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Introduction

This past October, Trinity College Center for Urban and Global Studies (CUGS) held a symposium in celebration of its 10th anniversary, entitled, "Hartford: Past, Present, Future." The keynote speaker was Mayor of Hartford Luke Bronin. In the first few minutes of his speech, Mayor Bronin told the audience two things: the first was that he had just come from a meeting about submitting a proposal for Amazon’s next headquarters; the second was that after this speech, he would be going to a meeting about the city’s budget and the effects of declaring bankruptcy for the municipality.¹

In his speech, Mayor Bronin continued, “the state as a whole needs to reassess the way we do business, [recognize] that the structure doesn’t work, and if we have that kind of partnership within the state, possibilities will exist to actually put the city on a sustainable path. Until we build a new partnership, we can’t address the underlying vulnerability that exists in this city… if we don’t talk about the crisis we aren’t going to fix it.”² The first chapter of this thesis addresses the huge divides in this city when it comes to the central business district and the neighborhoods throughout Hartford. This chapter examines the inequalities that exist within the Hartford region, where many of Hartford’s jobs are filled by suburban residents, while Hartford’s own neighborhoods don’t see the capital

generated by the businesses located in the city. At the same time, this chapter also places Hartford in the context of an increasingly global world, which has made these businesses and corporations less rooted in place, while cities grasp to keep them, deepening dependency on them.

On the other hand, cities do have many institutions that are very rooted in their place. Standing in the Washington Room on Trinity College’s campus, Mayor Bronin pointed out that “Trinity’s strength is tied strongly to the Hartford community.” Institutions such as Trinity are seen as a key resource for cities like Hartford as it tries to make a comeback from the devastation of population loss and suburbanization that has occurred in such a rapid and widespread way for the second half of the 20th century. Bronin went on to say, “the first step is for higher education institutions to come out of their walls and make this city their own.” The second chapter of this thesis explores the effects of those walls, as well as the effects created as institutions step outside of their walls and make a greater mark on the city. It examines the ways in which place-based institutions contribute to city development and the impact of their partnerships with city governments and community partners.

I have placed the issues that Hartford faces in the context of urban theorist Henri Lefebvre’s theory of “the right to the city.” As Lukasz Stanek translates, “Lefebvre wrote that spaces considered in isolation are ‘mere abstractions,’ whereas they ‘attain ‘real’ existence by virtue of networks and pathways, by virtue of

---

3 Martin.
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bunches or clusters of relationships.” In Lefebvre’s theory, nothing is static, and
space is continually produced and reproduced by social networks, as well as “the
flows of energy and labour, of commodities and capital.” Contested space is
essential to the production of urban space, as it is the homogenization and
fragmentation of space that destroys the urban. Stanek writes, “the moments of
space are related by means of the process of their social production and
classified by a unity and contradictions of this process within a given society.”
Urban space is shaped through the contested spaces, and contested spaces are
centered on social reproduction and both the contradictions and the points of unity.

Lefebvre also argues that centrality is important to a city, versus
peripheralization. The places of economic power and decision-making constitutes
this centrality. Lefebvre wrote “any centrality, once established, is destined to
suffer dispersal, to dissolve or to explode from the effects of saturation, attrition,
outside aggressions, and so on. This means that the ‘real’ can never become
completely fixed, that it is constantly in a state of mobilization.” Contested spaces
create the urban, which is constantly being shifted and redefined, including
centrality and peripheralization. As geographer Christian Schmid put it,

---

6 Stanek, 162.
8 Stanek, Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research, and the Production of Theory, 141.
“Constructions or conceptions of space are supported by social conventions that define which elements are related to one another and which ones are excluded – conventions that are not immutable, but often contested, and which are negotiated in discursive (political) process.”

Hartford itself is a city of approximately 125,000 residents. At its peak, in the 1950s, it reached 177,000 residents. Today, the city makes up just 10 percent of the entire Metropolitan Statistical Area, and yet despite its small size in comparison to its suburbs, the city is home to the state capitol and is rich with cultural institutions such as the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art and the Bushnell Center for Performing Arts. University of Connecticut, Capitol Community College, and Trinity College are also located in the city boundaries, with Goodwin College and University of Hartford just on the edge. The city has gone through many waves of migration as workers were drawn to jobs, including for a period a booming industrial economy centered on high-precision manufacturing, such as Colt Firearms. In addition, the city has seen the effects of deindustrialization, with waves of population loss and job loss.

In researching this project, I started by considering the inequalities that exist in Hartford through a number of different lenses. How does Trinity affect these inequalities, or even reinforce them? How are inequalities in Hartford created across racialized spaces, and what are the implications of that? To place Hartford in

a larger context of historical patterns across this country, I considered how Hartford’s past has informed the present. Lastly, to place these questions within Lefebvre’s theory, I asked, what are contested spaces; do non-city residents have the right to the city, and if so, what does it mean for them to have the right to the city?

To understand the city in a comprehensive way, this thesis uses data, news articles, interviews with community organizations, faculty and staff at Trinity College, as well as lectures and presentations by scholars and professionals in the urban studies field and in Hartford.
Chapter I

Hartford’s Citadel and Ghetto

The Carceral City in Relation to Neoliberalism and Globalization

Once the wealthiest city in the country, Hartford is now consistently one of the poorest. In 2000, Hartford was found to have the 2nd highest poverty rate of any American city. However, its legacy of wealth hasn’t entirely disappeared, as that same year, Hartford managed to top charts as the 6th highest in wealth among all metropolitan statistical areas in the country. Almost twenty years later, this narrative persists: while the greater metropolitan area is wealthy, the city is in talks to declare bankruptcy. How then, has one of America’s most prosperous cities become one of its most fractured and disparate cities?

In John Friedmann and Goetz Wolff’s article on “World City Formation,” they wrote about the existence of the citadel and the ghetto – a dual city dynamic in what they hypothesized as ‘world cities’ – in which “both cities [citadel & ghetto] live under the constant threat of violence: the upper city is guarded by private security forces, while the lower city is the double victim of its own incipient violence and of police repression.” For Hartford, Friedmann and Wolff’s argument of the Citadel and the Ghetto is an apt lens with which to frame the great inequalities and

---

14 Chen and Bacon, 8.
disconnects in the city. Global in many dimensions, Hartford is home to significant insurance and finance, government, higher education and healthcare institutions. The city is also global in its population, with a third of the 40% of Hartford residents who identify as Black or African American coming from the Caribbean or African countries. Hartford is 44% Latino, 77% of whom are Puerto Rican. And yet even the city of Hartford’s global dimensions can be separated into Citadel and Ghetto—two urban spaces that have very little interaction with one another despite existing within an 18 square mile city.

Henri Lefebvre defined ‘the urban’ as the space between the citadel and the ghetto—in which they interact. The urban is derived from differences and conflicts. “It is an intermediary and mediating level situated between two others – on the one hand, the private level, the proximate order, everyday life, and dwelling: on the other hand, the global level, the distant order, the world market, the state, knowledge, institutions, and ideologies.” The urban is the space that takes shape between the citadel and the ghetto, which, Lefebvre argues, “is in danger of being whittled away between the global and the private levels.” However, according to

---

19 Schmid, 28.
his theory, the urban is never static or already achieved, but rather a dynamic process that “must constantly be produced and reproduced.”

Hartford is a perfect example of how the citadel and the ghetto intersect or don’t, as the everyday lived experiences are a very different story from the command and control centers of government, finance, insurance, and various other institutions. More than 80 percent of Hartford jobs are filled by commuters earning more than 80,000 dollars, meanwhile 65 percent of Hartford residents commute out of the city for work. And of those commuting out of the city for work, 75 percent earn just around 40,000 dollars, a full half of the income of those making the opposite commute. Bianca Gonzalez-Sobrino, a PhD student researching racialized spaces and identity in Hartford, particularly among Puerto Ricans, found that many Puerto Ricans consider downtown Hartford a different city. One interviewee said downtown is “not for us.” Downtown is the citadel—where commuters drive in, nearly doubling Hartford’s population by day to earn more than twice Hartford’s median household income. The citadel of downtown Hartford, though close in proximity, is a separate space from the ghetto of Hartford—the neighborhoods in which people live isolated from the wealth of downtown. “The urban cores are turned into citadels of power, while their population becomes an elite.”

20 Schmid, 29.
The carceral city, another phrase that is useful to understanding urban landscapes with this contradiction, is defined by this constant threat of violence and the ways in which it dictates spatial dynamics and defines social wellbeing. This dual dynamic means that urban space is constantly being pushed and pulled, producing and reproducing the two cities. In other words, Lefebvre’s contested spaces that dictate the urban and require constant production and reproduction, dictate who has a right to the city, to participation and appropriation. This right, and the lack of it, can be understood through Edward Soja’s analysis of carceral cities.

“The postmetropolis is represented as a collection of carceral cities, an archipelago of ‘normalized enclosures’ and fortified spaces that both voluntarily and involuntarily barricade individuals and communities in visible and not-so-visible urban islands, overseen by restructured forms of public and private power and authority.”  

To cement Hartford’s income inequalities across racial lines: Hartford is a majority-minority city, while Hartford county (which includes the city of Hartford) is only 24% non-white. The homeownership rate in Hartford is only 23% as opposed to 64% county-wide. And while there is a 32% poverty rate for Hartford, the county has a rate of only 11%. Only 12% of Hartford residents work in the city,

27 “U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts.”
28 “U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts.”
yet 21% of all Hartford residents have no access to a car.\textsuperscript{29} This is a part of a continual history of white supremacy, protecting notions of “whiteness”, while imposing the violence of housing insecurity and poverty upon “non-whiteness.” The carceral city is experienced by those that have been deemed not worth investing in by creators of racial covenants in the 1940s, including in West Hartford, by policy makers granting access to loans in the 1950s, and today, by neoliberal governance looking to anchor corporations and attract business professionals who will contribute more to the tax base in Hartford.

Henri Lefebvre’s theories around the right to the city understand urban spaces through this lens of contested spaces, with the threat of the citadel and the ghetto becoming more and more separated, or with the threat of homogenization of these spaces. "On the one hand, the social potential of urban space lies precisely in its capacity to facilitate contacts and mutual interaction between various parts of society. On the other hand, access to urban resources is increasingly controlled and appropriated by global metropolitan elites."\textsuperscript{30} This evaluation of urbanization from geographer Christian Schmid, interpreting Lefebvre’s work on planetary urbanization and the right to the city is a narrative that certainly describes both the potential and the reality for Hartford. In Hartford, there are extremes in inequalities, from urban to suburban, between white, Latino, and black, and from city to global.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Schmid, “Planetary Urbanization: Henri Lefebvre Und Das Recht Auf Die Stadt,” 32.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
With Lefebvre’s theories of the right to the city, urban spaces are largely defined by the contested spaces in which people struggle for those rights to individualization, participation, and appropriation. These contested spaces are what makes a city not fixed, but always changing and shifting.

The carceral city is closely tied to processes of neoliberalism and globalization that largely define the political and economic organization of North America today. This is the public and private authority that Edward Soja explains as overseeing the carceral urban islands. Hartford and many other post-industrial American cities have this carceral separation of the citadel and the ghetto. As these cities have gone through periods of urban restructuring at different scales, ranging from the local to global level, the citadel and the ghetto have become more engrained in the spatial dynamics of urban life. Today, urban governance and political economies are largely dominated by neoliberalism and globalization, which has only exacerbated Hartford’s economic crisis. Neoliberalism is the process by which governments have privatized once public services and reorganized governance to prioritize the private sector. Ideally, the private sector would be so successful that everyone could have access to jobs and afford the services necessary for survival and stability for all of society. And by extension, cities would be successful on the basis of a free and open market that promotes economic growth. 

As A Critical Introduction to Urban Geography explains, “In cities, [neoliberalism] is manifest in the outsourcing of state activities to the private sector (e.g. refuse collection) and the reframing of cities as competitive entities and as commodities to be sold. Thus, its rhetoric is that of ‘smaller government,’ although in reality, the
process of neoliberalization happens through the actions of state institutions that facilitate privatization and deregulation." While the ideology might be smaller government and fewer barriers to a successful private sector, in reality, it means that governments consistently shift their organization of a city and their regulations, ultimately getting more involved in the establishment of a growing private sector in said city.

Neoliberalism manifests in two different forms, as defined by geographers Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell as “roll-back neoliberalism” and “roll-out neoliberalism.” Roll-back neoliberalism emerged as a dominant form of political and economic restructuring following the economic downturn of the 1970s, and it sought to deregulate the market and dismantle the welfare programs of the time that secured certain levels of social reproduction.32 Roll-out neoliberalism, however, followed this deregulation with more invasive political involvement in communities, though still a high level of dependency on and deregulation of the private sector. In effect, roll-out neoliberalism is “increasingly associated with the political foregrounding of new modes of ‘social’ and penal policy-making, concerned specifically with the aggressive reregulation, disciplining, and containment of those marginalized or dispossessed by the neoliberalization of the 1980s.”33 Local governance was rendered unable to provide for its constituents through roll-back neoliberalism, while roll-out neoliberalism brought national and global money and

33 Peck and Tickell, 389.
power into local communities, with destructive policies such as the war on drugs and the war on poverty, as well as urban renewal projects that cleared out city neighborhoods. “In the asymmetrical scale politics of neoliberalism, local institutions and actors were being given responsibility without power, while international institutions and actors were gaining power without responsibility: a form of regulatory dumping was occurring at the local scale, while macrorule regimes were being remade in regressive and marketized ways.”34 This is seen in Hartford today; the city is unable to fully effect change or address the impacts that neoliberalism has on those living in poverty in the city, or the unequal distribution of resources that shapes the greater metropolitan region.

During this period of urban governance, we see a shift towards public-private partnerships, a characteristic of neoliberalism and the increasing privatization or quasi-public privatization of public goods and projects. For example, United Technologies Corporation (UTC) and the State of Connecticut signed an agreement in 2014 in an attempt to further anchor the corporation in Connecticut. The agreement offers many tax breaks to UTC and calls for an increase in jobs offered by the corporation, as well as for UTC to “spend $810 million on research and development and capital projects.”35 This year the corporation opened a new research center in East Hartford and announced “it’s also building a Pratt & Whitney corporate headquarters that will remain in Connecticut for at least 15 years and

34 Peck and Tickell, 386.
establishing a Pratt & Whitney engineering ‘center of excellence’ in Connecticut.”

This provides job security through the private sector, and, with UTC being Connecticut’s largest employer, it also offers economic stability for the state. However, neoliberal political agendas have self-reinforcing effects, and as cities and the state give bigger tax breaks and incentives to corporations like UTC, they only become more dependent upon that corporation staying in place, and corporations gain more power to play cities up against each other, since companies are rarely place-bound themselves. Though it is normalized that these corporations are less grounded in location, this has occurred through “neoliberalized regulatory regimes, which favor mobility over stability and short- over long-term strategies.”

Aetna, for example, has been an important corporation in Hartford since it was founded in 1953, and yet when the city proposed an increased corporate tax, Aetna and Travelers both released statements about the damage the increased tax could cause. While it is not new to hear that any constituency is complaining about increased taxes, the neoliberal system of dependency upon large corporations often further deepens the deficits that the State already has, and only worsens Hartford’s economic crisis. After many years having an identity tied to Hartford, Aetna decided to move part of its headquarters to New York City, where they signed agreements to

receive $24 million in tax breaks.\textsuperscript{39} This came after the increase in corporate taxes from the State, even though, as Colin McEnroe reported for the \textit{Hartford Courant}, “What percentage of Connecticut’s state and local taxes is borne by business? In the fiscal year ending in June 2013, it was 28.9 percent, the lowest in the nation, according to an Ernst & Young study for the Council on State Taxation.”\textsuperscript{40} In December of 2017, CVS Health announced that it was acquiring Aetna, and in addition, that it would keep Aetna headquartered in Hartford. Despite the decision for Aetna to remain in Hartford, the city still faced the threat of its very own leaving the nest. There is an inherent contradiction in neoliberalism, particularly with globalization intertwined with the ideology. Corporations are less place-bound, while neoliberalism only increases government’s reliance on corporations remaining anchored in place.

Cities are unable to make ends meet through tax revenue as they increase tax breaks. So when cities do take on big projects, they have no other choice but to create public-private partnerships in order to carry them out. The \textit{Hartford Courant} reported in the UTC case that “in return, the state allowed UTC to receive tax offsets of up to $400 million over 14 years. [Governor Dannel] Malloy and fellow Democrats in the legislature hailed it as a key economic development deal that keeps thousands


of engineering, manufacturing and scientific research jobs in Connecticut." With a focus on greater economic growth through the private sector, governments lose their ability to provide for the shortcomings of the private sector for society. The potential tax revenue that the city would have gotten from the private company if it were paying the taxes it is assessed to pay remains in the pocket of that company. And so a power dynamic unfolds, where corporations have a say in what aspects of a city they will invest in, and in whom they will invest, furthering the uneven distribution of services and investment.

Neoliberalism not only privileges lean government, privatization, and deregulation, but through a combination of competitive regimes of resource allocation, skewed municipal-lending policies, and outright political pressure undermines or forecloses alternative paths of urban development based, for example, on social redistribution, economic rights, or public investment. This produces a neoliberal ‘lock-in’ of public-sector austerity and growth chasing economic development.42

With the city chasing economic development, unable to provide for its residents or invest equitably throughout its urban spaces, neoliberalism further deepens the inequalities.

The uneven investment throughout cities and rise of neoliberalism began alongside urban renewal after World War II. Urban Renewal programs were instituted throughout the country with top down governance. Alongside the Housing Act of 1949 and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Redevelopment Agencies opened in American cities. These state-led efforts “frequently razed established neighborhoods and replaced them with new retail districts, housing projects, and

41 Singer, “UTC Announces Additional $115 Million Investment While Showcasing Expanded Research Center.”
highways. State bureaucrats wielded their urban renewal powers not only to address self-evident urban problems but also to defined certain neighborhoods and people (especially racial minorities and low income people) as problems to be remedied or banished.  

Hartford went through years of urban renewal projects itself. The Civic Center for example, opened in the 1970s and was seen as “a symbol of corporate urban renewal.” The opening was the sight of suburban supporters who clearly saw it as benefitting their lives, while Puerto Rican urban residents used the event to protest another plan that sought to push them to the peripheries of the city, if not completely relocate them to an isolated town outside of the city. Many Hartford banking and insurance executives came together to form a group called “the Bishops”, and along with the chamber of commerce, they created a plan that would insulate downtown from the low-income neighborhoods nearby, redeveloping along major downtown corridors, while asserting that “Puerto Rican in-migration must be reduced” and “consolidate[d]” to Clay Hill [now Clay Arsenal and Asylum Hill] and Frog Hollow neighborhoods. The Bishops also planned to build housing in Coventry, a town east of Hartford that takes about 30 minutes to drive to today. “The new town would be home to displaced people from impoverished areas of Hartford whose neighborhoods would be redeveloped.” As is consistent with urban renewal plans across the country, minority and low-income

43 Jonas, McCann, and Thomas, Urban Geography, 45.  
45 Simmons, 102.  
46 Simmons, 101.  
47 Simmons, 101.
residents were seen as a problem to be dealt with, confined to certain spaces that
had enough social and physical distance from the downtown centers of
redevelopment, in which neoliberalism was growing as an ideology. The everyday
lives and social networks of city residents were disregarded, furthering the carceral
city and the deep divides seen today between the citadel and the ghetto.

While neoliberalism is reorganizing governance around the private sector
and increasing dependency on specific corporations in order to operate, we add
globalization and this picture becomes less stable. The “spaces of flows” is an
important aspect of globalization, defined by Manuel Castells as “the system of
exchanges of information, capital, and power that structures the basic processes of
societies, economies and states between different localities, regardless of
localization.”\textsuperscript{48} While corporations can be located in a city like Hartford, receiving
tax breaks, the space of flows spans across borders, and the flows of capital could
travel from city to city, or transnationally and not reach the city it is located in at all.
Therefore, the people who live in that city—whose everyday life is grounded in that
urban space—don’t see the capital. Globalization brings a new angle to the
inequalities that neoliberalism produces, and it further invalidates the ideology
itself.

With Hartford’s uneven spatial dynamics, the space of flows manifests and
perpetuates the carceral city. CEO’s and many employees live outside the city—
nearly doubling Hartford’s population from 9-5, and then travel back outside the
city to their suburban enclaves. Meanwhile, Hartford residents bear the burden of

the tax revenue that Hartford seeks to collect to make ends meet. This burden is extreme due many factors that have allowed spaces of wealth to avoid contributing to Hartford’s tax base, while depending on and benefitting from the city. Hartford employees that fill 83 percent of jobs in the city drive back to their suburbs that pay no tax to support the city, in part due to the abolition of the county system in 1960.\textsuperscript{49} At the same time, there are countless churches, schools, non-profits, and both state and municipal properties that make almost 60\% of properties in Hartford tax exempt.\textsuperscript{50} This includes institutions such as Trinity College—a school that was ranked in \textit{The New York Times} for having the highest ratio of students coming from the top 1 percent of wealth, in comparison to the bottom 60 percent.\textsuperscript{51} Trinity College as a tax exempt institution represents the inequalities that get perpetuated through space, as one of the wealthiest spaces is tax exempt, next to a neighborhood with a median household income of $21,674 that is expected to generate the tax revenue for the city to function—to collect trash, plow snow-covered streets, repave roads, and provide quality public education among other things.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{49} “2016 Metro Hartford Progress Points,” 3.  
The next layer to Hartford’s disproportionate tax burden on low-income residents is the tax rate and its relationship to access to suburbs. In Hartford, the mill rate is 74.29 ($74.29 for every $1,000). Meanwhile surrounding suburbs, including Glastonbury, Wethersfield, Simsbury, West Hartford, and Manchester all have a mill rate between 36.4 and 39.68. The highest mill rate of a neighboring suburb is still 30 mills lower, with East Hartford’s mill rate at 45.86. Although Hartford properties are valued far lower than those in neighboring towns, the penal tax rate means that low and middle income residents purchase a home they can afford but then have to allocate a far higher portion of their income to taxes on their home, putting Hartford residents even more steps behind suburban neighbors in their capacity to accumulate wealth through housing security. Furthermore, Hartford’s development of suburbs has occurred in a particular racial context of who has access to homeownership, and the accumulation of wealth. It is not as simple as an argument that Hartford residents can move to West Hartford to solve their problem. During the 20th century, Hartford, along with many other U.S. cities, saw high levels of white flight to suburbs, and exclusionary racial covenants, racial steering by real estate agents, and access to mortgages for whites specifically in suburbs. These racialized systems of housing access occurred at all levels, endorsed by federal and local governments, created by banks and perpetuated by real estate companies across the country. In West Hartford, there was a “1940 deed for the

55 Kalafa.
High Ledge Homes subdivision, which included this race restriction: ‘No persons of any race except the white race shall use or occupy any building on any lot except that this covenant shall not prevent occupancy by domestic servants of a different race employed by an owner or tenant.” Among many other tactics, racial covenants were put in place across the country to create exclusive suburban neighborhoods in which property was considered desirable by maintaining “whiteness” or “wealth” as a part of the neighborhood character. As Jack Dougherty, Trinity College professor reports in his findings,

Overall, we found two types of restrictions on property deeds between 1915 and 1950, which we labeled ‘value’ and ‘race.’ Value restrictions were more common than race restrictions. Value restrictions typically stated that the owner could not build a home below a certain square footage, or below a minimum price (such as $5,000 in the 1920s), in an effort to maintain higher property values. But race restrictions stated that the land could not be occupied by non-White people, except for domestic servants. In some cases, deeds combined the two types. In either case, individuals or developers used these restrictions to control social class and/or racial composition of a neighborhood, and its relative price in the minds of prospective wealthy White buyers.

Today's urban and suburban spatial dynamics are based upon a white supremacist history in which whites could obtain homeownership and the accumulation of wealth, while people of color were left in the city that was being further disinvested in, or even facing destruction as highway construction and urban renewal projects took place. Even without a history of racial covenants, time and time again, low-income people are excluded from suburbs that don't provide affordable housing, or that require minimum lot size zoning and other tactics to

57 Dougherty.
maintain high income neighborhoods. Therefore, Hartford has been a place where low-income people can find a place to live; yet they are expected to pay an unfair portion of the taxes for the whole city to operate. This violence is placed upon low-income residents who continue to be spread too thin economically, while wealthier residents of the MSA have enjoyed access to the city without the burden of any payment to support the city. These are the spaces that produce and reproduce the citadel and the ghetto, as city residents must fight for the right to stay put while, as Schmid explains, "privileged spaces for new urban elites that formed under the neoliberal development model" continue to take precedent.58 Hartford is a quintessential example of the "fundamental urban contradiction in the world capitalist system."59 This is the contradiction between transnational corporations, and global circulation of capital, which does not incorporate the working class people that inhabit a city who "move in locally-bounded communities."60 This is the contradiction of the citadel and the ghetto.

And while Hartford's workforce brings in 100,000 people each day, they drive out of Hartford at the end of the day, across the highways that fractured Hartford's landscape into isolated spaces. The lack of a county tax to support Hartford means that people who have had access to suburban housing on the basis of race and class can continue to deepen the inequalities by benefitting from Hartford's jobs, and the highways that connect their town to the city. And at the

60 Hill and Feagin, 160.
same time, suburban residents expect the city and highways will be maintained, presumably by residents of Hartford, 32% of whom live below the federal poverty rate. Neoliberal urban governance creates a crisis in which middle class and upper-middle class residents, along with corporations, expect the upkeep, reproduction, and access to urban space, yet city government is focused on maintaining and growing economic development, lacking the proper resources at present to maintain these urban spaces. Hartford’s history of suburbanization, similar to other American cities, followed the trend of wealth leaving cities, and an overall disinvestment in urban areas. Neoliberalism and globalization are layered on top of this history.

The carceral city manifests in relation to globalization and neoliberalism. It is important to examine the carceral through this lens, and not as an isolated part of cities or of marginalized communities. As Erica Meiners defines it, the Carceral State is “[alluding] to how the logic of punishment shapes other governmental and institutional practices, even those not perceived as linked to prisons and policing.” The fact that Hartford is one of the poorest U.S. cities, surrounded by some of the wealthiest suburbs, meanwhile Hartford residents must pay a mill rate almost double that of those in the surrounding towns, is an example of the logic of punishment placed upon low-income residents. And this logic of punishment further incarcerates people in space and prevents them from being able to leave poverty.

---

Neoliberalism produces great wealth and at the same time, huge shortcomings. Cities struggle to fill the gaps of those shortcomings while continuing to pursue neoliberal political agendas. As a result, entire populations of people who do not benefit from the neoliberal economy are expected to fill the gaps in the shortcomings that neoliberalism has produced. That is the logic of punishment; it places continual stress, trauma, and destruction upon lower income communities.

In his book, *The Value of Homelessness*, Craig Willse connects race and housing in a continual historical context dating back to "the theft of native lands and the enslavement of African populations," which "created 'racially contingent forms of property and property rights.'" In this sense, there has been the notion of whiteness and a system of governance put in place by whites for whites to legitimize their right to land and to reproduction while delegitimizing those rights to native people and blacks since the beginning of white settler colonialism. If we extend back this far, property has always been a strategy for furthering power, and only gives power because it refuses to give it to everyone. As long time activist and Trinity chaplain John Selders said, "Wealth is built on the fact that there is poverty; it is not an accident that Hartford is surrounded by those wealthy communities—that's the nature of how they develop: there is not a lot of multi-family housing, no public housing, public transportation is whack, and it is near impossible to get places without a vehicle." This is not only something that occurred centuries ago. The connection between housing, the accumulation of wealth, and social reproduction

---

64 John Selders, November 6, 2017.
was explicitly redrawn with the post-World War II policies that secured this wealth accumulation attached with private property for whites and created further instability for people of color. "Housing necessarily builds up life and in doing so shores up racialized hierarchies and racialized subordination as well."\(^{65}\)

The segregation and inequality that exists today between Hartford and its surrounding areas is due to the deliberate and continual choices, from housing access to the placement of jobs and transportation access. All of these questions of access within the context of globalization bring into focus the carceral and how the reorganization around private sector interests continually hurts working class and low-income people. David Harvey writes,

> Globalization entails, for example, a great deal of self-destruction, devaluation and bankruptcy at different scales and in different locations. It renders whole populations selectively vulnerable to the violence of downsizing, unemployment, collapse of services, degradation in living standards, and loss of resources and environmental qualities. It puts political and legal institutions as well as whole cultural configurations and ways of life at risk and it does so at a variety of spatial scales. It does all this at the same time as it concentrates wealth and power and further political-economic opportunities in a few selective locations and within a few restricted strata of the population.\(^{66}\)

Globalization creates instability at the very local level for communities, and as a result, marginalized communities are constantly the victims of the violence of capitalism.

Feagin and Hill write about the phases of urban restructuring that have characterized Detroit and Houston. They outline that "three themes have ordered [their] tale of these two cities: (1) specialization and growth; (2) crisis and
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\(^{66}\) David Harvey, *Spaces of Hope* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2000), 81.
reorganization; and (3) decentralization and uneven development.” The same can be said for Hartford. This city is not alone in its very systemic issues of inequality. The carceral city of today is the product of these three themes that have been layered upon the one that came before. The deep contradictions that lie at the very foundation of capitalism and neoliberalism further notions of the carceral. As these global economic forces exclude whole populations in localized ways, they only entrench poverty into the global fabric of our society. ”The city incarcerates the underprivileged and further marginalizes them in relation to broader society.”

As the City attempts to deal with its economic crisis, and looks to draw more wealthy people to live in the city and contribute to its tax base, it walks a fine line between further incarcerating the underprivileged and displacing them in their own homes and neighborhoods, versus finding a way for more opportunities for everyone in the city. The metro region has many critical issues to address, and neoliberalism only further galvanizes these racial inequalities. It is a result of neoliberalism and globalization that 72% of future jobs are predicted to not cover a family-sustaining wage for a family of four. With this kind of threat on the horizon, how can society continue to survive? With neoliberal political agendas that further render the city incapable of providing for the shortcomings of the private sector, the future looks bleak, and the carceral city will only become more incorporated in people’s daily lives. Ruth Wilson Gilmore writes, “research shows that increased use of policing and state intervention in everyday problems hasten the demise of the

68 Harvey, Spaces of Hope, 11.
informal customary relationships that social calm depends on.70 Whether it is the policing of daily life, or the violence placed upon communities as the space of flows surrounds them but never reaches their neighborhoods, the lack of safety and constant threat of being displaced or removed from space is traumatic and oppressive. As there is no quick fix or easy answer for poverty, it is important that Hartford’s political agendas seek to build up communities and strengthen networks for more marginalized groups. Without the ability to accumulate capital, a first step to survival is for communities to feel strong and safe, and for the informal customary relationships that Gilmore emphasizes to be able to grow, since they are so important for social calm.

Chapter II
Anchor Institutions & the Right to the City

Universities and hospitals are large institutions in cities that typically don’t move around or relocate. And as the private sector becomes less and less place-based, this immovability is an asset that cities are turning to more and more. Grouped in with hospitals as well, these institutions are often referred to as “Eds and Meds,” shorthand for educational and medical establishments. They act as major employers in regions, offering stability to cities. “For example, in Philadelphia and Washington, four of the top employers are eds or meds; in Boston and New York three of five, and in Baltimore one of five. Adding public universities to the list puts eds and meds in the top five in Boston and Baltimore. In Providence, eds and meds occupy four of the top five spots.”\(^7^1\) In addition to providing employment opportunities, these institutions often take on expansion projects that create development in the city. As a result, planners have adopted the term “anchor institutions” for universities and hospitals, “denoting institutions that are connected to an area or city and have built an identity tied to the neighborhood and city.”\(^7^2\)

For cities such as Hartford, which lost a large portion of its population along with its manufacturing jobs and faces high levels of poverty today, the anchor institutions are seen as resources for urban revitalization. And while these


institutions are important resources for the city and region, they can also cause displacement and destruction of communities through revitalization strategies in which institutional expansion and political agendas align, leaving low-income communities at risk, and most often communities of color. Anchor institutions create a power bloc with the city, claiming their right to the city and its landscape, and potentially excluding the community that lives there from the decision making process, thereby preventing them from their right to urban space, their own neighborhoods, and built up social networks.

Trinity College has been calling itself an anchor institution on and off since at least the 1990s, Carlos Espinosa, Trinity alumnus and Director of Trinfo Cafe tells me from his office at Trinfo on the northeastern corner of Vernon Street and Broad Street. Trinfo Café is one important place where the college puts a sustained effort into its relationship with the surrounding community, offering access to computers and Internet, and holding computer literacy workshops in addition to programming around the community garden there. The term anchor institution and efforts in community development have in fact been a part of Trinity since at least the late 1960s when the college hired a Director of Community Affairs, Ivan Backer. He would become Executive Director of Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance (SINA) in 1977 when it was formed as a community development organization that brought together funding and resources from two major Frog Hollow anchor
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institutions, Trinity College and Hartford Hospital.\textsuperscript{74} As these institutions stake a claim to their neighborhoods and city as anchor institutions, they also bring interest and investment to urban revitalization. This chapter seeks to explore the ways in which anchor institutions approach revitalization efforts, particularly with a history of urban renewal programs with which these institutions have a shared history. Furthermore, this chapter examines the power dynamics that lay at the foundation of city revitalization through anchor institutions, thinking about Henri Lefebvre’s theory on the right to the city and how it is expressed in people’s everyday lives.

Hartford lost more than 26,000 manufacturing jobs from 1963 to 1972—in a city whose peak population reached just over 177,000 residents in 1950.\textsuperscript{75} Along with losing its manufacturing jobs, Hartford’s population has decreased 29 percent since 1950.\textsuperscript{76} As of 2016, the city had close to 125,000 residents, with a median household income of $32,095, and a homeownership rate of just 23.7%.\textsuperscript{77} However, break these numbers down racially, and it is even more unequal. As seen in the maps below, the highest poverty rates by far are in the locations in which blacks (green dots) and Latinos (orange dots) live. Per capita income in Hartford is highest for whites, still at only $21,654; it is $17,610 for blacks, and only $13,541 for

\textsuperscript{76}Birch, “Anchor Institutions in the Northeast Megaregion: An Important but Not Fully Realized Resource,” 221.
Similarly, the percentage of Latinos renting rather than owning homes is far higher than it is for whites and blacks. Between 36 and 38 percent of white and black residents rent their homes, while more than 44 percent of Latinos are renters. Nearly 60 percent of these renters are considered “rent-burdened,” meaning they pay more than 30 percent of their income to rent. A far lower income and lower rate of homeownership demonstrates greater instability, and in Hartford, this is true for Latinos in particular.

![Figure 1](image_url)  
Figure 1 Highest rates of poverty (red) correlate to the concentration of greed dots (Black and African American residents) and orange dots (Hispanic or Latino residents). (U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2015, prepared by Social Explorer).
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80 “Hartford Neighborhood Planning 2016: Demographic Overview” (Hartford, CT: Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), April 25, 2016), 13.
Nearly 60% of properties in Hartford are tax exempt, and the “anchor institutions” that supposedly offer the answer to Hartford’s urban revitalization are large contributors to this.\(^8\) However, they also have the budgets for large capital spending projects that bring people to a city, and can even generate revenue.\(^8\) Universities and colleges have incentives to pursue these projects for attracting students. As a Student Admissions Associate, I learned that it is a part of the informational session scripts to mention activities and entertainment opportunities in the city. Revitalization can make the school more attractive to prospective students. Anchor institutions also have many government subsidies and incentives that enable them to pursue these projects as well. For example, Hartford established a land bank in 2016 with 5 million dollars in funding from the State of Connecticut.\(^8\) A land bank is a centralized system for the city to acquire foreclosed properties and brownfields and perform demolition and site remediation, in order to resell them for redevelopment.\(^8\) As the site is already cleared, and then sold at a reduced rate, the buyer (such as a university) doesn’t have to spend the money for demolition and cleanup. Additionally, universities and hospitals have access to grants and incentive programs from the state and federal governments as well. Anchor institutions will act in their own self interest, which may align with surrounding communities at times, but won’t at other times, such as during expansion plans. If communities have

\(^8\) Bell, “Properties Exempt From Paying Property Taxes in Connecticut.”
\(^8\) Settlemyer.
strong positions of stability, political representation, and economic power, then these can be contested spaces of the city in which urbanism produces and reproduces space in a just way. However, as seen throughout cities such as Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Cleveland, anchor institutions are given this power to affect and create urban revitalization with municipal support because they are located in very low-income neighborhoods, and the city is looking to raise property values and attract more middle class residents. This is certainly the case for Trinity’s surrounding neighborhoods. In particular, Frog Hollow is located between Hartford Hospital and Trinity College, and has a median household income of $21,674, and a homeownership rate of just 6.7%. While Frog Hollow residents are vulnerable because of such low incomes and access to wealth through homeownership, there are also many ways in which the neighborhood has established itself and its right to the city. There is a strong economic presence along Park Street, a vibrant commercial corridor with many small, local businesses. Additionally, it serves as a Spanish-speaking and Latino shopping area, drawing Latino customers from across the state that make up 13.4 billion dollars in purchasing power. In Trinity alum Mary Daly’s senior thesis, she wrote, “despite discrimination and a low socioeconomic status, the Latino community in Hartford used the community organizations and the power of their ethnicity to obtain representation and
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Frog Hollow’s economic strength along Park Street and its strength in organizing and representation as a largely Latino community enables residents to shape urban space and maintain an identity tied to the neighborhood.

In Henri Lefebvre’s theory of the right to the city, he points out the underlying significance of community stability, as well as the fundamental character of urban space—that it is always shifting, and that the urban is only truly defined by the contested spaces in which there is friction and struggle. As Christian Schmid writes, “Lefebvre’s concern was not to propose a new comprehensive slogan demanding the right to the basic needs. It was about something more – a specific urban quality, which had hitherto been neglected in public debate: access to resources of the city for all segments of the population, and the possibility of experimenting with and realizing alternative ways of life.” Thus, this is not an argument against universities and medical institutions, or the inevitable competition of space in cities and importance of revitalizing cities such as Hartford that are at such a loss that they are considering declaring bankruptcy. This is to say that as Trinity considers itself an anchor to the neighborhood, it must also take seriously the context of access, and the importance for all people in the city to have the right to transforming space, and the right to be rooted in place. Echoing Brown, Bachelder, Gomez, Sherrell and Bryan, how then, “do we anchor communities and address the phenomenon of displacement by anchor institutions?”

87 Daly, 31.
There is a growing draw back to the city for upper and middle class residents; defining features of this migration include increased policy and planning for mixed-use development, a greater push for pedestrian and bicycle paths and public transportation. This transformation in cities is also seen in the “ABC’s of gentrification” which stands for the rise of art galleries, bookstores, and cafes.

“Gentrification is the process by which urban neighborhoods, usually home of low income residents, become the focus of reinvestment and (re)settlement by middle classes.”90 The new middle class residents drive property values up, displacing current lower-income residents, and usually, whether by their presence and growing claim to the neighborhood, or by driving residents out with the rise in cost of living, damage important social networks.

Alan Ehrenhalt (2012) argues, however, that this growing draw back to the city is bigger than neighborhood change and gentrification, and forms what he calls “demographic inversion.” He writes,

Gentrification refers to the changes that happen in an individual neighborhood, usually the replacement of poorer minority residents by more affluent white ones. Demographic inversion is something much broader. It is the rearrangement of living patterns across an entire metropolitan area, all taking place at roughly the same time. ... The poor and the newcomers are living on the outskirts. The people who live near the center are those, some of them black or Hispanic but most of them white, who can afford to do so.91

This demographic inversion means a changing notion of an appealing lifestyle from suburban neighborhoods, backyards and garages, to city centers, with shopping, entertainment, and neighbors all within walking distance. Ehrenhalt wrote, “for

90 Jonas, McCann, and Thomas, Urban Geography, 32.
several decades now, cities in the United States have wished for a 24/7 downtown, a place where people live as well as work, and keep the streets busy, interesting, and safe at every time of day.”\(^{92}\) In Hartford, the zoning regulations were overhauled in 2016, putting forth a new framework to foster development towards more walkable and mixed-use neighborhoods. For example, parking in front of buildings is prevented for “cottage commercial buildings” and “commercial center buildings.”\(^{93}\)

There are eight district types in the new zoning regulations, four of which mention mixed-use development as a key characteristic.\(^{94}\) With a clear agenda in Hartford for this kind of urban development, universities are intertwined with this demographic inversion. As Trinity College professor Davarian Baldwin argues, “it is the very commercial amenities historically associated with ‘university life’—concerts, coffee shops, fully wired networking, and foot traffic congestion—that are central to the reignited demand for an urban experience.”\(^{95}\)

There has been a surge in higher education development in downtown Hartford. The University of Connecticut opened its downtown campus to students just before the 2017 fall semester, a 140 million dollar investment by the state.\(^{96}\)

The old Hartford Times building is now renovated and restored after many years of vacancy and blight. As UConn President Susan Herbst said, “for many years, this

\(^{92}\) Ehrenhalt, 5.


\(^{94}\) Bobowski et al., 52–54.


magnificent edifice at the center of our capital city sat abandoned, crumbling and dark. Today, there’s a bright new light here in downtown Hartford as another great Connecticut institution rises up in its place and opens its doors, from decay to new life.⁹⁷ Standing just behind City Hall and the Wadsworth Atheneum, it serves as another cultural and historical landmark, as well as another property that won’t generate tax revenue for the city. Nevertheless, it repopulates an empty downtown, reimagines an old historical and cultural landmark, and brings business to the many restaurants and amenities within arms reach of the building, such as the Front Street District.

Colleges and universities, in partnership with cities and states, are huge contributors to this demographic inversion and gentrification. Many have instituted incentives for faculty to live near the institution, meanwhile, urban planners have embraced or at least allowed these institutions to expand and develop big urban projects.

Neil Smith (2002) referred to this inversion as “Third-wave Gentrification,” that is “retaking the city of the middle classes” with a label of “social balance.”⁹⁸ This is the new vision for urban revitalization that Hartford is currently seeking. He wrote, “social balance sounds like a good thing [...] until one examines the neighborhoods targeted for ‘regeneration,’ whereupon it becomes clear that the strategy involves a major colonization by the middle and upper-middle classes. [...] Advocates of ‘social balance’ rarely, if ever, advocate that white neighborhoods

---
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should be balanced by equal numbers of people of African, Caribbean, or Asian
descent.”99 As an article in the Vancouver Sun pointed out, “the problem with social
mix is that it assumes an even playing field between people. However, people who
have more resources, and stronger property rights, have a clear advantage.”100

Hartford, however, is still recovering from the damages of urban renewal,
such as the extreme loss of population downtown. Therefore new residents thus far
have not replaced current residents. SINA’s Melvyn Colon believes that
gentrification patterns occur over a 15-20 year span, and that Hartford hasn’t even
entered the beginning stages of this 20-year span.101 “We’re not at the level right
now that there’s a private market that’s functioning. Right now everything we do is
with public subsidies whether it’s rental housing or homeownership homes.

[Gentrification] can happen pretty quickly, meaning it can happen in a period of 15
to 20 years,” Colon says, “but we’re not even talking about a strong downtown, so
when we talk about gentrifying neighborhoods, we’re not in the beginning of that 15
or 20 year period where we’d begin to see that transformation.”102

Other cities for which anchor institutions have already played a significant
role, displacement has certainly been the case. In Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Medical
Institutions offers incentives and grants for employees to live near the medical
campus—a part of Baltimore that is very poor and time and time again has been the
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site of huge displacement of African Americans, and today a large Middle Eastern community as well.¹⁰³

Not only were original homeowners displaced, but the program was intentionally structured to give differential access and preference to individuals in professional and knowledge-based positions. Given the pivotal support of the local and state government, the Live Near Your Work program is essentially an exclusionary gentrification policy, diminishing the lives and wealth of families who are displaced and erecting a two-tiered structure that determines which employees will be invited into the new community and which employees will be left out.¹⁰⁴

And while some hail the University of Pennsylvania’s affects on its surrounding neighborhood in Philadelphia, others have coined the term “Penntrification” to talk about the ways the neighborhood has been taken over by the institution and middle classes.¹⁰⁵

In Buffalo, New York, the Buffalo-Niagara Medical Campus has acquired the neighboring affordable housing complex, McCarley Gardens for its expansion project. “The impacted communities are predominantly black, while the percentage of residents who are black constitute a minority of the city’s overall population. Moreover, economic insecurity in terms of income and poverty is more pronounced in the impacted communities when compared to the city as a whole.”¹⁰⁶ McCarley Gardens will be completely demolished, and current residents will be relocated to a
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¹⁰⁴ Brown et al., 86.
¹⁰⁵ TEDx Philly, Mapping Experiences and Access to Opportunity in Cities: Amy Hillier at TEDxPhilly, TEDxPhilly: The City (Temple Performing Arts Center, 2011), pt. 6:08 min, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HQ6d0By7GhE.
neighborhood nearby, but certainly the networks that arise out of a specific landscape and connection to place will be lost in this relocation, as neighbors are dispersed.\textsuperscript{107} This neighborhood is well established, with 99.3\% housing occupancy, and yet the power bloc created between the Buffalo-Niagara Medical Campus and City of Buffalo further places state violence on minority groups and economically strapped people, delegitimizing their right to place and to factors that are so important to social upward mobility—stability, social cohesion and social networks, and the safety of a home.\textsuperscript{108} “Collective self-determination is the responsibility and right of all people in a community’... When universities participate in displacement of communities and the uprooting of neighbors via eminent domain, their behavior is the antithesis of collective self-determination and a perfect illustration of an external entity imposing its power to act in its own self-interest.”\textsuperscript{109}

Over and over again, these low-income and vulnerable neighborhoods are communities of color. Some 68 percent of residents in Frog Hollow are Latino and of the other 32 percent that is not Latino, 20 percent are black.\textsuperscript{110} Combined with a median household income of $21,674, this neighborhood is vulnerable to the same trends seen in other cities as institutions of higher education pursue urban development.\textsuperscript{111} Trinity is not just a representation of tax exemption and inequalities, but of neoliberalism itself. Defined in the previous chapter,
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neoliberalism is an ideology for political and economic organization that has become dominant in North America since the 1980s, seeking to deregulate and privatize many institutions and processes, making governments highly dependent on the private sector, and involved in deregulation and privatization.\textsuperscript{112} Trinity President Joanne Berger-Sweeney testified in support of a Connecticut State senate bill in 2016 “concerning innovation, entrepreneurship and Connecticut’s economic future,” in which she claimed that “institutions of higher education are in the business of developing intellectual capacity and harnessing creativity for social good... We are the foundation of a knowledge-based economy.”\textsuperscript{113} While Berger-Sweeney argues that institutions such as Trinity are essential for Harford’s economy, she places Trinity in the circulation of capital and space of flows. Manuel Castells’ “space of flows” (defined in the previous chapter) and the “circulation of capital” are components of globalization, that occurred “when, in the 1970s, the global financial system expanded dramatically and foreign direct investment was dominated, not by capital invested directly into productive functions, but rather by capital moving into and between capital markets.”\textsuperscript{114} This space of flows leaves out real spaces in Hartford, such as Trinity’s surrounding neighborhood. Berger-Sweeney claims that, in fact, Trinity does contribute to the health of the whole neighborhood. She ends her testimony saying,

\textsuperscript{112} Jonas, McCann, and Thomas, \textit{Urban Geography}, 39.
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While it doesn’t appear my institution would be impacted by these bills, I want to express my opposition to the legislation that would place a tax on endowment funds and college properties. I would urge you to consider the impacts that either bill would have on colleges and universities that are major economic drivers in their neighborhoods and communities.115

This is a prime example of neoliberal governance; a private institution in which tuition to attend is more than three times that of the median household income of the residents around it, claims it is integral to the economy, and therefore should not have to pay taxes. If and when Trinity acts as an “economic driver” to the “neighborhood and community,” it does so by its own choices of how it will invest in the surrounding area, while the city cannot provide basic services to those residents.

With the growing university presence downtown, Trinity has also decided to invest in a space there. On Trinity’s own website, it announces “Almost 200 years after our founding, Trinity College is re-establishing a presence in Hartford’s central business district with the launch of our downtown campus at Constitution Plaza.”116

Ten Constitution Plaza is now the site of a new Liberal Arts Action Lab, launched in December of 2017. The Action Lab brings students from both Capitol Community College (already located downtown) and Trinity College together in this downtown space to work on research projects that community partners identify as issues they are facing in Hartford.117 The choice to locate downtown and work on research and
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collaborative learning here points to a network of universities establishing a presence here, forming a conglomeration of higher education institutions. In 2014, Trinity purchased 200 Constitution Plaza, a far larger space that Trinity decided to resell in 2016 rather than develop because it “would have meant taking on the responsibility of becoming a landlord since the building had more square footage than Trinity could use on its own.” This institutional expansion and choice to locate downtown rather than within Frog Hollow shows Trinity’s movement towards greater urban development and having a stake in the emerging redevelopment of Downtown. “UniverCities,” a term Davarian Baldwin has coined to denote the increasing city redevelopment that universities pursue, “emerged when the interests of higher-education administrators, government officials, business leaders, and young professionals converged in the new service-and-information economy.” This is becoming a more dominant form of economic development for the city today.

Anchor institutions can be the drivers of urban revitalization, and over and over again this is done in ways that further entrench people of color in poverty, and further solidify poor people into marginalized spaces, rather than revitalizing a city in ways that are in the best interests of those that live in the city and produce the urban. There is a continuation of the practices of urban renewal that were so detrimental to urban communities that did not have access to wealth or the

opportunities to leave cities. In the post-war era, highways were built with no regard to urban environments and the communities that existed in them; building through neighborhoods, displacing residents, dividing cities, and destroying communities. Robert Moses’s construction of the Cross-Bronx Expressway is the prime example of the destruction that these urban renewal and highway construction projects created. This massive endeavor was undertaken in 1953 after years of planning to “allow people to traverse the Bronx from the suburbs of New Jersey through upper Manhattan to the suburbs of Queens in fifteen minutes.”  

It would improve business and solidify wealth to Manhattan as wealthier residents migrated to suburbs. The expressway is a prime example because it showed the carelessness with which poor residents and minority populations were regarded, as the plan destroyed homes and livelihoods, uprooting 60,000 residents. As Jeff Chang wrote, “using ‘urban renewal’ rights of clearance to condemn entire neighborhoods, [Robert Moses] scared off thriving businesses and uprooted poor African-American, Puerto Rican, and Jewish families. Many had no choice but to come to the places like east Brooklyn and the South Bronx, where public housing was booming but jobs had already fled.” The effects of urban renewal are still felt today, as these projects gave increased wealth to whites, while destroying the economic and social stability that may have existed for already marginalized
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communities, providing no other option than public housing and a deindustrializing economy. As George Lipsitz writes,

The processes of urban renewal and highway construction set in motion a vicious cycle: population loss led to decreased political power, which made minority neighborhoods more vulnerable to further urban renewal and freeway construction, not to mention more susceptible to the placement of prisons, incinerators, toxic waste dumps, and other projects that further depopulated these areas.\(^{124}\)

Development and planning of this time fundamentally changed the way Americans live and cemented racial identities into spaces of power – for whites in suburbs – and spaces with a complete loss of power – for people of color in cities.

Hartford was no exception to urban renewal and highway construction projects. The entire Front Street neighborhood was destroyed for the construction of Constitution Plaza from 1958-1964.\(^{125}\) Constitution Plaza (ironically, the site of Trinity’s new campus), does not just hold a legacy of displacement from urban renewal times, but also was the site of the Wangunk Village of Suckiaog that White settlers relocated in 1636 to Coltsville in the South.\(^{126}\)

Urban Renewal was seen as essential to maintaining business in Hartford. Historian Andrew Walsh wrote,

These priorities became urgent in the mid-1950s, when both the Connecticut General Insurance Company and the newly organized University of Hartford purchased large suburban campuses and moved out of town. In the mid-1950s, it appeared that Hartford was losing its population and its factories to
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\(^{125}\) “2016 Metro Hartford Progress Points,” 3.  
the suburbs, the prospect of losing white-collar and retail employment downtown seemed too much to bear.\textsuperscript{127}

As whites gained access to loans and mortgages for home ownership outside of cities and in all-white neighborhoods, Urban Renewal was performing “slum clearance,” destroying ninety percent of existing low-income housing.\textsuperscript{128} Spurred by the threat of losing more private capital in the city, urban renewal in Hartford advanced policy and planning with neoliberalism and gentrification. In the 1950s and 1960s Downtown’s population went from 10,000 to just a few hundred residents.\textsuperscript{129} The urban renewal projects of this time and their effects can still be seen today in concentrated poverty and racial divisions across space and economic lines—and it was done in this space of ‘crisis,’ when suburbanization was changing city dynamics and leading city officials to feel that attracting more white business was absolutely essential.

The Puerto Rican population was also increasing dramatically in Hartford at this time. In 1955, the Migration Division of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor located an office in Hartford.\textsuperscript{130} In 1960, just over 15,000 Puerto Ricans were living in Connecticut, and by 2000, that number grew to nearly 200,000, making up “5.7 percent of Connecticut’s population, the highest proportion of Puerto Ricans in the population of any state.”\textsuperscript{131} In the early 1960s, Puerto Ricans were gaining key spaces of representation, establishing their right to the city. Glasser writes, “the
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collection of bodegas, churches, compadrazgo networks and social and political organizations founded by the pioneros were like a microcosm of Puerto Rico small-town culture.” However, within a decade, political agendas only sought to cut out Puerto Ricans in this time of economic crisis and through the destruction of whole neighborhoods for development. In 1969, the city council and chamber of commerce partnered to prioritize downtown development that aligned with corporate interests, and "thus, development strategies favored office construction, gentrification, and real-estate speculation, as well as upscale retail centers rather than neighborhood revitalization, housing construction, or neighborhood retail outlets.” Also at this time, Nicholas Carbone joined the city council, a politician closely aligned to the business elite in Hartford, who sought to cut out Puerto Ricans from economic opportunities and participation in the city's changing landscape. At this time, the Greater Hartford Process plan was created by the Bishops (mentioned in the previous chapter), which “involved displacing Puerto Ricans from their neighborhoods, containing them in limited areas, and preventing more from migrating to the city.” However, as Cruz explains, "By then [the end of the 1970's] it was clear that Carbone's strategy had left out Puerto Ricans as they suffered the triple whammy of displacement, unemployment, and relative political
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invisibility." At this same time, Clay Arsenal and Asylum Hill, neighborhoods largely home to Puerto Rican residents, were destroyed by the construction of interstate highways 84 and 91, forcing those residents to move further south in the city. "By 1973, the city Redevelopment Agency had acquired a great deal of property in the area and began to relocate Puerto Ricans. Puerto Ricans removed from South Green, not without protest, were joined by others in an area known as Frog Hollow." And the relocation of whole communities brought about tensions and protests as people fought for the right to stay put, and the right to their livelihoods. Relocation disrupts social cohesion and stability, and rather than allowing spaces to naturally produce and reproduce through the small contestations of the urban, relocation violently shifts the production of space towards the vision of those in power—in this case the chamber of commerce and the city council, placing highway construction and office buildings as more valuable than the livelihoods and everyday life of Puerto Ricans. "The bulldozers that 'cleaned up' neighborhoods often destroyed the emblems of a whole way of life slowly and painfully built up by these migrants." The displacement and destruction of these neighborhoods and communities represents that erasure of the carefully crafted, and slowly built up rights to the city.

Universities began to form strong alliances with local, state, and federal governments during this period of urban renewal. In fact, in 1959 "section 112" was
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added to the Housing Act of 1949. The Federal Housing Act of 1949 enabled urban renewal projects to use eminent domain to redevelop spaces considered blighted. These programs took place across 993 American cities, with 2500 projects; 1 million people were displaced, 75 percent of whom were people of color. Section 112 specifically pertained to urban renewal projects that enabled university expansion. Passed through congress after a “a study group [was formed] of fourteen leading urban universities to develop a case for federal aid for campus expansion at institutions that faced changing demographics, aging infrastructure, and economic transformation of their local communities.” Composed of influential universities such as Columbia, the University of Chicago, Yale, Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, and New York University, these schools had strong connections to senators, helping to get the act passed. This interest in campus expansion in part rose out of the expectation that from 1960 to 1970, the student population would nearly double across the country, with universities seeing a dramatic increase in student enrollments. In response, universities were looking to expand and many partnered with the local redevelopment agency, receiving grants and assistance
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from the federal and local government to demolish existing neighborhoods for the purpose of creating bigger campuses that were more enticing to faculty and students.\textsuperscript{146} As Kenneth Ashworth, assistant director of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in 1964, explains, the redevelopment agency would acquire properties that were considered to be a part of a “slum neighborhood”, relocate the residents living there at the time, and demolish the buildings, at which point, the university could purchase a parcel of land at a very reduced rate, especially given that it was at this point just a piece of land without buildings.\textsuperscript{147} In addition to the sale of property at a reduced rate, the universities received grants in portions of one-third coming from the local government and two-thirds coming from the federal government.\textsuperscript{148} Ashworth, a clear proponent of urban renewal and university partnerships with cities, wrote, “Section 112 of the Housing Act ... can accomplish two major objectives simultaneously: it can improve the neighborhood by removal of adjoining slum areas and it can expand its campus.”\textsuperscript{149}

Despite “slum clearance” that largely targeted Puerto Ricans in Hartford, they did find key ways to live Lefebvre’s concepts of the urban experience, in which “they facilitate concrete processes of appropriation and the recognition that urban spaces can be used in different ways than were previously envisaged.”\textsuperscript{150} And furthermore, they became a part of the “centrality” of the urban despite a constant push for “peripheralization” by city government and urban renewal projects. Centrality for
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Lefebvre “implies the availability of manifold possibilities and access to social resources. Conversely, peripheralization stands for dispersion, demarcation, and exclusion from urban life.”¹⁵¹ Puerto Ricans found this centrality through business and economic development, which enabled fellow Puerto Rican and Latino residents in Hartford to form the social and economic stability that enabled their right to the city and their centrality. “For customers, these stores did not just provide material goods and services, but also became important social centers and sources of advice for new arrivals and a growing community. As they helped their fellow migrants, store owners became important community leaders.”¹⁵² As Puerto Ricans in Hartford opened stores and churches, they quickly found these spaces to be keys to the rights to the city; spaces for the community to strengthen and support one another, and by gaining these rights to spaces, they gained stability and security for themselves as a community.

Existing businesses on Park Street began to adapt to the new population of Spanish-speaking residents in the area. “Park Hardware, a hardware store that has been on Park Street since before it became a concentration of Latinos, had to start employing people in 1986 who spoke Spanish in order to compete in the Latino environment and help the Latino customers.”¹⁵³ This demonstrates a right to the city and a right to appropriation, as businesses realized they needed to adapt if they were to stay in business. In addition to Park Hardware, “Bean Pot, a restaurant that has been on Park Street through many waves of ethnic groups, changed their menu
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in order to incorporate more Latino foods when the street turned majority Latino."¹⁵⁴ Puerto Ricans and Latinos established themselves in Frog Hollow, gaining economic strength and creating strong social connections that gave them the power to transform and reproduce space.

“The negative perceptions of Park Street and the neglect of the Latino community in Hartford has created an ethnic enclave and a conglomerate of businesses centered around Latino culture that has been able to survive because of the ability of its inhabitants to easily walk around the area and frequent multiple stores pertaining to Latino culture.”¹⁵⁵ With Park Street a central area of Frog Hollow, it escaped much of the destruction of urban renewal. Frog Hollow was a neighborhood that Puerto Ricans were pushed into by urban renewal projects, disinvested in, but not razed for redevelopment.

The Latino community has certainly found centrality to the city through its commercial corridor on Park Street. By 2010, the city found that retail vacancy rates on Park Street were in the single digits, while Downtown still struggled with a retail vacancy rate of 43 percent.¹⁵⁶ Providing stability for the street’s economic success and production of urban space, there are countless organizations that promote Latino identity and economic development for the street. Beginning in the 1970s, and continuing on for the rest of the twentieth century, organizations such as the Spanish American Merchants Association (SAMA), The Hispanic Health Council, Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance (SINA), Hartford Areas Rally Together
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(HART), and countless others established themselves, helping to anchor the neighborhood as redevelopment projects continued to disrupt or destroy urban neighborhoods. Many business owners on the street feel they know everyone, and that there is a strong sense of community there. While economically strong, Park Street also has important social networks and cohesion that enables it to thrive, and empowers business owners and residents to stay rooted in place and shape the urban space.

Trinity’s location, just half a mile from Park Street poses an interesting dynamic, as in some ways they feel like worlds away today. Park Street is well anchored, as is Trinity, therefore what happens to the space in between? In 1994, Trinity made the decision to close off its portion of Vernon Street, which had to get passed by the city. It was for the purposes of “safety,” and as Trinity Alum Hunter Drews writes, “The closing off of Vernon Street in 1994 was yet another example of the enclosure of a once-public space into the physical landscape of the campus as a means of keeping the outside community out of Trinity’s everyday life.” With a continual history of distancing the surrounding community and enclosing itself as a suburban white enclave, how does the university help to anchor its surrounding community?

Similarly, in 2010, Trinity began a process of acquiring properties on Crescent Street and evicting residents. On the South end of campus, “once local residents were evicted, their homes and the old dormitories were demolished, and
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the foundation of the empty lot was set, a row of large, three-story buildings were
constructed on the south side of Crescent Street, making a barrier between Trinity
and its neighboring community out of a multi-million dollar housing project.  

Recent Trinity Alumnus Courtney Roach recalled speaking to a woman that worked at Broasterant, a neighborhood restaurant famous for its chicken. The woman lived in one of the last standing houses on Crescent Street; she was holding out on letting Trinity purchase the home that had been in her family for a long time. The noise from students didn't bother her and she had enjoyed the college’s campus safety presence on the street. As Roach recalls, it wasn't that she didn't have options of places to live—she had family in Meriden—however, this had long been her home, and she felt forced out rather than leaving willingly. This resident lived and worked locally, presumably shopped locally as well; this was her community, but Trinity’s own self interests and development plans eventually took over, forcing her to relocate elsewhere.

Trinity has claimed itself to be an anchor for the community, yet it has a history of alienating the surrounding neighborhood and creating racialized spaces. A predominantly white institution in a brown neighborhood, the term “locals” is often assigned by Trinity students and administrators to Hartford residents. Although it means to come from a specific place, the term is used at Trinity to understand the college’s very own neighbors as other, and foreign. Chiarra Davis, a student tour guide for Trinity Admissions, wrote about a tour in which a mother asked about the
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safety of students at Trinity, understanding Hartford residents as a potential danger to her child. As Davis recounts, the mother asked,

“So is it safe here?” After she registered my quizzical expression she quickly backtracked saying, “No you know, I know the campus is safe, obviously.” Before I could respond another mother standing nearby extended her arm and patted her on the small of her back. She looked at the quizzical mother with a knowing smile and assured, “I had the same question. I talked to someone in admissions and they said as long as the kids stay on campus they will be more than okay.” As the group returned to the Long Walk the two mothers walked arm in arm and one said quietly to the other, “The people that live over there, they call them ‘locals’.” These two women were certainly not the first to utter the word “locals” when referring to Hartford residents and in fact most on campus do so with much more hostility and aggression. Many Trinity students and administrators perceive Hartford as a city laden with crime and Trinity as a campus of refuge. It is understood amongst many students, particularly white students that crime, specifically drug crime originates from Hartford.\textsuperscript{164}

With a long history of understanding those that live just outside the gates of Trinity as a danger and threat to those that attend the elite institution, it is easy to imagine that Trinity’s own self interest and the self-interest of those living near Trinity would differ. And Trinity is not unique in this dynamic with Hartford. As LaDale Winling describes, the University of Chicago “seemed to be threatened by its South Side location, where it was surrounded by an expanding African American community that worried admissions officers, faculty recruiters and the parents of prospective students.”\textsuperscript{165} Similarly, Trinity has taken pride in being an elite and selective institution, and often finds that identity threatened by its urban location and minority and low-income neighborhood, which has consistently fueled a fear
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and perception of danger and crime. And over and over again, it further pushes the university to seek to enclose itself, making itself a white enclave.

While the campus continues to struggle with defining the level of enclosure and exclusion it creates both physically and socially, in many ways the Liberal Arts Action Lab and Trinfo Café are successes because they are not quite a part of the enclosed campus itself. When meeting with Carlos Espinosa, he described Trinfo as “a conduit with many pathways.” He said the access to technology provided by Trinfo, the training workshops, and the opportunity to broaden basic computer skills is available to the community. Trinfo is closely linked to community partners as well to ensure a broad reach. At the same time, Espinosa explained, Trinity students are able to apply skills as they lead the technology workshops and other training programs. He said it creates more access to opportunities and learning for both parties. Similarly, Megan Brown, director and professor for the Liberal Arts Action Lab, says that the advantage to being located downtown is the partnership with Capital Community College. With many Capital students being Hartford residents, it has brought important background to the research projects. In addition, Brown has found that community partners are far more interested in working together when they hear that Capital is involved. The Action Lab has
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organizations submit proposals of ideas, and then the community partners and an advisory board made up of Hartford residents with some familiarity with research choose the projects by identifying the most important issues for Hartford.\textsuperscript{173} In turn, students use research methods to help these organizations in Hartford further their own work. As it was only launched this past January, it is too early to know how successful the action lab will be. Nevertheless, as an anchor institution, Trinity has created learning environments for its students while also creating partnerships in Hartford.

Even the reach of anchor institutions in research can have large impacts for city development. LaDale Winling writes, “the coexistence of these many, well-educated, creative constituencies working within one institution toward human, economic, regional, and cultural development, often in creative tension with one another, is part of what enabled universities to assume such a prominent role in postwar urban development.”\textsuperscript{174} This constant critical approach and evaluation that the competing interests of constituents within universities bring to the table enables contested spaces to be a constant, and this is essential the Lefebvre’s theory of the urban and the right to the city. Universities are powerful in urban development because they constantly produce and reproduce new ideas of how to redevelop the city in a way that gets powerful support and economic assistance.

Trinity’s impact on urban development has not been as widespread or deeply embedded into city planning the way it has for eds & meds in other cities. Overall, students have not defined Hartford’s landscape when it comes to urban

\textsuperscript{173} Brown.
\textsuperscript{174} Winling, “Students and the Second Ghetto,” 61.
development. “The Metro Hartford region retains the fewest four-year graduates of any metro region with 60% of recent graduates citing ‘jobs’ as their primary reason for leaving.” Hartford has seen growth in the last few years, however, as the University of Connecticut opened its new downtown campus. The City of Hartford and universities are clearly aligning closer when it comes to urban planning and city development.

As anchor institutions continue to shape the urban landscape, it is the spaces in which different self interests meet which create the contested spaces that shape the urban. As Carlos Espinosa said, if people are open about their self interests, then people are on the same level. Trinity’s own agendas and that of Frog hollow or downtown may be different at times and should be different at times. But how do people whose lives are rooted here have the ability to remain rooted here, or to transform these spaces? How can the city be shaped alongside these different livelihoods and notions of place?
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Conclusion

“Programmatically, [Lefebvre] demanded a “right to the city”: the right not to be displaced into a space produced for the specific purpose of discrimination.”¹⁷⁷ Just a few days ago, on April 7th, the New York Times Editorial Board published an article entitled “America’s Federally Financed Ghettos.” Released at this time because United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Ben Carson wants to “[delete] the phrase ‘free from discrimination’ from the HUD mission statement.”¹⁷⁸ The Fair Housing Act was passed 50 years ago, the article points out, and this half-century marks a time in which access to wealth became solidified to race, with policies that provided this access to whites and prevented access to blacks, and, in Hartford, Latinos as well, all while destroying whole neighborhoods.¹⁷⁹ This is all to say that 50 years later, we are still experiencing the effects of racialized spaces produced by federally endorsed urban and suburban development. Hartford is a product of this history and has created these spaces of discrimination that Lefebvre references.

As we move towards new redevelopment schemes and economic frameworks, these agendas and projects need to be placed within Lefebvre’s theory for the right to the city. Inequalities will only deepen if we continue to ignore the realities of everyday people, and if some don’t have the rights to participation.

¹⁷⁷ Schmid
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Without the rights to the city, “for Lefebvre, this crisis consisted primarily of a tendency towards the homogenization of lifestyles and an engineering and colonization of daily life.”\(^{180}\) We will lose the urban as these inequalities deepen, and redevelopment and homogenization become synonymous.

With neoliberalism and globalization, there are certainly new dimensions to understanding what the right to the city means. As Craig Willse wrote, “In the neoliberal context, the freedom of market mechanisms, and not the health of a population, is understood to guarantee the well-being of a national economy from which individual well-being is presumed to flow.”\(^{181}\) As redevelopment and urban political agendas occur within a neoliberal context, the health and social strength of a city’s residents will still be essential to urban space. Lefebvre theorized, “the urban level is in danger of being whittled away between the global and the private levels.”\(^{182}\) Anchor institutions continue to align with neoliberal and globalized agendas— institutions within the space of flows that global markets produce—and therefore they should be placed within a critical framework for redevelopment that considers the right to the city as well.

In Hartford, employment growth from smaller and locally owned businesses as well as nonprofits has increased by 23 percent.\(^{183}\) Employment growth for small businesses helps to anchor communities and offer neighborhood stability that can help gain rights to the city. If the growth is large enough, it can reduce dependency on large corporations, as the city receives tax revenue from these businesses and
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improves employment opportunities for residents. Furthermore, small businesses can also participate in urban redevelopment initiatives, and often in ways that support the surrounding community. For example, Park Street’s business community has its own Business Improvement District (BID) with the support of the Spanish American Merchants Association (SAMA), which is also located on Park Street. The BID raises 12,000 dollars each year through a small additional tax that is spent on street improvements, maintenance and marketing for the business owners. The taxes are collected from each member of the BID, which in this case is every property owner on the street.

This more localized business development can reduce the growth of the carceral city. To remember from the first chapter, this is defined as “a collection of carceral cities, an archipelago of ‘normalized enclosures’ and fortified spaces that both voluntarily and involuntarily barricade individuals and communities in visible and not-so-visible urban islands, overseen by restructured forms of public and private power and authority.” The isolation and barricading of individuals and communities reduces as communities can see the circulation of capital in their own urban spaces, empowered with economic development and neighborhood stability to influence city development. For example, “Both SAMA and The Hartford Economic Development Corporation came together with Fleet Bank to create a public-private loan for businesses on Park Street. The loan helped the business owners jump-start their business idea, and out of 35 businesses that they helped in
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the Park Street area, just three have been unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{188} This kind of economic power to anchor local communities also helps to stabilize these urban spaces and social networks, particularly as anchor institutions look to redevelop and expand.

However, this growth in small businesses is not enough. Metro Hartford Progress Points reported in 2016 that “72 percent of future job openings in our region will be jobs that don’t pay a family-sustaining wage.”\textsuperscript{189} This signals a dire need to focus on the social reproduction of urban spaces, and rethink ways to stabilize Hartford’s communities when jobs become less and less able to offer a social wage.

For future research and continuing this study of Hartford’s spatial dynamics, there would be more in depth data collection. This further research would include Downtown and Frog Hollow, the two neighborhoods I focused on here, but also expand to other neighborhoods, such as in the Northend, which was not covered at all in this study. The Northend is particularly interesting because the construction of interstate highways 91 and 84 cut it off in many ways from the rest of the city. Its residents have been very isolated from the city’s resources and development, and it is certainly a prime example of the carceral urban islands that Soja wrote about.

Some quick information on the Northend: While Frog Hollow (in the south end of Hartford) has an unemployment rate on par with the city overall, at 18 percent, Upper Albany and Northeast have unemployment rates of 27 and 30 percent.\textsuperscript{190}
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However, among these three neighborhoods, Frog Hollow has the highest number of residents living in poverty (although all three are very high). The U.S. Census considers living “in poverty” as below 100 percent of the determined poverty threshold, which was close to $25,000 for a family of 4 in 2016. In Frog Hollow, this number is at 46 percent. Upper Albany has 37 percent of its residents living in poverty, and Northeast has 44 percent. While Clay Arsenal’s number of owner-occupied units (11 percent) is similar to Frog Hollow’s (7 percent), Northeast has 24 percent owner-occupancy. Meanwhile, Blue Hills, just adjacent to Northeast has a homeownership rate of 56 percent, unemployment below Hartford’s overall rate, and only 16 percent of residents are considered “in poverty.” In a city of just 18 square miles, how can Northeast and Blue Hills be situated next to each other and have such differences across employment, income and homeownership? And what does this mean for the production of urban space and right to the city?

Additionally, as suburban development and access to wealth was highly racialized, how has this shaped the Northend of Hartford? In both Northeast and Blue Hills, just over 70 percent of residents are black, while almost all other residents in Northeast are Latino, and in Blue Hills, the next largest demographic of
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residents are white. Lastly, what kinds of migration patterns have occurred between neighborhoods in Hartford? How has this defined the landscape today?

![Map of Hartford](image)

Hartford's landscape is one that reflects many trends that have occurred in cities across the country; it shares the legacy of many postindustrial cities that still wear the scars of deindustrialization and urban redevelopment schemes. The appropriation and reimagining of a city brings life into urban spaces as economies change over time, and as Lefebvre argues, so long as there is the right to the city, the
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urban can be produced in heterogeneous ways. Hegemonic forces such as corporate interests, urban renewal, and anchor institutions with large redevelopment plans, create and perpetuate the homogenization of lifestyles and spaces in which the rights to participation for urban residents are left out. For Hartford to have a viable future, it must give its residents the right to the city.
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