity between this group of women actually makes a ‘place’ for the Mexican immigrant families in the art school. Again, this presence was unconventional but did not change the institutional relationship with the Mexican immigrant working families of Santa Ana. This solidarity gained visibility and representation within the art institution and increased access, but did not impact decision-making in the long term.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The Artist and Worker Divide

The experiences of Mexican immigrant workers in the City of Santa Ana points to important misconceptions about the role of communities of color in cultural development. These misconceptions are that: 1) communities of color are not part of creative developments or “excluded” from the creative city and 2) tolerance, diversity, and multiculturalism are inherently part of the creative city. Cultural spaces cannot exist without immigrant and working class labor.

Literature on “participatory arts” demonstrates the importance of arts outside of formal institutions in reproducing the values around community development (Alvarez, 2005; Jackson and Kabwasa-Green 2003; Goldbard, 2006; Morarity, 2004; Peters & Cherbo, 1998; Wali, Severson, & Longoni, 2002; Walker & Rosenstein, 2003). These findings add nuances to these theories by explaining how certain relationships within art and cultural development projects can exacerbate inequality and racialized divisions. By capturing the everyday experiences of immigrant residents working in these cultural spaces, this research shows how Mexican immigrant artists’ experiences are distinctive from other artists as well as other working class workers.
Relationships of cultural production are part of the social, political and economic positioning of the working class in the creative city. Learning one’s ‘place’ in each cultural space is an important part of the racialization process. These positions are part of relationships and conventions that individuals learn and reproduce daily. What role one plays within each space and where one works become normalized. What Sergio refers to as the “same old same old” are the conditions of working too many hard hours in the back kitchen. This also translates to what it means to be Mexican, undocumented and a young man of color in Santa Ana. Individuals learn much more than just job training and art skills in the creative city; they learn inequality, discrimination and criminalization as well. The ‘place’ of the Mexican worker does not only refer to an individual experience, but rather the place of a group of people with something in common. These conditions do not come without resistance. Community development can often challenge the state when there is a collective voice that develops strength through solidarity. This will be discussed further in the following chapters.

The timing and scale of cultural policies overlap with the political strategies of the state. In the case of immigration policies at the national scale, the local government has responded and created local enforcement policies. The collaboration between ICE and the Santa Ana police department, combined with the forces of gentrification and displacement, create an environment of displacement and removal. Cultural practices are not immune to criminalization or state violence. Furthermore, some cultural spaces participate in different security standards that alienate immigrant workers. These local and federal immigration policies impact an individual’s ability to move between cultural spaces, practice art openly and access new cultural establishments.

The respondents experienced a lack of citizenship, not only at the national level but also at the city level—a local citizenship associated with individual’s rights to the city. The state’s role in
both guaranteeing safe spaces and facilitating economic mobility is eroding. However, the power, presence and persistence of the nation state (Leslie and Catungal 2012: 115) is still felt in workers everyday lives. These realities force important questions about the rights of the Mexican working class community in the creative city. What rights to the city do communities of color have as the city invests in this type of creative vision? What role do we have as planners in the development of cultural projects in working class communities of color?

This research provides some recommendations concerning the investment in workers themselves, who add to the creative potential of the city. Scholars assert that gender and racial relations must be considered when evaluating the impact of creative city policies (Parker 2008; Leslie and Catungal 2012). Improving the wages and working conditions in the service sector is part of ensuring participation in the creative economy, promoting economic and social participation by workers, and beginning to address inequality in the workforce.

Investing in workers as artists and artists as workers also points to the need to invest in public infrastructure as a creative policy. Creative city policies are further compounding inequalities along the lines of gender, class and race by displacing resources from education and health care (Parker 2008). At the same time, this research also points to the significant role of public institutions and public places in developing art and cultural skills in the working class communities. Public institutions both in Mexico and the United States are significant spaces to learn and practice skills. Teachers and supporters in these institutions make a significant difference in many individual’s stories around access to space and resources. The investment in the arts does not ensure an investment in workers, low income, and working class families. However, the investment in public schools and public space, such as parks, are important spaces for working class community members to learn, practice, and share collective experiences. Access to these
spaces and technological infrastructure increases creative potential in the city. More attention to parks, recreational spaces and public schools is an investment in working class communities and their creative potential and expression.

As Allen Scott states (2006 p 15) this is more than a question of income distribution and involves, “basic issues of citizenship and democracy, and the full incorporation of all social strata into the active life of the city, not just for its own sake but also as a means of giving free rein to the creative powers of the citizenry at large.” Collective spaces for expression also represent an alternative space for community participation and citizenship. Community experiences and reflections about living in the city are important elements to good planning processes. Urban planners need to develop new forms of engaging in community processes outside of city halls and planning charettes. Using the poems, art and dance produced outside of formal institutions is part of understanding a community’s experiences that often do not surface in state or private planning processes. The creative city promotes diversity yet resists the community “writing itself culturally and politically into the local landscape” (Talbot & Bose, 2007, p. 114). Any attempt to develop creativity in the city requires a concern for citizenship that goes beyond statist definitions and into the communities’ own abilities to collectively express their challenges and everyday realities.
Chapter 6

Shaping a Vision of Culture, Diversity and Displacement

*Interviewer:* Considering all these changes that you’re talking about, what do you think downtown will be like in the next five years?

*Developer:* I think downtown will be very similar to what it is now. I just think it’ll be a little more...I think it’ll be younger. I think it’ll be more second and third generation. I think it’ll be more diverse..."

This chapter examines the role of diversity in creative development. I argue that the discourse around diversity becomes part of modernist development theories and ultimately can lead to the displacement of cultural spaces in a majority immigrant community. Studying cultural development in a low income community raises questions around diversity and integration. As urban planners, diversity is often a guiding principle for our practice. The push for diversity largely came from a postmodern response to sociospatial inequalities of segregation, urban renewal and disinvestment. Postmodern theorists critique modernist approaches to developments. Ideas of modernization and progress describe “underdeveloped” as an internal slowness and efficiency of certain nations, individuals and groups (Petras and Morley 1990). According to these theories, inefficient patterns, behaviors and values prevented these individuals and groups from adopting characteristics of efficiency and integrating into the dominant economic and political system. These groups did not have the appropriate cultural, social and psychological attributes and norms to participate in the process of modernization and are in large part responsible for their predicament.
Urban planning scholars and practitioners proposed theories of integration, incorporation, multiculturalism and diversity. These theories were part of recognizing and shifting the active role of urban planners in the destruction and segregation of communities of color (Hayden, 1996; Sandercock, 1998). Acknowledging this history, involves recognizing the contributions of communities of color to planning (Amin 2002; Fainstein, 2005; Sandercock 2003).

In many ways, diversity has become a standard for urban planning and an important discourse around revitalization efforts. Jacobs (1961) and Low (2000) demonstrated the importance of diversity in public cultures while other scholars showed the role of difference in creating democratic and just spaces (Young 1990; Sandercock 1998). Most recently, the creative city literature links economic development to tolerance and diversity, presenting them as economic engines behind innovation and creativity. Diversity can refer to the built environment and demographics. In this case I define diversity as the representation of different people, ethnicities, classes in the physical environment. Diversity is not without its established challenges. These challenges include exclusion, anxiety and fear when different communities come together. Another critique of diversity is that it does not address issues of inequality and exploitation. Furthermore, diversity efforts often fail to put an end to long-standing divisions of race and gender.

Cultural planning and creative development becomes strategies through which some public agencies attempt to address issues of disinvestment in low income communities of color. This revalorization and reinvestment comes to areas that were left abandoned due to white flight and the Fordist economy that helped build the suburbs. These communities become staging ground for cultural investment that attempts to address social isolation, the concentration of poverty and political disempowerment. Part of this is a “revalorization” of the contributions of communities of color and a commodification of culture. Marketing strategies connect culture to liberal and
progressive values. In places like Harlem and New Orleans face a type of gentrification where black culture becomes part of a marketing package. In this context, cultural development has a range of economic and social consequences on low income communities of color and what race means in these contexts (Curran and Hanson 2005).

The following analysis shows a convergence between these political and economic prescriptions of cultural development and the expansion of private interests through strategies of displacement. I argue that while the investment in the downtown was much needed, alliances between property and business owners exacerbated inequality by consolidating political and financial power to shape the development. I interview property owners who participated in the PBID and who mostly rented out their properties to understand their perspective. The first section titled “Help Me Help You” explains how property assessments helped promote a discourse around the need for redevelopment. A history of crime and violence, in addition to antiquated marketing skills and customer service, was part of the “problem” that needed a “solution.” The need for a safer Santa Ana converges with an increase in police presence and their allocation from the City’s general budget. The real needs of the community become the same pretexts for its own displacement.

The following section titled “Diversity and Displacement” demonstrates how the idea of a neutral market of supply and demand builds on concepts of diversity and progress. Redevelopment expands on traditional development discourses by focusing on markets for consumption rather than production. Diversifying the market on the grounds of inclusion and progress requires distinguishing between first and second generation, changing the language, cultural symbols, and ultimately displacing ethnic businesses.
I conclude that cumulative advantages and power inequalities can create a revisionist historical processes that allows for the erasure of history and the displacement of communities. Alliances around redevelopment mobilize certain areas and activities as “safe,” “clean,” “legal,” and others as not. In turn, they help determine how, what and where cultural spaces develop and who deserves the opportunity to inhabit those spaces. These experiences form part of a racialization process that shape what it means to be Mexican, undocumented, and working class in the creative city.

“Help Me Help You”: Learning About the Past, Progress and Re-Development

The Property Business Improvement District (PBID) in Santa Ana represented the City, property owners, developers and merchants who started an envisioning process for Downtown through meetings and seminars prior to establishing the district. Property owners started meeting and building the economic and political power to collectively shape the development of Downtown Santa Ana. The proposal was to increase financial resources through the PBID assessment and the city council’s initial buy in. The distinction between this district and previous districts was the focus on property owners and not merchants. The majority of the funding, directed to a specific 66-block area, went to marketing and security. The PBID provided funds from the Downtown property owners for organizing events and distributing newsletters and flyers that promoted those same events, in addition to promoting new restaurants and businesses. There had not been this concerted effort to market Santa Ana in the previous decade.
Table 7: PBID Allocation of Funding from 2009-2012 (for a 66 block area)

The PBID envisioning process depended on identifying the “problem” in Downtown Santa Ana and determining “the best way to go forward.” According to many interviews, the “reason why PBIDs get started in the first place is when the revenue start to go down and sales tax revenue started plummeting here in Santa Ana.” The development plans built ideas on increasing this tax revenue, but also determined how this process would take shape and why this “problem” existed in the first place. Thus, moving forward required marketing a future while also redefining the problems of the past. In reality, sales tax fell 19.8%, from $45.59 million to $36.55 million in 2009-2010. However, regional, state and national economic crisis were impacting Santa Ana on a much larger scale. In 2009 Santa Ana’s unemployment rates were at 13.5% and the median home prices dropped from $560,000 in 2007 to $249,000 in 2009 (City of Santa Ana document 2009-2010).
Retail sales dropped throughout the City of Santa Ana from $3,016 million in 2005 to $2,140 million in 2009 (California Board of Equalization, 2000-2009).

Building a memory of a dangerous and crime ridden downtown Santa Ana was as much a part of the discourse around development as the unique and profitable future. The assistant city manager Cathy Standiford summarized the City’s perspective on the regulation of cultural spaces linking Santa Ana to a past of crime and to a future of safety and commerce:

“[Downtown Santa Ana] was not seen as a desirable place for people to be...The City’s been working hard to try to transform that. What that means is a balance between regulations that allow restaurants and other types of businesses to thrive, but at the same time to protect against harmful effects that can happen there”.

According to one developer:

“I think that’s one thing that’s good. It’s having these events and getting people to see what’s down here. I think that’s also helped change the perception of Santa Ana. Because again, it’s been always thought of as not safe. I mean I grew up in Irvine, that’s how it was.”

A PBID representative recalled the first steps following the formation of the PBID:

“First of all one of the things we knew is that we had to make Santa Ana safe. Because the perception whether it was true or not is that it was not safe and I had to say Carolina, in the early days, my husband and I would come down here at 2 in the morning and it wasn’t safe. There was a lot of drug activity right across the street

---

32 Permits are another way of consolidating different interests making it easier for some and more difficult for others to develop cultural spaces. The city’s regulations of entertainment and alcohol permits became a central issue for the opening of some of the new cultural spaces that included bars, live entertainment and dancing. The new changes to the policy would eliminate the site plan review (which saved businesses thousands of dollars and processing time, according to the City) for both on-sale and off-sale Conditional Use Permits (CUP). This is common in other cities such as Seattle in the 1990s.
and in the day there was during the day...there was drug dealing going on and then
at night a whole prostitution ring.”

Although Santa Ana police have increased prostitution arrests, they have no reliable method since
arrest methods often shift. At the same time, crime rates have fallen to historic lows since 2003
(Kyle, 2013). However, the PBID newsletter announced “Downtown Inc.’s efforts since 2009 have
contributed greatly to reducing violent crime within Downtown Santa Ana.” The perspective of the
past was one of crime, drugs and gang violence. The new vision required investing in “cleaning up”
and “safety” or “sanitizing public space” (Perez, 2002)

The presence of both private security and police increased. Private security wearing yellow
shirts would drive or walk around and police on horseback would patrol downtown during Art
Walk. The increase in police presence and discourse around criminality came at a time when the
budget allocation for police was over 50% of the general fund. Despite the huge 10.2 percent drop
in the general fund (from $244.71 million to $219.85 million) in 2009, the budget allocation for
police was still 52.2% of the 2009-2010 city budget.

Table 8: City Funding allocated to Santa Ana Police Department from 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Police Allocation ($)</th>
<th>% General Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>106,229,582</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>98,928,698</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>104,594,649</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>101,365,485</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased police in the downtown only added to the existing financial and social tension around
police and community relations in the Latino community. In recent budget forums, residents
complained about trusting the Police Department because of their strong collaboration with Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE) and poor outreach to Latino neighborhoods.

According to the proponents of the PBID, part of the problem was also the lack of business skills of the merchants. Attempts to “include” the existing businesses in this new vision included providing workshops on customer service, window dressing and the “new trends.” This assessment also came from the experiences of a white property owner and various PBID representatives who felt they were not welcome in these stores that were primarily Spanish-speaking:

“I wasn’t always very welcome. I was a large Anglo woman that was not very welcome. This kind of led me to ask ‘do we need some customer service?’ That’s what lead me to the classes.”

When respondents referred to whiteness they linked these experiences to those of exclusion. Race helped shape the experiences of some of the property owners, private urban planners and PBID representatives. When asked about bad experiences in the Downtown, a PBID events organizer stated, “I mean the snarky comments from business owners that don’t want white people here. Rude things.” According to the interviews, people in the Downtown would not participate in the activities because of race. One representative for the PBID who was a white male explained:

“I had a game for them that was supposed to be like a scavenger hunt to find names and phone numbers so that they could have each other’s resources. That’s how I started out. I want everyone connected. That was my thing. We did get participation but some people looked at me like I had four eyes and horns coming out of my head. ‘I am not going to this place where there are white guys.’”

Race was an issue that many of the developers brought up for lack of participation, for bad customer service and even for some of the violence. One respondent explained how he felt he had
been jumped due to being white. According to the perspective of the developers and property owners, race negatively impacted the white actors coming into Santa Ana.

In order to “clean up” Santa Ana, existing businesses would also have to change. According to the interviews, property owners felt a collective impact from the antiquated marketing and business strategies practiced by some of the existing businesses. In turn, this “problem”—as defined by the property owners and not necessarily the merchants—was adversely impacting the entire downtown area and leading to its decline. The new vision required existing businesses to be “open minded” to these new changes and what many considered more “up to date” marketing schemes. The PBID sponsored workshops on marketing skills and good business practices; they brought in professors and big retail corporations such as Bebe and Opus to give the merchants workshops.

The new vision demanded that businesses “clean up” to be successful in this market. One property owner summed up the general topics of some of the workshops:

“How do you market? Do you have a Facebook page? Do you have handwritten signs? They need to be printed...This looks cluttered...How do you clean this up? How do you do that? What kind of products do you bring in? What’s the trend these days? You know, customer service. Have bilingual help. Make sure the bathroom is clean.’ Simple things to the average retailer but you know for a lot of these people they are very old school. And again, if it works, great, but the problem is it’s not working. And not only is it adversely affecting downtown, it’s adversely affecting all the landlords in downtown.”

One property owner said that the idea was to tell merchants, “okay look it, clean your store up a little bit. ...Get rid of some hand written signs and people will come in your store.”
Property owners had a heavy hand in influencing the customer service, the appearance of the shop, the types of signs used, and even the language being spoken. The approach relied on blaming the older businesses for their own failure.

The types of events that the PBID promoted did not include the uses of some of the existing businesses that targeted immigrant customers. These new marketing schemes put a spotlight on Santa Ana’s night life. The PBID sponsored and marketed events that took place in the evening, such as the monthly Art Walk. While bars and new restaurants could stay open late, business owners on Fourth Street who were open during the day were often closed by then. Many Mexican business owners who owned jewelry stores and retail stores that sold cowboy wear and quinceañera dresses, could not afford to be open during the night time events, or did not find the investment worth it. This funding became a point of contention between existing and in-coming merchants. The PBID board met with complaints from property owners and merchants, who were White, Latino, and Asian, who said the new clientele coming at night from neighboring cities and of different ethnicities and classes did not buy at their shops.

One property owner who was also a developer explained some of the conflict:

“So we’re trying to get more of the Fourth Street merchants and it’s a challenge, but we’re hoping they’ll get more involved. We’ll see because what happens is these events are taking place. I think they start in the afternoon. Most of the shops close at 5 or 6 o’clock. Are they gonna stay open for a thousand people walking through downtown? If I were them I’d be open. I think that’s part of the problem. You can give people tools to do a lot of things but if they don’t wanna take those tools and use them and try to be open minded to it, you’re not gonna get anywhere. So the
businesses that are open minded and utilize the tools are seeing the benefits and the ones that aren’t, aren’t. It’s that simple.”

For some developers this was evidence of the antiquated business practices of the existing merchants. In an interview, a property described how a business woman’s business challenges were due to her own inability to improve her store:

“She’s doing horrible. She’s trying to blame everyone else but herself. And it’s like okay well what would you do to improve your business?...You have plastic chairs. Get some nicer chairs. I told her she has the whole patio space, she can do something with the patio...Her signs are all handwritten. The menu board is thirty years old. You can go in there and spend a thousand bucks and make that place look modern. And again I think that would drastically impact her business. I tried to tell her that. I try to help her. I even had people go in there and speak to her in Spanish about it.”

The responsibility of surviving these challenges fell on the business owner and depended on their ability to fit into the new vision.

The PBID hired employees to organize events and serve as “ambassadors” who could outreach to all the businesses. These ambassadors were also in part responsible for building collaborations between businesses around some of these events. In an interview with a PBID ambassador, he explained some challenges he met when trying to “help” the older Mexican businesses gain clientele during large events:

“Well, too many people say...’but they don’t come into my store’ [imitating the businesses]. Cause you’re angry, scalding and your store is filthy. I don’t want to eat here either. It’s gross. I can’t help it...you have 4,000 people here that you could be
making money with, but they are not going to come into the store because you’re
an angry bitch and you won’t clean your damn store. It’s filthy. Your floors are
completely worn through. No, don’t complain that the white people don’t spend
money, but you all service them. You don’t like me in your store and your store is
filthy and I am here to help you. I’ll do it. What do you want to do? I’ll advertise it.
I’ll promote it. Whatever it is.”

The alliance of property owners, new businesses and promoters marketed, taught and promoted
the new vision through advertising, workshops and events organized to solidify relationships and
audiences specific to the new cultural spaces. Older businesses faced the pressure to revamp their
stores and image to fit into the new order, or survive despite the push for new types of businesses
and night life. As the area changed, businesses had to keep up or leave. The displacement of the
older businesses was often due to the inability to keep up with the market rate for rents in the
downtown area. The decision of who could stay and who had to leave were up to the property
owners. Property owners would blame the businesses for not improving their look and appeal.

It is also important to note that property owners stated their “carrying” of certain businesses
who could not afford their rent. For example, one property owner who rented many spaces in
Downtown mentioned lowering monthly rates and allowing certain businesses to be late on their
payments for months. This same owner mentioned bringing in certain businesses that “fit” the
vision. In the case of one movie theatre, the previous Mexican business owners were replaced by a
white male from Long Beach who received two years of free rent to help start him off.
Diversity and Displacement

At 2:30 pm on a Monday afternoon, walking down Fourth Street starting on Main Street toward what used to be called Fiesta Marketplace, now called the East End, I pass by a bridal shop, a jewelry store, a Mexican restaurant and a retail store selling Mexican cowboy shirts, hats and boots. I wait on the corner to cross the street with a man speaking in Spanish to someone who appears to be his wife, and they’ve brought three children with them.

As I continue on Fourth Street another bridal shop is displaying a hot pink quinceañera dress next to two others that are leopard and fluorescent green. An empty storefront, a shoe store, chapel, beauty salon and photography studio are down the street. I pass by several Mexican women walking with their strollers and holding young children’s hands. Other women outside of the chapel and bridal shops pass out flyers promoting different services ranging from party rental stores to hair salons. A young Mexican man stops at a street vendor selling chicharrones (pork rinds). Another street vendor selling fruit with lemon and chile is on the next block.

Once I get closer to where the carrousel used to be, I see a new stylish, modern restaurant on the right side of the street. This place used to be a Mexican seafood restaurant. I can’t go in yet because it doesn’t open until evening. This is one of the newest restaurants in Downtown. The sign is in English and still looks new. I come back at 7:00 pm as the evening approaches; this restaurant is now open as many of the other shops are starting to close. Some of the quinceañera shops are still open but the majority of the stores are closed for the evening. A crowd of individuals who appear to be White, Asian and Latino gather at the popular restaurant. Everyone is speaking English and looks to be in their mid twenties and thirties. This place draws a contrast to the previous restaurants a block away. Some Mexican families walk by with their strollers and a couple
of young Latino men pass by on their bikes looking at the people in the restaurant. Neither the family nor the young men take a step inside. Fieldnotes, November 2012

The cultural shift in Downtown Santa Ana is evident not only in the changing businesses, but also in the changing demographics of the people visiting and consuming in Downtown Santa Ana. This shift in culture began in a targeted area with a specific cultural space that serves as a flagship development. In this case, it was the Yost Theatre in Fiesta Marketplace. The geographic proximity of the different cultural spaces is important in creating that regional draw. The new crowds who attend the Yost can also eat at the neighboring restaurants and visit the new bars. A member of the board of directors of the PBID in Santa Ana who was white and male owns the Yost.

Diversity was part of the discourse around the gentrification process. The Yost was meant to attract bigger and more diverse crowds but also bring in a crowd to support some of the new businesses and events that the PBID organized. Diversity referred to broadening the audience to go beyond a single ethnicity and culture. A property owner explained his perspective on current business owners’ failure to diversify and change:

“I also say, for example, when you’re looking at marketing, if you’re a marketer or you’re a business...if you can only have like this or you can have everything, what would you want? Most people would say ‘I want everything’, right? Well a lot of people down here don’t want everything. They want this. They only want immigrant customers. And they’ll even say ‘We don’t want white people here. We don’t want black people here. Those kids with the weird colored hair and the earrings, we don’t want them here’.... And I’m not trying to generalize but I’ve just seen from experience a lot of people that are very hesitant to change period.”
For some property owners, the lack of diversity in the downtown was detrimental for business. The new marketing strategies to promote this diversity required changing the existing marketing tools, business hours and products. The PBID proponents’ vision required appealing to a more diverse consumer base that would have a significant impact on the character and culture of the area. According to the PBID, making Downtown Santa Ana more diverse also meant transforming the culture of the area. The cultural shift did not always take place through the demolition of significant cultural spaces like the carrousel or kiosk, but also included the transformation of everyday culture of the area by changing the names, language, businesses, products and customers.

On Names and Language:

The PBID pushed for a change in names of cultural spaces including stores, marketplaces and sometimes products. This began with the changing of the name of Fiesta Marketplace. The East End was meant to target a larger, non-hispanic audience. A property owner explained why the name changed from Fiesta Marketplace to the East End:

“The name East End was brought on because again we wanted the larger appeal. Fiesta Marketplace conotates Hispanic only. And we wanna be open to everybody. So if you say Fiesta Marketplace, I mean in all honesty a white guy probably is not gonna go there. An Asian guy probably is not gonna go there and it needs to be open to everybody. And we started with the Yost opening. It’s a huge regional draw”

In some cases, names in Spanish represented a lack of diversity. Changing the name of other businesses in the area was also part of creating a regional draw, making each business more diverse and appealing to other communities. One property owner explained:
“Same with the ice cream lady on the corner...The name of her place is La Reina de Michoacan. The king of Michoacan or whatever it is...Okay so great. La Reina de Michoacan. Now, if I’m at the Yost that night and I’m walking by and I spot La Reina de Michoacan, my girlfriend is not gonna go in that place. And that’s the reality of it. She’s not, because she doesn’t even know what La Reina de Michoacan means. I don’t either, until I ask somebody. So again, if I’m a white kid, Asian kid, I mean I might even be a third generation Hispanic kid who doesn’t know what that means. So the point is she’s really gearing her market to a very small segment of the community. Even if she changed the name in Spanish and it was like something cool like a hip name I think it’d be totally different. But the fact that it’s so out there it’s like I don’t even know what that is. I think she’s gonna have difficulty attracting a broader customer base.”

This perspective was that Spanish signs and names limited the customer base to Hispanics, while English was the language of inclusivity, increased diversity and could help build a larger consumer base. The majority of new business names were in English and I interviewed one business that actually came in with the name of a Mexican painter. I asked if he could explain how he came up with the name for his new cultural space. He had originally named it the East End Theatre but later through some friends found out the local politics around the area and so decided to change the name to something that better represented the culture of Downtown Santa Ana. He did not want to get in the middle of the gentrification battle from the start off and he was trying to build on the diversity of the area. His theatre had replaced a movie theatre that screened subtitled movies. He was trying to screen some movies with subtitles as well.
On Finding Diverse Tenants and Customers

Diversity also referred to the businesses and types of products being sold. To many of the PBID proponents, the many quinceañera and bridal shops on a single block represented both a lack of diverse businesses and customer base. Property owners looked for diverse tenants and businesses that would fit the new vision, bring in a unique product and new clientele. For example, a PBID representative mentioned that Santa Ana did not have a cupcake shop yet. According to interviews with property owners, finding “unique” and “hip” tenants to move in was a large part of diversifying the area. When businesses could no longer afford to stay in the area or were not allowed to renew their lease, empty storefronts served as opportunities to bring in new businesses would sell “unique” products and bring in a “diverse” clientele. A property owner explained how diversity provided changes in business practices:

“How do you find businesses that attract everybody? And again, I don’t care if it primarily is one thing or another thing but at least it’s open to everyone and everyone feels welcome. Some of the places for example, Moya’s Bakery next to the Yost theatre, everything is in Spanish, no one speaks English and you’re bringing a very diverse crowd to the Yost every night. If I was him I would say, “okay, well we’re bringing a lot of people here. Let’s find a way to sell to them.” It’s almost his business was doubling when he was open at night for the Yost. But guess what? He doesn’t want to be open at night. He wants to go home and just be with his family. Which is fine but if I were him I’d hire someone else.”

The PBID promoted many events at night, forcing the existing businesses to reconfigure their hours of operation and budget to include increased staffing hours. This bakery was in Fiesta Marketplace for 29 years. They sold Mexican baked goods, like pan dulce (sweet bread) and pastel
*de tres leches* (a Mexican cake made of three different types of milk). Some property owners considered the Mexican products they sold as limiting because they could not reach the new crowds of people coming into Santa Ana.

When the property owners suggested making changes, the business often invested in changing their signs and added an outside seating area as the property owner had suggested. According to the business owners serving the immigrant community, these changes did not make economic sense when new customers still did not visit their shop. Existing businesses stood in competition with the changing culture of the area. Unfortunately, despite all the improvements and changes, the owner of the business was still not able to compete and his lease was not renewed. In early 2013, the property owner told him he had six months to leave.

Property owners quickly filled some vacancies, but other properties remained vacant until they found the specific tenant they were looking for. The process of choosing new tenants was largely up to the property owner and real estate agents. One property owner explained what he was looking for and how he decided on who would rent the new spaces:

“When I say different what I mean mostly is unique. Again, if I have a store that’s opening up and they just sell jeans it needs to be hip. It needs to be cool. For example, the Barragans that opened. The Hispanic family that owns the Charlie’s Tattoo. I don’t know if you’re familiar...They sell tattoo supplies, magazines. They sell that kind of stuff. They have a better selection of that stuff than anyone around here. They have people that have tattoo shops that go buy from them. So they’re offering a unique, hip product... It’s different. It’s hip. You’re not gonna find it at the mall. A little counter culture-y. And that’s what we want.”
According to the property owners interviewed, culture was a big part of determining who was to rent in Santa Ana. The businesses were part of making a new culture for Downtown, and the property owners were part of ensuring what type of culture that was. However, not all the property owners used diversity in the same way. One property manager who was responsible for renting out the spaces considered diversity a precaution. In this way, an entire area would not close down if certain shops were no longer successful. Diversifying meant spreading out similar shops and bringing in new ones to make areas less susceptible to complete abandonment. At the same time, his property also went empty for months looking for the “right” tenant.

Part of sharing in this vision meant sharing contacts of potential tenants. For example, one property owner of several new restaurants shared information and contacts with another property owner when looking for a new tenant on Fourth Street. Although “unique” was part of this new vision, many developers followed a model of other cities. One property owner stated:

“We want something that’s hip. Go to Melrose in L.A. Go to Gaslamp. They’re just cool, unique kind of businesses and that’s what we’re looking for.”

Developers and property owners would mention places like Melrose in Los Angeles and Gaslamp in San Diego as examples that they had studied as successful business areas. One property owner stated:

“This is what we’ve seen is successful in other downtowns, how can we model that? And so what we’ve done is we’ve gone after tenants that we think are different and unique.”

Other businesses were not simply inspiration but actually represented a larger investment for property owners. One owner of a new bar, part of larger property, considered this investment part of his larger work on developing business in historic cultural center of Southern California cities.
including Los Angeles. This new bar that largely serves a young white, Latino and Asian crowd replaced a bar that served mostly Mexican immigrant working class men.

Displacing tenants and replacing businesses transforms the culture of the area through the changing of appearance, names and target audience.

_On Second Generation and Youth:_

For property owners and much of the city council as well, the issue was not one of race but rather business knowledge and diversifying the market. A property owner explained how he viewed displacing a Mexican immigrant business.

“I really have a respect for second language English speakers. I really have a respect for people that work hard and for me to even consider getting rid of a tenant; I couldn’t even sleep at night thinking about it. But at a certain point they’re burning themselves. They’re putting their own savings in the business. If they’re next to a new business that just opened then all of a sudden they need the synergy of the one that’s next to them so there’s a lot of factors that could lead into that whole thing. And again I’m not saying that this is right or wrong or whatever but it’s just necessary to progress downtown.”

Displacing tenants was described as the fault of the tenants themselves and “progress” was the responsibility of the individual. Not being able to keep up with the market and clean up their stores was seen as a question of business savvy. However, there was a collective investment on the part of the PBID in attracting not the immigrant customers, but their children. According to some property owners, an important part of diversifying the market included reaching out to the second generation of immigrants. Attracting youth to the new night life and the “cool” aspects of
Downtown was part of drawing a new crowd that, according to property owners, did not come to the area before.

“Second and third generations are coming to downtown. I mean I have just spoken to numerous kids that are in Santa Ana High School or kids that are in college that don’t really know my involvement in town and I say ‘you go to downtown?’ And they’re like ‘downtown? Why the hell would we go there?’ These are Hispanic kids you know they’re like ‘we have nothing to do there.’ Last year, I started to hear more of them saying ‘Yeah there’s this cool bar, there’s this cool new restaurant to go to.’ We’re starting to get that...that saturation or that...We’re starting to get that impact from that community which we think that probably in all honesty is our target customer.”

Second generation immigrants were a target audience for these new cultural spaces as well. This cohort was born in the United States, speaks English and has US citizenship. One property owner explains how the question was not to kick out the immigrants but rather, appeal to their children.

“There’s 300,000 or 500,000 people of Hispanic origin or of South American origin or whatever you want to call it within 3 miles of here. It’s probably one of the most dense cities in America. There’s no way it would be feasibly possible to kick everyone out of the area. I mean, that’s just the reality of it. And there’s no question there’s going to be a demand for certain businesses that appeal to those people. But really what we think [is] it is their kids and their kids’ kids. It’s the second and third generations because you might speak Spanish at home to your parents but when you’re out with your friends you’re probably speaking English...I’m just saying that’s typically what a lot of these, these second and third generations are doing.”

This typical practice of marking to younger generations also differentiates between first and second generation. New businesses specifically targeted the second generation and not their parents, often
making a distinction between US born and foreign born Mexican migrants in a largely immigrant city. The notable distinctions between generations included age, language, education and legal status. Thus, the new cultural projects developed in Downtown were often driven in some way by this differentiation. While the older businesses targeted the immigrant customer, these new businesses were meant to target their children and thus, helped build separations and distinctions between both groups through the spaces they use.

**Conclusion: A Day of Reckoning**

“Which is fine I mean at the end of the day it'll be a day of reckoning. If they’re beneficial to the area and they make positive changes they’re doing well great. And if they’re not, they’re not. We’ll have to see how it goes.” – Interview with property owner.

According to development and modernization approaches, the survival of certain nations depended on changing their own inefficient behaviors, patterns and culture that prohibited them from participating in modern economic and social processes. Previous development theories closely correspond to the perspective of many of the actors involved in the Santa Ana redevelopment process. In the Santa Ana case, political and economic resources came together through the formation of the PBID to enforce this approach towards progress and efficiency. Property owners and landlords organized themselves to consolidate their interests in the development of downtown, and in turn, shift the culture of the area. Through establishing a PBID, owners were able to invest in marketing, physical improvements, security and even promotional education, making the development of downtown a cultural and economic project. The “power of place” in this case does not refer to the history, existing relationships and networks, but rather to
the political and economic mechanisms that reshape the physical environment, the culture and the
discourse around these changes. The PBID investment went beyond the development of
downtown and spilled over into consolidating economic and symbolic power to rationalize the
displacement of existing cultural spaces.

What we see on the ground are property owners with the economic base to invest and develop
in physical enhancements, marketing tools, new businesses and shape the discourse around
displacement. The political and financial support helped develop certain types of cultural spaces
while changing the clientele for others during an economically difficult time. The PBID assessment
increased the value of each cultural space by investing in physical improvements and the
surrounding areas. Flagship cultural projects such as the Yost Theatre stimulated changes in the
surrounding area by bringing in an audience that could help serve the new businesses and events.
In addition to the rise in property values and the PBID assessment, was an additional cost to many
of the smaller property owners. As property rates increased, the ability to continue to rent the
space became increasingly difficult. This economic and cultural shift pushed certain individual
business owners out; the abandoned properties provided opportunities for property owners to
bring in new businesses that fit their own vision. Smaller businesses and property owners who
could not afford the change were often forced to seek alternatives elsewhere, or were put out of
business completely. Larger property owners had a heavy hand in determining who survived the
changes by defining progress, choosing the new tenants, and then shifting the culture of the area to
favor the new vision for downtown.

The discourse used by the actors involved in the redevelopment of Downtown Santa Ana
largely overlaps with many development approaches that place the blame on the victim’s culture,
history and behavior. First, the need for redevelopment depends on rewriting a past of danger and
criminality. Crime and violence are part of the past, while the changes and processes of gentrification are part of progress, efficiency and modernity. Second, the dominant narrative around displacement builds on the “inability” of some of these businesses to “progress” and “diversify.” Empty spaces become symbols of an inefficient and dangerous past and their closing is due to their own incompetence.

Race and diversity serve two different pieces of the redevelopment discourse. On one hand, according to the interviews, race is something that existing businesses “need to get beyond.” Some White representatives of the PBID and property owners associate race with bad customers service and divisions. They explain how some Mexican retail owners do not know how or do not want to service White customers and use race to keep “certain people out.” Race is part of an antiquated and violent past. On the other hand, diversity is described as part of progress and efficiency. Spanish signs that monolingual English speakers cannot understand are symbols of “inefficiency” while adding English signs are signs of advancement in marketing. Diversity refers to the ability to assimilate with a growing market. Developers and PBID representatives spoke about diversity as part of a future of Santa Ana while race was part of the contention that actors needed to “get beyond.”

In this sense, the discourse around redevelopment differs from that of development. While development approaches often focuses on modes of production, redevelopment focuses on spaces of consumption. Diversity refers to the expansion of the market and the creation of new spaces for consumption. Youth, second generation immigrants and individuals from the surrounding areas all represent a diverse and growing market. Redevelopment is a collective way to clear the path to make way for the entrance of new products and new buyers in new cultural spaces.
The discourse around diversity also draws lines between first and second generation immigrants. Developing spaces specifically targeted for one and not for the other results in creating businesses and products for second generation youth while replacing the spaces of their parents. The new cultural spaces are part of forming a new consumer identity around second generation immigrants who could speak, purchase and participate in ways that their parents could not. These distinctions between generations help determine who is welcome in those spaces and who is not. For example, as businesses serving Mexican immigrants left, certain areas became predominantly English speaking. Pressures to change the names, culture and products also impact who feels welcome in downtown. The culture of the area, or the “synergy” created by neighboring businesses is both part of the result and the cause of the loss of Mexican immigrant customers and the displacement of many of existing businesses serving that community.

Urban planners participated on all sides of the redevelopment battle. Professional planners worked as consultants for the PBID helping to facilitate the planning process for incoming businesses. City planners made presentations at city council meetings attempting to change the permit processes for liquor and entertainment permits. They often spoke about making the process fair for “everyone,” but specifically focused on entertainment and liquor permits. In most cases, urban planners helped facilitate the redevelopment process and thus, the transformation of downtown in the image of the PBID’s vision. This is not to say that city governments, planners and developers are not the sole actors who produce and shape culture. Mexican immigrant communities are not powerless nor do they remain marginalized from this changing cultural and political landscape. The following chapter focuses on how citizen planners contest the erasure of Santa Ana’s history and fight to shape a future for Santa Ana that represents the community’s interests.
Chapter 7

Spaces of Resistance

Renters, business and property owners respond to the threat of displacement through different tactics and strategies around community based planning and cultural development. Collective tactics where community members engage community assets in regional and political strategies can build power and challenge the urban regimes that structure the local political environment. These alliances open the possibility for transformational relationships and projects that defend low income interests (DeFilippis 2004; Logan and Molotch 1987; Fainstein and Fainstein 1985). This chapter examines the tactics and strategies of community members that include renters, business and property owners and residents who respond to the threat of displacement in different overlapping and sometimes countering ways.

A group of Mexican immigrant women founded a Mexican cultural center in Santa Ana in 1994 as a nonprofit organization. In 2006, the center moved to the more accessible downtown area and grew to house over twenty-five classes including music, literacy for adults, art and dance. In this new space, the cultural center also served as an incubator for new organizations. It became the home of a small theatre that showcased Latina playwrights and helped develop up and coming young Latina writers. Another community partner organization did educational and citizenship advocacy for the undocumented immigrant community. The center became a hub for cultural activism in the Mexican immigrant community. The organization paid up to $7000 a month through fundraisers, grants and donations. Despite the high prime rental rates the members of the cultural center valued their central location that gave volunteers and students many transportation options that eased some accessibility challenges.
In 2011, the property manager abruptly gave the cultural center a 30-day notice to plan, pack, move and find another space. According to the cultural center organizers, the property manager had said there were new plans for the building and the cultural center did not fit in this new vision. Beginning in 2009, their property owner had changed the terms of lease from annual to monthly. Despite their monthly payments that ranged from $5000-$7000 during their five year tenancy, the Orange County Register reported the property owner’s public statements accusing the cultural center of “abusing their tenancy” (Galvin, 2011). The abuse, according to interviews and descriptions in local newspaper media, included graffiti in the elevator and thus, according to the property owner the “building was in bad shape” (Galvin 2011). The owner cited the youth in this space, mostly Mexican and immigrant, as part of their decision: “the kids were unsupervised and it wasn’t working out anymore.”

Soon after the cultural center received the official notice, community organizers mobilized their local networks to gain the support of a city council member who would pressure the property owner to give the cultural center a two-month extension. During the next three months, hundreds of community members gathered in meetings and forums to discuss and understand the process of gentrification and to strategize on how to take action. The press began to interview both the property owner and cultural center organizers, who had begun to train each other on how to communicate with media and the community. In those three months, the community organizers sought and found another space, packed, moved and prepared their students, teacher and volunteers for the change.

Organizers were able to successfully relocate some of the classes to different homes, organizations and public spaces. Other classes could not survive the displacement and were ultimately cancelled. The organization running the Latina theatre, for example, decided to shut its
doors. They did not have the funds to reinvest in rebuilding the infrastructure they had developed, then lost, at the center.

A month after the cultural center was ousted, organizers had found a suitable new space and were prepared to sign a new lease. Meanwhile, the circumstances of their sudden eviction had brought together musicians, painters and writers whose support coalesced into a public manifestation of solidarity with the surrounding community. On September 3rd, 2011, over one hundred community members walked through the streets of Downtown Santa Ana playing instruments and displaying art pieces in a vigil/march. They walked from the former home of the cultural center to Fourth Street, through the Fiesta Marketplace and into the Artist Village. The group included young art teachers wearing their work aprons, musicians playing their instruments, mothers with their children in strollers showing their children’s art work produced at the cultural center. Many carried bilingual posters that said “Art for people, not for profit”, “Santa Ana no se vende” (Santa Ana is not for sale/Santa Ana doesn’t sell out), “We have rights.” The protestors also carried a black coffin raised about their heads. The coffin was painted with names of important symbolic spaces that had been recently demolished and spaces where the Mexican community felt they were not accepted. These included the carousel that was a point of reunion for their families, historic Fourth Street and the kiosk where the community held many cultural celebrations.
The single case of this cultural center is an example of a collective experience of displacement in which organizations and individuals respond and shape the economic transformation of their cities, creating a contested cultural and political terrain. Despite the powerful economic and political forces behind these changes, low-income working communities of color take part in community development in often-oppositional forms.

In order to better understand how low income communities shape cultural development from the bottom up, this chapter focuses on Downtown Santa Ana based nonprofits, businesses, property owners who own or run small businesses and organizations, and who experienced the threat of displacement. Through over forty interviews of individuals who work, own or help run a cultural space in Santa Ana, California, and participant observation of over twenty cultural spaces,
this chapter documents these actors’ struggle and fight over land, cultural representation, and political participation.

The following section lays out how theories of community development and immigrant integration have made great strides in recognizing the importance of community participation as well as the significant barriers low-income communities face in the planning processes. However, they fall short in addressing how certain relationships reproduce economic and political barriers and inequalities. This shortcoming is partly due to the shift in community development theories from radical to more market driven and asset based approaches. This chapter’s findings help reconstruct these theories by showing the overlaps between resistance, community and capitalist development and how integration and participation can also reinforce inequalities and strategies of displacement. Instead of integration and participation, I propose a theory of transformational relationships of solidarity. I do not mean solidarity in the sense of working class consciousness that can often limit consciousness to attitudes of combativeness and moments of crisis. In order to consider a wide range of cultural practices generated in social struggle, “cultures of solidarity” refers to “a cultural expression that arises within the wider culture, yet which is emergent in its embodiments of oppositional practices and meanings” (Fantasia1988: 17). These expressions can arise from hegemonic culture but still represent something oppositional and independent.

Furthermore, using action oriented work by radical and progressive urban planners, I argue that the oppositional character of community development has the potential for building transformative and collective cultural planning alternatives.

Moving Beyond the Integration Approach

The challenge of incorporating low income communities of color in creative and other forms of revitalization is an ongoing challenge for urban planners. Previous work used concepts of ethnicity
that separated groups by certain norms from the mainstream population. Minority groups were considered to bring “different norms to bear on common circumstances with consequent different levels of success—hence group differences in status” (Glazer & Moynihan, 1975, p. 7). Ethnic identities helped explain the contemporary positions of each ethnic group and their barriers to group incorporation. Theorists and policy-makers considered ethnicity reproduced in the home, family and community, as the source of the failure of those groups to incorporate into mainstream society and the main obstacle to move up in the social ladder to higher occupations, education, etc.

Urban planning research has moved the debate far from these assimilationist approaches and the “one size fits all” strategy. A large focus has been on how to “incorporate,” “include” or “integrate” communities of color in urban planning processes. Much community development research proposes that policies and programs should be tailor-made and take into account the particularities, needs and skills of individuals and their communities (Ong and Sideris 2006). Questions of access to opportunities and linkages have surfaced as key words in the immigrant “integration” literature. Addressing questions of exclusion includes understanding the physical and social barriers that obstruct low income communities of color from participating in planning decisions and projects.

Community development literature has also followed this framework. Access and opportunities to education, training programs, cultural resources, housing and social services are common recommendations in recent community development literature. Considering political, geographic and economic barriers, many of the solutions focus on creating more employment, cultural opportunities and resources. Many of these approaches recognize the significance of creating place based policies that include the contributions of low-income working communities of color on the urban landscape as well as the economic and political barriers to political participation.
This research proposes building community assets and networks, both formal and informal that exist within these communities. Community assets include community institutions, ethnic networks, businesses, churches, and civic organizations. Such proposals include building linkages between sectors, organizations and the wider community as part of responding to the legacy of segregation and isolation experienced by communities of color.

Some cultural planning approaches also parallel this integration approach. That literature goes beyond nonprofits and includes participatory and unincorporated arts, and highlights the importance of creating art and cultural venues. These groups of scholars help us understand the different sectors, spaces, and institutions that interconnect to create a cultural ecosystem (Markusen et al 2006; Stern and Seifert 2010), highlighting the linkages, networks and overlap that already exist. Part of this ecosystem includes the cultural character and artistic contributions that can work as placemakers and community development (Markusen and Gadwa 2010; Chaskin et al 2001).

Work on participatory and unincorporated arts highlights that forms of unincorporated arts and organic “cultural clusters” need economic and public support (Alvarez 2005; Stern and Seifert 2010). Place-based investments meant to revitalize creative and economic development projects develop performance metrics that hope to avoid displacement and gentrification (Markusen and Gadwa 2010). Much of this work focuses on creating cultural opportunities for low-income communities and highlights the cultural resources and assets that exist in low-income communities of color. Ethnic/race specific work in community and cultural development consider “how race, class, poverty and discrimination shape the process, through a politics of belonging of dis-belonging” (Bedoya, 2012, p. 2). Part of this scholarship argues that cultural investments and creative placemaking initiatives require adequate evaluations based on specific criteria that can
measure their impact on the community they find themselves (Jackson M. R., 2012) as well as build cooperation amongst different partners (Markusen A. , 2013).

This scholarship and practice has made great strides in recognizing the significance of community assets and the different actors –nonprofit, private, public, and community— that come together to build the cultural and social character of a neighborhood and cities. They have also documented some of the barriers to participation and the need for increased opportunities. However, this focus on existing community assets can deflect attention from addressing those structural barriers and existing relationships that form part of historic and systematic racism and inequality. Furthermore, less attention is placed on the political aspects of these existing relationships, alliances and crossovers. Community development, which took its roots in Black Power and radicalism in the 1960s has moved towards less explicit political goals such as capacity building and asset-based development. This shift included focusing on social capital construction and less of a focus on movement and political organization. Cultural planning has followed in this direction.

In order to capture the individual and collective tactics that engage communities in political strategies, I use work that documents the possibilities of transformational relationships. Literature in radical planning (Friedman 2002; Sandercock 1998), insurgent spaces and citizenship (Miraftab and Wills 2005; Holston 1998), Rights to the City (Lefebvre, 1996; Marcuse, 2010; Harvey, 2003; Purcell, 2003) and the Just City (Fainstein, 2010) each include the political aspects of community development that are “grounded in civil society” (Friedman 2002; 76). Rights to the City literature documents activism in communities of color as part of assessing their rights to political participation, public space and self governance (Purcell 2003; Mitchell 2003; Carpio, Irazabal, & Pulido, 2011).
This work highlights the role of community based organizations as important actors in building these types of proposals to defend low-income interests (Logan and Molotch 1987; Fainstein and Feinstein 1985). Researchers such as Chester Hartman have not only contributed to this work theoretically but have also put together action manuals intended to be used by community organizers and their advocates (Hartman, Keating, & Richard, 1982). This body of work a perspective is significant in that it is action oriented and considers the significance of local traditions, culture, and politics while also understanding the impact of capital mobility and neoliberal globalization.

There is much research that shows the steady decline of public space or at least its transformation including great privatization and downsizing (Banerjee 2007). At the same time, research has shown the significant role of public space on civic engagement and insurgent citizenship (Holston 1995; Sassen 1995; Amin 2008) and place-making for communities of color (Hayden 1995). Practices such as parades demonstrate the political component of public celebrations as well as the complexities of community based practices (Veronis, 2006; Mitchell, 1995). Cultural, economic and political manifestations can form part of claiming space for community needs.

Each of the following sections examines the tactics and strategies of community members in response to the threat of displacement and the impact on their rights to access private and public property. It includes those businesses and organizations, both Latino and non Latino, that felt they were under threat of being displaced or were actually displaced. The section titled “Forcing the Fit,” shows how individuals who both own and rent cultural spaces attempt to adapt and align themselves to the changes in order to survive in Downtown Santa Ana. Business owners who own and run cultural spaces “buy into” the change, which requires a certain investment in the direction
of the new vision but does not guarantee their future. The second section, “The Uprooted” represents a collective identity of community members who feel they and their cultural spaces are being displaced and organize around the cultural planning projects. The “Day of the Dead” section goes beyond the private sphere and considers the relationships around public space and cultural development. The findings show that grassroots tactics around cultural planning are not isolated but rather influence the direction of the changes and in turn, are shaped by them.

Forcing the Fit: Individual Responses to a Changing Demographic

The investment in cultural development Downtown Santa Ana had varying degrees of impact on existing organizations and businesses. In Downtown Santa Ana, a group of property owners owned prime downtown real estate and had the financial and political capital to invest and actively pursue opportunities to rent to new businesses. They accomplished this by placing some of their existing businesses on month-to-month leases, rendering some tenants of cultural spaces in Downtown Santa Ana more vulnerable to displacement. Like the cultural center described above, many businesses could no longer obtain an annual lease from their property owner. Regardless of their occupancy history, this revised contract provided them with only thirty days notice if and when their lease was not to be renewed.

This also made businesses that were not up to code or did not have the correct permits increasingly vulnerable to property owners seeking a justification to terminate a lease. Some of the businesses and organizations operated without proper zoning or Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) for years. Many groups and organizations held informal special events such as live music, or hosting dances and events. In one example, a cultural center existed in an office building and they removed a wall to enlarge their space to accommodate a dance room. “We can’t afford a space
like a theatre or a real cultural center, so we have to do what we can with what we have” said one volunteer at the cultural center.

Despite the challenges, some tenants believed that the change could be good for Santa Ana. Seeing an increase in white and middle to upper class patrons walking around Downtown could mean a more affluent clientele. Several business owners began putting money into changing their window displays, their menus and some of their merchandise. One businesswoman explained how she was now selling jewelry directed toward the white women who increasingly visited Downtown Santa Ana.

Others had to go out of their way to bring in the new customers and some began organizing cultural music, art and performing events to bring in the new crowds. One coffee shop owner born and raised in Santa Ana explained:

“We have this event coming up...We have to go out of our way to pull these white people, these hipsters over here so we can be part of their art walk, you know ‘cause we’re not part of it. We’re too far on the edge, even though they count other shops on Main and 17th Street as art walk...We’re not part of it. So we have to do our thing and go out of our way to bring them.”

These music, art and performance events became part of the attraction to Downtown Santa Ana although they were initially a response to the changes. The Property Business Improvement District (PBID) would sometimes sponsor and provide funding for some of these events. However, negotiating these changes came with costs that included paying for the upgrade, time invested in making the changes, getting new permits and organizing events to bring new crowds. It also involved a high amount of risk for some of these businesses that were barely hanging on to begin with. While the first business owner had hope in making more money, she had yet to see if it
worked out for her during the interview. On the other hand, the coffee shop owner felt he was investing more than he could afford and more than he would profit.

Some businesses invested in organizing events meant to draw in more customers but could not afford to obtain the proper permits to host different types of entertainment. When a new thrift shop opened in Artist Village, the business owner attempted to bring in live music to draw a crowd during Art Walk. She would sell artwork in her store and try to organize special events during the Art Walk. However, she could not afford to obtain the permits necessary to have these types of events and the events were cancelled.

A bakery at the center of Fiesta Marketplace (recently renamed the East End) that sold Mexican bread, chocolate and coffee felt the pressure of change. The bakery had been in Santa Ana for thirty-two years and the most recent business owner had purchased the business nine years ago. The changing businesses and clientele physically surrounded the bakery. In 2011, a kiosk, a carrousel, and a Mexican seafood restaurant, which mostly served the Mexican immigrant community, neighbored the bakery. In just one year, the kiosk, the carrousel and the restaurant were gone. The property owner of many of the properties in the area, including the bakery, replaced the Mexican restaurant with a restaurant that featured a chef who had won a television show on the FoodNetwork. It was at the center of a major creative re-investment that including a historic theatre with new business owners that changed it from a theatre to a music venue. A single family, one of the PBID’s biggest supporters, largely owned this particular area, including the bakery.

The several times I visited the bakery in the middle of the day it was busy with Mexican families who visited the area. It would close during the evening. When the property owner suggested he open at night to cater to the new guests coming to the theatre, the business owner first
resisted because he would use evenings to spend time with his family. In the end, he finally relented and began working evening hours, with his family accompanying him. Often, he said, some of his children would fall asleep in the back because the place was so empty. When the landlord suggested he add an outside patio, the baker again invested in the renovations. In the day, the patio was packed with families. However, at night, the patio with new outdoor furniture lay practically empty. He replaced all the signage and the menus that used to be in Spanish. All handwritten signs were removed. His survival tactic was to fall in line and try to ride the wave of gentrification in order to have continued rights to lease his space.

When the area underwent building renovations, the baker still had to pay full monthly rent although the renovations were prohibitive to accepting customers. His investment was not paying off and new customers were not coming into his business. However, the property owner claimed that he could command a much higher rent from that storefront that the current business owner could not afford.
In the case of the bakery owner, most of his clients continued to be the Mexican immigrant community. Businesses had to negotiate the economic and cultural changes without losing their primary customers. The coffee shop’s owner explained the importance of community support for his business. His strategy also included strengthening the relationships he had with local organizations and cultural spaces. For example, he would hire from local community based organizations, including the cultural center:

“So it worked out perfect, right, but then you throw in there that they do belong to an organization and the organization not only have its core people, but they are attached to other groups, you know….Different groups, different [art, dance, educational] classes at different times; all that is going to help us run our small business, ‘cause now you have classes through different days with their kids and the
mom’s come in and get their licuado (shake) or the kids come in and get their fruta picada (chopped fruit). Groups like that sustain your mom and pop small shops. Yeah, we kind of count on the federal building, their workers for the lunch rush, but in reality if your community is not in place in different hours of the day, in different organizations, in different groups, in different likes of comida then your business is going to be hurting...”

Maintaining community relationships was part of this business owner’s plan for surviving. Hiring from local organizations and bringing in local residents would connect the business to a larger network of economic and social support. While in this coffee shop for example, members of different organizations would stop buy to eat lunch, have their meetings, or would ask to host events in the space. The space was necessary for different community gathering but also for everyday encounters where people would update each other on current events. While these relationships helped sustain the space economically, they impact the legal right to continue to rent or lease the property.

The bakery also had a community presence on a daily bases. Despite this participation and the baker’s own investment in the business, he could not pay the rent that the property owner wanted for the locale. The property owner gave him five months of free rent to find another space and perhaps find someone to buy his equipment. The business owner responded in an interview: “That wouldn’t even cover what that oven cost me,” in regards to the five months of free rent not coming close to the value of the business. The property owner felt that the baker was costing him a potentially higher rent from a new business.
The Uprooted: Collective Tactics Around Displacement

In addition to the individual attempts to “ride the wave” of gentrification, renters and property owners collectively organized around sentiments of being “pushed out” or even “cleansed.” As the PBID pushed their vision for Downtown Santa Ana through tax assessments, businesses and property owners who could not afford the PBID assessments and felt the benefits were directed elsewhere came together to fight for its disestablishment. Property owners who ran their own businesses suffered as tax assessments, shifts in customers and in the surrounding consumer culture made it more difficult to financially sustain their businesses. These businesses were mostly owner occupied businesses such as Laundermats, travel agencies, a religious store, bridal shops, shoe and furniture stores. The property owners would gather once a week, meet with city representatives, and attend city council to speak up against the PBID and what it was doing to their businesses. According to interviews, one woman who owned a coin laundry stated she paid close to $4000 a year under the assessment. A Mexican business man in the group owned three properties and paid more than $7000 in improvement district assessments.
This group was ethnically and politically very diverse and represented White, Mexican, Mexican-American and Korean property and business owners. About half of them were first generation immigrants. They would meet once a week to discuss the legal case for disestablishment of the PIBD and their own economic hardships. Despite their differing political views, the group was unified in their pursuit of rights to participate in the process of the PBID formation and their right to benefit from the investments taking place in the downtown and determine fair tax assessments. In Dec 2010, they collectively delivered almost three dozen petitions to city hall demanding the disestablishment of the PBID. This still was not enough. The city had removed the disestablishment clause when they approved the PBID, and thus, the business owners had to reinstate a way of legally terminating it.

---

The City weighted the ballots based on how much each property owner would pay into the PBID. This included city-owned properties.
Instead of the disestablishment option, in August 24, 2011 after lots of pressure from this group of property and business owners, the city council voted to redraw the boundaries to exclude only some of those properties not in favor of the PBID from taxation. This was a small change since many of the businesses still found themselves within the boundaries. Despite the all Latino city council and mayor, only one city council member publically stated their support for disestablishment. Other city council members publically stated there were issues but did not support disestablishment and touted the success of the new downtown.

Instead of disestablishment, on July 1, 2013, the city council voted to approve a new downtown business tax replacing the PBID\(^a\). After not being able to establish quorum\(^b\) to vote on either renewing or dismantling the PBID, the city council voted to create two separate business improvement districts where businesses would both financially contribute and take part in the decisions. The previous tax assessments would no longer take place. This was a direct result from the organizing of the group of downtown property and business owners.

The cultural center’s public manifestation described in the opening of this chapter, is another example of a collective community response to the changes taking place in Santa Ana. In addition to the march, the participating community members wrote a street theatre piece called “The Uprooted” or “Cortando la Raíz.” As the group marched on Fourth Street they first stopped at Fiesta Marketplace where the kiosk once stood to perform the play in Spanish. Written by young Chicano and Chicana artists and writers from Santa Ana, the play used popular theatre methods like using handwritten signs to distinguish the different characters so the audience could

---

\(^a\) The City agreed to provide $400,000 annually to the PBID and split the proceeds of the new district evenly between the two BIDs which would be approximately $250,000 annually, far less than the PBID (Elmahrek, Santa Ana Oks Two Year Budget, 2013).

\(^b\) Three city council members declared conflict of interest and one city council members was arrested for sex-related charges. This only left three votes, and four votes were necessary (From city council meeting notes).
identify them: a gardener, a dreamer⁶⁶, business man, developer, pedestrians, city council members, a police officer and community members. The multigenerational play showed an older Mexican woman flowering the seeds of culture that grew into music, dance, poetry, and education in Santa Ana. The narrator explained:

“These seeds of culture have been passed down by our ancestors to our elders, watered by espacios colectivos and grassroots organizations and nurtured by our communities. Do you see the value of cultivating seeds? Is this something that belongs in our communities? Is this something worth protecting? Is this something that belongs en el centro de (in downtown) Santa Ana? “

The character of the developer was named “Chasing Race” where the character pushed and uprooted the seeds harvested by the community. The performers presented how the city council members allowed for an illegal property tax bid to pass despite the low votes in favor.

The group of community members made a second stop at Artists Village during Art Walk to perform the play. They stopped in front of the artist galleries and performed the play in English so the majority of the attendees could understand. On their way from one stop to another, various hip hop artists performed accompanied by son jarocho music that served as the background to both traditional songs and chants. Aztec dancers led the march and brought dynamic sound and energy to the procession. While previous media reports on theousting of the cultural center highlighted the developers’ perspective and their accusations on vandalizing the space with graffiti, this procession brought out press and provided the community’s perspective. This was a different

⁶⁶ A Dreamer is an undocumented youth. The identity is inspired in the Dream Movement for undocumented students rights.
way of both documenting the history of the cultural space in the area and the political and cultural moment that the community was living.

The uprooting of the cultural center forced the community organizers to investigate more information on the different property owners and the larger reinvestment plan in the area. During the march, organizers passed out flyers with information regarding gentrification to business owners and residents. The flyer below is a hand drawn map that depicts the property owners who supported and benefitted from the PBID (red) and those that did not it (blue).
Consequences for Participating

Aside from informing the public and gaining support for the cultural center, this organized form of political and cultural expression had serious consequences for the ousted cultural center. The day after the march, the cultural center was scheduled to sign a lease for a new building in Downtown Santa Ana. It had taken the cultural center three months to locate the space and a month of discussion leading up to lease negotiation. The day the organizers went to sign the lease, the building manager said there were concerns about the use of the space despite the previous month of conversations. The organizers believed this was a direct result of speaking up publicly about their ouster. The developer who owned the cultural center also owned several properties and had a significant influence and relationships with other property owners. This was corroborated by an
interview with a separate property owner who explained how the marching in the street took away any chances of the cultural center securing their new building.

Other property owners also mentioned repercussions for politically participating. Some business owners with rented storefronts mentioned caution when answering questions or opposing the view of one’s property owner. Even when this was not the case, participating in opposition as renters was complicated. One business owner explained the complications of being asked to “speak up” during some of the city council meetings around the disestablishment of the PBID:

“The last two times I’ve been to a City Council meeting has been because our property manager is part of the [PBID] board and he asked us and most of his tenants if we could go to the city council meeting to hear it out and we could decide if we are for it or against it... I think it’s a conflict ‘cause now...we wanted to stay very neutral on the whole [PBID], So we are trying to stay really neutral about it and to the point we are not seeing it one way or the other or against it and then we have [property manager] coming in, ‘Hey as property tenants I need you guys to go to the City Council meeting and listen to it and if you have anything to say on behalf of Downtown Inc. I would appreciate if you can go up there and say it.’ So is like, ‘Hmmm, we kind of wanted to stay neutral,’ and he’s like, ‘But it would really, really mean a lot.’ Last time I thought I was going to go and I told [a friend], “Dude, what we are doing?”

The power of property owners indirectly and directly placed political pressure on certain business owners to both speak up and stay silenced. Reaching out for community support was difficult for some business owners who were closing. In the case of the bakery owner, he feared getting the community involved. When he first found out that his lease may not be renewed
different community organizers approached him to see if he wanted the community to get involved. He thought this could be an incentive for the property owner to rescind the additional five months he had been given. In 2013, the bakery was gone and the property owner announced he would replace it with a new bakery, one owned by the same owner of the new restaurant on the corner.

**Re-Claiming Public Space**

Public space was an important part of challenging the lack of rights over valuable property and cultural resources in Downtown Santa Ana. The organizers working in the cultural center used public space to challenge their lack of rights to the property they had been renting for over five years. Other public manifestations such as parades and festivals also use public space and broaden the limits of who has access to manifest their culture.

In Santa Ana, large cultural celebrations take place in this contested territory. Cultural organizations and businesses get together to organize these events that represent both formal and informal alliances. Some major festivals such as the Cinco de Mayo festival in Santa Ana bring in 150,000 people and the Mexican Independence celebration brings around 265,000 people. The city works in collaboration with festival companies, local business owners and property owners. Large corporations such as Budweiser, Disneyland, Time Warner and other corporations reaching out to the Hispanic marketed are big financial sponsors.

The Dia de los Muertos or Day of the Dead festival in Santa Ana is the only festival in Santa Ana where the community and not corporations, sponsor the event. The event is a collaboration put on by a nonprofit organization and a local business. In 2012, an event organizer explained what this event meant in terms of their cultural presence in the City:
“A big one for us is the Dia de Los Muertos event. Like that is just huge...it became this small little side street event to...it’s grown bigger and bigger and now this last year we moved it to La Calle Cuatro (Fourth Street) and not only La Calle Cuatro, our main street, but it’s in front of the federal building. It is like, ‘Dude, who closes down the federal building street?’ We’re able to! So we shut it down and we have 30,000 people walking the street. And you know, yeah, the lights are kind of yellowish. But literally the whole street was a yellow glow.”

Despite its temporary nature, the celebration represents the community’s power to use public space and even close down the street and federal institutions like the Ronald Reagan building to represent their own community traditions and culture.

The community celebration includes altars honoring the dead, their lives and their community. The organizations working to put together the Dia de los Muertos celebration chose to stay away from commercializing it in order to fundraise for the cost. The focus was kept on the essence of the celebration and not cultural consumption.

The celebrations are a cornerstone of the community’s experience and history. Altar builders and participants include family members who honor someone who has passed recently. One woman who was selecting representative items for her grandmother’s altar describes the personal and deep cultural experience:

“So I got the Thanksgiving Angel that reminded me of Grandma...but she always used to whistle songs and I’m not sure how else that would be represented...and also a miniature sewing kit....maybe a small travel one... ...oh and also a little bit of yarn...for me that would represent the hair on the dolls she used to make us...and a scarf - the kind she always used to wear...and some hard candy the kind she always
carried with her...and some packets of sweet and low the kind she would always
take from restaurants...and a bottle of that light nail polish she always wore...what
about a perm rod because she always got a perm on her hair.”

The event is a public display of many individual personal and family memories that together
represent a community history. It is a way through which the community writes its own meaning
and memories.

In 2003, about 600 people attended the celebration held at the Artists Village. In 2012, the
event drew 40,000 attendees. Because the holiday is traditionally on November 1st and 2nd, the Dia
de los Muertos celebration takes place during the Downtown Santa Ana Art Walk scheduled every
first Saturday of the month. In the Artist Village, galleries would also organize their events during
this cultural celebration and often would conflict with the holiday’s reverential tone. For example,
one year, a gallery hosted a monster fashion show right next to the altars created in honor for
families loved ones who had passed. The celebration moved to Fiesta Marketplace (now called
East End) when the carrousel and kiosk still existed. Soon after, the event moved to West Fourth
Street where the organizers would close down the entire street. At this point the celebration cost
over $20,000 to organize.

Throughout the life of the festival, the discourse around the arts and culture in Downtown
developed as did the different forms of support and funding. Originally, the city council
determined the funds to sponsor these types of events and the council did not financially support
the festival. However, after the PBID formed, the city council gave the power to determine what
events and project to fund to the PBID’s board members since the tax assessments were to partly
fund these types of projects. In order to afford the required permits and police, these
organizations, events and festivals had to be sponsored by the PBID to receive financial support.
In 2010, as the numbers of the festival grew, the PBID provided major funding for the Dia de los Muertos event as the cost of the police department rose along with the number of participants.

These large cultural celebrations fell nicely in line with the PBID’s vision for Downtown Santa Ana. The PBID office had Dia de Muertos posters on its main entrance walls. One PBID board member described how the event came together with the new vision for Santa Ana:

“I think that ties into culture in Mexico and ties to a lot of other organizations that really help with good cultural and I would even say bicultural events that attract...I mean Day of the Dead is a perfect example. You can be white, Asian, Hispanic you can be an alien and it's a cool event. It's got cool artwork. It's got cool vibe. It's different. It's unique. It has cool food. It's in Downtown. It's got an element that you know you just don't get anywhere else. And again it goes back [to a previous point]. It's different. It's unique. It's hip. It's tied to art and it's tied to all those kinds of things.”

The PBID’s vision of culture and diversity matched with the different groups of people that Dia de Muertos attracted. Another business owner of a theatre, also a resident in one of the artist lofts, explained how Dia de los Muertos was part of what attracted new residents:

“Its just basically people who moved into Downtown expecting, you know, nightlife, and just didn’t expect it to be Irvine...They’re just really excited, you know. They’re coming to Dia de los Muertos. They’re coming to all the festivals. They’re coming to the Artist Village. They’re shopping down here. They just love it, or else, why would they be here I mean.”

37 In 2012, the group organizing paid $4,153.75 for the police.
Another property owner explained that “whatever is the best for downtown, wherever it's gonna be successful, wherever it's gonna bring a lot of people is great.” Dia de Muertos was an event that would bring in a large crowd to Downtown. Many of the new bars claim that the Day of the Dead is one of their busiest nights of the year. One bartender stated, “we have to bring in extra people to work that night ‘cause it gets packed.” The public celebration was a tactic to show the presence of a growing tradition and cultural force in Santa Ana. At the same time, the event also formed part of the growing market that the PBID sought to attract. It appeared that the event served both the development needs and the community purposes.

As the PBID increasingly invested to transform Fiesta Marketplace into the East End, the location of the Dia de los Muertos celebration also became increasingly strategic. In 2011, Fiesta Marketplace became the East End, the quiosk and the carousel were no longer there, and the businesses had changed. Having financially supported the festival, members of the board of directors of the PBID suggested that the organizers move the celebration back to the East End. When the group decided to keep it on Fourth Street in support of that area, the PBID board decided to cut the funding in half. In 2012, the year after the cultural center was kicked out of its space, the organizers of the Dia de Muertos event stopped accepting PBID funding because they felt they were legitimizing the current gentrification of the area. In addition, one of the property owners on the PBID board was the property owner of the cultural center. Instead, the organizers asked for support from the businesses organizing against the PBID. Although the businesses’ financial support was significantly less than the PBID sponsorship, this gave the organization autonomy from the PBID. At the same time, the PBID was unable to claim credit for sponsoring or supporting the event for that and the following year.
Today, the event continues to grow, as does the pressure to accommodate a larger crowd and more altar-building participants. This requires more police, more permits and more funding. The City of Santa Ana does not provide any funding for the event. The Dia de los Muertos organizing committee continues having to fundraise without the PBID support.

**Tactics and Strategies of Community Development and Cultural Planning**

Community actors including business owners, residents and workers respond to the economic and cultural transformation of their city through both individual and collective responses that reclaim their rights to their city. This means enacting different forms of individual and collective tactics in order to culturally and economically subsist while also mobilizing to gain popular and political influence to change the direction of the development. The resistance of these individuals and groups is cultural and economic.

Cultural planning and development research that highlights the importance of creative spaces, organic cultural clusters and place-making need to also consider existing property relations. The right of communities of color to acquire and inhabit private property in an increasingly valuable downtown area impacts what cultural spaces can and cannot develop. In the Santa Ana case, we see business owners who have contributed to the cultural history and authenticity of the downtown. Some fought to stay and take advantage of the wave of investment but had few had property rights. Despite the lack of tenure, there was much investment of time and money with little or no guarantees for businesses to “stay” and survive in a changing downtown. When the property value depends on the rental margin, the investment of renters can have little or no effect unless they can meet the rising market value.
Even those business owners who had managed to acquire their own property could not necessarily compete with the economic and cultural shifts backed by city and large private investments. Those property owners who owned their own property and business collectively organized invested time and money in hiring lawyers, and organizing to disestablish the PBID. At the same time, property owners had to pay the tax assessments increasing the individual costs of the new vision and also their potential loss. Their right to their own property and business partly depends on the city and larger developers vision for Downtown Santa Ana.

The surrounding community also proved to be a significant economic and political force. In the case of small business owners, the residents who lived in the surrounding area were constant customers who continued to support the business despite the changes. While some of the businesses would balance their attempt to reach out to both the existing and new demographics, the continuous participation and consumption of the existing customers would keep the business afloat during (...the transition, period of acclimation, adaptation...). In the case of the Mexican cultural center, the community’s political power pushed the city council to ask the property owner for more time. While each business and organization was central in bringing together the surrounding community at the everyday level—sustaining those community relationships through employment, entertainment, events, and meetings—these relationships became essential for the survival of those cultural spaces as well.

The use of public space as a form of reclaiming one’s rights to the city brings up important questions of access to property and citizenship. In this case study, community manifestations in public space including the Dia de los Muertos and the march/procession make the community’s own cultural history, expressions and realities present and visible. While this supports the significance of public space for civic engagement and citizenship, it also demonstrates how this
right to public space is negotiated through relationships that are not explicitly drawn but rather lie in the nebulous political territory around each cultural project.

The Santa Ana case demonstrates several important findings around community development and cultural planning practice. As much community development and cultural planning literature focuses on providing increased cultural opportunities, this chapter finds that relationships between property owners, the city and community members shape the future of these cultural developments. In this case, the focus on the provision of cultural assets can distract from the political struggle around cultural spaces.

Resistance in maintaining these cultural spaces is a significant part of cultural planning and community development strategies. Place-making as part of cultural planning in communities of color inherently involves a form of resistance. Even in the cases where communities organize themselves, this collective control by underrepresented communities creates a form of resistance to political and economic power at different scales. This is evident in the street theatre piece that exhibits the removal of people of color and the “uprooting” of their cultural assets. This opposition is necessary to maintain and build around the history and culture of communities of color historically molded by racist and discriminatory forms of planning.

The attempt to influence the development processes in Downtown Santa Ana had distinct consequences. The resistance, especially collective resistance can impact residents’ ability to use, maintain, and develop existing cultural spaces, both private and public, that can be lost or are under threat of displacement. Furthermore, businesses can lose the opportunity to continue to rent increasingly valuable property. Although the procession around the community center’s displacement and the Dia de los Muertos festival are both forms of re-claiming public space, both examples had distinct responses from the city and developers. In the case of the cultural center,
publically marching and condemning the displacement of certain cultural spaces is part of the community’s right to a political voice. However, the collective political participation in the streets was at the cost of having future access to specific valuable private property in addition to the loss of their own cultural planning project. Without being able to purchase property, the cultural center continued to be dependent on their relationships to the different property owners who determined their access to rent private property. Despite their level of investment in the community, the distinct level of rights between renter and property owner does not change. In addition, this relationship could impact the right to protest in public spaces and participate civically in the future. Active forms of citizenship had a certain level of costs that impacted community access to valuable property. On one hand, the public protest threatened the community’s access to private property. On the other hand, large property owners who invested in redeveloping downtown welcomed the festival that fit with their visions for development.

These collective responses can also help form new relationships that build bonds through a conscious resistance that creates a binary between them and the developers. The play, *The Uprooted*, drew parallels between different experiences of displacement. The *Dia de los Muertos* organizers’ decision to not accept the PBID funding also brought them together with the small business and property owners. These actions strengthen new alliances, fundraising abilities, creative possibilities and alternative visions of development. This resistance builds on the relationships and networks that also help keep these organizations and businesses afloat.

**Conclusion**

According to David Harvey, the freedom and rights to a city are more than increased opportunities and access to what already exists. It is a right to shape the future of the city (Harvey, 2003: 939).
These findings show us that this right to shape and participate in the city’s future requires the economic and cultural survival of the existing community and their relationships. The active form of opposition and resistance that community development requires resisting displacement and resisting the direction of the changes while also fighting to shape the course of the city’s future. This resistance is evident in the business owners’ struggle to adapt to the new demographics and cultural consumption needs, the community members’ cultural and public manifestations and the collective group of property owners struggle to change the direction of the vision for development.

Investment in a low-income community certainly brings opportunities for certain individuals. Much planning literature has focused on providing increased opportunities for “integration” for low-income communities of color. However, these opportunities for “integration” can distract urban planners from the continuous and systematic displacement of existing cultural spaces that represent the relationships necessary to participate in shaping the future of the city. At the same time, opportunities for “integration” often do not address the existing lack of property rights and anti-displacement measures needed to ensure true “place-making” that considers the historic relations of discrimination and racism. The findings show how the progressive and oppositional nature of community development moves the discussion beyond providing opportunities for low-income communities of color and instead proposes building on existing opportunities that can address systematic relations of inequality. The Santa Ana case study demonstrates the importance of re-focusing our attention on the range of interdependent relations around property and community that are a central part of community development.

These forms of civic participation and collective manifestations represent forms of active citizenship that shape the future of cultural spaces in the city. The range of consequences for participating brings up new questions around who has the right to participate in these urban
planning processes and in the everyday cultural spaces that are both private and public. In addition, cultural and community development helps shape the actual contested geography of the city. In this case, the East and West End of the city become political spaces around which distinct relationships build.

These forms of individual and collective forms of participating in community development and cultural planning also bring up new questions around their transformative power. Property owners who felt disenfranchised, residents who felt their culture displaced, and community members who came together to publicly display their traditions all formed new solidarities through their actions. Still, some of these actions coincided with the larger strategies of displacement and the rhetoric around growth, bringing up reasonable doubts around their potential to transform the direction of development. The interdependencies that exist spatially, politically, and economically, established both possibilities and limits around cultural development and planning. Cultural manifestations can be both a tactic of re-claiming public space but can also fit as part of the larger strategy of reinvestment and displacement by coinciding with the established development vision. The communities’ tactics of survival and the city and developers’ strategies of cultural and economic development can overlap. Cultural tactics and strategies do not exist outside of the political and economic landscape but rather can both change and influence one another.

The following concluding chapter of the dissertation uses a lesser case in West Oakland study to further explore some of these findings around cultural development in Santa Ana. As this chapter critiques the integration and opportunity model as part of its findings, the following chapter uses West Oakland as a comparison where the opportunities to purchase cultural spaces were part of an anti-gentrification strategy. These are two clearly distinct examples of low-income communities of color restating their historic, economic and political presence through tactics based
on culture and art. Together they help us reconstruct some of our previous assumptions around cultural planning and community development.
Chapter 8

**Conditions of Possibility**

This research examines the possibilities of residents, businesses, property owners and nonprofits in building an alternative kind of cultural project, inspired by progressive forces of art and culture and address questions of inequality. The findings show that far from marginalized, low income communities have central and historic roles in cultural development. However, urban planning strategies often displace, remove or do not recognize – perhaps make invisible – these contributions. Rather than focusing on the provision of increased opportunities as immigrant integration and community development theories often do, this work focuses on the possibility of communities transforming these relations of inequality.

These research findings push community development theories to include the complex relationships between different actors. Community relationships including businesses, residents, nonprofits and property owners are interdependent. Urban planners can learn from these actors who can exacerbate inequalities or work to strategically address systematic forms of inequality. This chapter reviews some of the dissertation’s major conclusions and then introduces a lesser case study of West Oakland to take these findings a step further. These two cases studied side by side can help community based planners understand how tactics and strategies of time, place and scale impact community possibilities of existing and future cultural planning projects.

**Cultural Development as a Project of Racial Formation and Resistance**

Cultural development and planning can both be a project of racial formation and resistance where different actors including the state, developers, business owners and community members determine and challenge what it means to be low-income, Mexican, Chicano, second generation
and undocumented. Chapter Five used theories of cultural production and racial formation to examine the everyday experiences of workers. Through the process of cultural production, individuals learn and practice skills but also learn about their own position in society. Learning art and culture is a transnational experience that includes specific immigrant realities such as being undocumented, learning in immigration camps, and working in the kitchen.

Workers in cultural spaces experienced inequality, including lack of mobility between spaces, limited access to spaces and material resources as part of learning art and culture. State security involves criminalization, violence and deportation rather than including security of employment, expression and equal access to resources. City council decisions on collaborating with ICE further promote these violent forms of securitization. Respondents create spaces with complicated institutional relationships as a response to the alienation felt in other spaces. While individuals learn what it means to be Mexican, they also contest these meanings through relationships of solidarity. These processes of learning and practicing art and culture also create an awareness of race and class—a consciousness that builds solidarities.

In Chapter Six, the development of cultural spaces goes beyond artists and workers, and includes alliances of different actors. Property Business Improvement Districts (PBIDs) are a clear example of property owners aligning their interests and obtaining support from the city council through permits, funding and even changes in the city charter to facilitate the development of certain establishments. Larger property owners had a heavy hand in determining who survived the changes by defining progress, choosing the new tenants, and then shifting the culture of the area to favor the new vision for downtown.

In this case, private developers and the city council have a heavy hand in shaping the spaces that community and individuals can inhabit. Alliances between the city council and large property
owners can develop strategies that 1) help reteach the past, the present and the future 2) change the formal and legal forms of regulating cultural spaces and 3) normalize the forms of displacement as part of a hegemonic discourse around the market and progress. Destroying cultural markers, renaming landmarks, districts, advertising, marketing and giving workshops for businesses all were part of reteaching the past and shaping the discourse around displacement and gentrification. Both city council and property owners have the power to establish new standards for cultural spaces including businesses and nonprofits that rent. The new history and discourse used concepts of diversity, authenticity and trendiness, as part of normalizing the changes and displacement taking place. The market, survival, progress and development were part of the new discourse around diversity and made part of the hegemonic discourse around the market. Respondent both accept and refuse a common sense understanding that the hegemonic order imposes.

In Chapter 7, documents how residents, business owners, small property owners practice different forms of resistance around private and public spaces while participating in the cultural development of the city. Complicated relationships impact the access of communities of color to political influence, valuable property and cultural resources. Spaces of resistance become potential ways through which communities build transformative relationships that can build alternative cultural projects. At the same time, community tactics of resistance can overlap with strategies of displacement.

**Cultural Planning in Two Communities of Color: Santa Ana and West Oakland, California**

The Santa Ana case study demonstrates important findings on how cultural development takes place in a low-income Mexican immigrant community. In order to further understand how
questions of race inequality impact the development of cultural spaces in low-income communities, I compare these findings to a lesser case study of creative economic proposals in West Oakland, California. These two case studies deepen our understanding of how time, scale and place are part of political tactics and strategies that simultaneously impact the shape cultural planning takes on the ground.

Oakland, California in Alameda County is growing as new cultural spaces open up in Downtown Oakland. Forces such as Art Murmur, an art walk that highlights opening galleries, rise in the hundreds each month. Unlike Santa Ana, the City of Oakland has a Cultural Affairs Commission that helps promote Downtown. Downtown Oakland has grown to bring thousands of people and includes a diverse range of organizations and artists. Downtown Oakland in some ways parallels the gentrification in Downtown Santa Ana. At every Art Murmur thousands of individuals fill the street and wander in and out of galleries. The Oakland art scene is attracting artists and collectors but is also transforming the image of the City. As a gallery owner states, “For so long, people would google ‘Oakland,’ and bad things would always come up. Now, good things are starting to come up instead” (O’Brien 2007: 152). The cultural development is part of this transformation. As one developer stated: “There’s not one bad neighborhood in Manhattan anymore, and the same thing can happen in Oakland” (O’Brien 2007).

When visiting Downtown, West Oakland does not appear to be part of these cultural and economic changes (except when some of the gallery shows in Downtown exhibit some of the realities in West Oakland). West Oakland is also physically in the outskirts of these developments. Despite being a historic center of economic, cultural and social movement activity, today it is marked by decades of disinvestment. According to a study by the Alameda County, an African American in West Oakland is 1.5 times more likely to be born premature or low birth weight, and
seven times more likely to be born into poverty than a white child in the Oakland hills (Beyer et al 2008). According to the report, “By fourth grade, this child is likely to live in a neighborhood with twice the concentration of liquor stores and more fast food outlets. As an adult, he or she will be five times more likely to be hospitalized for diabetes, twice as likely to be hospitalized for and to die of heart disease, three times more likely to die of stroke, and twice as likely to die of cancer” (Beyer et al 2008).

Oakland has remained a predominantly African-American city (25.4% of Oakland is Latino/Hispanic and 28% is black). However, the number of blacks in the City of Oakland has dropped from 38% to 28% in the last ten years (Census 2010). The percentage of families below the poverty level is 15.1%, and the medium household income is $57,325. The average household size is 2.51. The population at the start of this project was similar to Santa Ana’s around 398,798 (2000 census). While the population of Santa Ana decreased in the past ten years, the population of Oakland has increased.

In the 1930s, West Oakland was known as the “Harlem of the West,” a cultural center for jazz. Prescott Oakland, also known as Village Bottoms, was the last stop on the Southern Pacific Railroad. The social movement history of the area powerfully represents black struggles and cultures of resistance. West Oakland was home to the Black Pullman Porters and to Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (U.N.I.A.). West Oakland was central to the rise of community organizing efforts by the Black Panthers.
The West Oakland community has a history of culture, violence and resistance. Police violence includes using grenade-type devices in neighborhoods in order to deal with gangs. Today, many of the cultural spaces including jazz clubs and theatres lay empty, closed and dilapidated. At the same time, a cultural vibrancy rooted in the area’s historic resistance remains. Several cultural spaces represent community responses to how these changes and investments impact West Oakland. The following section shows how local artists and activists conceived of a black cultural district as a focal point for the black community to enhance neighborhood stability in West Oakland. The Mandela Parkway to the east, 7th Street to the south, West Grand Avenue to the
north, and the former Oakland Army Base to the west mark the boundaries around the Lower Bottoms. This area still includes coffee shops, a community garden, galleries and a cultural center as part of an anti-gentrification tactic of some property owners and community organizers who are developing properties to serve the black community. These cultural projects are part of a larger development of live work lofts that replaced the Cannery Factories. This project lies in the same area as other cultural spaces at the other end of the 7th Street. This is a small area where many of the old jazz clubs and a theatre used to be. Organizations here have helped build local cultural movements around hip hop, bike riding, and art. There’s a small coffee shops that helps attract people to the area.

**Two Cultural Spaces in West Oakland**

Downtown Oakland is the center of art and cultural development and the debate around gentrification while the “Bottoms” in West Oakland represents the outskirts of this creative investment and the racial, economic and geographic boundaries of cultural development. Oakland itself is shaped by the development in San Francisco which lies only a couple miles away and is transforming rapidly with increased investment coupled with a push for new art and cultural spaces. This investment in San Francisco is felt in Oakland. As one respondent noted, “I’ve been here for the last 15 years. Everyone is over here now. Now it’s like the people who were over there are over here now because they can’t afford it.” Economic and cultural changes begin to impact who can live in Oakland and who is forced to move and find something cheaper. For those who would like to live close to Downtown Oakland and are in search for something more affordable, West Oakland is now an option.
As some investments began to enter this area, community organizers attempted to shape the direction of the development. In 2000, a group of black community organizers, artists, entrepreneurs came together with the idea of developing a black cultural district. One specific development represented an alliance between a community organizer and a large developer. One newspaper reporter described them as “the village nemesis” and “the committed bohemian and life-long crusader” (Swan 2008). A white developer and black community organizers joined forces in 2000 when the developer invested in building a townhouse complex. The development was set to include both affordable units and market rate condos where sales prices started at around $295,000. The developer, trying to entice new buyers and artists, permitted this community organizer to use a space in the lot as a gallery and cultural space. The developer had started gaining of respecting the local community history in part by naming one of the three courtyards after the
Chinese immigrant entrepreneur who found the canning company that used to be in that building. At the same time, the community organizers helped guide the development with values around black culture and identity.

In 2009, 250 housing units were completed in the area (Village Bottoms, 2009, p. 35) and the organizer and developer had established a community partnership as part of obtaining the community’s acceptance of the project. A real estate magazine describes the Cannery lofts and the area:

“The Cannery Lofts is a unique warehouse conversion building in an up-and-coming neighborhood of West Oakland. The “Central Station” area is growing fast yet still affordable, perfect for buyers who have been priced out of San Francisco. It’s Oakland’s equivalent of SOMA, the Mission, or Potrero Hill: areas that were once considered undesirable but transitioned into some of the city’s hottest neighborhoods.” (Lee)

The Cannery development included 163 total units completed in 2009, 20 of which were to be resold at affordable prices to low and moderate income homebuyers at 100% AMI. All affordable units contained the same design and fixtures and amenities as all of the other units.

This same year, a community development corporation (CDC) and nonprofit organization established an agreement to work the organizers on a community plan that linked neighborhood vitality to a needs assessment. This was part of a larger effort to fight the gentrification of the neighborhood and invest in black cultural spaces. The organizer and other black artists took the opportunity to serve as “founding buyers” and bought other property at a discount from the developer to start their own black cultural spaces—And like the developer said, so they could “all co-exist peacefully.” Community organizers found other property owners to purchase pieces of
property in the area and redevelop them with the inspiration of the cultural spaces that had been lost when the state rerouted the freeway. These new projects specifically targeting the surrounding working class black community and included a couple of new storefronts and Victorian houses that turned into galleries and artist residencies.

The goal of the cultural district was to develop culturally relevant enterprises and to “maintain historically significant, black cultural presence in West Oakland in the face of rapid gentrification” (Village Bottoms 2009). With the help of community organizations and some of the neighborhood residents they transformed various large vacant industrial sites into a community garden. The plan, located on the site of a former auto junk yard, featured an aguaponics system in efforts to grow and sell fish and vegetables in a sustainable manner (Village Bottoms 2009). Soon the collective of black artists started First Fridays when they would open the cultural spaces on Friday evenings.

Fast forward to 2011 and many of these spaces in the black cultural district were closed. The Victorian houses that served as galleries (sat empty/remained empty/emptied out/became dormant) and the coffee shop that was a central meeting space for the individuals involved in the black community development was frequently closed. The cultural center was open only for events making everyday impromptu visits impossible. The work that had been going on for nearly a decade seemed to have disappeared. The cost of the properties were too high and the were lost during the foreclosure crisis.
In 2013, the community farm invested in by the organizers, CDC and a nonprofit had a for sale sign up in front and appeared to have been abandoned. The lofts continued to be there, but many of the black cultural space are closed or no longer there. What began as a project to jointly develop black cultural spaces and loft living resulted in the sole survival of the larger development
project. Many of the purchases had used loans and many of the properties were lost in the foreclosure crisis (Stuhldreher 2007).

Figure 16: Mural of Marshall “Major” Taylor in West Oakland. November 20, 2012, Photo by Carolina S. Sarmiento

In 2009, a bike shop opened several blocks away from the black cultural district. A mural of Major Taylor the first Black cycling world Champion is painted on the outside of the space and a mural of Oscar Grant is painted inside, above a wall of bicycles, both new and used. This space was never part the black cultural district on the other end of the area but represents years of organizing against police brutality and poverty in West Oakland. Having moved from meetings in individual homes, organizers running this cultural space provide educational workshops on rights, and have a space where drop ins can come together. In the following description, I explain this everyday occurrence:
While I was in the space interviewing Daren, one of the organizers who helps run the shop, a young black boy walked in with his bike. He was no older than thirteen. Daren greeted him and told him that his project was in the back. The young man walked right past us to the other side of the shop. During the interview, the young man came back and showed Daren a tire that did not seem to want to keep air in. Daren took the tire and asked him “Well, have you tried...”. and gives him some suggestions and showed him techniques to check the tire. About half an hour later, the young man came back with the tire full of air and started explaining the problem with the tire to me as if he were a bike expert. I’m not exactly clear on what the problem was with the tire, but what was clear, was how comfortable this young man felt in the space.

The focus of this space was on building relationships and connecting personal experiences to their surrounding environment. Martin another one of the main community organizers in the not for profit bike shop stated: “You have to have some physical space where people can sit down and be comfortable and take in information and also share. So you have to have a physical space for that.”

The space was important to build a political and collective voice. Martin continued to explain how that process would take shape in relation to the surrounding political environment:

“It’s safe for people. We just had a gang injunction. We had a lot of people who was considered gang members on the list, so they felt safe enough to practice their two minutes spiel. We’re safe in that regards as far people coming and talking about organizing, trying to engage civically here. It’s safe for that, for them to come here and engage with the system in a way that they can protest and advocate. It’s safe in that regards. They will have technical support and information to help them in that way.”
Organizers in the space supported the existing community in becoming politically visible in terms of the political decision-making and influence. A safe space was necessary to develop individuals ready to engage with the political system collectively.

The bike shop rented the property and although business in the area was very limited, the neighboring coffee shop served as an “anchor business” where they would sometimes get the “foot traffic people who go and get coffee.” The bike shop survived off of sales and donations. They hoped to apply for grants in the future. Their property owners also owned and ran the coffee business and allowed the organizers to use the coffee shop to have events and meetings. At least this small block highlighted two significant everyday spaces for community organizing that individuals could just stop by and “plug in” as stated by one of the organizers in the bike shop.

There was little relationship between the black cultural district and the bike shop. As stated by one organizer:

“Like we went to their events. They would hold stuff. I know [one of the organizers] did some stuff over there, and different events. And we would go over there to that extent. They had their own thing going on. It was kind of insular...

Those were artists. Those were not organizers and they made that very clear.”

The cultural projects, although attended each other’s events, worked apart from the other and developed their own separate alliances. On one hand, the Black cultural district worked with local artists, economic development organizations and CDCs, in addition to their relationship with the developer. On the other hand, the bike shop had largely been born out of another nonprofit working with youth and focused on building local cultural movements like the Scraper Bikes who would collaborate in organizing events. Since 2008, the bike shop would host an annual bike ride that grew to include between 300 to 500 riders. In July of 2013, during their 6th annual peace ride,
the community non-profit bike shop held their ride in memory of Trayvon Martin and all youth victims to violence and police brutality. These rides still take place throughout Oakland.

**Possibilities of Cultural Planning and Spatial tactics**

Planners in search of more equitable planning projects around culture and the arts can learn from the possibilities that grassroots communities create despite the political and economic challenges. Understanding how communities organize spatial strategies and tactics in both Santa Ana and Oakland is part of understanding these possibilities as urban planners. Furthermore, urban planners searching to implement these equitable possibilities for cultural planning require a spatial perspective that links place, scale and time.

Community-based planning often emphasizes traditions, culture and decision-making at the local scale. The work of Purcell (2006; Brown & Purcell, 2005) critiques how much of this type of planning falls into the “local trap” and how this planning ignores the political character of different scales. Purcell states how the local scale is not inherently democratic, as is evident in many NIMBYist planning examples (Born & Purcell, 2006). This trap often prohibits planners a more nuanced and political analysis of scale. Both the Oakland and Santa Ana case show that different actors play distinct roles at each scale. Business and property owners, for example, had different forms of power depending on the scale and the timing of the development and waves of investment. In Santa Ana, the property owners responded to a moment of high investment, gentrification and displacement. Property owners organized collectively to influence the vision of development. This included both accelerating the changes in the case of large developers and slowing it down for small business and property owners.
Despite this collective action at the local level, many of the tactics of resistance focused on individual spaces, businesses or at the largest scale, the Downtown area, ignoring the connections to the surrounding neighborhoods and much less the rest of the City of Santa Ana or West Oakland’s neighboring cities or regions. In Santa Ana, for example, while community based tactics focused on each individual business and space, the city council changed the zoning code for the entire downtown and surrounding areas (Sarmiento and Beard 2014 Forthcoming; Gonzalez et al 2012), easing the barriers for development in other working class neighborhoods. The historic neighborhood of Logan, which lies minutes from Downtown, has seen a rise in housing development, including both affordable housing and Artist loft construction. South Main Street Santa Ana, the area with the lowest median income of Santa Ana, has also seen an increase in investment. However, no attempt has been made to bring together the businesses, resident and organizations from each of these areas.

In West Oakland, organizers were witness to the intense Bay Area housing market pressure that transformed Downtown Oakland and understood its potential impact on West Oakland. The black cultural district was an attempt to prevent the gentrification occurring in Downtown Oakland and influence the future direction of development. The black cultural district in West Oakland was proposed early enough to begin building alongside the new lofts and shaping the vision for the future of the neighborhood. Black community organizers took part in the envisioning of their cultural spaces before the property rates increased. This permitted them to purchase the property, challenging the existing property relations. However, the community

38 There are certain collective spaces in Los Angeles and Santa Ana that have begun to meet to exchange tactics (including cultural spaces that are part of this research) but these meetings were in their very early stages at the time of this research
relations were not sufficient to economically and politically resist the pressures of the housing crisis. The issue was not solely local, but was taking place at a regional and national scale.

At the national scale and global scale, phenomena like the housing crisis and immigration had powerful and distinct impacts on each cultural project. The role of the state ranges from determining national immigration policy to individual experiences with police brutality while coming out of a punk show. As we see through these examples of criminalization and police violence, the state impacts individual artists and their artistic development. The lack of safe spaces to express ideas collectively becomes an issue of political and cultural rights. At the same time, opportunities for youth of color, undocumented immigrants, and low income families to participate civically cannot succeed without collectively addressing the systematic methods of criminalization. The city council in these cases takes part in shaping conceptions of race through the practice and regulation of individuals and the cultural spaces they use everyday.

The power of the state impacts cultural development at every scale. However, this power is not determinant. The case studies remind us of the power of cultural networks to go beyond political boundaries. In the case of Santa Ana, families experiences took place in two countries because often times families were split between two different sides of the border. Despite this political and economic barrier, communities go back and forth between Mexico and the United States learning and teaching music and art as a part of the immigration experience. Studies on transnational cultural networks shed light on how community development shifts and jumps scales when needed (Sarmiento and Beard 2013). In the case of Oakland, scraper bike organizations and events connecting spaces throughout Oakland represent a larger network of individuals and neighborhoods. These networks are not immune or isolated from other regional and national
policies. However, building on these cultural networks that lie outside of the dominant geography of investment, creates an alternative map that is built around community realities and needs.

Conclusion

“Never again will a single story be told as if it the only one.”
—John Berger

The possibilities of creating cultural spaces based on principles of social justice and equity expand when community members understand the interconnections between different stories of struggle and resistance. Residents create spaces of resistance in both Santa Ana and West Oakland and experience culture in a way that teaches one’s position in society but also provides an opportunity to rearticulate that position. Cultural expression and development can form part of both oppression and resistance. In terms of economic possibilities, low-income communities face an increasingly growing challenge. However, in terms of political possibilities, cultural development can help develop a collective political identity that can influence the future of the city, as is the case with the property owners and community organizers in Santa Ana and West Oakland.

The challenge for urban planners is to develop cultural spaces as part of an alternative globalization “in which the progressive forces of culture can seek to appropriate and undermine those of capital rather than the other way round” (Harvey 2002: 109). The following and final section provides recommendations for community based organizations, advocacy and city planners interested in nurturing the possibilities of building cultural spaces as part of a larger project around rights to the city.

1. Start with what you have. As this research shows, the survival of cultural spaces serving low-income communities of color depends on how various economic and political relationships
impact the very community they serve. As Susan Fainstein (2013) stated in a lecture we cannot simply look at a place and “say it is either a winner or a loser. What you have to do is look at the people within the place and the quality of life that people within that place have.” Investing in the creative development of children, workers and families through artistic education in schools, cultural centers for workers, and after school programs has proven effective but these programs have largely been defunded and privatized.

Community based organizations and planners have shown successful struggles in keeping public and private investment in cultural development accountable to low-income community needs. This may include new types of development agreements such as Community Benefit Agreements that legally hold the city and development accountable (Baxamusa 2008). This work often requires coalition building from various organizations that represent a range of interests to garner political power.

2. Planners need to develop new strategies that consider the political character of the various relationships, networks and scales at work in the production of cultural spaces. Starting with what you have does not mean getting stuck in the “local trap.” Although some “buy local” campaigns aim to secure local production and consumption, local does not necessarily mean more democratic (business interests with little concern for social or environmental justice can come together locally to influence political decisions), inherently sustainable or equitable (many new locales feature locally grown food at much higher prices). For planners and community organizers this means finding solutions that go beyond “local control” of “local space” and instead supporting movements that counterbalance private interests with the needs of inhabitants across various scales. This also means building cultural projects that do not assume the needs of local property owners and inhabitants to
be more important the needs of inhabitants in other neighborhoods, states or countries. Stressing the interconnections, networks, and interdependencies while also making the political and economic distinction between worker and owner, 1% and 99%, instead of native vs immigrant, insider and outsider, or local vs non local. Linking the Santa Ana grassroots with those in Oakland is a form of developing cultures of solidarity beyond local struggles.

3. Part of ensuring the maintenance and sustainability of cultural projects and serving a specific community is avoiding displacement and gentrification that may come from development. Planners can help small business owners explore collective models of ownership such as business incubators, cooperatives and community owned stores that conventional redevelopment make difficult to survive (DeFilippis, 2004). In addition to direct organizational and financial assistance, commercial and residential anti-displacement measures in low-income communities of color could help support owners and renters of both small commercial and residential properties who may not be able to compete with velocity of the market changes. Community land trusts for example are often private, nonprofit corporation that can acquire properties and then redevelop the land according to community driven plans including some affordability provisions (Reinventing Dayton and the Miami Valley Assessment Report, 2005). The community land trust removes the cost of land from the housing price and can apply resale restrictions (Greenstein & YSungu-Eryilmaz, 2007). Boston’s Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative is an example of a land trust that revitalized a neighborhood without displacement.39 Supporting these community

39 It is important to note that Dudley Street Trust did exercise some form of eminent domain authority from the city of Boston possibly making it a difficult case to simulate.
based alternatives supports forms of integration that can grow apart from a single capitalist notion of property rights that are so central to urban planning processes.

4. Planners need to pay closer attention to cultural spaces as racial projects that impact democracy and citizenship in cities at various scales. Examining the everyday realities of low-income communities can help planners develop a local and transnational perspective essential to achieving justice in cities. For example, planners need to recognize the policies that shape displacement at various scales within the city. National immigration policy impacts the local policing of each cultural space and deepens our understanding on the geography of displacement and the various roles of private and state support. Municipalities should, as much as possible, work to guarantee access and rights for undocumented immigrants and youth of color, which they deserve and require to develop themselves in society and economically. Sanctuary cities were a first example of municipalities standing apart from the policies of deportation set up nationally. Another example would be to develop safe spaces where immigration and police action are restricted and individuals feel safe to be able to communicate with each other without fear of retaliation. These safe spaces allow the nurturing of cultural expression, participation and development that offer conceptions of culture, art, diversity, safety and security that are based on the everyday realities of working class communities. “Immigrant Friendly Community Initiatives” (Harwood S. A., 2014) in places like Detroit (GlobalDetroit.com) and Dayton (www.welcomedayton.org), are examples of city governments, nonprofits, businesses, and private organizations trying to attract and retain immigrant for economic development purposes. Some strategies include increased access to services for immigrants, opportunities for civic engagement and economic development opportunities.
5. Finding new ways through which planners can engage low-income communities of color in cultural development entails a shift in our ontological approach (or “how we know what we know”). This means moving away from the preconceived notion of an expert planner that is removed from the lives and spaces of the people which he/she seeks to serve and towards an ethnographic approach (Miraftab and Wills 2005; Holston 1999: 158). This means developing skills, such as participant observation, in the planning profession capable of appreciating the everyday spaces that serve as repositories of alternative histories of struggle, forms of expression, and cultural resources. Considering poetry, dance, art and cultural works as significant forms of individual expression and collective engagement with the urban environment can also help planners move away from what has become routinized planning processes for community participation.

These recommendations can help planners nurture cultural planning values and strategies that are not rooted in the neoliberal market. At the same time, the transformative potential of these strategies lies in putting these values into practice through developing spaces that will help produce equitable relations around property, cultural resources and political power.
Appendix

Table 9: 100 CULTURAL SPACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Spanish Primary Language</th>
<th>Art- 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>barbershop</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>writers</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>museum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>store curious/Coffeshop</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>AV-CLOSED</td>
<td>store/gallery</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>dance hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>public area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>dance studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>bridal shop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>bookstore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>no space</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>fashion/design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>bridal shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>bridal shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>dance studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>storefront</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>bridal shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>no space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio lofts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery/offices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>public area</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>no space</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>dance studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>OUT OF AREA</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>gallery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>movie theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>bakery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Worker</th>
<th>Businessowner/Executive Director</th>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Planning Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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