

Summer 7-14-2017

The Ivory Tower, Urban Growth, and State Subjugation: An Historical Analysis on the Construction of Student Identities and the Public Good During University Generated Redevelopment Projects

Jacob R. Wolff
Jacob Robert Wolff

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/geog_etds



Part of the [Human Geography Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wolff, Jacob R.. "The Ivory Tower, Urban Growth, and State Subjugation: An Historical Analysis on the Construction of Student Identities and the Public Good During University Generated Redevelopment Projects." (2017). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/geog_etds/35

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Geography ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Jacob Robert Wolff

Candidate

Geography and Environmental Studies

Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

John Newman Carr, Chairperson

K. Maria D. Lane

David Correia

**THE IVORY TOWER, URBAN GROWTH, AND STATE SUBJUGATION:
AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF STUDENT
IDENTITIES AND THE PUBLIC GOOD DURING UNIVERSITY
GENERATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

by

JACOB ROBERT WOLFF

B.A., Geography and History, University of Pittsburgh

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**Master of Science
Geography**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2017

DEDICATION

For Pop.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a near endless number of people for whom I owe my most sincere gratitude. Without the support of my family, friends, advisor, committee and colleagues, I could not have completed this brief work of scholarship. Their support, in contrast, has been monumental.

Specifically, I want to thank my Great Grand Mother, Grandmother, and Mother for paving the way through their three generations of academic success in both undergraduate and graduate endeavors. I want to thank Mam and Pap for encouraging my interest in the profession of higher education and I must thank my father, a first generation college student, for reminding me that education is of immeasurable value.

I am additionally indebted to my advisors – formal and informal, past and present – for their guidance through my undergraduate and graduate educations: At the University of New Mexico; John for his enthusiasm and kindness, Maria for her clarity, David for his thoroughness, And of my undergraduate professors; Bill for his love of geography, Ola for his forthright advice, Susan for her sincerity, Paul for his insights, Bob for his friendship.

Finally, I would be remiss not to mention Hayley, Evan, Jordan, and Kalea, the very best friends a person could have. Their unrelenting support is responsible for giving me the emotional fortitude to finish this project.

To all, both above and unmentioned, all my love and appreciation.

Epigraph

I'm hiring a DJ for the eve of our destruction.

- Jack's Mannequin, *My Racing Thoughts*

**THE IVORY TOWER, URBAN GROWTH, AND STATE SUBJUGATION:
AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF STUDENT
IDENTITIES AND THE PUBLIC GOOD DURING UNIVERSITY
GENERATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

by

JACOB ROBERT WOLFF

B.A., Geography and History, University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

Having become almost cliché in academic discourses, the term gentrification offers a conceptualization of sociospatial transformation too narrow for contemporary understandings of inequality within the post-industrial city. Generalizations of a wealthy populous displacing working-class and marginalized populations fail to address the diversity, complexity, and scope of economic hollowing-out and fail to fully account for other incoming subpopulations such as the emergent “creative class,” comprised of university-educated individuals who are not necessarily considered affluent by traditional economic measures. To this end, scholars in the United Kingdom have identified university neighborhood formation as a significant yet distinct process of place production that results in exacerbated patterns of inequality that are incongruent to the predominant narrative – the degeneration and reconfiguration of physical property in areas of student occupation, thus leading to rising, increasingly exclusionary rents charged by private developers. This process, termed studentification, has gained little traction within the American academy, despite similarly pervasive neighborhood change

surrounding research universities, and despite a wealth of scholarship interrogating the regenerative economic impact universities demonstrate as urban anchor institutions. And considering that urban real estate markets are largely a consumptive byproduct of globalizing capital, universities should be positioned at the administrative nexus between transnational networks of production and the localized processes of neighborhood recommodification, thus warranting a multi-scalar evaluation of campus expansion as a spatial practice of power.

Drawing upon three case studies of ostensible studentification – Columbia University in Manhattan, Temple University in Philadelphia, and the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque – my intervening research therefore seeks to resolve how academic institutions purposefully reprogram the cityscape for, in their appraisal, the public good, while specifically considering how university administrators leverage an economic idea of the student from their mission in urban planning processes. Each case represents a particular magnitude of scale; the global command city, the intermediate metropolitan, and the national fringe. The empirical work identifies a consistent ideology emphasizing intellectual accumulation and exchange, where students are positioned as both consumer and product; and as such, motivate and legitimate the increased institutional consumption of space. Such considerations, in turn, reinforce a theoretical discussion integrating studentification within university-generated urban development initiatives. Ultimately, this work builds upon contemporary analyses by positing that universities are central to a larger political project intended to reprogram urban space via the productive logics of a knowledge economy. As such, the humanistic ideal of infinite

intellectual possibility is dangerously commoditized in corporeal form, the graduate *or human capital*, to provide an (a)spatial-fix to the limits of capitalist growth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Background	11
Chapter Three: Literature Review	31
Chapter Four: Research Design	61
Chapter Five: Columbia University in the City of New York	71
Chapter Six: Temple University	107
Chapter Seven: University of New Mexico	133
Chapter Eight: Towards a Theory of University Power	152
Works Cited	176

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

The Post-Industrial Promise

From a young age I had watched the economic landscape around me shift and change. The main street movie theater shut its doors shortly after I learned to walk and by the time I was out of a car seat, the service station on the edge of town no longer had an attendant and full service. Within view of my neighborhood playground, state contracted bulldozers closed a mountaintop scarred by strip mines left idle from my grandfather's generation. Most people on the Eastern Seaboard hadn't burned anthracite coal in their home furnaces for a half-century, and any remaining demand was purely local. We had a coal stoker. A lone hopper sat terminally immobile at the railroad siding, although royal blue painted Conrail locomotives occasionally passed through.

But among my cherished memories, what stands out most significantly was the community's love of my elementary school. A quintessential red brick building constructed in the early twentieth century, it was near enough that I could walk down the grey macadam alley from my yard, passing makeshift vegetable gardens and an abandoned flag pole that once towered over a baseball grandstand, to get to school. Once there, I lined up with my friends in the walnut and linoleum clad lobby waiting for our teachers to lead us into the classrooms. There we learned about the alphabet, language, and mathematics, but also of our town's story. I sat marveling in sheer curiosity - and abhorrence - when the teacher talked of children marching to the mines to labor in dangerous coal breakers, sorting out slate with their bare, bloodied hands.

Yet, we also contemplated the future. The mines were clearly no more, and every one of us watched sad-faced men board up the windows along Main Street, a fading promise that reminding us that the era of small-town commerce was likely over. It was natural to wonder what was coming next. Our second grade teacher – my grandmother - asked the class to debate a proposed distribution center near the interstate highway that had – in the name of progress - been built over a former company town. The majority of my classmates argued to let nature overcome, although a few argued in favor of economic growth. The debate progressed rather one-sidedly until the closing statements when I encouraged my classmates to support the plan that would bring more jobs, and in turn, more families to town. More people, we decided, equated to prosperity and our subsequent vote, albeit powerless, was unanimous.

The warehouse was built because authorities above us decided they too agreed growth was good. My father's construction company bid the job and, after being awarded the contract, erected several masonry structures on site. But most jobs were filled by people from across the Schuylkill Valley, which includes much of metropolitan Philadelphia. Thus in the world of transient labor and capital, reinvestment by an outside firm had little impact on my town's productive economy and our local fortunes did not rebound. The agricultural community a mere seven miles to the south, saw, however, a significant increase in population during that same period. Low land prices and closer proximity to the commuter highways made their location ripe for speculative real estate development and subdivisions rapidly replaced farm fields as the engines of accumulation.

The contrast of this geographic juxtaposition was exacerbated by tensions within the school district, a product of statewide district reorganization in 1966. These two communities, separated by a ridge and valley spine, were flung into the same jurisdictional boundaries and as such, the several decade long process of population change thrust consumptive suburbs ahead of formerly productive hinterlands and school board members capitalized on the divergent growth rates.

Elected leadership in Pine Grove, the suburban borough, envisioned a single campus in the outskirts of their community. With both the middle and high schools, as well as an additional elementary school, all operations could be consolidated in one place. Following the spring of 2002, my elementary school was therefore closed. School board members contrived this plan without input from teachers, parents, or students, and hurriedly manipulated public discussion by undermining official political discourses in backroom negotiations.

For my town, the tightknit coal mining community devastated by decades of mine closures and factory layoffs, the local elementary school represented a promise to the people and it existed an institution where they could shape the next generation of citizens. Residents believed that the school could foster civic pride, a sense of place, where children would learn and grow up to love their homes and dedicatedly breathe new life into the declining town. Termination of operations stripped my community of any vision of possibility.

When the board did formally announce their agenda, I watched my mother, herself a third generation teacher, lead a robust campaign against the proposal. Persistently arguing instead to reinvest in the existing school, she enlisted hundreds of

fellow constituents to her cause, all crammed into our 78 year old, non-air conditioned auditorium, for a series of public forums. Concerned constituents gave an unending stream of impassioned speeches, pleas, emotional appeals, and data-driven dissents. *Tremont*, as the town is called, stood in universal solidarity. There was no support for consolidation from either my hometown or the suburban community headquartering the district uttered in those assemblies.

But the board did not listen. Six hours before the final meeting, the utility company terminated telephone service to the school. At the meeting, board members cited off-the-record testimony they heard from people outside the hearing process. Board members ignored the formal channels of discourse. I watched, then a third grade student, as democratic process was circumvented, elected officials casting their votes merely as a symbol gesture for a decision enacted long before community voices were heard.

Yet I do not share this vignette self-indulgently. Rather, these political dialogues emblemize the kind of growing pains people all across the country have had to negotiate for the past half-century. A fusion of federal strategies, chiefly domestic austerity, neoliberal trade reform, and strong dollar monetary policy, coupled with corporate transnationalism have effectively remade landscapes of capital, opening the globe to enlarging markets of accumulation and leaving some spaces absolutely abandoned and second-class. My childhood occupied the latter, yet its unique liminality on the regional edge exposed me to what others have termed "the metropolitan revolution." Parents, politicians, and community activists were trying to make sense of their shifting place in the world while we, the students, were jockeyed around, the ideas of our futures positioned in adult arguments, pawns in the pains of their change.

Attending university for my undergraduate degree on the liminal edge distinguishing the Northeast from industrial Midwest, I witnessed the same restructuring process unfold again in a later moment and to a greater degree. Many of my classmates were flooding the university from both the local and global hinterlands, promulgating a youthful reurbanization of urban core. Countless stories from news outlets such as the *Wall Street Journal* and *NBC Nightly News* reinforced my perception and recognized this post-recession migratory trend, reversing the half-century pattern of population and economic decline in center cities across the nation (Kusisto 9 June 2016; Calvert 5 August 2016; Adamy and Overberg 19 May 2016; Kostelni 16 November 2016; Dobnik 24 October 2016; Pamer 11 December 2012; Kotkin 4 August 2014; WSJ 13 January 2011). In one WSJ article, Laura Kusisto described the transformation of Cleveland, an Ohio city not widely known for having a cosmopolitan atmosphere, where many early career adults have moved from the suburban fringe back into neighborhoods once “postmarked by abandoned businesses” now “brimming with new restaurants and bars” (Kusisto 9 June 2016). Another article stated in the byline that “Philadelphia and other metro areas see jobs and incomes grow at their core while outlying areas are on the decline” (Calvert 5 August 2016) while *Forbes* reporter, Francesca Levy, found that college towns specifically were the growth poles. Citing “health care jobs” and “high-tech industries,” Levy argues that these regional cities expand due in large part because the “universities are large, relatively stable employers – and a steady flow of students keep the population young” (Levy 11 October 2011).

And on the national stage we see evidenced the role of universities hotly contested by politicians as a source for continued economic growth. For the first time in

decades, higher education became a major platform issue and candidates in the 2016 presidential election put forward plans that repositioned students as a central feature in their visions for the United States. Florida Senator Marco Rubio suggested market-based reforms to college financing schemes and argued in favor of federal accreditation to make available a wider range of institutional competitors in an increasingly digital marketplace of education (Czekalinski 10 February 2014). Former First Lady and Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton similarly emphasized debt and financing reform; however, promised fully-subsided, free tuition at public universities for students from families making less than \$85,000 annually (Clinton 22 June 2016; Lobosco 11 August 2016). According to Clinton's campaign website, she further promised debt- forgiveness to those entering the technology-driven commercial start-up sector:

Aspiring entrepreneurs will be able to defer their loans with no payments or interest for up to three years. Social entrepreneurs and those starting new enterprises in distressed communities will be eligible for up to \$17,500 in loan forgiveness (Clinton 2016).

The Clinton plan was, like republican ideas, grounded in a commercial work ethic, biased towards marketable degree programs. But self-proclaimed democratic socialist, Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders' online platform statement for president suggested he was most in-tune with a capitalist logic of education. On the issue, his website referenced the German model of higher education, where the state fully subsidizes technical and scientific training at universities for the benefit of the national economy, and claimed foremost that "in a highly competitive global economy, we need the best-educated workforce in the world" (Sanders 2016). The United States federal government would fund \$47 billion towards public university tuition and require states provide an additional

\$23 billion under his proposed *College for All Act*, effectively making 4-year public colleges and universities free for all families regardless of income (Sanders 2016).

While discursively jockeying students between self-investors and innovators, proposing programs to encourage higher education and incentivize training in the business and technology fields for a global economy, the most articulate manifestation of university wealth generation is not evidenced by any outcome from the recent presidential debates. There has, in fact, been little change to any federal higher education policies since the election of President Donald J. Trump, yet we continue to see the most dynamic material transformations taking place at the local scale, where university administrators conceptually situate students into local political discourse, particularly regarding their often controversial campus expansion and economic development projects in cities across the country. Just this year, Columbia University will open another building on its new, \$6.3 billion Manhattanville campus following a decade of community resistance (Dobnik 24 October 2016). Temple University is negotiating the design of a football stadium with residents in a North Philadelphia neighborhood. And the University of New Mexico, construction is underway on a 7 acre innovation district located between the campus and central business district, linked by an unpopular new urbanist transit corridor (Stone 6 March 2017; Domrzalski 15-21 February 2017).

Applied researchers have written at great length about the economic impact of these types of university expansion projects, recounting institutional capability to generate new employment opportunities in working-class spaces previously left abandoned by the post-war exodus to the suburbs and the closure of manufacturing firms during the late 20th century (Maurrasse 2001; Wiewel and Gerrit-Jan Knapp 2005; Perry

and Wiewel, 2005; Florida 2005; Rodin 2007; Glaeser 2011). In an edited volume, *Partnerships for Smart Growth*, Meredith Perry and John Schaerer argued in their study on collaborative planning at the University of Tennessee in Chattanooga that “expansion efforts, neighborhood revitalization, and commercial renewal” can create a “mutually beneficial” solution for campus and community (Wiewel and Gerrit-Jan Knaap 2005 [200]) and Judith Rodin, president emeritus of the University of Pennsylvania, published a seminal text on collaborative university neighborhood planning, *The University and Urban Revival* (2007). Others have nevertheless found that the university neighborhood is a hotbed for gentrification and exclusion, contradicting claims of mutual gain (Cohen, 9 October 2015). Researchers with the nation’s largest metropolitan business news publisher, *The Business Journals*, found that by 2014 Chattanooga was ranked within the top ten cities with the highest rates of severe income inequality (Thomas 31 January 2014) and the Pew Charitable Trust found remarkable levels of displacement near the universities in Philadelphia (Pew 2016).

Indeed, scholars in the social sciences have looked into the unjust dimensions of university growth, primarily concerned on two fronts: the historical study of higher education and urban renewal (Gumprecht 2008; Bradley 2009; Haar 2011) in addition to contemporary patterns of displacement driven by an increase in student occupation of rental properties throughout lower-income neighborhoods. (Kenyon 1997; Smith 2005; Pickren 2012). The former, widely regarded as an unfortunate moment in urban development, is forthright in its institutional condemnation; however, the latter scholarship has focused almost exclusively on either the actions of students and private developers within residential areas or on the politics of reactionary zoning, and neglects

to seriously consider administrative agency in shaping nearby real estate markets. In these conversations, the political-economic narrative deviates very little from analogy to gentrification. Demographic shifts from working-class to creative-class in reconfigured neighborhoods are described as a logic of accumulation by consumption, termed *studentification*, and are theoretically tied to globalization loosely as a symptom of the emergent knowledge economy in post-industrial nations (Chatterton 2000; 2010).

With a comprehensive reading of both critical and applied research and further informed by the numerous examples of presidential platforms and contentious university expansion plans documented in the popular press, it should become apparent that universities are deliberate actors within the ever evolving urban landscape and are politically expedient agents in extending the productive machinations of intellectual capital. A point of fact representing the magnitude of this institutional power, universities and university-affiliated hospitals are now the largest employers in nearly one-third of American cities (Maurrasse 2001 [20]) and “in every one of the twenty largest cities in the United States, an institution of higher education is among the top ten private employers,” according to Judith Rodin (Rodin 2007 [14]). Moreover, the U.S. Steel Building, the tallest structure in Pittsburgh, America's archetypal industrial city, is now branded atop with big, brightly illuminated letters spelling out UPMC for the primary tenant, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. These advances must prompt us to wonder how exactly the academy has negotiated its ascent to dominate our cities while residential counter-narratives must encourage us to question the assumption that knowledge-based enterprise is universally good for society. By drawing upon three aforementioned cases of ostensible studentification – Columbia University in Manhattan,

Temple University in Philadelphia, and the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque –
in the course of this thesis, I therefore endeavor to resolve the following inquiry:

*How do the ways student identities are constructed by universities and elected leadership
of a city frame or justify campus expansion and resulting gentrification processes;
relatedly, what do these discursive maneuvers reveal about state expectations of
contemporary subjectivity in a neoliberal economy.*

CHAPTER TWO BACKGROUND

There are Few Things More Enduring than a University

Incompatible goals and uneven power dynamics have long strained the relationships between Western universities and their host communities, reverberating in struggle for nearly 1000 years. Violence, vengeance, and murder tarnish the legacies of scholastic excellence at the medieval universities –empowered by the Roman Law of a decentralized religious state - including Oxford and the Sorbonne, while nation state sanctioned subjugation besmirches the reputation of contemporary universities in the Americas; whether that be the military policing of residents surrounding universities in the United States or the silencing of dissenting voices near Colombian institutions of higher education (Taussig 2005). But the threat of subjugation - and in rare cases biological and juridical death – is inescapable for those living adjacent to the privileged spaces of higher education. This violence has taken different forms through time, is conditionally ennobled by shifting derivations of power, but continues to evolve across space and empire.

Medieval Origins of Power

University privilege over local authority was first inscribed in Roman law by Church decree in 1058 CE. Having heard the concerns of vagabond scholars with no legal protections in the disunified sovereign states of Europe, Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa put forth a series of rights and privileges for faculty at the

University of Bologna. On grounds that “the whole world is illuminated by their learning,” the *Authentica Habita* granted scholars civil immunities comparable to those held by Catholic clergy. He dictated that the scholars, if found in violation of non-exempt laws, were to be tried in Bishops Court instead of civil courts¹ and further guaranteed academics freedom of mobility, legally allowing them to be *clerici vagrantes* in search of intellectual stimulation across the continent (Waddell 2000). An indication of the law’s significance, these securities were confirmed by Pope Alexander III and included in the Justinian Code of Roman Law. Furthermore, papal recognition thus extended academic rights to scholars at Padua, Paris, and Oxford, upon their respective dates of establishment (Kirbre 1954; Ridder-Symoens 1992).

Medieval Church jurisdiction over European universities became a point of major contention between town and gown, holding universities above local law, and in both England and France culminated in civil uprising and state sanctioned violence. In 1209 CE, townsfolk hanged two Oxford dons for an alleged murder with neither proper legal recourse nor ecclesiastic consultation, but with support from King John. University operations were subsequently suspended in protest, and several scholars sought refuge in Cambridge, where they founded England’s second university, earning royal charter by 1231 CE and church recognition shortly after (“About the University: Early Records,” n.d.). In 1229 CE at the University of Paris, similarly governed by the Church and not subject to the laws of the crown, several students were involved in an altercation with a tavern owner during the city’s pre-Lenten celebrations, consequently instigating a riot and damaging several nearby businesses. Complaints were filed with the ecclesiastic

¹ Frederick Barbarossa quoted in Pearl Kirbre, 1954. (Pearl Kirbre, 1954).

courts, and fearing an academic schism as had occurred with Oxford two decades prior, broached the issue cautiously. The French aristocracy ultimately demanded vengeance and the church allowed city guardsmen to execute several students. In response, faculty refused to teach, classes were suspended, and students either left for other universities or went home. After two years of reduced trade and commerce in the Latin Quarter, Pope Gregory IX issued the *Parens Scientiarum*, reopening the Sorbonne while reaffirming the university's right to self-governance and autonomy from local rules and regulations (Duncalf and Krey 1912; McKeon 1964). Following the 1355 CE Saint Scholastica Day Riot at Oxford that left nearly 60 students and 30 townspeople dead, university power was likewise reinforced. For 470 years until the mayor refused in 1825, town councilors were required to publicly march through Oxford to pay the university an annual fine per dead (Miller 1993; Koenig 2011).

The American University

American universities, although much younger than their European counterparts, share a common bond relating knowledge, state power, and territorial domination. The first campuses in North America – Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale – were established along the Atlantic coast by colonial governors to teach courses in divinity and philosophy (Rudolph, 1962) while North Carolina founded the first public university in 1795. An article in the state constitution ratified in 1776 dictated that “all usefull learning shall be duly encouraged and pro moted in one or more universities.” The first class graduated from Chapel Hill in 1798 (Snider 2004). Hugh

Henry Brackenridge secured a charter from the Pennsylvania legislature in 1787 to open a small academy in a log cabin west of the Alleghenies. By 1819, the state amended the charter and the academy was renamed the Western University of Pennsylvania. Thomas Mellon graduated class of 1837 before founding Mellon Bank. His family would later control the Board of Trustees during a controversial transition to a modern campus in the early twentieth century, becoming the University of Pittsburgh (Alberts 1986).

The 1862 Morrill Act of Congress solidified federal interest in higher education by establishing a system of predominantly public colleges, leveraging government land and specie to extend control of production on the agricultural and territorial fringe through technical education. Titled as “AN ACT Donating Public Lands to the several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts,” the American land grant university opened new territorial spaces to capitalist production by increasing the availability of operating capital to technical colleges for Anglo-American settlers and, as in the case of the Southwestern territories, conquered Spanish-speaking and Pueblo peoples. The policy was, as written, fundamentally an act of power to exert economic authority *and expectation* over the fledgling states and territories beyond the cosmopolitan eastern coast.

Each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading objective shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts, in such a manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life (*Morrill Act of 1862* 1862).

Designed to control and accumulate, the land grant policy quickly encouraged the proliferation of higher education in the American hinterlands, with subsequent amendments intensifying federal resources, empowering industry, and upholding military order on a growing number of campuses in states ranging from Maine to Alaska, and becoming an effective engine of Manifest Destiny and the American quest for a complete, continental empire (Geiger and Sorber 2013).

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, industrialists rich off the opening of western markets began endowing their great, private wealth to new research institutions located primarily in cities. Johns Hopkins, principle investor in the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, bequeathed seven million dollars for the incorporation of a hospital, medical school, and university in the City of Baltimore, upon his death in 1873, at the time the largest philanthropic gift in American history (Hawkins 2002). John D. Rockefeller, who made his money in the oilfields of Appalachia, gave \$600,000 in 1890 to the newly organized University of Chicago (Boyer 2015) and Leland Stanford, a western railroad magnate, and his wife, Jane Stanford, founded Leland Stanford Junior University on the outskirts of San Francisco the following year (Wels, 1999). Andrew Carnegie, a Scottish-American immigrant, used his wealth from U.S. Steel, the first billion dollar corporation, to establish the Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1900. The school was later merged with the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, first founded as a department within the University of Pittsburgh in 1911 by Andrew W. Mellon, son of Thomas Mellon, to create Carnegie Mellon University in 1967 (Fenton 2000).

The corporatist philanthropy of higher education, however, came to a crescendo in Pittsburgh with the construction of a gothic art-deco skyscraper that towers 534 feet

over the university district, built by the University of Pittsburgh and aptly named *The Cathedral of Learning*. Most citizens still identity the building as a civic monument belonging to the people, though the building was only made possible by favor of the capitalist elite in reciprocity for one of the most notorious cases of restricted academic scholarship (MacDonald 1938). The vaulted lecture halls were competed following the



Figure 1. Cathedral of Learning, University of Pittsburgh

Great Depression when working-class neighborhood were shrouded in thick, course smog billowing from the steel mills and foundries along the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers. Though progress was intermittent. Money was in short supply and historians at the university tout the collective efforts of 97,000 city children to partially finance the remaining work on the 41 story cathedral, each donating a dime to buy a brick (Fedele 12 March 2007). At a presentation in the public schools, one student asked why the cathedral did not have a spire, to which he was told, “there is no peak to learning... it’s a lifelong

process, and that's why the architects had to leave the top open" (Fedele 12 March 2007). The building was designed by Philadelphia architect Charles Z. Clauder to rise above the dirge of unmitigated industrialism, to represent the university chancellor's vision that "out of the smoky hills of Pittsburgh, University-inspired, an Athens of a grander sort, based on the machine civilization, might rise" someday (MacDonald 1938). Put another way, the Cathedral of Learning was intended to guide the way toward a new prosperity based on the sacrosanctity of knowledge (Holohan 2003).

Chancellor Bowman was nevertheless accused of silencing leftist scholars in the university, for fear that academic criticisms of the Pennsylvania Coal and Iron Police and anti-trust laws would legitimate labor reforms and offend the University Board of Trustees, comprised exclusively of members from Pittsburgh's economic elite – including Mellon and Heinz family members (Mulcahy 1986). Bowman also feared a loss of financial support from these affluent families and their friends and in 1934 "abrogated the university by-laws on academic tenure" to terminate Professor Ralph Turner (Mulcahy 1986). While no reason was given to the historian, his involvement with organized labor was widely known throughout the state and progressive Pennsylvania Governor Gifford Pinchot and the *Pittsburgh Press* came to his defense, the latter editorializing:

And so, as the material structure grew the soul was lost... A university cannot function on the same ethical principles of a chamber of commerce (Press, 9 July 1934).

The Association of American University Professors opened a case against the chancellor, eventually blacklisting the university as a result, but wrote in an unpublished report found in the Bowman Files that:

In the world of the existing Pittsburgh with its extremes of riches and poverty, its unrelieved dirtiness and ugliness, its ruthless materialism and individualism, its irrepressible industrial conflicts, its lack of any integrating principle other than the sign of a dollar, the Chancellor moves with one driving motive: to wring from the community the money essential to the development and support of the kind of university which his mind conceives as the ideal for this particular city (A.A.U.P. Report, 1935).

Chancellor Bowman wanted to redistribute industrial wealth, taken from robber baron and working-class resident alike, to renovate the city with an architectural monument to knowledge, a symbol of a future, more cerebral civilization, without permitting the production of knowledge that ran counter to an industrial-capitalist organization of society.

The global crisis of World War Two coupled with a continued fear of a new world order under communism drew together further the economic and state functions of Western higher education. The GI Bill made college education widely available to military veterans, and government agencies began pouring federal funding into defense research institutes while also creating more. Signed into law on 10 May 1950 by Harry S Truman, The National Science Foundation was founded for purposes of producing area studies and scientific knowledge in the name of national defense (*National Science Foundation Act of 1950*, 1950). But education policy research additionally emphasized “the transmission of a common cultural heritage towards a common citizenship” (President’s Commission on Higher Education 1946), which ultimately lead to the inclusion of “One nation under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance and both K-12 and higher education adopted Western Civilization and civics into their curricula. Spreading the rhetoric of liberal democracy through a propagandic lens on American history, the common cultural heritage was intended to homogenize a loyal Judeo-Christian and

capitalist citizenry. Moreover, the university was expected to spread a pro-American dialogue throughout the nation. The Higher Education Act of 1965 dedicated four years of funding towards “Community Service and Continuing Education Programs.” Explained as “assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use,” universities were to be mobilized for the alleged public good (*Higher Education Act of 1965* 1965). What this legislation did, much like papal decree in 1058 CE, was to reinforce university authority over non-academic space, however augmented by an ideology of liberal political-economy - counter to the biblical ordination of higher education in the pre-modern state. The hallmark initiative, the Teachers Corps, allowed colleges of education to train their students in low-income neighborhoods, often in rural towns or inner-cities, while leveraging state resources to better understand areas of poverty. Thus made an agent of the state, the universities operated to reinforce dominion by promulgating the expectations of citizenship established into education law in the previous decades (*Higher Education Act of 1965* 1965). In subsequent reauthorizations of the 1965 act, federal programs have been developed to incentivize academic degree completion for the explicit purpose of knowledge-transfer into the labor market that, in turn, extend a university’s institutional power to confer belonging into the otherwise public domain. For example, the government provided funding for new programs, including Providing Jobs to Careers, which specifically positions colleges to serve as an intermediary between citizenship and the technical labor force within a community (Duke 13 February 2008). The program aims to increase low-skilled worker access to occupational certificates. The

2008 reauthorization also created a program targeted at the supply-side of credential programs, establishing the Business Workforce Partnerships for Job Skill Training in High Growth Occupations or Industries to provide colleges with “venture capital” to develop marketable programs that “respond to business workforce needs” (Duke-Benfield and Strawn 24 September 2008).

Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of academic domination over the urban landscape, federal urban renewal policies permitted university administrations to forcibly seize blighted properties and subsidized the projects with assistance from local government planning agencies through Section 12 credits of the 1961 Housing Act. A significant number of institutions participated. Richard P. Dober wrote in his landmark book, *Campus Planning*, that as of 1962, “twenty-eight schools had projects involving Section 112 credits in the project execution phase; twenty-four institutions had projects in the planning state; and twenty-five others had filed statements of intention to begin preliminary planning” (Dober 1963 [275]). Of the seventy-seven total universities engaged in renewal processes during that year, ten were listed for further description and in aggregate accounted for 655 acres repurposed urban space. Yale, alone, acquired 257 acres. Six of the universities seized residential property declared “sub-standard” (Dober 1963 [276], frequently in diverse neighborhoods primarily home to Immigrants and People of Color (Jacobs 1961). And while universities only accounted for a fraction of renewal projects, Dober attributed the widespread success of renewal policies to “the pioneering work of several institutions located in cities where planning has been held in high regard” (Dober 1963 [277]). In defending the practice, he cited the University of Chicago, writing:

An excellent example of enlightened self-interest is the University of Chicago's leadership in one of the first complete urban renewal plans (1954) undertaken in the country – the 48-acre Hyde Park-Kenwood project, in a deteriorating residential neighborhood adjacent to the University (Dober 1963 [277]).

Lawrence A. Kimpton, president of the university at that time, is however quoted in the college newspaper for calling the development a strategy for “cutting down [the] number of Negroes” near the university” (Gamino 6 October 2014).² The African American population fell by 40 percent through the following decade (Gamino 6 October 2014). The blatantly racist agenda of urban renewal was not exclusive to Chicago and certainly did not go unnoticed.

Radical Resistance

This juridical privileging of academic institutions for morally reprehensible redevelopment purposes faced significant criticism from community members and students throughout the country, with activists focused on abuses of power including their practices of undemocratic control and domination over residents in the neighborhoods surrounding university campuses in the mid-century. Among many students, there was concern that they were not doing enough as members of elite student bodies to combat the racial injustices of their universities. Discontent grew as students from around the country banded together in the early 1960s behind the Port Huron Statement, the platform

² Per the Chicago Maroon article, David Greene, an executive vice president at the university, referred to contemporary real estate ventures in the Harper Court area “enlightened self-interest for us” (Gamino 6 October 2014). The university invested nearly \$100 million into the mixed-use development (Maidenberg 18 November, 2013).

of Students for a Democratic Society, a national organization part of the New Left. Their agenda called for universities to serve the broader, more equitable public interest.

We believe that the universities are an overlooked seat of influence. First, the university is located in a permanent position of social influence. Its educational function makes it indispensable and automatically makes it a crucial institution in the formation of social attitudes. Second, in an unbelievably complicated world, it is the central institution for organizing, evaluating, and transmitting knowledge. Third, the extent to which academic resources presently is used to buttress immoral social practice is revealed first, by the extent to which defense contracts make the universities engineers of the arms race. Too, the use of modern social science as a manipulative tool reveals itself in the "human relations" consultants to the modern corporation, who introduce trivial sops to give laborers feelings of "participation" or "belonging", while actually deluding them in order to further exploit their labor. And, of course, the use of motivational research is already infamous as a manipulative aspect of American politics. But these social uses of the universities' resources also demonstrate the unchangeable reliance by men of power on the men and storehouses of knowledge: this makes the university functionally tied to society in new ways, revealing new potentialities, new levers for change. Fourth, the university is the only mainstream institution that is open to participation by individuals of nearly any viewpoint ("Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society," 1962).

Peaceful student activism challenged state influence over the purposes of academic space and the ways universities should leverage their power over place; however, by the mid-1960s little progress was made in positively changing university operations. Speaking before a publicly assembled group of students at Berkeley, Mario Savio lambasted the University of California for its sustained corporate mission and new ban on political speech. In recognition of his own positionality as an undergraduate within the system, he elaborated that "if this is a firm, and if the Board of Regents are the Board of Directors, and if President Kerr in fact is the manager, then I tell you something – the faculty are a bunch of employees and we're the raw material." Not only would students question their participation in powerful and capitalist institutions, but would lead large scale occupations of major American universities by the late 1960s (Savio 1964).

At Columbia, the prestigious Ivy League university and second largest land owner in Manhattan, administrators proposed building a gymnasium on city park property located in the Morningside Heights neighborhood and acquired through a politically contested deal with Robert Moses. Predominantly affecting a diverse lower income population, the plan involved providing community access to athletic facilities through a rear facing basement door. With the proposed building project termed “gym crow,” African American residents felt they were second class citizens and came out in opposition to the university’s proposal, challenging the project as a racially motivated redevelopment scheme intended to assert Columbia’s superior right to urban space (Bradley 2009). Gymnasium construction began concurrent with a decade of eviction notices for tenants residing in university owned rental properties, bolstering community opposition and ultimately culminating in joint a joint resistance effort between residents and students. Writing to Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia, Mark Rudd, campus president of Students for a Democratic Society, promised in an open letter:

We begin by fighting you about your support of the war in Vietnam and American imperialism – IDA and the School of International Affairs. We will fight you about your control of black people in Morningside Heights, Harlem, and the campus itself. And we will fight you about the type of mis-education you are trying to channel us through (Avorn 1969).

Rudd further warns that this battle may become violent, and necessarily so “to end your power and your system.” The letter is the “opening shot in a war of liberation,” where administrators and faculty will see their campus taken over in a series of building occupations, ranging from generic academic halls to the president’s very own mahogany paneled office (Avorn 1969). Accelerating in 1968, higher education was “up against the wall,” forced globally to recognize its institutional power and privileged positionality.

Columbia protestors succeeded, albeit violently, in shutting down the gymnasium construction, but administrative reforms in the immediate aftermath of crisis were minimal.

Beyond the plush greens of Columbia, universities across the United States and world joined together in global solidarity to fight conservative governments and the capitalist economic system. Banks were bombed, factories occupied, and entire universities dismantled or restructured. In France, the socialist and communist parties unified to organize a countermovement against Charles de Gaulle and his party's *politique de grandeur*. During the planning stages of this legislative coup, left wing groups and students occupied a conference room in the administrative building of the Paris University at Natterre to discuss class conflict and collective action against education funding regimes controlled by the government. University officials alerted the police who promptly surrounded the building to force activists out. Following several months of continued conflict, the university was shut down. Twenty thousand students, teachers, and sympathetic residents marched in support of reopening Parisian universities, which now included the Sorbonne. As they approached the police, officers pugnaciously charged the protestors, drawing battle lines between the state and citizens. The wounded activists retreated to build barricades, all the while retaliating with thrown cobblestones and debris. Police returned fire with tear gas. On 13 May 1968, nearly one million people flooded the streets of Paris in response to the unrelenting police brutality against the university activists, and by late May ten million workers were on strike in solidarity. Charles de Gaulle, fearing revolution, fled for the country, leaving the government without leadership and activists without a target. Militarized police forces were

responsible for undermining activists during the suspension of government, and restored conservative order. Unexpectedly, the Gaullist party won resounding reelection to power in June 1968 (Sorbonne Occupation Committee 1968; Touraine 1971).

Seeking Political Stability

With university students at the forefront of revolutionary protest during the urban and imperial crisis; police, military, and world leaders sought quickly to stabilize their authority and coerce university faculty and students into subservience to the state. As demonstrated in France, brute, military force countered the collective unrest of ten million originally peaceful protestors, and universities were subsequently closed or restructured. Likewise, counterintelligence agencies in the United States engaged in covert missions to bomb and kill radical student activists (Rudd 2009) and by the early 1970s were occupying college campuses with state militia and police battalions. From Ohio to Mississippi and New Mexico, non-aggressive and constitutionally assembled students were publically injured or killed by the state. Students were shot at Kent State and National Guardsmen in Albuquerque stabbed eleven innocent students, leaving one hospitalized for two weeks. Public outcry fell in favor of the state, sympathizing that “students are not sufficiently mature to express political views through the usual channels” and that educators should not embolden anti-patriotism “at a university supported financially by GOOD Americans who don’t like what’s happening” on campuses across the nation (Horn 1981). Guardsmen could violate internal protocol and march through public property with unsheathed bayonets, but eighteen year olds were

out-of-place exercising their constitutional rights of freedom of speech or assembly on a public university campus (Horn 1981).

The immediacy of this physical violence should not diminish, however, the long-term transformations of higher education purposely enacted as mechanisms of social control. Marketization and hyper-corporatization of the American university were not passive strategies to make higher education more efficient or sustainable. Tuition, fees, and debt programs were deliberately expanded to discipline students and make the college experience a consumptive good. Enmeshed in Cold War McCarthyism, fears of radical university students permeated conversations within the highest levels of government. Unintentionally leaked correspondence between future Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell and President Richard M. Nixon suggest an interest in “political warfare.” Writing that “even within the free enterprise competitive system, legitimate advertising regularly includes elements of propaganda and psychological motivation,” Powell encouraged the president to retaliate against perceived “ideological war against western society” with an aggressive pro-business agenda (Shenfield 1970, Powell 1970). Vital to this conversation was a fear of campus activism and Nixon, having read Powell’s corresponding works presented to the American Chamber of Commerce and at the Southern Industrial Relations Conference, validated Powell’s sense of urgency against the “campus problems” in a letter dated 26 October, 1970.

I can see that we share many similar attitudes concerning the problems we are facing in America today. It was good to see you speak out in such a forthright manner. In view of your special concern for campus problems, I am taking the liberty if sending you two articles I know will be of interest to you (Nixon 1970).

The newspaper clippings articulated public angst against student activists and demanded universities prepare students for life in a free market business culture. A 1974 report, *Are*

Today's Schools Preparing Tomorrow's Business Leaders?, reiterated the demand for technically trained students with coursework not in the radicalized social sciences and humanities, but with instruction specifically in business. The report further encouraged university-corporation partnerships, thus introducing “business-oriented solutions” to higher education. Relying on global case studies, the report contrasted tuition free universities in Australia to student fee funded universities of Turkey. Having more thoroughly covered the latter, the authors convey an investment bias.

There is no justification from the viewpoint of either economic or social justice, for providing a university education to students free of charge. The university students are the ones who will benefit (through higher incomes) from their educations in later years. Moreover, the majority of university students come from the upper income groups; providing free, or practically free, education to them is equivalent to taxing the poor to subsidize the rich. It has already been seen that the absence of tuition, combined with price concessions, leads to students' taking an abnormally long time to get their degrees and to becoming, in a way, professional students.

In the State of California, Ronald Reagan campaigned for governor on a law and order platform of retaliation against student protests across the University of California, and upon taking office introduced tuition into the state system of higher education, thus terminating the nation's leading exemplar of university education as a public good. He continued his assault against education in the White House.

Tasked by the president's secretary of education to “present a report on the quality of education in American,” the National Commission on Excellence in Education warned “our nation is at risk.” I imagine to generate fear, the commission embellished a narrative of globalization and comparative decline. And to blame? *The average graduate*. The report concluded “the average citizen today is better educated and more knowledgeable than the average citizen a generation ago,” but insisted that “the average

graduate of our schools and colleges today is not as well-educated as the average graduate of 25 or 35 years ago.” A clear contrast drawn to question the effectiveness of education during the countercultural 1960s and 1970s, *A Nation at Risk* gave federal imperative for a nationwide reconsideration of higher education policy, and in doing so reinforced a neoliberal logic. It stated that “the traditional belief that paying for an education is an investment in ever-renewable human resources” is an “essential raw material needed to reform our educational system” (The National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983) The Spellings Commission Report (2006) built reflectively upon this belief.

Too many of our colleges and universities have not embraced opportunities to be entrepreneurial, from testing new methods of teaching and content delivery to meeting the increased demand for lifeline learning. For their part, state and federal policymakers have also failed to make supporting innovation a priority (Spellings 2006)

The pressures to corporatize universities and for students to perceive their educations via an investment mentality have; as evidenced by faculty debates in Pittsburgh over commercialized research and tenure, or the so-called innovated partnership between Starbucks and Arizona State University’s online school; have fundamentally restructured universities as economic actors, no longer operating exclusively within a legally dictated privilege over place, but emboldened by a neoliberal urban governmentality. Reiterations of institutional power are inseparable from place – manifest politically in place – and continually driving the renegotiation of relationships between local residents, students, and the state.



Figure 2. Construction at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Background Summary

Although medieval villagers are no longer rioting against students, and the government is not presently occupying a college campus with military force, contestation over campus and community space endures. Zoning ordinances restrict students from renting in upper-middle class neighborhoods and lower income residents are forced out of formerly working class neighborhoods (Hubbard 2008). Citizens angrily attend planning department charrettes, and students are excluded, lacking political respect as a temporary population. Law is mobilized to preserve bourgeois social and economic interest, and procedure is manipulated to undermine already marginalized voices. Economics envelop all, and the rhetoric of growth guides development. But accumulative logics are

nevertheless questioned (Harvey 2005). Notably, the exponential rise in student debt has not only contributed to the mental health crisis on college campuses, but has catalyzed a resistance effort to diminishing state education budgets and the converse rise in debt's discipline (Chatterton 2010). The Million Student March movement has forced a conversation on debt dependency at universities across the nation, and 2016 democratic primary candidate Bernie Sanders has made tuition-free public higher education a major policy issue on the political left. Universities are central to society, and integral to post-industrial economic prosperity; however, the political-economic frameworks through which they function and what privileges they exercise over communities are in constant flux. As observed, space is political, and power is negotiated, but historical narrative is not an adequate vehicle to understanding the principle social forces from which the academe derives its authority: the unique mechanics of university power in urban space are nevertheless gravely undertheorized. And because universities are now the predominant institutional stakeholders in a large percentage of American cities – and thrust to the center of both local and national debate – it is imperative that the details of their power be resolved in an effort to create a more just city.

CHAPTER THREE LITERATURE REVIEW

The Univer(s/c)ity is a Construction Site

Although historians have documented the long, and often tenuous relationship between town and gown, tracing back from oppressive Church sovereignty during the Middle Ages up through the anti-imperial student movement in the late-20th century, this literature review will analyze the theoretical development of a relatively new subfield in urban studies, the geographies of higher education, while situating such trends in the broader context of contemporary political-economic thought. I will first outline the university-generated urban development literature, emphasizing the role higher education institutions play in rejuvenating stagnant urban economies, before unravelling the second literature, critical perspectives on student influx to the university city. Each body of scholarship addresses one half of the economic model for markets; a knowledge supply made available by research publication and educational output, and demand for educational output represented by student migration into the city. A lack of integration between the two literatures informs the final section on neoliberalism and the knowledge economy, which in aggregate demonstrates space for an investigation into university agency in materializing economic ideology in the urban landscape.

Universities and Economic Development

The university is canonized in popular culture by the pastoral ideals of enlightenment era philosophy and stoic Catholic tradition, both pillars evidenced in art

and science, architecture and prose. John Henry Newman penned *The Idea of a University*, formalizing merger of scholarship and instruction within a liberal arts education. And romanticized verses describing Princeton grace the pages of F. Scott Fitzgerald's first novel, *This Side of Paradise*, as he recounts how "the night mist fell" upon the "Gothic peaks and all they symbolized as warehouses of dead ages" (Fitzgerald 1920). Elsewhere, grand libraries stand testament to the free exchange of ideas, permanent repositories for the multitudinous volumes of scholarship, and in Pittsburgh, the 41 story skyscraper towers above the community, illuminated by golden "victory" lights. In his elegant prose, British poet laureate John Masefield even proclaimed that "wherever a university stands, it stands and shines" (Masefield, 1946). But as has been described in the background section, university influence has grown steadily since inception in the United States, with a substantial boom during the post-war period as veterans came to campus flush with funding from the GI Bill and as the Department of Defense increased spending on areas studies and military technology research. It is also well documented within the economic impact literature that while institutions of higher education are beholden to the ebb and flow of micro- and macro-economic forces, universities are also measured to be effective institutional agents for remaking the productive capacities of a city and in anchoring regional economies (Gumprecht, 2009; Jean-Paul D. Addie, Roger Keil, & Kris Olds, 2015). Though, many institutions are marred by a legacy of urban renewal that has not entirely faded from the memories of city residents, this literature exhibits the various economic tactics – material and procedural – that universities have conceived to reposition their expansion as advantageous to the

community at large (Addie et al., 2015; O'Mara, 2012; Russo, van den Berg, and Lavanga, 2007; Hyatt, 2010).

Many scholars have deemed a historical geography of urban universities necessary to understand the regime-like control universities exerted over the city and the subsequent resolution of unjust development practices. Margaret O'Mara (2012) reiterates the renewal narrative by situating university land development schemes in the urban crisis of the 1960s, noting that while many universities were built in the monastic tradition on the outskirts of American cities during the late nineteenth century, residential growth and then industrial decline engulfed college campuses in a unwelcoming urban environment by the early 1950s that proved an impetus for institutionally led renewal. Universities had sunk too much capital in their urban campuses to simply close up shop and head to the suburban office park, yet the universities also had a labor force and clientele that were uninterested in what the city had become (Bradley 2009). As already recognized, these reactions served a racialized agenda, turning prejudice into practice and resulting in an explicitly racist *reconquest* of the city (Triece 2016). The University of Chicago's president described the renewal policies as a strategy of racial exclusion while his administration was in the process of demolishing the African American neighborhood, Hyde Park. Columbia University did the same in Morningside Heights (Bradley, 2009), as did the University of Pennsylvania in West Philadelphia, (Rodin, 2007) and Yale with New Haven (Lafer 2003). And if not documented well enough in historical record, Paul R. Mullins tracked the urban archeological record to reconstruct the material processes through which exclusionary logics of renewal were impressed upon residents of Color surrounding Indiana University-Purdue University (Mullins

2006). Institutional disdain for neighborhoods home to People of Color, coupled with federal programs designed to finance urban renewal projects produced a seismic-shift in urban demographics, de-diversifying the surrounding communities and enlarging zones of privilege (Flores 2012), that ultimately mired universities in an existential crisis (Hoover 1969). Nationwide protests attenuated ambitions for science centers and gymnasiums and defense research centers. Student groups and activists encouraged institutions to scale back projects and eventually abandon multi-block redevelopment plans (O'Mara 2012; Maurrasse 2001; Perry and Wiewel 2005). Universities nonetheless sought new ways to maintain their avaricious agendas (Davidson-Harden 2010). We now turn to this chief concern of the economic development literature.

While the brutalist movement is named for the exposed concrete, *béton brut*, that French architect Le Corbusier preferred, brutalism is more commonly known for the apparent brutality of the large, monolithic structures now an archetype of college campus architecture. Academic halls and were built to promote rationality, according to art historian Reyner Banham in his 1966 book, *The New Brutalism – Ethic or Aesthetic*. All decorative features, any kind of embellishment, were seen as superfluous and stripped away, leaving bare exteriors and exposing the structural elements of design (Banham 1966). The buildings were pure. However, the buildings also symbolize power. Another scholar explained, “The aesthetic principles of Mies’s [brutalist] architecture grow from rigid, calculated, rectangular systems based on the structural logic of steel and glass technology,” before emphasizing that the primary contribution of the movement was to meet “the growing demands of the American business world” (Curcic 1969). Brutalism stripped the art from architecture, minimized ornamental waste and in turn emphasized

economic efficiency. As university administrators turned to brutalism for novel campus plans during the 1950s, some saw the style as an opportunity to reinforce the monastic tradition in the modern era. Paul Rudolph, architect of the Art and Architect Building at



Figure 3. Ortega Hall, University of New Mexico

Yale, envisioned the first brutalist campus buildings as “educational buildings that were intended to be richly expressive citadels for high culture” (Lowder 18 October 2013, Rohan 2014). In symbolic harmony with the political practice of urban renewal, brutalism was often the aesthetic of choice for structures built on seized land, though an enduring material representation of liberal ideological order that remains long after the policies and practices of renewal have fallen from favor.

Corresponding to the immediate aftermath of student activism and the often violent clashes between students and police on campuses through the early 1970s, university architects further engaged brutalism as a military tactic, in addition to the fears

of geopolitical unrest. Tom Vanderbilt wrote in his book, *Survival City*, that during “the Cold War, all architecture was military architecture,” designed to withstand seize and even attempted destruction of total war (Vanderbilt 2010). Design took form against both the Soviets and citizens. *Exempli gratia*, the University of New Mexico commissioned W.C. Kruger and Associates – a firm best noted for designing the nuclear laboratories at Los Alamos – to plan the 1970s campus expansion and adopted the fortress-like design of pueblo cliff-houses. Construction began following a period of anti-war protest and vicious intervention to patrol student activism with the National Guard by order of President Ferrel Heady (Strasser 2015). While protesters were non-violent, a fact confirmed even by a University Regent, troops affixed bayonets and stabbed eleven students in total (Horn 1981 [66]). One student was badly wounded to the point of near death. Ortega Hall (figure 2) was finished one year later and the Humanities Building in four, both complete with concrete barricades, reinforcing militaristic power and administrative authority (Strasser 2015).

An alternative response evidenced elsewhere around the world was to restore order via the de-politicization university space, creating the façade of neutrality and anti-elitism through structural efficiency (Fernandez 2014). Near Frankfurt, Germany campus operations of Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, campus operations were consolidated during the 1990s at the IG Farben Complex, the former headquarters of a Nazi-era banking firm. The 1930 modernist building was converted into classroom space, replete with dropped ceilings and unadorned sheetrock walls, and in a place-naming controversy, was stripped of its nazi-era sobriquet. An act of erasure, students were expected to forget the genocidal legacy of Nazi regimes culturally embedded within the physical space of

campus (Belina Petzold Schardt and Schipper 2013). The goal, as with renaming and redesign efforts in the United States, is to move beyond the archaic – and unjust – meanings of old campus spaces, (Holden, 2017) often toward the economized, depoliticized university (Aiken, 1970; Chomsky, 27 May 2016).

The subsequent period of urban decline - in which increasingly fluid networks of capital reorganized the scales of production from core to periphery during the late 20th Century – further eroded the commercial integrity of American cities. Between 1973 and 1975, most industrialized nations saw widespread stagnation and high unemployment, an unprecedented crisis ending the post-War boom (Harvey 2005). Growth ceased. American manufacturing could not compete with increased production in the global South and East and as a result entire swaths of the urban grid were abandoned. Shuttered firms left large numbers of the remaining population without a source of income (Hackworth 2007). As the industrial base dissolved, so too did the influence of cities and it is within this thematic context that most economic development researchers have focused their studies on higher education. When all else failed, universities remained (Goddard, Coombes, Kempton, and Vallance 2014; Lafer 2003).

Universities, with their large endowments and tax-exempt status, mobilized surplus capital to acquire significant acreage, creating moats around their campuses as one political geographer described (Lafer 2003) about Yale, while others such as the University of Pennsylvania invested in science parks specifically designed to revitalize urban economies via research and design (Rodin 2007). Theorists speculated that technology could resurrect urban growth following the crisis of Fordism, and assumed that knowledge production, taken as inherently good, would justify urban expansion,

regardless of exclusionary results (Perry and Wiewel 2005). Simultaneously in Great Britain, economically motivated polytechnic and career-centric universities were designed to promote a more equitable access to education in a predominantly elitist system. A. H. Halsey's elaboration on academic policy reform and resulting "massification" of higher education provides context for understanding this transformation (A. H. Halsey 1982). He writes that the policy suggestions put forward by the Lord Robbins Report informed several decades of significant government investment in redbrick and polytechnic universities intent on building an educated labor force beyond the traditional gates of Cambridge and Oxford, with redevelopment intensifying during industrialization, in service to an emergent knowledge economy. The Report, (1963) itself, states that:

"We consider that among what are now Regional Colleges there will be found scope for some further elevation of institutions to the status of universities. These and our other recommendations this chapter should together give new impetus to the development of vocational higher education in Great Britain and, in particular, should remedy weakness in the natural and organization of technological education and research" (146).

Institutions were strategically expanded near deindustrializing communities with partnerships forged to train a high tech workforce (Glasson 2001). The rapidly globalizing economy and expanding high tech sectors certainly helped propel formerly contentious universities into prominent positions as anchor institutions (Benneworth, Charles, and Madanipour 2010; Goddard, Coombes, Kempton, and Vallance 2014), reinforced by the range of economic impact assessments revealing a causal relationship of universities to commercial and industrial growth around the world (Steinacker 2005; Mullin, Zeenat Kotval-K, and Jonathan Cooper 2012). It has been widely accepted, universities preserve growth within the metropolitan economy.

And as dependence of metropolitan economies has been recognized, universities have likewise sought more collaborative expansion schemes to avoid ethical transgressions characteristic of the renewal era and minimize political pushback by crafting mutually beneficial development plans (Wiewel and Knaap 2005). Frequently university construction projects and resulting employment opportunities are touted as a solution to inner-city poverty, (Maurrasse, 2001; Rodin, 2007; Mullin, Kotval-K, and Cooper, 2012); yet, plans still take form of disproportionate power relations. Researchers in Pittsburgh analyzed the complicated legal procedures through which city planners could circumvent neighborhood activists and accelerate post-renewal campus expansion into the residential neighborhoods surrounding the University of Pittsburgh (Deitrick and Soska, 2005). The solution to imbalance is corporate benevolence. Much like industrial firms reacting to labor unrest during the early 20th century, universities leverage their excess resources to provide services to the community. At Temple University, local high students living in neighborhoods affected by gentrification were promised scholarships to attend the institution (Hyatt 2010) and at the University of Pennsylvania, administrators required a certain percentage of construction and service contracts be signed with minority and female owned West Philadelphia companies (Strom 2005). Magnate schools and continuing education programs for community members are additional services common among large research universities, ranging from the University of Florida conservation clinic (Ankersen and Kibert 2005) to the downtown magnet school funded by the University of Tennessee in Chattanooga (Perry and Schaerer 2005).

Indeed, under the rhetoric of economic development compared to urban renewal, the politics of university-driven redevelopment evolved to promote community

engagement in the urban planning process (Zerland 1997; Baker-Minkel, Moody, and Kieser 2004). Russo, van den Berg and Lavanga (2007) further hypothesize "that the role of higher education to affect local development depends crucially on the ability to balance the multiple relationships established between the place in question and its stakeholders" (200). The active participation of local residents since the late 1980s is a marked change from the renewal era projects impressed upon residential neighborhoods during the midcentury, and stakeholder frameworks provide the most politically expedient model for campus expansion (Martin, Smith, and Phillips 2005), creating the perception of choice, as Judith Rodin remarked following her tenure as President at the University of Pennsylvania (Rodin 2007), overcoming the practices responsible for prompting mass protest during the 1960s. Transition towards collaboration is theorized as a paradigm shift from government to governance that helps institutions move beyond oppressive urban legacies (Martin, Smith, and Phillips 2005).

A 2007 New York Times article (Chan) nevertheless chronicles a public debate among elite universities over their role as partners with their communities. At the panel discussion, with college presidents discussing candidly their concerns over gentrification, yet counterbalancing hesitance with accolades for creative class (Florida 2003) ideals and the logics of market growth, there is a precarious relationship between the post-Fordist imperative for economic development and non-oppressive community relations. Volumes have been written describing university efforts to improve collaboration with community groups (Maurrasse 2001; Wiewel and Knaap 2005), some scholars taking equitable opportunities – although perhaps not equal outcomes – more seriously than others (Haar 2011; Perry et al., 2005; Rodin 2007). The culture of collaboration between university,

city, and community nevertheless masks socially unjust results of development practices where long-term residents are disenfranchised from the benefits of growth and see their right to the city eroded (Mitchell 2003). Gentrification continues, (Smith 2004, 2005; Sage, Smith, and Hubbard 2013; Hubbard 2009), and this temporal continuity in displacement between eras of urban renewal and stakeholder planning has yet to be evaluated in the academic literature.

“Studentification”

Scholars in the critical social sciences have long been concerned with the ethical ramifications of displacement in cities, whether the result of unmitigated market forces or a heavy-handed state (Stuttles 1968; Bourne 1981; Redfern 1996). Renewal projects did little to reduce poverty, merely concentrating lower-income individuals together (HUD 2014), and social welfare programs and market-based reforms offered little beyond a symptomatic treatment. Writing at the peak of urban crisis, David Harvey hypothesized that no matter the policy intervention, legal privileging of exchange value would always manifest in the satisfaction of economic demand, but not social need, and when applied to urban real estate, reaffirm rights to residency based exclusively on ability to remunerate market rates (Harvey 1974 [154]). Neil Smith argued after regenerative processes became evident a decade later, that “gentrification is part of a larger redevelopment process dedicated to the revitalization of the profit rate,” finding that market-based redevelopment and gentrification, in fact, produce spatial inequalities. As demand for space increased, the influx of affluent residents displaced working class

communities without opening channels of upward mobility, leaving unresolved structural inequity in a market economy (Smith 1982).

Interest in the residential dynamics of college towns has grown out the economic development literature and its inability to address social concern about rapidly expanding student populations in previously working class and minority group neighborhoods. This fast-paced economic and social transformation is what spurred sociologist Elizabeth L. Kenyon (1997) to conduct preliminary ethnographic research in Loughborough, UK, elucidating homeowner perceptions of neighborhood change in order to conceptually sketch physical, social, and economic neighborhood conversion in areas of growing student populations. Although she identified an important "spiral of anxiety" to abstract permanent resident perceptions, her work is credited more for establishing interest in studying spatial dimensions of student-driven urbanization processes. Paul Chatterton (2000), whose work marks the beginning of geographers' foray into the field, compared student populations, charting distinctions between traditional and non-traditional student lifestyles in Bristol drawn through the lens of class status. He noted that class dichotomy catalyzes the commercial production of a youthful environment marketed towards wealthy students near the elite Redbrick University, thus illustrating the roles both university and city space may play in teaching and reinforcing privileged student behavior. In so doing, the author speculates that comparable university cities "will be able to resist such diversification and remain ghettos for traditional students," therefore being a "gentrifying force" (132). In this early stage of observational literature, conceptual disclarity and under-theorization of neighborhood conversion underpin speculation into

future trends, an attempt at making sense of emerging residential landscapes in post-industrial British cities.

In a 2004 conference paper discussing student neighborhood formation, Darren P. Smith descriptively refined these urban transformations as "the processes by which existing private rented or 'single-family' owner-occupied housing is recommodified by property owners, investors and developers to provide student accommodation within Houses in Multiple Occupation" (2) that he terms studentification. This work merges Elizabeth Kenyon's exploratory ethnographic findings with Paul Chatterton's theoretical exposition, although Smith diverges from Chatterton, arguing studentification as distinguishable from gentrification. Positing gentrification as over-applied toward too many urban transformations, Smith (2005) asserts a need for sub-"itrifications" because, per his assessment, physical patterns of change and displacement are not analogous. His conceptualization relies upon separating student settlement from middle-class settlement patterns in urban space, while conceding that both students and typical gentrifiers exercise consumer sovereignty, defined first in 1936 by production output as a determinative function of consumer demand (Hutt 1940). It minimizes producer agency as purely reactionary. Ultimately, Joanna Sage, Darren Smith, and Philip Hubbard broaden this definition of studentification to encapsulate not only Houses in Multiple Occupation but all student occupied properties, including "purpose-built student housing" that result in "a reduction of owner-occupation," (see figure 3) but this does little to move the body of research beyond a descriptive nature and still only recognizes non-university affiliated developers (Sage, Smith, and Hubbard 2013).



Figure 4. Purpose-Built Student Housing, Albuquerque, NM

Through the early 2000s, student neighborhood studies were focused on defining transformation, an attempt to make sense of rapid change, and provide workable solutions for colleges and communities to mitigate emerging social concerns (Smith and Denholm 2006; Jayne, Holloway, and Valentine 2006). Towards the latter half of the decade, increasing numbers of scholars entered the field engaging wider theoretical dimensions with the conceptual growth of studentification. Smith and Holt (2007) situate studentification in the lifecourse stages theory of gentrification and Smith (2008) grounds the theoretical advancement in United Kingdom politics, citing examples of successful local resistance to increasing student populations. He argues that examples of community activism against students can reinvigorate resistance to comparatively unsuccessful gentrification protests. Phil Hubbard (2008) flips the conversation and alternatively suggests viewing student neighborhood formation through a social cohesion perspective

in which studentification "may be described as an outcome of processes of spatial marginalisation" (324). Upper-middle class residents, he observed, commandeered planning meetings to demand residential codes that prohibit rental to students. This reconsideration does not view students as culprits and residents as victims, but seeks to "look beyond discursive stereotypes of student occupation to explore how particular student spaces emerge from specific networks of heterogeneous association (involving, among others, students, the University, local authority planners, developers, landlords, and local residents" (324). In moving beyond previous dualist tendencies, we can see that the residents' "rhetoric suggesting that students do not belong in the town and should be restricted to campus" (333) has prompted local planning of exclusionary zoning and ordinance policies, thus restricting the politically unrepresented students (339) and causing them to believe the town is unwelcoming. He (2009) expands upon this exclusionary outlook with the suggestion that student residential growth entered the corporatized third wave stage of purpose-built housing in reaction to neighborhood exclusion. With this transition, Hubbard argues that "studenthood is now being effectively gentrified," (1904) consequently altering the previously dominant houses-in-multiple-occupation dynamic of studentification. Prompted by the emergence of purpose-built student housing, Paul Chatterton (2010) narrates this new evolution in the student city through a neoliberal paradigm, reiterating the commodification of student experience explained by Hubbard's gentrified studenthood, but elaborating on the economics of change, placing responsibility in the hands of financial institutions and the state. Chatterton credits "the availability of large sums of easy credit for students have

empowered the growth of the consumption-oriented student city" (511) which Sage, Smith, and Hubbard (2012) relate to economic reforms of the Thatcher administration.

From qualitative study and collection of resident narratives, the authors elucidate how privatization policy has legally enabled the most dramatic cases of lower-class marginalization during studentification processes, transforming formerly public rented-housing developments near Brighton universities from a community whose housing stock has shifted from being almost entirely owner-occupied to an estate owned by speculative investors. Graham Pickren (2012), who writes from an American context, argues a multifaceted responsibility of local government, developers, and student/parent consumers for the intentional displacement of working class, minority groups in Athens, Georgia. His work suggests that it is overly simplistic to singularly acknowledge either students or developers, and argues that a more complex politics of student-centric space is necessary. There is not, however, a significant examination of university agency in facilitating private student housing construction or consumption.

American geographers corroborate early British conclusions on physical form of student neighborhoods and resident perception of change (Powell 2014; Cunningham et al. 2009), nevertheless differ in explanations, due in part to variation in local planning procedures (Pickren 2012). Elsewhere, Spanish scholars have documented high-density, vertical studentification unique in Iberian cities (Garmendia, Coronado, and Urena 2012) while Venetian based research indicates globalizing influence of higher education on diversifying neighborhoods in transnational tourist communities (Russo and Sans 2009). What is evident, however, across all space is an increasingly capital driven culture in student geographies that stimulates spatially segregated residential areas along class

boundaries in university cities, establishing boundaries between traditional students and permanent residents. From this point, however, it is evident that the literature oscillates between similar socio-spatial themes of displacement and gentrification, yet overwhelmingly ignores a deeper theoretical conversation on university agency over student subjectivity in the city (Sage, Smith, and Hubbard 2012; 2013). We turn next to the political-economic ideologies that delineate the boundaries in which universities and students can exercise their agency.

Neoliberal Subjugation of Higher Education

Though oppressive development practices are substantiated in the historical record and contemporary theorists have posited both the advantages and drawbacks of university-dominated urban regimes, higher education is under attack in the public arena. In introducing contemporary dynamics of free-market economic ideology and a spatial fix, this section will situate neoliberal practices as a reaction to post-war middle-class power before then elaborating upon the consequential budgetary and administrative controls that shape human experience under current university decision making processes in the city. The section will anchor the overarching theoretical lens through which we come to understand the two preceding literatures and will frame analysis in my following research on university development projects.

Not long after the Association of American Professors ruled in favor of Dr. Ralph Turner and condemned corporate influence of higher education, the Western economic elite, defined as the top 0.1% of earners in France, Britain and the United States, saw a precipitous decline in share of national income (Task Force on Inequality and American

Democracy 2004). The Great Depression, then in its second decade, ascertained the inherent flaws of an unmitigated market economy, and impelled populist insurrection against bourgeoisie order. Leftist organizations in the United States pulled the nation towards socialism as the Roosevelt administration adopted Keynesian economic principles as part of the New Deal agenda (Leuchtenburg 2009) while the British Labour Party reformed unemployment insurance and then set minimum wages for mineworkers under the 1930 Coal Mines Act during their brief control of Parliament from 1929 to 1931 (Sheperd, Davis, and Wrigley 2012). The war effort and existential threat of Nazi conquest further intensified social democratic practices (Lohr 13 October 2008). Britain nationalized all railways (Simmons and Biddle 1998) and when Sewell Avery of Montgomery Ward refused instruction to settle a wartime strike, Roosevelt ordered the U.S. Army to seize management of the department store chain (Liparito 2012). Following allied victory, the United States immediately returned wartime industries including Montgomery Ward to private ownership; however, many large-scale social welfare programs and labor protections of the New Deal would last through the 1970s. Restrained capital accumulation and a more equitable redistribution of profits caused an unprecedented rise in middle-class prosperity at the expense of bourgeoisie power, but as Gérard Duménil and Dominique Lévy argue, was not without riposte (Duménil and Lévy 2013). Having grown quickly under the G.I. Bill and under newly minted protections on academic freedom, universities were among the first cohort of institutions under neoliberal assault.

Broadly speaking, lobbyists, senators, bureaucrats, and presidential cabinet members with deep ties to Wall Street demanded the needs of business be taken seriously

and viewed the university as an asset to their system of enterprise and ambition to restore class power (Harvey 2005). During the Cold War, influential members of the political right long admonished universities for promulgating communism in their gothic lecture halls and sought to reclaim the academy for commercial purposes. McCarthy's House Un-American Committee targeted leftwing professors even though universities were indeed positioned – at least institutionally – as engines of free-market capital, not only capable of filtering ideological discourse but also in the capacity of commoditized knowledge production (Harvard Crimson, 1967). Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, wrote of economic significance in 1960, stating:

The basic reality, for the university is the widespread recognition that new knowledge is the most important factor in economic and social growth. We are just now perceiving that the university's invisible product, knowledge, may be the most powerful single element in our culture, affecting the rise and fall of professions and even of social classes, of religions, and even of nations.” (Quoted in Newfield 2003 [118])

And recognizing the power of knowledge to decide the fate of civilization. In an address to the Southern Methodist University given during the autumn semester of 1961, William C. Sullivan, Assistant Director of the FBI, reiterated the burgeoning economic power as he made illusion to Milton Freidman, Economist of the Chicago School, promising that marketplace of thought should be “without any undue interference or control.” He nevertheless asked a few moments later for universities to redirect their attention towards silencing “the evil of communism,” referring to it as propagandic non-truth (Sullivan 1961) in hopes that the university would not operate against the interest of the existing State. Sullivan explained:

Its terminology is put to an excellent mythological purpose. It makes superb propaganda use of these fine old terms: Brotherhood, Peace, Prosperity, Humanity, Progress, Democracy, Justice, and Freedom. Beside these, the famous

revolutionary triad of an earlier age, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” appears anemic. Communism presents itself as a shining knight in armor moving courageously and relentlessly against the horrible dragons (Sullivan 1961).

Taken in light of these early statements, the university was understood by leaders to operate as a technology of power in the Foucauldian sense, a tool for the State to defensively indoctrinate students against collective ideologies and to combat the socialist compromises embedded in a Keynesian capitalist system (Foucault 1997). However, that is not to say that there was no resistance. Mario Savio, a student organizer during the Berkeley Free Speech Movement railed against Kerr in a speech given before fellow activists, arguing:

If this is a firm, and the Board of Regents are the Board of Directors, and if President Kerr in fact is the manager, then I tell you something – the faculty are a bunch of employees and we’re the raw material! (Savio 1964)

Elsewhere, students protested government involvement in Vietnam and the urban renewal practices prevalent in almost every major city with a university. As mentioned, Columbia University students marched in solidarity with Harlem residents who were unhappy with the construction of a campus gymnasium on a public park and University of New Mexico students protested the Vietnam War. Students were shot by government forces at Kent State and Jackson State, and in 1967 at Temple University, 4,000 students marched in spite of Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo ordering officers to “get their black asses” (Brandt 1 April 2014).

This insurrection of students – or subjects, or raw material – in the universities demonstrated a legitimate threat to existing law and order. In a 1970 memorandum sent to President Richard Nixon, Lewis Powell, then Virginia Secretary of Education and later Supreme Court Justice, warned that the United States was “losing the ideological contest”

and imbued the president to renew “political warfare” in the name of “freedom on this earth” (Powell 30 June 1970). Bereaved, Powell spoke of the multitude of leftist sympathizers in Students for a Democratic Society, and lamented their civil disobedience at the Southern Industrial Relations Conference on 15 July 1970 (Powell 15 July 1970). A year later and two months prior to his nomination to the Court, Powell resolved in a leaked speech from the National Chamber of Commerce that the organization “should consider establishing a staff of highly qualified scholars in the social sciences who do believe in the [free market] system” (Powell 23 August 1971). Corporate leaders echoed his sentiments. A 1974 report published by the Conference Board, a nonprofit business research organization, and circulated in the Powell Papers called for increasing the number of partnerships between business and educational institutions and for universities to adopt corporate governance structures (Duerr 1974). In a symbolic move that demarcates the beginnings of reinvigorated market practices in public education, Ronald Reagan ran his gubernatorial campaign in California on cleaning up “that mess in Berkeley” (Bady and Konczal 2012). The University of California was established in 1868 with the legislative mandate that “tuition shall be free to all residents of the state” (Vega 22 December 2014) and while Reagan was unsuccessful at requiring tuition counter to the charter, his administration succeeded in making the university administration charge fees for in-state students (Lindsey 27 December 1982).

The events in California higher education precede austerity measures taken against public welfare programs at the national scale; however, underpin the policy maneuvers following the 1970s recession and are emblematic of the larger project unmaking market reforms through the penultimate decade of the twentieth century

(Flores 2012). As Reagan ascended from the West Coast to Washington, so too did his ideology and his practices. And to this end, the United States government slashed the corporate tax rate, deregulated labor and industry, and cut social welfare programs. The British government did the same. In 1984, Margaret Thatcher and her government crushed union members on strike against coal mine closures, arresting many and charging in total 8,292 individuals with ambiguous charges including “breach of the peace” (Richardson 1995). By the end of the decade, the Tories privatized or sold nearly fifty national companies. Margaret Thatcher called the privatization scheme “one of the central means of reversing the corrosive and corrupting effects of socialism” (Osborne 8 April 2013). David Harvey moreover stresses that the laissez-faire State practices operate to liberate markets, the relationship articulating an ideology hereby referred to as neoliberalism that is “presumed to work as an appropriate guide – an ethic – for all human action” (Harvey 2005). Neoliberalism is, then, a return to the belief that the aggregation of competing self-interests will produce the greatest social good, contradictorily to evidenced material conditions. The Economic Policy Institute reports that:

Income inequality has risen in every state since the 1970s and in many states is up in the post–Great Recession era. In 24 states, the top 1 percent captured at least half of all income growth between 2009 and 2013, and in 15 of those states, the top 1 percent captured all income growth. In another 10 states, top 1 percent incomes grew in the double digits, while bottom 99 percent incomes fell. For the United States overall, the top 1 percent captured 85.1 percent of total income growth between 2009 and 2013. In 2013 the top 1 percent of families nationally made 25.3 times as much as the bottom 99 percent. (Sommeiller, Price, and Wazeter 16 June 2016)

All-in-all, austerity measures serve to reduce middle-class wealth and to restore ruling-class power, (Duménil and Lévy 2013) while the ideological premonitions of free-market

prosperity erase widespread doubt in the elaborate political project adopted under coercion from the ruling-class.

For American universities, business interests have almost always permeated the ivory tower in spite of campus radicalism and reactionary protections on academic freedom, and at present most university budgets, public and private, rely in some capacity on state and federal funding (Newfield 2003). Universities are, however, under increasing pressure from the State and private sector to assimilate operations in a hyper-commoditized model of knowledge production, exchange, and accumulation - moving far beyond the most optimistic dreams of Ronald Reagan or Margaret Thatcher (Newfield 2008). All extraneous functions are to be shed and auxiliary services privatized (Robin 28 October 2016; Payne 25 October 2016). Moreover, non-marketable departments, and entire colleges, are closing and merging under the logics of supply and demand, with the rate expected to triple according to a Moody's Investor Service report (Woodhouse 28 September 2015). The remainder of this literature review will chronicle the extent to which scholars have researched the various administrative reforms impressed upon universities with the purpose of identifying constraints placed upon on urban development agendas.

Public universities receive a sizable portion of their operating capital from appropriations decided by state legislatures, decidedly more austere Research universities, whether private or public, compete for increasingly scarce grants from federal organizations like the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Under proposed budgets from the alleged-President Trump administration,

NSF and NIH face significant cuts while NEA and NEH may be eliminated outright (Kaiser 29 March 2017; Naylor 16 March 2017). In Wisconsin, Governor Scott Walker and the republican-controlled legislature slashed funding for the University of Wisconsin system by \$250 million years and attempted to remove public service from the university mission (Hoover 16 March 2015; Kertscher 25 May 2016). The 2015 Budget in Brief demanded:

...the state's relationship with higher education must be thoughtfully reevaluated, enabling the University of Wisconsin System to meet the challenges of a dynamic academic universe and respond to market demand in numerous fields of endeavor in a transparent and accountable manner (Department of Administration 2015).

And the story is much the same in other states. Arizona slashed budgets, so too did Illinois and Pennsylvania (Barlow 23 July 2015; Ehrlich and Fu 23 March 2015), catalyzing micro-financial shock and forcing institutional reform, as many legislatures limited tuition increases or required tuition to be frozen in response to declining funds (Fedele 27 July, 2015; Miller 2 March 2017; McMullen 24 March 2017). Despite tuition controls, costs remain high and demand for a college education has increased steadily through and following the 2008 recession (Parker 6 March 2015). Student-held debt has, of course, become a politically-loaded issue and elected officials use the impending crisis as a major campaign issue (Crowley and Knoester 2012; Akers and Chingos 2014; Flannery 2015). Even the right-leaning Forbes Magazine published an opinion piece warning "that public higher education may fast becoming politicized" (Ehrlich and Fu 23 March 2015). The politicization of higher education, however, coerces the supposedly apolitical condition: *marketization* (Burstein 2 March 2015; Churchill 4 April 2011). As the Scott Walker budget dictated, the Wisconsin public university system must perform to market demands and as the Chronicle of Higher Education reports:

As neoliberal economic policies set everything from prisons to schools to compete in the market, and took away a heck of a lot of public funding in the process, universities had little choice but to rely more and more on corporate and individual donors (Essig 1 February 2011).

The journalist, Laurie Essig, goes on to note that growing dependence on corporate and individual donors weakens the institutional autonomy and increases the influence of moneyed interest in guiding administrative and academic decision making. One affluent donor tightened his purse strings because all incoming students at his alma mater were required to read a controversial text on Muslim-American experiences during the War on Terror and in closing, Essig cites the 1940 American Association of University Professors' 1940 statement on academic freedom (Essig 1 February 2011) – the document written in response to Chancellor Bowman's 1934 dismissal of Turner at the University of Pittsburgh (Peterson 2000).

Social scientists echo documentation by the popular press that declining federal funding in tandem with growing and corporate philanthropy has coerced universities into making structural reforms that reinforce marketable educational ideals through economically productive curriculum and research (Hohendahl and Raimondi 2012; Belina, Petzold, Schardt, and Schipper 2012). As university administrators likewise belabor responsible financial management in the wake of state budget cuts, the adopted rhetoric of efficient output coupled with a commodified education mobilizes mechanisms through which labor can disenfranchised or controlled (Radice 2013), often leading to subcontracting ancillary functions. Mass privatization of on-campus services, whether bookstores, dining halls, residential facilities, or physical plant operations, allows the university to outsource non-academic labor and effectively shed all responsibility of institutional, corporate welfare to people who are often hired out of nearby

neighborhoods (Hyatt 2010; Lafer 2003). Low wages and non-existent or minimal benefits packages are not the concern of university leaders, and ethical questions of social responsibility are instead directed at contracted firms that rely on part-time, non-union labor (Payne 25 October 2016; Robin 28 October 2016).

As for academic labor, longstanding trials of tenure rights have been further compounded by strategically increasing competition for faculty positions. Mark Purcell (2007) observes a significant reduction in available tenure-track jobs in traditional disciplines concurrent to a rise in part-time and non-tenure-track positions in American universities from 1975 to 2003 and equates it to the greater neoliberal project of the state. Hyper-competition among candidates disempowers the labor pool while reinforcing administrative authority (Iasevoli 2015; Bryson 2004). Existing tenure-track faculty are also disciplined through managerial expectations of increased output in high-ranking journals. This academic freedom is limited by the demands of marketable knowledge (Salmi and Altbach 2011; Fish 2009) and necessity of external funding (Dowling 2008). Finite federal dollars are hung in front of researchers who best propose to conduct the research desired by the state, disciplining faculty whose employment security is contingent upon bringing grant money into the university. For scholars in the social sciences and humanities, this can often result in pressure to conflate university-sanctioned work with community based activism in ways that may delimit collectivist principles (Greyser and Weiss 2012). Faculty autonomy is eroded throughout the academy.

The pressures of commodifying teaching and service outputs further regulate faculty behavior, requiring 24/7 email access, either by student, colleague, or administrator expectations, or through the proliferation of online education. With web

based teaching applications, no longer can faculty show up to lecture, talk, and leave for office hours. Grades are to be posted online, content made available, and assignment updates or discussion boards managed (Gill 2009). Customers (students) demand service and managers (administrators) enforce operations (Bansel and Davies 2005). Increased competition, tightening funding requirements, and managerial surveillance thus combine to reformulate faculty subjectivities and redefine the parameters of faculty membership within a market ethic. Morrissey (2013) theorizes this transformation through the lens of Foucauldian governmentality and subjugation.

Student positionalities within the university and in consequence urban space, have similarly been redefined, with the studentification literature illuminating a growing consumptive practice of students in real estate markets that replicates the material conditions and displacement patterns of gentrification. The explicitly neoliberal literature focuses, however, on student experience in a market economy. Descriptively, Alex Callinicos notes that due to the increasing costs of higher education, more students are forced to work longer hours to pay for school, often while still facing the burden of insurmountable debt and that this in turn motivates students to seek employment in fields that will allow for debt repayment (Callinicos 2008). A result of state policies, the university deliberately shapes student expectations about university education as preparation for entry into middle-class employment (Cheng 2015), thus the student as middle-class consumer "portrays students in the neoliberal institutions with a radically different identity than that of traditional conceptualizations of students in higher education" (Saunders 2010). No longer are students seeking knowledge as a public good. The so-called golden age of higher education (if it has ever existed beyond ideal) is

undone, and young adults are forged into human capital (Brown 2015). The consumerist governmentality, likewise, exacerbates competition between universities to attract customers (Stevens 2007). In sum, the process of subject-making in the neoliberal university is an ongoing project and has been a focus of scholars critical of neoliberal practice in education; yet there has been no interaction in this field with the spatial perspectives on university development and state power.

The Extent of Knowledge

Within disciplinary conversations among geographers, sociologists, anthropologists, and economists, the aforementioned privileging of university administrations within the city-scale; concurrent federal austerity; and resulting politics of remaking the build environment as a student space has become an exploratory inquiry over the past two decades. American research has unearthed the considerable impact institutions have on the global economy and spaces surrounding campus (Torres and Schugurensky 2002; Looser 2012; Davidson-Harden 2010) while critical geographic scholarship in the United Kingdom has elucidated the many ways neighborhoods are socially transforming and, per the popularized terminology, “studentifying” (Smith 2004). An emergent thread centering on the consumptive patterns of students in “college towns” has linked the student experience to debt's discipline of the middle-class, mirroring post-structural theorizations of neoliberalism in which all things, including the non-economic, undergo economization (Brown 2015). Public education, once a public good, is overthrown by debt dependence and high tuition upon through which the student is coerced to perceive education as an exchange-value investment (Chatterton 2010). Wendy Brown theorizes this reconstruction of the self as brought about by neoliberal

reasoning of governmentality that reformulates individual subjectivities, creating "homo economicus." The self, she argues, is remade entirely as human capital (Brown 2015).

Moreover, the *in loco parentis* expectation of university administrations places the responsibility of mediating the relationship between students and the city upon their institutional staff. Inherently political, universities are therefore positioned to discursively construct student identities enframing their institutional position within the city (Cheng 2015). So as students are drawn into neighborhoods near anchor institutions of higher education and expend great deals of credit on consumer goods and services during their years of study, universities are caught in tension between community and commerce and the demand to be "good neighbors" (Chatterton 2010; Perry and Wiewel 2005). This negotiative axiom between university and city endows university leadership a disparate level of authority, despite collaborative public planning and relations paradigms, that often manifests in uneven development. But scholarship is thus far limited.

It is true, geographers and social scientists have descriptively characterized the negotiations and public debate around proposed redevelopment projects, and theorists have unraveled evolving economic governmentalities with their associated shifts in student subjectivities; however, there has neither been research designed to interrogate the role universities actively play in effectuating commercial development potentially by a neoliberal ethic of student consumption in the city, nor has there been any significant attempt among critical scholars of political economy to disentangle the discursive motive power – or ideological assumptions – behind the increasingly potent productive capabilities of higher education institutions. Therefore knowing that universities are engines of economic growth and that students are agents of neighborhood

transformations, both processes widespread and ennobled by the state, we are left to resolve the relationship between ideology, power, and space. The theorists do not directly engage campus expansion or universities as anchor institutions as an economic development strategy. There is little talk of university innovation districts, technology parks, or live-work-play student communities as mechanisms of neoliberal subjugation. Therefore, as I seek to clarify university agency in the urban environment as a vehicle for capital accumulation, we must collapse these bodies of knowledge into one another, questioning how universities discursively situate students within the ideological imperative for institutional and urban growth.

CHAPTER FOUR RESEARCH DESIGN

Defining the Project from Command City to National Edge

Universities, under pressure from the state to finite resources, remain economically powerful and culturally significant institutions, understood as having a commanding voice in the community that is politically authorized to communicate myriad messages in society, whether celebrating scientific discovery or emboldening architectural progress in the city, yet universities are responsible for the perpetuation of social injustices, *de facto* segregation and displacement, and the reproduction of an hierarchical economic order. Our most enlightened institutions are now often most at fault. I therefore endeavor to resolve the aforestated gap in the academic literatures to resolve the under-theorized themes of university agency in urban space. Drawing upon three case studies of ostensible studentification – Columbia University in Manhattan, Temple University in Philadelphia, and the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque – my intervening research therefore seeks to resolve how academic institutions purposefully reprogram the cityscape for, in their appraisal, the public good. It also considers how university administrators leverage a specific idea of the student in their mission to legitimate desirous outcomes in collaborative urban planning processes, with each case representing a particular magnitude of scale; the global command city, the intermediate metropolitan, and the national fringe.

Research Question

How do the ways student identities are constructed by universities and elected leadership of a city frame or justify campus expansion and resulting gentrification processes; relatedly, what do these discursive maneuvers reveal about state expectations of contemporary subjectivity in a neoliberal economy.

Hypothesis

Aware that many argue state subjectivities have been remade in a neoliberal economic ethic, defining the value of individual beings exclusively by the worth of their human capital in the labor market, we should expect that university administrations enframe academic purpose and subsequent intuitional ambitions – campus construction of research facilities and increased student resources – in terms of a knowledge economy, ascribing exchange value metrics to all university operations. As such, the public good – a long held mission heralded by the academe – should be redefined with the same ideological assumptions. The free-market of ideas should anchor conversations on expansion.

Case Studies

Three case studies have been selected foremost, due to the long and often tenuous relationships between the universities and their host communities, in addition to contemporary, ongoing redevelopment efforts. All three – Columbia, Temple, and the University of New Mexico – are Research 1 institutions, per the Carnegie Classification system, and all three have large student populations over 30,000, including

undergraduates, graduate students, and professional students. Columbia, however, represents the most elite echelons of research universities. As a member of the Ivy League, Columbia is privately owned and manages a multi-billion dollar endowment, although operates as a non-profit corporation in the most economically powerful city in the United States. The university has produced Nobel Prize winning scholars and has cultivated alumni who have subsequently ascended into the highest ranks of government in the country and abroad. Temple, on the other hand, is a major public research university located in Philadelphia. Faculty are governed by a state-appointed and elected Board of Trustees and tuition is subsidized for in-state students. Most graduates are trained in professional programs, in compliance with an historic mission to serve working-class students as a vehicle for upward mobility into the middle-class. The University of New Mexico has a comparable governance structure to Temple, with operations managed by a state-appointed Board of Regents. But while not founded on the same principles as Temple, the University of New Mexico has since adopted economized language within the institutional mission during the past half-decade in hopes of becoming more competitive among American research universities. Each of these three cases represents a different category of urban research university: Columbia as the academy at the economic, political, and cultural forefront, Temple as an established university situated in a city transitioning from industry to education, and UNM as a public university aspiring to transform a long-stagnant urban economy in Albuquerque. The following paragraphs offer a brief introduction to each institution..

As a recurrent example of controversial urban development that often appears in the popular and academic press, Columbia University in the City of New York serves as

the first, and most comprehensive case for analysis, which can be attributed to its status as an elite university in a global command city. The Ivy League university was first established by royal charter in 1754, operated for a century as a teaching institution, and quickly adopted the Germanic research model of higher education in response to market interruption by Johns Hopkins University in the 1880s (Melhuish 2015). In the early twentieth century, McKim, Mead, and White designed the iconic Beaux-Art campus to house the growing university, creating a granite citadel for affluent faculty and students, facing inward and closed to the Harlem community of African American laborers, artists, and musicians. Midcentury aspirations to seize public land for construction of a student gymnasium crystalized dissent, becoming the archetype of racialized urban renewal (Bradley 2009). Hundreds of residents and student activists were arrested. The state came down with a heavy hand but the project never materialized and for three decades, sat a sleeping giant having spent its political capital on a failed project (Rudd 2009). In 2002, the Board of Trustees announced the hiring of Lee Bollinger, a Columbia Law School graduate and President of the University of Michigan, as President of Columbia. Before taking office, Bollinger toured Northern Manhattan and announced ambitions for a 17 acre campus in the semi-industrial and residential neighborhood a year later (Paul 2010). The first buildings are now open or under construction, programmed for business, medicine, and engineering, and are the result of contentious legal battles over eminent domain and compromise with resident organizations.

Just an hour south by train and home to nearly 450,000 college students, Philadelphia represents the intermediary city with a characteristic economy torn between industrial and intellectual, but universities are widely heralded as partners in an urban

renaissance (Florida 27 August, 2012). In comparative studies of higher education and the city, collaborative planning at the University of Pennsylvania counterbalances the strong-armed policies typical in New York City; however, campus neighborhoods in both cities have undergone dramatic transformations as the universities have grown in enrollment and physical magnitude (Rodin 2007). For this case study, I analyze overarching economic conditions in the metropolitan area before then looking specifically at Temple University, founded by a Protestant minister during the nineteenth century with a mission to serve working-class citizens in Philadelphia. The university now trains more students in professional programs than any other university in Pennsylvania and champions the economic opportunity of a college degree for residents in the city (SmithGroup JJR 2014). Nevertheless, Temple University anchors the fastest growing real estate market in Philadelphia, and with few policies in place to mitigate gentrification is driving the displacement of thousands of lower-income African American residents from North Philadelphia. Recent planning initiatives, notably for a new football stadium, have been interrupted by activists and plans have been put on hold (Orso 2016).

The final case study interrogates the institutional maneuvers of a university through the preliminary stages of gentrification, preceding significant increases in property values in the surrounding neighborhoods, and does so far from the dense networks of capital investment between the coastal cities. On this national fringe, the University of New Mexico is attempting to construct a seven acre “innovation campus.” Elected officials in Albuquerque have closely aligned the city master plan with university ambitions and together are remaking the primary commercial corridor that links the

historic campus to the central business district. A rapid transit system is under construction, causing as much as a 30 percent decrease in revenues for existing businesses, while the university is building a six story, mixed-use facility on the seven acre site. Thus a quintessential example of the creative destruction paradigm in economic growth that frequently precedes unequal development, resistance has focused singularly on short-term decline, allowing university officials to promote their agenda with much fanfare (Hornbeck and Keniston 2014).

Data Sources

The data collected provides a range of content in multiple formats, digital and print, representing various purposes, from photographs to maps, marketing copy, official statements, and planning documents. On web pages this includes activist blog posts and promotional sites published by universities or university-contracted firms. There are also user-uploaded videos of protests and planning meetings on YouTube. Non-university sources enliven contextual discussions and provide additional insight into the social repercussions of growth, whether political demonstrations or lawsuits charged against the institutions, which would not necessarily be advantageous for a university to publicize. Moreover, government documents and planning reports can corroborate university ambitions and demonstrate coordination between the city and university. Specific types of documents are listed below:

University Documents

1. Student Affairs/Community Service Offices - Freshman orientation community service schedules, experiential learning programs, dormitory construction plans.

2. Community Engagement Departments - mission statements, policies, proposals.
3. Government/Public Relations Departments - mission statements, policies, proposals.
4. Economic Development Departments - mission statements, policies, proposals.
5. University Planning Departments - Comprehensive/Master Plans, development proposals.
6. Admissions Offices - marketing material.
7. Marketing Offices - UNI social media accounts, how are development programs described and where do students fit within these conversations.
8. President's Offices - public statements, speeches, and open-editorials.

City Documents

1. City Planning Documents - Comprehensive/Master Plans.
2. Mayor's Offices - tweets, public statements, etc.
3. Court cases between universities and community organizations.

Community

1. Neighborhood groups - public statements, event advertisements, meeting minutes.

News Media

1. City Newspapers – coverage of university operations.
2. Student Papers – coverage of redevelopment and administrative affairs.
3. University Faculty/Staff Newspapers - stories about university development/policy plans.

Primary source information is collected, generally, from university and newspaper archives as well as online city government repositories and cover the date ranges of the significant redevelopment projects. Source material is also drawn from websites specifically developed for the university development projects. Archive and website information is listed below:

Columbia University (2002-2017)

1. Columbia: Manhattanville
<http://manhattanville.columbia.edu/>
2. Columbia Spectator Archive

- <http://spectatorarchive.library.columbia.edu/>*
3. New York Times Article Archive
<http://www.nytimes.com/ref/membercenter/nytarchive.html>
 4. New York City Department of Records
<http://www.nyc.gov/html/records/html/archives/archives.shtml>

Temple University (2000-2017)

1. Temple News Archive
<http://www.nyc.gov/html/records/html/archives/archives.shtml>
2. Daily Pennsylvania Archive
<http://dparchives.library.upenn.edu/>
3. Philadelphia Inquirer Archives
<http://www.philly.com/philly/archives/>
4. City of Philadelphia Department of Records
http://www.phila.gov/records/archives/Philly_History.html

University of New Mexico (2012-2017)

1. Innovate ABQ
<http://www.innovateabq.com/>
2. Daily Lobo Archive
<http://www.dailylobo.com/page/archives>
3. UNM Newsroom Archive
<http://news.unm.edu/categories/archive>
4. Center for Southwest Research and Special Collections
<https://elibrary.unm.edu/cswr/>
5. City of Albuquerque: Department of Planning
<http://www.cabq.gov/planning>
6. City of Albuquerque: City Clerk, public records
<https://www.cabq.gov/clerk/public-records>

Analytical Method

It is necessary to remember that power is central to the question of how universities claim space and communicate a right to the city as suggested in the literature review of neoliberalizing higher education. As such intangible, disentangling the operations of power is a discursive project intended to glean the subtle messages that reveal ideological assumptions within the archives. Interpretation of planning documents

and public speeches contrasted to institutional practice affords insight into assertions of in/out of place, diversity, inclusion versus exclusion, and the capabilities of knowledge to solve emergent social, political, and economic issues. This method can thus suggest rhetorical incongruity with broader, humanistic ideals that hold higher education transcending political economy. Pursuant to this epistemological understanding, the project is informed by a post-structural concept of power and ideology; however, is developed as an historical-narratological project drawing upon actual policies and practices of university, city, and community actors as documented in the aforesaid legal texts, public planning and government materials, public statements, and newspaper documentation of developments.

I employ an historical-geographic material method of analysis per the established practice of Marxist geographers such as David Harvey and Neil Smith to evaluate the qualitative data from each of three institutional case studies, each being particularly emblematic of university-generated gentrifying processes at three distinct urban and institutional scales (Harvey 1973; 1996; Smith 1982). It is crucial to unravel themes of power and domination from the language universities use in their urban development plans and communications, but also in how the universities communicate these gentrifying missions to students (Foucault 1997). University-student interface has not yet been critically studied in context of urban expansion campaigns and discourse analysis allows for this question of student positionality and subjectivity to be resolved. The research results are organized by each case study; however, woven together in a national narrative, drawing a generalized conclusion on the extractive remaking of the city and

arguing that the critical studies on higher education require we take seriously urban development as the exercise of university agency and a spatial practice of power.

CHAPTER FIVE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

For the Advancement of the Public Good

The Quintessential Great Urban University

With the Greco-Roman colonnade of Low Memorial Library towering over Harlem, Columbia University has come to embody more than any other academic institution the contradictory urban politics of intensifying economic and racial, a pattern that has continued into our current neoliberal epoch. It is a university caught between the demands of urban growth and academic competition, the global economy and neighborhood activism, as well as a haunting past of failed campus expansion. As suggested by the seemingly infinite string of scandals and administrative missteps, administrators at Columbia have navigated their position with an unsatisfactory political aptitude and have learned very little from the events of 1968; however, expert their Ivy League educations may prove. Whether leveraging the neo-renewal tactics of eminent domain to secure entire city blocks or lobbying officials on the Planning Commission to rezone Manhattan's semi-industrial periphery in an effort to build a new campus, the will of neighborhood residents has been reduced to mere burden against institutional progress. Campus administrators assault principles of democratized planning in their pursuit of power and prestige, all the while touting the universal value of enlightenment knowledge and having inscribed in gold and granite the promise for "the Advancement of the Public Good" on the library architrave (Ballon 2003).

Administrators have long given up on expansion into Morningside Heights as an affront to the liberal ideals of a university; however, administrators now claim that the success of Columbia rests in a Manhattanville campus, under construction with the first buildings opened in 2016. Affluent donors have gifted several hundred million dollars to construct a new business school, an engineering and applied science building, a neurological research center, and a performing arts complex (Manhattanville Press Release, 2016). Moreover, the architectural renderings, proposed programming of the spaces, and public negotiations that have moved redevelopment forward demonstrate future patterns of economic production remarkably well and expose just how institutional and community actors have come to renegotiate rights to the city under the logics of a post-industrial economy. The project area, colloquially known as West Harlem, is institutionally defined as Manhattanville and governed locally by Community Board Nine. University ownership encompasses 17 acres between 110 to 155th Streets and was rezoned specifically for campus expansion; however, has historically - up until intervention by Columbia – operated under light-industrial and lower-income residential guidelines, producing value for landowners and providing sustainable wages the many tenants living in fixed-rent accommodations. According to a local activist publication, as of 1991, when the community began their independent planning process, there were nearly 1,600 jobs in retail and manufacturing. Many establishments, including a cluster of automotive service stations were immigrant or minority owned and the 2000 census documented that of the approximately 40,000 residents, 52 percent were Hispanic or Latino, 32 percent African American, and only 10 percent White (Baldwin 15 August 2008). Activists made headlines for organizing against what residents considered legal

conquest while the university enfram'd expansion as universally beneficial for the public (Williams 2006).

Utilizing the array of available planning documents, legal contracts, press releases, promotional media, newspaper reports, and activist blog posts to reassemble competing dialogs, this chapter seeks to explain precisely how university officials brought the new master plan to bare in brick and steel, seizing the land through eminent domain in spite of historic protests and renewed resistance by a coalition of activists. Ultimately, I portend that the university's positioning of students as deserved beings - occupying a privileged mantle within a conceptualization of the emergent knowledge economy ideology - thus legitimates a university-centric right to the city and associated rights to reprogram the productive capacities of urban space. These discursive conditions further suggest that disproportionate university power over place is deeper than a reactionary symptom of neoliberal capital, and that universities intentionally leverage their authority to open real estate markets and create the very patterns of extractive accumulation that result in residential displacement.

Town and Gown Relations

As evidenced by the historically close relationship between administrators and mayor's office, Columbia University and the New York City government enjoy a collaborative relationship, in-step with one another through the spatio-temporal fluctuations of capital from urban crisis to present (Bloomberg, 20 May 2009; Anderson, 25 April 2013); however, the association between Columbia and Harlem, the adjacent neighborhood, is far more tenuous, problematized by coexistent yet contrasting scales of

economy (Bradley, 2009). Of meager commercial value compared to the Financial District or Midtown, Harlem is arguably the cultural capital of New York known for its rich, African American heritage and immigrant tradition. When countless White artists were fleeing the states to Paris to write their restless novels and poems about growing up in a lost generation, internationally acclaimed jazz artists – Duke Ellington and Lena Horne – performed pioneering music at the Cotton Club and poets – Langston Hughes and Zora Neale Hurston hauntingly chronicled that they, too, were America and should not be treated like second-class citizens based on the color of their skin (Wintz, 2000; 2006). But Columbia administrators have long dismissed the concerns of their neighbors, alternatively choosing to turn a deaf ear towards existing residents’ claim to urban space whilst relegating the people of Harlem and their stories of the Harlem Renaissance to the sanitized shelves of an academic library. University practice indicates that scholarship is a greater public service than respecting the people and places responsible for the nation’s finest works of art.

The crisis between academe and community first derived from divergent fortunes during the mid-century, as previously mentioned in the background section. Affluent residents had abandoned the once prestigious Morningside Heights neighborhood in favor of greener pastures in Long Island and the Hudson River Valley, leaving property values – in which Columbia was heavily invested – to plummet, thus diminishing the already feeble endowment (Avorn and Friedman 1968 [14]). The university nevertheless retained a good deal of political clout and administrators turned towards urban renewal policies to reinvigorate markets for their investment portfolio. In the late 1950s, President Grayson Kirk approached Robert Moses, then New York City Parks Commissioner and Columbia

doctoral graduate, to purchase 2.1 acres of public land in Morningside Park, a once magnificent greenspace designed by Fredrick Law Olmstead, for the construction of a modern university gymnasium. Following nearly a decade of negotiations, Columbia broke ground on the site, ushering in a wave of protests that would ultimately rebuff any further development in the park (Bradley 2009 [44]; Avorn and Friedman 1968 [18]).

Initial demonstrations challenged the desecration of Olmstead's original design, but racial inequity, whether symbolic or systemic, provoked the greatest vitriol amongst residents and students. The problem was, quite frankly, that the gymnasium segregated people into a *de facto* racial order. Plans for the gymnasium included two entrances, one downslope opening into the basement and the other facing campus; the former reserved exclusively for neighborhood residents, predominantly People of Color, who would only be granted access to 12 percent of the facilities. In what was termed "gym" row, lower income African Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Asian Immigrants, were effectively marginalized so Columbia could better compete with Harvard and Princeton, then rapidly expanding their campus infrastructure, by enhancing opportunities for privileged, predominantly White, university students (Avorn and Friedman, 1968 [13]).

Hundreds of residents took to the streets in protest and several undergraduate groups joined in solidarity. On February 20, 1968, the day after groundbreaking, twenty people staged a sit-in. Six residents and six students were arrested. Subsequent protests were organized, antagonizing administrators, who, at the start of the academic year, banned all demonstrations from within university buildings. During a university-wide memorial for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Mark Rudd, recently elected president of Students for a Democratic Society chapter at Columbia, defiantly rose from his seat in St.

Paul's Chapel and walked toward the pulpit, positioning himself in front Vice President

David B. Truman. In a book documenting the tumultuous year, student authors observed:

Truman stopped; the microphone went dead.

"Dr, Truman and President Kirk are committing a moral outrage against the memory of Dr. King," Rudd said quietly, leaning over the lectern. How, he demanded, can the leaders of the University eulogize a man who died while trying to unionize sanitation workers when they have, for years, fought the unionization of the University's own [B]lack and Puerto Rican workers? How can these administrators praise a man who fought for human dignity when they have stolen land from the people of Harlem? And how, Rudd asked, can Columbia laud a man who preached non-violent disobedience when it is disciplining its own students for peaceful protests? "Dr. Truman and President Kirk are committing a moral outrage against the memory of Dr. King." Rudd repeated. "We will therefore protest this obscenity." (Avorn and Friedman, 1968 [28])

Upon concluding his remarks, Rudd exited the church and was followed by forty additional students. Dr. Truman resumed his eulogy as if there had been no interruption (28).

Students for a Democratic Society emerged a major force in campus activism that spring and was one of two principal student organizations responsible for the tense student-administrator relationship. Counter to President Kirk's insipid claims that students were haphazardly rebelling, the organization's nearly 26,000 word manifesto, grounded much of Rudd's ideological diatribe in a well-articulated series of wide-reaching policy recommendations, from disarmament to participatory democracy, educational reform, and civil disobedience. The Port Huron Statement specified:

As a social system we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation. (PHS, 1963)

To which President Kirk, when coupled with Rudd and the other activist's actions, condescendingly reiterated:

Our young people, in disturbing numbers, appear to reject all forms of authority, from whatever source derived, and they have taken refuge in a turbulent and inchoate nihilism whose sole objectives are destruction. (Avorn and Friedman 1968 [20, 25])

Thus evidenced left wing students and conservative administrators talking past one another with rhetoric heightened per rising emotions, Rudd reminded President Kirk in an open letter dated April 22, 1968 that while “you call for order and respect for authority; we call for justice, freedom, and socialism,” before issuing the crass threat:

It may sound nihilistic to you, since it is the opening shot in a war of liberation. I'll use the words of LeRoi Jones, whom I'm sure you don't like a whole lot: “Up against the wall, motherfucker, this is a stick-up.” (Avorn and Friedman, 1968 [25])

A day later, students marched on Morningside Park to reclaim the construction site; and students organized sit-ins of 700 began in Hamilton Hall, the main classroom building. Harry Coleman, acting dean of Columbia College, was taken hostage; plunging the university into what many on around the nation considered a downward spiral [299]. Students held classroom buildings for eight days, and took the president's office on the second day but infighting between different student factions and residents of the nearby neighborhoods limited the power of the resistance. Following failed negotiations and ad-hoc faculty meetings, New York City police forces evicted demonstrators from campus. Over 700 people were arrested and nearly 150 injured. Three weeks later, activists took control of another university-owned building and reoccupied Hamilton Hall, leading to more arrests and the suspension of 66 students. On June 4th, the university held its 214th commencement. Several hundred graduates arranged a counter-ceremony on Low Plaza

and by summer's end, President Kirk announced a premature retirement (Avorn and Friedman, 1968 [300-301]).

Columbia, battered and wholly distrusted by many students and most neighboring residents, was ultimately unable to move forward with ambitions to take ownership of the public park and complete the Morningside Gymnasium. Activists succeeded. The elite, liberal university was prevented from mobilizing markets and the state to enable their further subjugation of lower-income subjects, chiefly People of Color, Immigrants, and the White working class. Nevertheless, neither student activists nor the university perceived the events of 1968 as a victory. No great socialist revolution swept across the county. Accumulative surplus was merely delayed and gentrification stalled. And as such, alongside nationwide civil disobedience and resistance in the civil rights movement, New York City – in terms of economic wealth – deteriorated. Forestalled campus expansion weakened long-term competition with peer-institutions weakened and the university fell in international rankings. In tandem, the endowment dried up as funds remained in a poorly performing local real estate market and especially as alumni and alumnae lost faith in their alma mater and ceased to replenish investment capital via their donations (Perry and Wiewel 2005; Marcuse and Potter 2005 [50-51]).

Administrators, henceforth anchored in place, were left with no choice but to renovate existing buildings on the Morningside campus while watching for three decades as Yale acquired significant acreage in New Haven for business incubator districts and science centers; the University of Pennsylvania bought out West Philadelphia; and Princeton expanded into the once pastoral farmland of suburban New Jersey. A bitter resentment grew from the specter of “gym” crow looming over Columbia; but by the late

1990s, New York City's so-called renaissance renewed Trustee interest in building a larger campus. Perhaps bolstered by Giuliani justice, the university leadership began purchasing properties in West Harlem and sought administrators who, with political clout and economic gravitas, may overcome the near certain community resistance. In 2003, Lee C. Bollinger, Columbia law alumnus and distinguished president at the University of Michigan, was hired to bring their vision to fruition (SAGE Activist Guide 2010; Ouimette 5 May 2016).

Place and Power

Deriving power immediately from the privately chartered Board of Trustees, the university president is the authorized proxy who, as dictated by official statute, "shall have general charge of the affairs of the university." The president, by definition, administrates on behalf of board interests; presiding over faculty senate and each administrative board, administers discipline, and advises on "the condition and needs of the University" (Charters and Statutes, 13; Columbia University 2007). Or put simply as former president Kirk once quipped, "There is no part of this University that is immune from the central authority" (Avorn and Friedman, 1968 [25]). With all reaches of the institution moderated by the president as dictated by Columbia charters and statutes, institutional power is nevertheless influenced via informal channels of control, heavily prejudiced by the composition of board members and their individual agendas, and, as such, is worth consideration. At present, the 24 member board is made up entirely by Columbia graduates, some with additional degrees conferred at peer institutions. Of those

with outside degrees, the most frequently occurring institution is Harvard and eleven board members attended Ivy League universities, exclusively. Fifteen held or still hold jobs in finance; six founded commercial enterprises; five have served as Chief Executive Officers, yet only four have ever worked in a charitable organization. Two members have worked in medicine and two more as federal judges. Only one trustee holds a doctoral degree. (Columbia 2016).

The Board of Trustees is comprised of high achieving, economically successful individuals who have a vested interest in reaffirming the prestige of Columbia as a liberal institution in the heart of North America's preeminent commercial city. Three, including the current president, Lee Bollinger, were enrolled when Columbia and its capitalist mission were under attack during the 1968 protest and ten more Board Members graduated in the following decade. Acknowledging the apparition of tattered Ivy League prestige, Trustees hired Bollinger for the purpose improving university rank; and indeed, he immediately took to enlarging Columbia's footprint both in the city and in the world as a means to that end. According to the New York Times, Bollinger surveyed Manhattanville prior to taking office and was admittedly aware "that securing capital and space for Columbia's advancement would be a critical first step in his presidency" (McDonald 25 April 2012; Ouimette 5 May 2016).

When speaking at length during his installation as the 21st president of Columbia University in the City of New York, Bollinger recounted the university's long and influential history, celebrating Nobel Prize winning scientists; listing Presidents and Supreme Court justices and Secretaries of State among other illustrious alumni; and quoting famed men of Western antiquity – Pericles, to whom he credits the university as

ideologically indebted. When, however, previewing the achievements of his two immediate predecessors, Bollinger précised the 1960's and 70's as "a vexed and difficult time" that forestalled "particularly harsh consequences for Columbia and New York City" (Bollinger 3 October 2002). He took the allusion as an opportunity to forewarn adversaries of his administration, implying any resistance as Machiavellian self-interest:

For its part, when society invites our participation, it must be careful to resist the impulse it feels at times to crush that fragile intellectual spirit, for in any unrestrained battle, as Machiavelli said years ago, the state will win (Bollinger 3 October 2002).

Thus inverting the power dynamic between Columbia and Morningside Heights manifest during the late 1960s student movement, this subtle maneuver more accurately represents the cunning ambition of administrators and their will to reprogram urban space for the university. Bollinger echoed these remarks in later statements to the press, lamenting to the *Daily Spectator* that "the way it played out had a more harmful effect on the institution than at any other university in the country." He repeated, "Columbia was really, really hurt by what happened in that period of time" (Ouimette 5 May 2016). Michael McDonald, a *New York Times* reporter, also observed, "the president is soft spoken and polite yet resolute about reestablishing the stature the university had before student protests in 1968" (McDonald 25 April 2012).

Bollinger's inaugural invocation is likewise riddled throughout per recurrent allusions to a Manhattan Manifest Destiny, reiterating mid-century aspirations and often at the expense of contradiction. He demanded preeminently that the university "must be guided by a comprehensive vision" for its "real needs," defined as advanced scholarship in the emergently important fields of life sciences, globalization, and the arts, thus

necessitating Columbia to “expand significantly over the next decade;” Morningside, West Harlem, and Washington Heights all considered (Bollinger 3 October 2002). “Real needs” discursively normalizes university scholarship as legitimate and preemptively undermines activist critiques of social injustice from gentrification as superfluous. All-the-while, Bollinger exclaimed that “the University benefits enormously by living amidst such creative and resilient communities,” reveling in Columbia’s remarkable integration “into the fabric of the neighborhoods,” in the course of his remarks tactically omitting the inevitable market stimulus that campus expansion would magnetize, remaking the socio-economic fabric of the surrounding areas that are so laudable. (Bollinger 3 October 2002). The president argues that the neighborhood culture is richly beneficial to Columbia, an asset to the Ivy League experience, and that university must lay claim to effectuate its intellectual authority in ameliorating educational conditions for students and scholars. Shortly thereafter, President Bollinger wrote in a Wall Street Journal op-ed honoring the institution’s 250th anniversary that the university “has been intertwined with the fortunes of the city,” and ensnared the logics of a globalized command city as inseparable from the localized function of higher education (Bollinger 15 October 2003). Bollinger relates urban and national *progress* to Columbia:

Everything from the sewers (Charles Fredrick Chandler), to the 12-avenue, 155-street grid system (Gouverneur Morris), to the subway (William Barclay Parsons), to the parks and highways (Robert Moses), to the public school system (De Witt Clinton), to Broadway (Roger and Hammerstein), to Wall Street (Warren Buffet), to the Yankees (Lou Gehrig), to the mayor’s office (one-seventh have been Columbians) – every facet of the city has been created and shaped by Columbia faculty or graduates. And the same is true of the country: the drafting of the Declaration of Independence (Robert R. Livingston) and the Constitution (Gouverneur Morris); the authoring of the Federalist Papers (Alexander Hamilton and John Jay); the office of the president (both Roosevelts and Eisenhower) and the Supreme Court (nine justices, the most recent being Ruth Bader Ginsburg) – and so on (Bollinger 15 October 2003).

Thus demonstrating the productive capacity of his university through the burgeoning material conditions that the institution has produced, Bollinger's maneuver attempts to create an ideological impetus for university power in the highly competitive economic core. The merger of informal power derived from ideology and formal power as ascribed by law ennobles campus expansion in the subsequent decade. In the following sections, we will come to see how this negotiative discourse on economic development unfolds as mediated by the law, observing a tactical framing of public beneficence via university accumulation.

Defining an Institutional Right to the City

Whilst promotional literature for the Manhattanville campus would suggest that the new construction is in the shared interest of Columbia and the community, with monthly newsletters titled *Growing Together* and containing quotes celebrating the “open, accessible” campus, administrators have, however, shrouded the campus planning process in secrecy, holding closed-doors meetings in Low Memorial Library and releasing few public statements during the initial design stage (Press Release 24 October 2016; *Growing Together* 2017). Instead, President Bollinger and his executive leadership would retreat again into legal practice to bring their vision to bare. One unnamed Columbia official said of Bollinger in a 2010 *Politico* article, “he is a visionary with bad practice (Shapiro 6 February 2012). Through the early 2000s, his administration manipulated city governance structures to privilege the university in planning procedures, in-turn repeating the same heavy-handed strategies of the Kirk administration that still

haunt the institutional history and, because neighborhood residents were not welcomed into initial conversations, provided again a discursive void that would be filled by activists. In 2003, the *Coalition to Preserve Community* was organized and only after a decade of resistance would Columbia develop a succinct message and comprehensive public engagement strategy. I endeavor in this section to piece together the early political-economic framework that guided the institutional pursuit of growth while contrasting that university plan against a counter-vision developed within local processes of neighborhood planning. Subsequently, I will disentangle the ideological assumptions embedded in each proposal before then resolving how each constitutes a distinct right to belonging. The arguments ultimately lay ground for legal conciliation and codification of the knowledge economy in urban space.

Since initial framing of the Manhattanville project was sparse, early evidence is either inarticulate or lacking detail. Moreover, later sources retroactively clarify the timeline of development, evidence I will use discriminately – official histories are meticulously crafted narratological technologies of power - in reconstructing the discursive logics emboldening expansion (Behrent 2013). The university plan, which for the first four years of public knowledge encompasses such rudimentary concepts as *desire* to build, was initially premised on the rather narrow concern of institutional needs, simply rationalizing growth by competition within the Ivy League. Several reports documented fewer square feet per student than Harvard and Penn, among others, and administrators leveraged this comparative shortage of space as an impetus for expansion, thus justifying a land grab so Columbia could reclaim a fading status among global research universities (O'Halloran 6 June 2010). In turn, acquired land would be

reconfigured for research and instruction, creating a necessary infrastructure to fulfill the core university mission - producing a well-educated student body (Shapiro 6 February 2012).

President Bollinger made the first statement of intent during his inaugural address, but a 2003 *New York Times* article reported that the university was mounting rhetorical leverage for their ambitions as early as 1998. According to Charles Bagli of the *New York Times*, the Office of the Provost commissioned the first of its internal surveys on institutional real estate and found that Columbia had less space than almost all other elite universities: Princeton, located in the provincial New Jersey countryside, maintained the most at 561 square feet per student; Harvard had restrictively less in Cambridge, Massachusetts, with 368 square feet; but the University of Pennsylvania, located in a similarly dense Philadelphia neighborhood was able to provide 440 square feet of space per student (Bagli 30 July 2003). In contrast, Columbia had a mere 194 square feet in 1998 and, despite growing by approximately one million square feet each decade, had less than half the space as peer institutions by 2003 when Manhattanville was announced (O'Halloran 2010). A 2010 *Report of the Campus Planning Task Force* to the University Senate corroborates that this shortage of space motivated proposed expansion. The committee argued that the university had “exhausted the expansion space available in Morningside Heights” (6 June 2010). Moreover elucidating the competitive impulse for space as university enrollments continued to grow per annum, Charles Bagli reiterated that “officials say [Columbia] needs to expand if it is to continue to attract top professors, researchers and students” (Office of Planning and Institutional Research 2016; Bagli 30 July 2003).

What is of critical importance in understanding administrative thinking is their choice in metric. Even though the great wealth of knowledge is produced by research, for research is the mode from which academic prestige is derived, campus space is measured by square footage per student, thus privileging the educational function of the university. Likewise, President Bollinger heralded his excitement towards instruction during his address, crediting that “we do all that we do in large measure to help us nurture the next generation of men and women, who will act on what we now preserve and discover” (Bollinger 3 October 2003). This corporeal measurement is then the form in which institutional value is ascribed and mobilized by discourse, but not in practice. Preliminary architectural renderings for Manhattanville were biased towards constructing state-of-the-art research facilities and making space for highly marketable degree programs much to the dismay of Columbia College, the liberal arts division of the research university (Shapiro 6 February 2012). Thus demonstrating two divergent notions of the student, an ideal defined by an humanist concept but operating as the economized self, the student-centric metric is, as framed, a political maneuver intended to maximize persuasive capital against a controversial plan.

Contradictory university treatment of the human bares most evident in preliminary stages of campus planning for Manhattanville, when the primary hurdle administrators had to clear - between 2003 and 2008 – was clearing space to build their new campus. With 40,000 people residing in Manhattanville, the proposed construction site was not *tabula rasa*, and several landowners and tenant organizations stood in the way of university expansion. On 7 March 2003, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution to establish the Campus Planning Task Force to consult administrators and the Board of

Trustees on “planning, reviewing, assigning priorities” through the process of “implementing the University’s physical development.” The committee, comprised of five tenured faculty, two non-tenured faculty, two administrators, three students, one alumnus, one library staff member, one officer of research, and one administrative staff member, included no members of the West Harlem residential community and made no requirement for community engagement but was nonetheless instrumental in determining the fate of the neighborhood (O’Halloran 6 June 2010). President Bollinger reassured the community that this era of university expansion would be different than before, as quoted in the *New York Times Magazine*:

There was a time when Columbia really turned its back on where it was located. I wanted to take exactly the opposite approach (Eviatar 21 May 2006).

However, made no meaningful effort to that end unless pressed by local organizers. A 2003 *Columbia Spectator* reporter observed that initial “efforts have failed to eliminate many of the bitter feelings emanating from many local residents” (Ferris 9 October 2003) because few project details were shared with activists, including residents and many faculty, staff, and students. The Coalition to Preserve Community had to protest for an entire year before President Bollinger would open channels for town and gown collaboration and according to the *Activist Guide*, a publication by the *Student Coalition against Gentrification*, administrators finally established three advisory boards in January 2004 to consult on the planning process, though it did little to alleviate tensions. The first public open house was also held by administrators in late January 2004. There, eleven officials presented on various aspects of the Manhattanville campus, each at a different topical station of which the *Columbia Spectator* observed that everything appeared a “work in progress” and drew but a “lukewarm reception” (Spectator 2004). When the

community advisory boards advocated against the university plan, Bollinger dismissed the members (CAGe Activist Guide 2014).

In the same 2006 article where Bollinger promised to engage with the community better than his 1960s predecessors, Bollinger reflected that his beliefs on development fell “somewhere between the Jane Jacobs and Robert Moses of the world,” finding balance between the aesthetics of a pedestrian-oriented streetscape and the centralized practices of large-scale institutional management. Moreover, his logics align more precisely with that of the Moses public interest. The city and urban institutions should function not locally, but as nodes within larger networks of exchange.

We are not a profit-making institution looking out for our own advantage. We are trying to do things that help the world more broadly. The community is not everything (Eviatar 21 May 2006).

Shortly there-prior in the spring of 2004, Columbia submitted the *General Project Plan* (197-c) (hereby referred to as the University Plan) to the City of New York, a formal proposal for the City Planning Commission and City Council that first went to review by the local Community Board 9. Against the council of the advisory boards, Bollinger requested that the area between 110th and 155th Streets be rezoned from manufacturing to mixed-use. The University Plan would illegitimate existing means of semi-industrial production to make way for a higher profit-margin economy (Kirschenbaum 29 May 2010; CAGe Activist Guide 2014). Furthermore, this proposal would authorize the state to exercise eminent domain on the university’s behalf. Such a measure would give Columbia universal control over property in the 17 acre project site.

In conjunction with the Pratt Institute, the Community Board 9 concluded their decade-long democratic planning process, submitting a *197-a Plan* to the City Planning

Department (hereby referred to as the Community Plan). The alternative vision, developed before the *197-c Plan* and with an engaged citizenry, forbade eminent domain, retained some manufacturing and light-industrial productive capacities in the zoning codes, and would permit Columbia to expand while allowing current land owners to retain their private property rights (Eviatar 21 May 2006; Kirschenbaum 29 May 2010). The populist agenda, albeit comprehensive, did not maximize profit-earning potential of urban space; however, would “mitigate the growing problem of tenant displacement spreading throughout greater Harlem,” according to the 2014 Activist Guide (CAGe 2014).

The university promised arts, architecture, and urban amenities, but refused an equitable engagement with neighborhood residents. When the university sponsored community advisory board vocalized support of Community Board 9’s *197-a*, President Bollinger terminated the body (CAGe Activist Guide 2014). When posed with the neighborhood counterpoint against eminent domain, President Bollinger quipped that he “would be irresponsible as president of Columbia” to give it up, further warning that he “should be prepared to use it” (Williams, 20 November 2006). Notwithstanding, the university penned a letter in 2004 asking the Empire State Development Corporation to condemn West Harlem properties not under university ownership (Williams 20 September 2006).

The juxtaposition of university practice against President Bollinger’s evocations of the human - and humanism - thus emerge oxymoronic. In his inaugural address, he depicts students as being nurtured by the university, young men and women who will act upon “what we now discover and preserve,” arguing then a lack of campus space as

inhibiting the noble, intellectual mission. Yet, Bollinger and his administration subsequently framed the university's right to the city not by humanitarian mission or a mutually beneficial partnership between campus and community, but by the profit-maximizing potential of a knowledge economy. Administrators abandoned transcendent values in favor of economic expedience, and in an open-editorial published by the *New York Daily News* in 2007, President Bollinger derided the diminished influence of the manufacturing sector. Asking instead "where are the new opportunities for those in the middle," he quickly posited in higher education. President Bollinger outlined the number of his employees, 14,000 people - making Columbia "the seventh largest nongovernment employer in the city." And he promised more. Manhattanville, the site of still successful industrial production, could provide "about 6,000 new jobs" if the university is permitted to replace existing business (Bollinger 7 January 2007). Similarly, the Community Benefits Agreement, written as a concession to those disaffected by expansion, reiterated the value created by privileging higher education within the economy and promised up to \$750,000 in support of workforce development training programs for residents in West Harlem (Columbia University 2009). The University's *Declaration of Covenants & Restrictions* connected construction practice to a larger project of reprogramming the daily productive possibilities of the city, situating university expansion within the ideological impetus of a knowledge economy:

Higher education is essential to the intellectual and economic growth of both the City and State of New York, with Columbia widely regarded as one of the leading institutions of higher education in the world. Private colleges, universities, and other cultural institutions have grown at a rate more than three times the rate of New York State's economy, increasing employment by 16% percent between 1990 and 2005. While industrial employment has been steadily decreasing in New York City, private colleges and universities annually spend \$2.1 billion in research in New York State, spurring the creation of 10,000 new jobs in the

private sector. Although technological changes have shifted jobs in finance, insurance and real estate away from urban centers, the interpersonal nature of educational institutions is more difficult to replicate in cyberspace.” (The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York 2011)

Students, as consumers and outputs of human capital, are spatially confined to campus by the alleged superiority of in-person instruction. Universities, likewise, provide the only growing source of jobs. In this sense, the university and all people associated with the university are defined foremost by their economic versus humanist worth, overriding the operational value of traditionally defined students and moreover minimizing lower-income residents who seek industrial labor to an impedimentary presence towards New York City’s greater potential as a space for knowledge production and exchange.³ The humanist conception of the student, and the humanist conception mobilized by lip service to resident equality serve merely as an ideal, a rhetorical ploy. Pragmatically, all university operations and expectations are governed by the economic construct of self. In addition, the Community Benefits Agreement simply prescribes a treatment to the symptomatic effects of gentrification impressed upon individuals by growth, outlining a percentage of construction contracts that would be guaranteed to “minority, women, and local businesses,” an effort to appease ideological incongruity between residents, the academy and the city (Columbia Press Kit 2016).

Therefore articulated are two very different conceptualizations of productive purpose – the university seeking urban space programmed for profit maximization with humans operating in support, and the neighborhood seeking urban space programmed for social service, with economic production operating in support. Community Board 9’s

³ The Wall Street Journal reported on December 30, 2013 that from 2008 to 2013 institutions of higher education spent \$4.2 billion on construction; however projected that the figure will grow to \$10 billion by 2017 and repeatedly referred to education as a “big business” (Tarquinio 2013).

197-a Plan would limit profit producing capacities, not giving full power to the knowledge economy pattern for production; however, would preserve the ability of existing residents to maintain the means to their longstanding livelihoods in West Harlem. The community plan assumed a collective interest, providing space for shared opportunity between both existing residents and the university. Conversely, the university's *197-c Plan* sought by way of law to obliterate all avenues for the perceivedly outmoded means of production rooted in a mechanical economy. By 2007, both neighborhood plans were submitted to the City and under official review. All further considerations should have been, after that point, impartial, open to unmitigated public hearing, and left to the independent city agencies to decide what right to the city and modes of production would be validated.

Scorched Earth Policy, Legal Manipulation, and the State Sanctioned University Expansion

At City Planning Department meetings, residents near unanimously opposed the university plan that would invoke eminent domain to claim all properties within the proposed 17 acre campus site, and vocalized their concern with granting the elite university unilateral control over urban space; however, administrators waged an unrelenting, total war against neighborhood groups and tenant organizations, refining the institutional concept of an academic public good in the language of universally beneficial medical science and locally equitable commercial growth (Williams 4 September 2008; Columbia University 14 December 2011). Administrators funded blight studies and likewise sought to sterilize space, deploying place-naming tactics for the attempted

erasure of racialized histories, while leveraging undue political influence from hired lobbyists and faculty-affiliated politicians to legitimate university interest within the formal channels of urban planning. Hence a discursive project crafted to undermine neighborhood autonomy and secure the right to structurally reprogram the city for reinvigorated capital, this section will therefore unravel precisely how Columbia deployed a successful neo-renewal strategy within the collaborative-planning governance paradigm (Williams 20 November 2006; Vielkind 21 April 2004; Baldwin 15 August 2008).

On 15 August 2007 President Bollinger came before five hundred West Harlem residents at a Community Board 9 public hearing, part of the legally mandated review process for the planning proposals, where he demonstrated the university initiative to more persuasively frame higher education as an enterprise fully in the public interest. The meeting was recorded by Nellie Bailey, a Harlem community organizer, and was subsequently posted to YouTube. When Bollinger arrived, deafening chants of “liar” echoed across the dated auditorium, he stood smugly in his pressed shirt and cuffs with a hint of condescension in his smile, waiting for the crowd to calm before taking the microphone (Nellie Bailey 2007). He admonished, “It would be a pity if [Manhattanville] were not to be debated in a serious way and not thought through,” berating the audience for their indecorous reception. Bollinger lectured without elaborating upon his criticisms that university expansion would “create a campus that Columbia must have,” with benefits “spread throughout the community,” He promised jobs and affordable housing. The university would provide this growth through expert guidance, irrelevant of initiatives designed via the early planning processes of the Community Board’s 197-a

Plan (McDonald 25 April 2012; CAGe Activist Guide 2014). President Bollinger argued that Columbia wanted to do “something that has not been done before” (Nellie Bailey 2007); whereas Yasmeen Ar-Rayani, a Columbia College undergraduate observed, “there he stood, a [W]hite man informing [P]eople of [C]olor that the takeover of their territory was in their best interest” (Ar-Rayani 7 February 2011). In a 2010 radio interview on WNYC, Bollinger glibly dismissed community planning efforts as neither “realistic” nor “helpful,” and “not going to happen” (Quoted in Paul 28 March 2010 [24]).

La-Verna Fountain, a Columbia spokesperson, clarified university intentions in a statement to the *New York Times*. Stating that:

Columbia wants to work on the kinds of issues that impact humanity, like Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s disease.

Trymaine Lee, a reporter with the paper, summarized the university logic, stating that administrators believe “the benefits will also spill over to others” (Lee 22 July 2007). The university, in sum, validated public beneficence by an appeal to the neoliberal platitude that a rising tide – in the university’s case, of knowledge, will lift all boats, portraying an accumulative framework for urban success as the only way forward and casting aside any alternative as unrealistic. Whereas President Bollinger proclaimed an enlightenment ideal early in his presidency, honoring the time-tested sentiment that universities are “meaningful because they respond to the deepest of human needs,” his elevation of humanism to stand on par with “the more often cited interests in property and power, around which we organize the political and economy systems,” faltered when facing institutional competition and the opportunity for discursive expedience found in the ideology of a knowledge economy (Bollinger 15 October 2003).

Knowing full well that the structural shortcomings of unbridled expansion within a capitalist economy would catalyze a sequential rise in market-rate rents surrounding the proposed campus footprint, Matt Carhart, a student journalist, decried:

If Columbia will not live up to its highest ideals at its current size, what's the point of getting bigger? (Carhart 21 January 2005)

Tom Kappner, activist and Columbia Graduate, quipped similarly, asking “Do you really need every square inch of land to find a cure for Alzheimer’s, Mr. Bollinger?” to a local reporter, hoping to bring attention to the contradictions in administrative ideologies (Williams 4 September 2008). Despite sustained reverberations of this message among activists in the community and an unrelentingly negative press, the university never substantively rebutted criticisms. In the words of Robert Kasdin, senior executive vice president tasked with overseeing the Manhattanville project, “whatever we do, we will be subject to criticism because we can’t fix the underlying problems” (Williams 20 November 2006). Thus acknowledging institutional avarice and an inability to resolve spatial injustices of displacement under the structural mechanics of a capitalist social system, Columbia administrators selectively restricted the intellectual capabilities of their institution to that of the economic *status quo*, accepting that legitimate knowledge (per administrative definitions) can only resolve social issues insofar as markets will allow, barring any question against the sacrosanctity of growth, and in-turn relegating worthwhile academic pursuits exclusively to traditional sciences, medicine, and commerce.

To this end, having exhausted the self-inflicted limits of knowledge production as a public good, university officials endeavored to undermine democratic planning efforts and activists through the subtle art of identity politics and place (re) naming in Northern

Manhattan. Per the philosophy of French phenomenologist Gaston Bachelard, place is a psychogeographical construct central to the formation of individuals' identities (Bachelard 1994). As such, the unique spatial histories of each neighborhood thus inform resident and university identity construction - and influence public officials who subsequently mediate and govern the people and institutions in contested urban space. Therefore political, leveraging university authority to determine the dominant narratives associated with places – and exercising the authority to create the determinative boundaries of places – becomes in a major tool for cultural erasure civil discourse, and in turn a tactical opportunity for bringing the Manhattanville plan to bare upon West Harlem.

Although emphasized by the resurrection of Columbia's full corporate title, Columbia University in the City of New York, for institutional branding purposes during the Bollinger administration, President Bollinger first extended the name to exalt stewardship of the proposed campus site in 2003, arguing with localized terms that "over the long term, Upper Manhattan is our home" in a public address, the rhetorical move interjecting a certain authority in claiming institutional residency (Bollinger 14 November 2003). In the course of constructing an official identity for the space proposed to be redeveloped, administrators selected that area between 110th and 155th Streets precisely because of its derelict aesthetic that could be separated from common, culturally rich perceptions of Harlem. The *New York Times* published:

When Columbia officials look at Manhattanville's ramshackle warehouses, garages and decaying factories, they see temples for teaching and research. Where car engines crank and roar from dozens of auto repair shops, the university envisions a new business school or a school of the arts." (Lee 22 July 2007)

Foremost in this analysis, productive possibilities are privileged over people, of whom many did live in the industrial space, yet the image of 20th Century smokestacks and battered brick warehouses implied out-modality or abandonment upon which Columbia could posit their “contemporary” vision (Columbia Press Release 2016). Likewise, President Bollinger and his administration forewent any allusion to the place name, Harlem, the jurisdictionally correct moniker associated with iconoclastic, African American heritage, choosing instead to connect their proposed campus to broader assumptions about Manhattan, recognized as the financial and corporate epicenter of the United States. Manhattanville in turn becomes, as a psychogeographical entity, the academic extension of the Manhattan identity.

Though what New York City historian, Eric Washington, called “an odd sort of quibble,” this alteration of place name is paramount in discursive maneuvers of the university around residents (Davis 31 December 2007). For residents, a changed name shifts the spatiotemporal points of comparison, allowing the university to set up a trans-scalar dichotomy of smaller Manhattanville as out-of-place due to slower growth rates over time than its larger namesake Manhattan; whereas residents strip away the hierarchical perception instead to contrast their current West Harlem experience to what the West Harlem experience had been in previous decades. Nick Sprayregen, a local landowner, claimed “the neighborhood is far better off now than it’s ever been, yet Columbia, ironically, is claiming it’s so terrible and so blighted” (Vitullo-Martin 1 June 2006).

The naming scheme allowed the university officials to rescale neighborhood positionality in conversation to expunge cultural ideas, notably those tied to race, that are

embedded in the project site. Thus exemplar, the contemporary iteration of Duke Ellington's famed Cotton Club from the Harlem Renaissance, is located on West 125th Street and Sarah Martin, area resident since 1957, remarked "I've considered the whole area Harlem." On these grounds, preliminary activism gained momentum. Nellie Bailey, executive director of the Harlem Tenants Council, described the university plan as "diabolical" and "racist in nature" (Williams 4 September 2008). Tom DeMott, member of the Coalition to Preserve Community, explained the scalar disconnection:

[Columbia administrators] don't like to use the word Harlem because it is essentially an Ivy League, elite institution that is encroaching on a black, working-class neighborhood" (McDonald 25 April 2012)

Place (re) naming, if not actually a calculated attempt by the university to illegitimate protest, was perceived by activists to undercut opposition; and no matter did in practice allow for the (re) definition of neighborhood comparisons by the university from an intra-scale to inter-scale juxtaposition, fundamentally opening ideological space for publically beneficial redevelopment in the framework of a knowledge economy (Huffman 2007/2008). This tactic, however, only partially activated institutional opportunity and was unleashed in full force through legal validation of the university generated postindustrial narrative.

As mentioned, President Bollinger requested back in 2004 that the Empire State Development Corporation, the public entity responsible for exercising eminent domain on behalf of private developers, condemn the properties of West Harlem not under Columbia's control (Williams 20 November 2006). The university sought concurrent influence over the democratic machinations of urban politics in an ambitious lobbying campaign. Together, these tactics comprised a comprehensive strategy of conquest,

ultimately resulting in state sanctioned expansion of Columbia into West Harlem and in the processes reprogramming the urban space for rejuvenated accumulative potential via the continuation of a capitalist mode of production.

Because the *Coalition to Preserve Community* and the *Student Coalition on Expansion and Gentrification* were so vocal with protests, hunger strikes, citation in newspaper articles and blog posts, and in their participation at community hearings, President Bollinger established a counter organization, the *Coalition for the Future of Manhattanville*. He persuaded former New York City mayor, David Dinkins to lead the organization. In an 2007 open-editorial to the *New York Times*, Mayor Dinkins forgivingly wrote that “Indeed, I was one of those picketing Columbia back in the 1960s,” but promised that this new “expansion project will broaden its mission of teaching and academic research, patient care and public service, and enhance the quality of life for those who live and work in Harlem and across our city” (Dinkins 27 May 2007). Without explanation of how growth would benefit the people residing within the footprint, refusing to address activist concerns just as President Bollinger had talked past community members in public forums, Mayor Dinkins spoke in vapid platitudes. Yet, President Bollinger cited Mayor Dinkins in a university statement reiterating the benefits of growth. He wrote in response:

If you saw the May 27 op-ed in the New York Times by former Mayor – and our professor of public policy – David Dinkins, you know the strong case he makes for the many mutually beneficial ways Columbia and Harlem can grow together (Bollinger 18 June 2007).

It is also important to note that in the early 2000s, according to the New York Times, Columbia “maintained the second largest lobbying contract in New York. Spending \$682,743.00 on the services of Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel, the university pushed

the Manhattan Borough President's Office, the New York City Planning Commission, and Community Board 9 to support the Manhattanville plan (Durkin 1 April 2005).

Bending under university influence, the University Plan was approved by multiple city departments - the only exception being at the most local level, Community Board 9. On 26 November 2007, the New York City Planning Commission approved the plan to rezone all 17 acres Columbia sought to redevelop (Bollinger 26 November 2007; Sachare 2009). Less than a month later, President Bollinger spoke before the New York City Council, seeking further approval of his ambitions. He reminded council: "I am so pleased this project is in the middle of Congressman Charles Rangel's district and he supports the project" (Bollinger 12 December 2007). The City Council voted in favor and President Bollinger celebrated:

Now, after five years and innumerable discussions, negotiations, plans, documents, hearings, and votes, we have arrived at a significant turning point on the matter of space for the University to grow – for our generations, I should add, as well as the next (Bollinger 19 December 2007).

Notwithstanding city approval of the university vision, administrators had one last structural obstacle to clear – the acquisition of all properties in the project space. To this task, the university required support from state bureaucrats, as eminent domain proceedings fall under state jurisdiction and per legal mandate, must serve the public interest. State law requires proposals receive approval from an impartial state agency, the Empire State Development Agency. In 2006, the ESDC began the preliminary research process in Manhattan, a necessary step to declaring an area blighted and eligible for eminent domain. A year later, Alea King Rosen and Flemming published the neighborhood condition study and found that the area struggled with blighted conditions and an unproductive economy (Gregory n.d. [56]). By July, the Empire State

Development Corporation acted upon the study in Columbia's favor, formally declaring the future Manhattanville Campus blighted and in consequence allowing the university to force the remaining landowners to sell their properties (Williams 20 September 2008).

Nevertheless, Columbia used their economic power to covertly influence the results in subsequently discovered subcontracts with a development firm of shared interest with the state agency. The Activist Guide states:

The ESDC hires Alee King Rosen and Flemming (AKRF), the same company Columbia contracted to coordinate their expansion, to conduct a 'neighborhood conditions study' in Manhattanville. AKRF, in turn, subcontracts Thornton Tomasetti, Inc., a structural engineering enterprise, to actually carry out the details of the investigation. The Chairman of the Tomasetti firm is Richard Tomasetti, Adjunct Professor of Civil Engineering and Mechanics at Columbia University. In this dizzying web of conflicting interests, the state authority designed to investigate the ethics of eminent domain hires an engineering firm profiting from Columbia's expansion, which then proceeds to contract the company of a Columbia Professor to write their report. The outcome will deem whether or not Manhattanville is 'blighted', or in such economic disrepair that it requires complete overhaul, rather than further development (CAGe Activist Guide 2014).

In a 3-to-2 decision, the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court corroborated with activist claims of unfair collusion and ruled against the university in *Kauer v. New York State Urban Development Corp.*, a case brought forth by landowners Nick Sprayregen and Gurnam and Parminder Singh (Carlson 3 December 2009). Justice Chatterson wrote in the majority decision:

The blight designation in the instant case is mere sophistry. It was utilized by ESDC years after the scheme was hatched to justify the employment of eminent domain but this project has always primarily concerned a massive capital project for Columbia (*Kauer v NYSUD Corp.*, 2009).

On behalf of the university, the Empire State Development Corporation challenged the ruling at the New York State Court of Appeals. Judge Carmen Beauchamp Ciparick

presided over the case and, with five other judges, ruled that, regardless of unsavory process, “the indisputably public purpose of education is particularly vital for New York City and the State to maintain their respective statuses as global centers of higher education and academic research,” reversing the Appellate ruling against eminent domain (New York Court of Appeals, 2010). The *Chronical of Higher Education* later reported on the verdict, quoting Judge Ciparick:

Columbia University, though private, operates as a nonprofit educational corporation. Thus, the concern that a private enterprise will be profiting through eminent domain is not present (Carlson 24 June 2010).

Because university-generated accumulation is not siphoned off by shareholders, the assumption holds that wealth is used exclusively for education and research – the public good (Daviet July 2016).

Global Logics and the Construction of a Cosmopolitan Campus

Finally having state approval for the full acquisition of remaining properties on the 17 acre site and having earned all approvals from the city government for the University Plan, in 2010 Columbia was ready to mobilize engineers, ironworkers, and masons to unleash upon West Harlem a transformative processes of reprogramming the semi-industrial cityscape with the logics of an academic economy. “Starchitect” Nenzo Piano designed a campus with “amply landscaped grounds “to “be woven into the existing street grid” and “with no walls or gates;” moreover promising that “all buildings will be open to the public and programmed for community use at street level” (Press Release, 2016). In a statement to YNYC, Piano claimed moral high ground:

It's not just aesthetics — making things well is more than aesthetics — it's ethics (Barrett 24 October 2016).

As buildings rose above the streetscape, the university continued their project to tactically reframe commercialized university expansion as a public good. The Jerome L. Green Science Center would fuel “scientific discoveries that otherwise would never have the chance to flourish” (Press Release, 20016). The Mortimer B. Zuckerman Mind Brain Behavior Institute would “bring together approximately 800 researchers working in more than 50 labs, each with its own principle investigator, to pursue one of the most urgent and exciting challenges of our time” (A Mind to Discover 2016). And the promotional literature, *A New Kind of Campus*, proclaimed:

This is a milestone for Columbia not only because we are building a future in our home community, but also because we’re doing so with the best urban planning principles and architectural designs that reflect both the shared values of city life and a fundamental need for a more sustainable society.” (A New Kind of Urban Campus 2016)

Indeed a milestone, by 2010 Harlem was no longer an African-American majority neighborhood and by 2013 there was a shortage of housing for even the elite university faculty (CAGe Activist Guide 2014; Reyes and Tolan 6 May 2013).

Columbia finally succeeded in cultivating a high market-value urban landscape in Northern Manhattan, able to achieve an agenda left unfinished following 1960s campus and community activism. By leveraging public hearings as data collecting opportunities in an effort to selectively accommodate neighborhood concerns within a capitalist ideological framework, and then coupling that *Community Benefits Agreement* with the aesthetic considerations of Jane Jacobs, New York’s 1960s anti-renewal warrior, to overcome the image of civic brutalism; the university has succeeded in “doing things differently,” to borrow President Bollinger’s words. Under the discursive logics of a

knowledge economy – the potential for accumulative growth beyond industry, insurance, or finance – it seems the university affords opportunity to the City of New York and offers scientific promise for the rest of humanity. The outcomes of these assumptions, legitimated by court and council, instruct us that the urban renewal practices once idealized by Robert Moses – structural conquest for accumulative gain – can again manifest if realized under an inclusive politick⁴. And under the sacrosanctity of the academic mission, the university is thus privileged to space, transcending private property rights; however, is absolved of responsibility under a market ethic for the subsequent injustices of peripheral residential displacement. The *Community Benefits Agreement* then appeases the affected in partial resolution to the contradiction that the rising tide of a knowledge economy will not otherwise lift all boats.⁵

Students at the Ivy League university are therefore fortunate beings when compared to the people displaced, conferred an enlightenment education but measured in economic impact, and occupying, as human capital, the highest rank of opportunity in a global network of exchange. We see the pronouncement of this deservedness as the

⁴ On 11 May 2007, President Bollinger hosted “a small delegation of ‘68ers” for breakfast at his home to discuss a reunion event and current university affairs. The Columbia 1968 40th Anniversary website mentions that:

It became clear that the Columbia administration today is not anything like the one we protested against in 1969. Bollinger’s chief of staff talked about “embracing conflict,” his PR director talked about engaging the community, and Bollinger himself talked openly about Columbia’s vulnerabilities in this area and his desire to move carefully. One reason Bollinger may be keen on doing a 1968 anniversary event is to convey just this message: that this isn’t your father’s Columbia anymore. That’s certainly open to debate, as is Columbia’s current expansion drive, but they’re surely handling these issues far differently than in Grayson Kirk’s day (Columbia 1968 2007).

Although handling community protests with an improved political acumen, the projected results of displacement and oppression are the same from 1960s Morningside to 2010s Manhattanville.

⁵ Out of resident concerns that Columbia administrators were not meeting the terms of the Community Benefits Agreement, members of the Community Board Nine voted 30 to 0 on a resolution calling for the State to audit all construction contracts (Mays 2013). No such audit took place, but the University released a report in 2015 documenting the implementation of promised benefits to the community (The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York 2015).

corporeal vessel through which the university justifies its expansion of knowledge production, evidenced in President Bollinger's interactions with students.⁶ In an effort to placate students upset at the university land-grab, Bollinger hosted a fireside chat at his mansion, inviting graduate students. There, he bemoaned that previous efforts to grow "were stifled," emphasizing the 1968 gymnasium protest, and reiterated that the movement ultimately hurt Columbia graduates (Renault, 25 April 2014). At a second fireside chat, Bollinger sought to normalize the privileged student positionality in expansion projects, calling international exposure made possible by an enduringly competitive global university as a "basic experience" expected of Columbia caliber graduates in an increasingly interconnected world (Grasdalen 11 November 2014). The new campus is intended to maintain Columbia's international stature and reproduces student cosmopolitanity, which he defines as an asset in defining their exchange value. As framed, it is in the students' self-interest to support Manhattanville. His recent claims, moreover, resolve the initially framed problem from 2002 that Columbia just did not have enough space for students, but represent a departure from the concept of student employed in his 2003 inaugural address. When recounting his administrative priorities, and as previously referenced, Bollinger imparted:

I want to close with two thoughts. The first is to recognize that all we do all that we do in large measure to help us nurture the next generation of men and women, who will act on what we now preserve and discover. A measure of the general health of the university, just as it is of a parent, is the degree to which we actively

⁶ The University has also been accused of coordinating with the New York Police Department to selectively police drug use among non-university affiliated residents in West Harlem (NEWS). In 2014 over 100 suspected "gang members" were arrested in West Harlem, celebrated as "one of the largest" in New York City history by Columbia Vice President for Public Safety, James F. McShane. Although facing widespread criticism as a racialized practice to expel longstanding residents from the Manhattanville community, University officials increased motorized patrols by campus security forces (McShane 2014).

seek to help develop the youngest among us. Columbia has much to be proud of on that measure (Bollinger 3 October 2002).

Bollinger uses words of humanity, emphasizing the whole person and unbridled by economization; but as framed in 2014, students are defined by value as elite subjects – and future leaders - anchored in the command city guiding the globalizing – and increasingly knowledge driven - economy. The renegotiation of a student identity is preeminent of the broader restructuring of higher education and socio-economic ideology, unfolding with the structural reprogramming of West Harlem as Manhattenville.

CHAPTER SIX
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY – OF THE COMMONWEALTH
SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

*“Down here it's just winners and losers and
don't get caught on the wrong side of that line.”*

- Bruce Springsteen

In the Gothic Shadow

Widely considered the gritty, working-class alternative to New York City, as it remains – even in the post-industrial era – home to rolling mills, oil refineries, and railway manufacturing facilities; Philadelphia is nonetheless a thriving center of finance and education, and, as such, is emblematic of neoliberalism as an incomplete political project in American cities. Neither knowledge production nor financial speculation and real estate ventures have fully usurped the productive capacities of a traditional industrial economy, and the urban fabric appears torn between epochs of Western capital. And because the entire City of Philadelphia is caught between two economic paradigms, Philadelphia has been an ideal place to evaluate gentrification as an urban strategy. Neil Smith, in fact, completed his undergraduate thesis on Philadelphia gentrification in 1977 and documented the forced removal of 600 lower-income residents from an affluent neighborhood, Society Hill, adjacent to the colonial-era Delaware River harbor (Smith 1977). Transformations were violent and restoration of the profit rate required state assistance. However, because spatial reprogramming and displacement are now concentrated near institutions of higher education, Philadelphia becomes an ideal place to both evaluate gentrification as an emergent university strategy and to study knowledge production as a mechanism for further implementing the neoliberal project (Hilbert 4 May 2016; Brey 19 May 2016; Laker 23 October 2016).

The city is home to more than 450,000 university students and twenty 4-year colleges and universities, but this chapter is primarily concerned with the two largest, both Carnegie Classification R1 universities – the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University (Phila.gov/residents/colleges). The two universities were first compared in 1936, when *Time Magazine* published a critical vignette:

In the Gothic shadow cast across Philadelphia by the ancient and excellent University of Pennsylvania, Temple University has spent ten years clamoring for public recognition (Time 2 March 1936).

Then merely a night school for working-class residents, Temple offered technical degrees in law, medicine, and commerce, as well as courses in the traditional liberal arts on their small campus near the homes of students in North Philadelphia. Penn, on the other hand, had deliberately cast aside “this utilitarian model” of local service in favor of an international “collegiate ideal,” competing against the other Ivy League universities to attract top students from affluent families throughout the nation (Thomas 2002). Both universities benefitted from post-war enrollment booms and both universities leveraged urban renewal policies to satisfy increased demand for space - though for distinct institutional missions. Temple, a public institution, has since grown into the largest educator of professional students in the state of Pennsylvania whereas Penn now ranks among the world’s most elite private research universities and is regarded as the archetype of collaborative leadership in university-generated neighborhood redevelopment projects (Temple 22 September 2008; Rodin 2007; timeshighereducation.com 2016; Melhuish 2015). Temple, however, has faced considerable backlash from pursuing an increased role in neighborhood planning (Strom 2005; Hilbert 4 May 2016). Noting this apparent contradiction in the relationships between the two universities and their host communities, this chapter will first draw upon

Penn for constructing an ideological and practical framework for university interventions in the Philadelphia real-estate market to then analyze public discourse on Temple expansion into North Philadelphia.

Out of the Ivory Tower

Penn administrators forged key partnerships with community organizations and made preemptive concessions to the community as a way to mitigate resistance for their urban strategy of control, and the collaborative agenda has been effective (Rodin, 2007). The university promised “to restore peace and security in the neighborhood,” protecting private property with their own university patrols (Rodin 2007). The university limited institutional construction into residential areas, opting instead to build on more expensive land along the industrial Schuylkill River waterfront near Center City (Rodin 2007 [44, 167]). The university quietly subsidized employee mortgages and renovations in University City (Rodin 2007 [100-102]). The university financed a high-caliber public school for University City (Rodin 2007 [153]). The university improved public parks on behalf of the city parks commission (Rodin, 2007 [171]). And the university continues to grow – now completing a \$4 billion expansion (Moskowitz 31 December 2014). Judith Rodin explained when drawing together a summary of her university presidency that the key to remaking University City was cultivating “neighbors’ sense of control,” because, according to her earlier research as a psychologist, “significant positive outcomes result from individuals’ perceptions that they have a say in decisions” (Rodin 2007 [185-186]). The Penn model, unlike that of Columbia, is more closely aligned with the planning

ideals of Jane Jacobs, encouraging the “natural” function of markets in remaking the streetscape, though university capacity for change manifests like a translucent hand, omnipresent status yet obfuscated by decentralized responsibility – corporate benevolence, public-private partnerships, neighborhood association membership, and employee mortgage programs. Via these mechanisms, instead of massive land-grabs through eminent domain, without community consultation, Penn has remade much of Philadelphia without crippling social conflict and has effectively reprogrammed industrial and working-class space with high-tech and creative-class space. The university calls it “Pennovation.” Activists responded with “Penntrification” (Webb 2013).

Civic Boosterism

University of Pennsylvania President Emerita, Judith Rodin, wrote candidly about her defining initiative to “revitalize” West Philadelphia – or *University City* – in her acclaimed book, *The University & Urban Revival*, in which she argues that “any successful urban strategy must be just that – strategic” (183). During her tenure, Rodin expanded Penn’s influence in Philadelphia, establishing a university-funded magnet school to improve educational opportunities for underserved communities. The university budgeting office diverted endowment funds to subsidize mortgages for faculty and staff residing within the university area. And Penn invested heavily in commercial properties on the western periphery of Center City, both attracting anchor tenants and providing start-up capital for budding entrepreneurs. But perhaps most importantly, and integral to actualizing a genuine strategy of economic revitalization, Rodin organized a consortium

of university and college presidents in 2001 with the help of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce (172). The Presidents Council could build consensus among the many universities across the entire metropolitan area and systematically respond the tides of inner-city deindustrialization similar to the justification for the Manhattenville campus at Columbia University in New York.

Rodin, herself a native Philadelphian and 1970 Columbia graduate, observed that the growth of universities is encouraged and legitimized by an ideology of knowledge accumulation as a solution for rejuvenated economic expansion and explained how the Presidents Council took advantage of this political capital to reinforce their position within the urban regime.

When a report by the Pennsylvania Economy League recognized the importance of greater Philadelphia's "knowledge industry" for driving the region's economic competitiveness, the presidents group became a natural ally for transforming the findings into action. The study acknowledged that "the greater Philadelphia higher education cluster is, and will continue to be, the region's single greatest asset in the global competition for knowledge-based economic development." It noted that more than eighty colleges and universities and other institutions of higher education are among the area's largest employers. Together, they deliver an economic impact that exceeds \$6.4 billion annually. Higher education is also a leading "exporting industry" and brings new dollars into the region through tuition payments, local spending by students and their families, and research funding from the federal government and other entities (Rodin, 2007 [173]).

Per this logic, the university system functions to reorganize the productive capacities of the metropolitan, drawing people from around the region and world to concentrate back in the urban core to generate wealth in knowledge-based industries. But as Rodin then acutely notes, the greatest impact is made "by virtue of what [the university] produces – educated people." Collapsing consumer into product therefore reinforces the limitless opportunity in a knowledge economy, where the magnitude of growth is determined

simply by the labor force's ability to amass innovative skills, what Rodin describes as "the multiplier effects of enlarging the pool of talented students" (Rodin, 2007 [175]). This position, in turn, confers an unrivaled degree of power to the universities which serve as nodes of intellectual exchange. However, for the urban economy to benefit in the long-term, the city must retain students following graduation.

A year after establishing the Presidents Council to improve coordination between the many educational institutions that attract students and produce graduates in Philadelphia, Rodin formed a broad-based coalition of private- and public-sector organizations to increase the retention rate of recent university graduates by connecting students to opportunities in the city (Greater Philadelphia Regional Review, spring 2003 [11]; Passaro 20 January 2005). Incorporated as a non-profit organization, the Knowledge Industry Partnership funded several market research projects and in a 2004 study aptly titled *Should I Stay or Should I Go*, framed the problem of economic growth in the language of inter-city competition, explaining under the heading "Jobs vs. Place" that:

In today's new economy, it's not always the workers following the jobs. Instead, knowledge workers are migrating to those areas offering a high quality of life and, in turn, the best job opportunities are now following knowledge workers. (KIP June 2004)

To identify areas for growth within the target demographic, researchers surveyed 2,250 recent graduates from 29 universities in the Greater Philadelphia area and contrasted retention rates to Boston, the quintessential East Coast college town (results listed below in table 1).

	Philadelphia	Boston
All university graduates	64 %	50 %
Graduates originally from within the region	86 %	72 %
Graduates originally from outside the region	29 %	42 %

Table 1. Graduate Retention Rates (Adopted from KIP, 2004)

The researchers found that Boston outperformed Philadelphia only in retaining college graduates who matriculated from homes outside the region and then crafted policy recommendations to improve performance with this specific sub-demographic and net “new knowledge workers” (KIP 2004)⁷. Designed to “attract, engage, and retain,” the organization focused \$7.8 million effort on “connecting students with the community” under the marquee branding initiative, *Philadelphia is One Big Campus* (KIP 25 August 2004; Campus Philly March 2015). Existing companies increased internship opportunities in “high retention fields” and the coalition created an easy-to-navigate internship portal (careers.campusphilly.org) to connect students with potential employers (Innovate Philadelphia 3 April 2003). Likewise in an effort to cultivate a sense of urban livability similar to that of Boston or New York, KIP partnered with cultural institutions - the Art Museum, the Symphony, and Restaurant Row – to provide student discounts for

⁷ In a 30 October 2003 article published by the Temple News, Lisa Mishraky, a senior social work major, suggested that “the city should try to cultivate the strength of students from elementary and middle school levels and work with them through college. That way, students eligible for college are there in the community already, and when they graduate, they will be prominent leaders in the community, bringing in resources that way” (Editor, 30 October 2003). According to the Pennsylvania State Data Center, all five suburban Philadelphia counties ranked within the top ten of Pennsylvania counties for percent of high school graduates that were college bound in the 2003-2004 school year. In comparison, the city of Philadelphia ranked 29th out of 67 total counties (Research Brief, 8 June 2006).

special events and general admission and highlighted youthful neighborhoods in the *Insider Guide*, a promotional specifically distributed to potential students (KIP PowerPoint 2004). According to KIP, streamlined access to employment opportunities and better marketing of cultural resources significantly improved student perceptions of Philadelphia and have improved graduate retention rates. A 2015 bulletin by Campus Philly, a KIP subsidiary that manages marketing and digital operations, reported that by 2010 approximately 48 percent non-regional students remained in Philadelphia following graduation, up from 29 percent in 2004. The organization also reported that “83 percent of recent college graduates recommend Philadelphia as a place to live, up from 55 percent in 2010” (Campus Philly March 2015; Campus Philly 2010).

Discursive measures to reposition Philadelphia as a lucrative destination for the elusive “creative class” succeeded in large part from collaborative civic boosterism, bringing universities together with private firms and cultural institutions to uniformly rebrand the city’s blue collar image; however, the structural alignment of university curriculum to postgraduate career opportunities is where public-private partnership most profoundly manifests a spatial practice and evidences an agenda to reprogram the urban landscape for rejuvenated economic accumulation through knowledge production. Citing the potential impact of a knowledge economy beyond improved graduate retention rates, Judith Rodin explained that “an additional concerted effort was needed that focused on university-technology transfer capacity” if, for example, Philadelphia were to successfully connect the “people with ideas to others who can help develop them into businesses” and “come close to rivaling Boston” (Rodin 2007 [175]). In 2004, the Pennsylvania state government established the Keystone Innovation Zone (NIZ) program

as part of an economic stimulus plan to “address the lack of entrepreneurial activity and knowledge economy growth,” achieved “by aligning the combined resources of educational institutions and the private sector” (Department of Community & Economic Development 2016). Local entities are required to submit an application to the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development for designation of a geographic area as an innovation zone, and if granted, constituent for-profit firms are then eligible for tax credits to minimize risk for investors (Pennsylvania Department of Community & Economic Development FY 2016-17).

Philadelphia has three Innovation Zones, all of which are university affiliated (City of Philadelphia 2015). The first, the University City KIZ, connects Penn to the central business district and Old City neighborhood, and is managed by the University City Science Center, a non-profit corporation responsible for the creation of over 15,000 jobs and an economic impact of nearly \$9 billion (UC Science Center, 2016). The 17-acre center is owned by 31 academic institutions, but Penn holds a 40 percent majority stake and has used the corporation and its jurisdiction over the innovation zone to effectively remake the space surrounding the classically liberal Ivy League university into a high-rent “knowledge neighborhood” (Rodin 2007 [177]; BizJournal Philadelphia 14 September 2009). As testament to West Philadelphia’s transformation, the University City Science Center, the nation’s first urban incubator park, has also become the largest (Wink 10 June 2009). The second NIZ, located 4.5 miles south of Center City along the Delaware River waterfront, encompasses 1,200 acres of the former U.S. Naval Shipyard and has since been converted to a mixed-use urban development by the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC), a non-profit economic development

organization founded in 1958 by the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce (PIDC 2017). While the shipyards had been a reliable source of nearly 12,000 working class jobs two decades ago, only one ship builder remains and most of the industrial buildings have been converted for knowledge economy productions. The Navy Yard Innovation Zone includes robotic manufacturing facilities, nano- and information- technologies research space, as well as a large corporate center near Interstate 95 managed by Liberty Property Trust and Synterra Partners. The corporate center alone is home to more than 145 companies and approximately 11,500 employees, many of whom are recent graduates from Philadelphia universities (Navy Yard Master Plan 2013). In total, the Navy Yards Innovation Zone has accrued \$1 billion in private and public investment and has replaced all jobs lost during the early 1990s⁸ (Woodward 21 July 2016; NavyYard.org 2017). The third KIZ in Philadelphia encompasses the entirety of North Philadelphia and extends into the inner-ring suburbs of Southern Montgomery County, covering the largest geographic area of any of the three urban innovation zones. Known as the 611+ Corridor KIZ, several universities including Temple established BioStrategy Partners in 2005 to control the zone and secure state subsidies for life science research and technology commercialization (Key 31 July 2006; biostrategypartners.org 2004-2017). The organization is registered as a 501(c)(3) charitable enterprise under the United States tax code, thus exempt from federal income tax, and lists its mission as “the development and transfer of academic research into the marketplace” (biostrategypartners.org 2004-2017).

⁸ In what many consider a symbolic gesture, the decommissioned *USS John F. Kennedy* is again docked in the Naval Yard harbor, now on display in front the headquarters for Urban Outfitters, a trend-setting clothing company. The ship was the last military vessel overhauled at the Philadelphia Navy Yard in the 1990s (Woodward, 21 July 2016).

All three KIZ sites are insightful locations to study the inherent contradictions of an advanced capitalist economy in the urban landscape, demonstrating state intervention to counteract declining growth rates and jumpstart stagnant commercial development. Ivy League gravitas and a private endowment has thus far proven the most powerful anchor to economic reprogramming, and Penn has set the *modus operandi* in Philadelphia; however, Temple, as a public university, articulates the greatest ideological incongruity in their spatial practices. In the most recent press release for the 611+ Corridor KIZ dated 4 November 2010, Temple relayed the importance of knowledge commercialization:

One of the most important aspects of any successful university research enterprise is the incubation of new ideas and the work of research faculty in developing them into new discoveries. But just as important is bringing those discoveries from the laboratory to the marketplace to benefit the public (Temple 4 November 2010).

Through this logic, the market is recast as a vehicle for distributing public university knowledge as a public good, *not a commodity*, in a move undermining civic ownership of the institution and its output. The market logic simultaneously minimizes state subsidization of public-to-private knowledge transfer seemingly in an effort to elude critique of corporate welfarism as has been extensively theorized of public-private partnerships. A chief concern, as David Harvey notes, is the use of public funds – paid for by current, and often working class, residents – to sponsor the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Much of the vaunted ‘public-private partnership’ of today amounts to a subsidy for affluent consumers, corporations and powerful command functions to stay in town at the expense of local collective consumption for the working class and impoverished (Harvey 1994).

For the remainder of this chapter, we will therefore discuss Temple-led efforts to transform North Philadelphia using this contradictory logic of capital to interrogate the knowledge economy as a false-promise for the public good.

To Live in Philadelphia and Not Be Rich is a Misfortune

From humble origins as a Baptist night school to rapid expansion in the post-World War Two era, Temple University has long operated under the assumption that a technical education is an engine of upward mobility in a capitalist economy. The founder, Russell Herman Conwell, engendered the university with this “Temple Idea,” a counter to labor unions and a clarion call for an individual work ethic, but has subsequently been negotiated and renegotiated as the material conditions of Philadelphia have evolved within macroeconomic cycles (Mantuano 2011). In the course of the university’s history, thousands have attended Temple, most of whom, however, have come from the working-class neighborhoods of Philadelphia and have stayed post-graduation within in the region (Brookings 2003). This section specifically looks at the ideological underpinnings of the “Temple Idea” as the university has grown from a night school to a state-related university, and identifies the emergent paradox of a regionally-drawn student population increasingly concentrated within the dense, urban campus.

While functioning informally as a theological night school in the basement of Grace Baptist Church since 1884, Temple was established in 1888 by charter granted from the General Assembly of Pennsylvania “for the benefit of working men” and was amended in 1891 to grant institutional “right, power and authority to confer all the useful

College Titles and Degrees” (Charter of the Temple College of Philadelphia 1888).⁹

Unique at the time, Russell Herman Conwell, the founding president and a circuit preacher, developed a practical curriculum “to give education to those who were unable to get it through the usual channels” and oriented the university to serve as a mechanism for upward mobility in the industrial city (Lovik 2005). His *Acres of Diamonds* speech, an address delivered in excess of 6000 times from 1900 to 1925¹⁰, is credited by the university for inspiring its current mission, which is largely intact from the ideological era of Social Darwinism (TIME 2 March 1936; Hilty 2010). In the speech, Conwell draws a parallel of purpose between the Protestant work ethic and an education in a critique against labor unions and the doctrine of collective interest. He argues to “be a man, be independent” and claims that through hard work the laboring man “shall then” ascend “from poverty to wealth.” In this line of reason, Conwell alludes to the market ethic, stating:

I care not whether you are a lawyer, a doctor, a housekeeper, a teacher or whatever else, the principle is precisely the same. We must know what the world needs first and then invest ourselves to supply that need, and success is almost certain (Conwell 1915).

And, in an *ignoratio elenchi* but clever ploy, contends that knowledge, not investment capital, is the most effective vehicle to achieving success: “You need common sense, not copper cents.” Conwell, moreover, sought to upend collectivist doctrine through the act of reclaiming the pulpit from labor organizers such as John Mitchell of the United Mine Workers who used the Catholic and Protestant churches as a platform to build union

⁹ The university charter was amended in 1907 extended the opportunity for admission to working-class women, who, prior were excluded from enrollment. Yet the legal notation maintained an emphasis on male education, written as “intended primarily for the benefit of Working Men; and for men and women desirous of attending the same” (Charter of the Temple College of Philadelphia, 1888; amended, 1891).

¹⁰ Conwell provided funding for nearly 10,000 students from income earned delivering the *Acres of Diamonds* speech (Foundation, 1926).

power in the Eastern Pennsylvania coal fields (Bailey 2008; Lichtenstein 2013).

Following his exegesis on markets, Conwell exclaimed that “he is an enemy to his own country who sets capital against labor or labor against capital,” and challenged the biblical assumption that “money is the root of all evil,” instead positing that “the *love* of money is the root of all evil.” He surmises, “We ought to be rich, because money has power” and warned of moral imperative:

For a man to say, “I do not want money,” is to say, “I do not wish to do any good to my fellowmen” (Conwell 1915).

Conwell led the university until his death in 1925, keeping tuition low and minimizing barriers to admission. The second and third presidents were private-sector executives. Charles Ezra Beury¹¹, a former chairman of the Bank of Philadelphia & Trust Company served the university until 1941 and was replaced by Robert Livingston Johnson, a Time Magazine executive with no traditional college degree (TIME 2 March 1936; Courier-News 18 September 1941).¹² Johnson was hired in secret by the Board of Trustees for his lack of university experience, pursued instead for his expertise in corporate advertising (Mantuano 2011). Temple, widely considered a “sham” evening school, sought better recognition for what administrators thought was a novel approach to higher education (Lovik 2005; TIME 2 March 1936).

Citing the university “as an integral part of a system of higher education in Pennsylvania”, the Pennsylvania State Legislature passed the Temple University–

¹¹ Conwell hand-picked Beury, an executive and heir to an Appalachian coal mining fortune. Beury, West Virginia was named for his father (Kenny, 1945).

¹² Livingston attended Yale University until 1917, leaving upon the declaration of war against Germany. When offered the presidency at Temple in 1941, several faculty protested against a president without full academic training; however, Yale then conferred a bachelor’s degree in recognition of his military service (Mantuano, 2011).

Commonwealth Act in 1965, a law designating Temple as “State-related” and guaranteeing subsidized tuition and funds for capital improvement projects. The Act, moreover, extended state authority over university governance. The Board of Trustees grew to 36 voting members and gave seats to the mayor of Philadelphia and state governor. Twelve trustees are appointed positions, approved by the state senate (Temple University-Commonwealth Act 1965). Today, Temple ranks among the top universities in production of professional school graduates and, per the mission statement, “prepares the largest body of practitioners in Pennsylvania” (About - Temple.edu 2017). The *About* section on the university website further defines Temple as “...An engine of employment. A melting pot of ideas and innovation. An incubator for tomorrow’s leaders.” (About - Temple.edu 2017). And nearly a third of all students are Philadelphia residents, having their permanent addresses registered within the city limits (Fact Book 2016-2017), although a growing number now come from the outlying suburban areas in Eastern Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York and at the expense of maintaining a localized, and diverse student body. According to Mike Benner of *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, as a percentage of total enrollment, fewer African American students were offered admission during the 2000s than in the previous decades and Stuart Henry found that “graduates from the Philadelphia public schools have declined from 29 percent of the freshman class in 1996 to 10 percent in 2005 (Benner 18 July 2007; Henry 2005). Former Temple President, David Adamany, famously quipped to the Philadelphia Inquirer about such changes in 2003, “Can you turn the better-qualified students away so you can take the least qualified? That’s not a policy anybody endorses” (Kerkstra 5 June 2005). Herein lies the nascent contradiction of the urban public research university:

abandonment of local the population in favor of increasing enrollment from the regional and global citizenry to improve institutional competitiveness in the marketplace of higher education.

A Strategy of Accumulation

The socio-economic composition of North Philadelphia, like other university neighborhoods throughout North America and Europe, has become decidedly more affluent given the rapid influx of students from the suburban hinterlands. Since 1998, enrollment has nearly doubled, climbing from 17,355 to 34,034 students by fall 2016, and has put significant pressure on university officials to increase “suitable” residential space for new students (Temple FY 2009-2010; Fact Book, 2016). Following protests in 1969, the university made an agreement with community organizations never to expand west of Broad Street; however, recent policies have been purposefully crafted to shape the surrounding neighborhood for students without formally commandeering space by urban renewal or eminent domain (McGoldrick 3 May 2016). Temple administrators have instead deployed university police into neighborhoods to secure private property while then relying upon the predictable outcomes of market stimulation, coordinating with private developers to satisfy student demand for residential space (housing.temple.edu 2017). Moreover, university planning efforts have produced guidelines to improve pedestrian features and architectural conditions along streets where the campus interfaces with the residential community (Sasko and Rolen 29 April 2014; Adams 2014 [67]). Chic restaurants and artisanal coffee houses have opened in former warehouses, automobile

service centers and neighborhood bars, exacerbating permanent resident concerns with cultural erasure and gentrification (Temple FY 2009-2010; Fact Book 2016). A North Philadelphia resident lamented to Aljazeera America:

In the last five years, we have had an 80 percent jump in rent. It's a concern that's lurking over you (Moskowitz 31 December 2014).

And in a 2014 article appearing in Axis Philly, a non-profit community news organization founded by the Temple Center for Public Interest Journalism, Solomon Jones explained:

That's what's so troubling about the current revitalization being implemented in poor communities in North and West Philadelphia. It reminds me of the days of urban renewal, because it's driven not just by private developers, but also by large institutions and government entities (Jones 4 March 2014).

This section therefore disentangles the various university practices of power in two interrelated parts: first analyzing how administrators have extended their juridical domain into the neighborhood, and then examining the planning practices that seek to reconfigure space for improved market vitality in North Philadelphia.

Of the 12,626 students who live on or near main campus, more than live half in non-university affiliated residential properties in the eight surrounding zip codes and Temple has been complicit in producing the off-campus residential culture (Fact Book 2016-2017 [69]). The *University Housing and Residence Life* department website enables students to find campus in the surrounding neighborhoods, encouraging renters to “use our interactive map feature... ..to discover which neighborhood is right for you” or to use the official *temple University Off Campus Housing* page on Facebook (housing.temple.edu 2017). According to Claire Sasko and Emily Rolen of the Temple student paper *Temple News*, the university has also hosted frequent off-campus housing

fairs for private developers to more easily reach their target customers (Sasko and Rolen 29 April 2014). While increasing residential demand in a reiterative process of market revitalization that is central to the second part of this section, growing student presence in North Philadelphia effectively extends university jurisdiction beyond the property limits of campus and produces *de facto* university dominion. Article III of the Student Conduct Code states that the jurisdiction of the code “shall apply to conduct that occurs...
...within 500 yards of university premises,” but “may also apply to off-campus incidents or conduct” (Student Conduct Code, 2016 [6]). This legal framing gives the university authority over student behavior no matter where students reside. Moreover, the Temple University Police Department, the largest university force in the nation, routinely dispatches patrol units into North Philadelphia neighborhoods and, according to a 2014 university press release, has extended the border of police authority farther into North Philadelphia in response “to growth in Temple’s residential student population” (Henry 3 September 2014; Temple 3 September 2014)¹³. The 2014 *Visualize Temple* master plan reiterates the importance of increased neighborhood policing:

Temple safety efforts also reach beyond the immediate limits of campus boundaries in response to a large portion of students who live off camps, especially to the west of Broad Street (Master Plan 29 October 2015 [83]).

Per the planning text, patrol areas should expand in tandem with future patterns of student population growth while policing logics are framed in a mutually beneficial

¹³ The Temple University Police Department has a longstanding partnership with the Philadelphia City Police Department which has intermittently manifest as a racial project. In 1967, African American students from Temple organized a protest against poor learning conditions in the School District of Philadelphia. The Police Commissioner, Frank Rizzo, was quoted as saying “get their Black asses” (Brandt 2014).

language.¹⁴ Charles J. Leone, executive director of Campus Safety Services, elaborated upon the patrol boundaries, explaining that increased policing complements the *Good Neighbor Initiative*, a program designed to assist students in “making Temple and North Philadelphia [their] home” without causing social problems for permanent residents (goodneighbor.temple.edu, 2017). Leone went on to state in a *Temple Now* article:

With Temple Police providing the same level of protection and responsiveness to students and residents alike, we are confident that the exterior patrol zone will create a safe environment and strengthen the quality of life for everyone who lives around Main Campus (Lausch 3 September 2014).

Indeed, many residents are pleased with initiatives to curb disruptive student behavior in North Philadelphia; however, such juridical practices empower universities to secure private property and protect markets (West 30 October 2010; Stamm 12 April 2017; Tanenbaum 6 April 2016). Formalized police authority coupled with legally-binding conduct codes thus extend university jurisdiction and recreate the conditions of neighborhood dominion that administrators agreed against in 1969 (Peleirangladien 30 October 2015).

The 2014 master planning process largely mimics the subtle ideology of juridical dominion over neighborhood space, creating the façade of collaboration while revitalizing real estate markets through the exercise of soft power. Termed *Visual Temple*, the university contracted SmithGroup JJR, an architecture firm with ten locations in the United States in China, to craft the master plan over an 18 month period beginning in early 2013. The comprehensive vision draws upon 18 months of research and

¹⁴ As a preventative measure against on-campus crime, the 2014 Master Plan states: “the lighting philosophy is “the sun never sets on Temple,” thus demarcating an unending area of surveillance no matter the time of day (Master Plan, 29 October 2014 [141]).

organizes the suggestions of nearly 3,000 members of the university community into a guide for 10 years of campus development. Planners formed university committees and focus groups to solicit feedback from faculty and staff, in addition to hosting open houses for student groups and the alumni association. An online portal allowed residents of North Philadelphia neighborhoods to share their opinions on campus issues; however, the executive summary dictates that the “primary aim” of the master plan is “to support the continued growth in academic excellence, research and quality of student life for the University” (Master Plan 29 October 2014 [5]).

Most importantly, *Visualize Temple* upholds the 1969 promise to preserve the existing legal boundaries of campus, suggesting that all new construction takes place on university-owned properties and maximizes structural square feet per acre, but explicitly emphasizes university influence over commerce over the public streetscape. The Architectural Design Guidelines chapter lists “engage the city” as a principle directive:

Continue investment and development in campus edges and adjacent communities to remain an education, cultural and economic anchor in the city, the region, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Master Plan 29 October 2014 [173]).

Along Broad Street, the agreed upon limit to university growth, planners wrote that “its continued revitalization is a primary goal of the master plan” and, to this end, made recommendations for an outward facing campus (Master Plan 29 October 2014 [177, 181-182]).

In particular, mixed-uses, 24-hour environments and lively streetscapes will enhance the campus image, better integrate campus and city and provide a safer public environment for students, staff and neighborhoods (Master Plan 29 October 2014 [183]).

Near the same time as the Master Plan was released, the Pew Charitable Trusts found that the displacement of long-time residents in Philadelphia was most pronounced near universities and Solomon Jones of the *Philadelphia Inquirer* reported:

“According to Pew, the area west of Temple saw the most extreme change in property values of all university areas in the city, with the median sale price of a house going from \$11,250 in 2000-01 to \$140,000 in 2013-14.” (Jones 26 October 2016)

Google, moreover, reclassified this area in West Philadelphia as Temple Town on Google Maps, replacing the traditional Cecil B. Moore Community name. The university distanced itself from the name change, considering that the once predominantly African American neighborhood was named for a local civil rights activist; however, realtors and property developers have continued to use the Temple Town moniker even following a reversal by Google (Roberts 15 November 2014; Sasko and Rolen 29 April 2014). Beverley Coleman, assistant vice president of community relations and economic development, went on record with the *Temple News* as saying “it’s not something that Temple controls” and undergraduate student body president, Darin Bartholomew, further absolved institutional responsibility, “I don’t look at it as good or bad, I look at it as the market being able to work” (Sasko and Rolen 29 April 2014).

In 2016, the university trustees commissioned a feasibility study for a potential \$100 million football stadium on university property and tangentially tied to the master planning recommendations calling for economic revitalization of North Philadelphia. Immediately facing criticism from local residents for proposing a project that would accelerate gentrification processes, the university turned to social reforms to circumvent their exercise of heavy-handed economic development. And as the most recent attempt at major campus construction, this particular event articulates a distinct strategy of

increasing institutional accumulation at the expense of local interest, albeit on hold. The university president, Neil Theobald, believed a stadium was essential to improving the university's public image (Lausch 8 February 2016; Mathis 5 January 2015).

Theobald imbued trustees and residents in a 2015 *Philadelphia Inquirer* open-editorial; first alluding to building an identifiable national brand, “we are proud of our team’s success and the national spotlight it provides,” and then emphasizing economic impact:

We are very realistic about the job potential for this project. The fact is that Temple is already the economic engine of North Philadelphia. With 39,000 students, a large hospital and 15,000 employees located on this site, the stadium itself is not being touted as an economic driver.

Having said that, building an on-campus stadium would, in the short run, employ hundreds of construction and trade workers during the two-year building process and promote significant economic activity at a time when North Philadelphia needs it” (Theobald 10 November 2015).

The president connected the facility to alumni outreach, “so they can see what an amazing renaissance has taken place” and called the stadium “a logical step” not only for the university, but for “one of the nation’s great cities” (Theobald 10 November 2015).

As a deviation from the soft-power techniques of market stimulation demonstrated in the collaborative master planning process, residents quickly condemned the administrative agenda and organized a resistance (McGoldrick, 26 February 2016). Along with students, residents formed Stadium Stompers, an activist group, and hosted several community forums (Tanenbaum 14 April 2016; Swann, 20 September 2016). Several local politicians and city council candidates spoke in solidarity against the proposal, decrying university stadium planning “a closed-door decision-making process” (Orso 10 February 2016). In March 2016, administrators announced that Moody Nolan would design the stadium and introduced the group as “the country’s largest African-American owned and managed

architecture firm.” Curtis J. Moody, president and CEO then promised to “help the university address concerns that are addressable” (Bohnel 29 March 2016). A featured article on the Temple University website suggested that neighborhood concerns “most commonly include noise, trash, traffic, and parking,” but a report in the Philly Voice, a digital-only newspaper, countered two days later that the chief concern of organizers is “temple made gentrification” (McGoldrick 12 April 2016; Tanenbaum 14 April 2016). As of February 2017, the Temple News reported that the design of the stadium was put “on hold” for the foreseeable future. Administrators could not confirm if the decision is permanent (Brandt, Christie, and Brennan 21 February 2017).

Everyone wins, except the people who have been living in Philadelphia their whole lives

Indeed, the tides have turned for many Philadelphia as a result of university-generated development and the knowledge economy. Temple has repeatedly justified state-appropriations requests by this logic, in fiscal year 2009-10 writing that “as Pennsylvania transitions from a manufacturing to service economy, a college education will be a requirement for an increasing number of entry-level professional positions, while Penn has become internationally renowned for revitalizing West Philadelphia and developing the nation’s largest urban research park. For the first time since the 1950 federal census, the city saw its population grow in 2010, although by a mere 0.6 percent to 1,526,006 from 2000 (Stamm 9 March 2011). State financed economic development has encouraged a dynamic real estate market throughout much of Center City, University City, and North Philadelphia neighborhoods and Penn President emeritus Judith Rodin

has even touted university neighborhood revitalization efforts as a mutually beneficial strategy for both students and citizens, and when writing about the neighborhoods near Penn emphasized that university policies were designed not to “leave the poor and unskilled behind” (Rodin 2007 [177]). Nevertheless, rates of displacement have been greatest near both Penn and Temple, causing one student journalist to remark in response to redevelopment, “everyone wins, except the people who have lived in Philadelphia their whole lives” (Roberts 15 November 2014).

For three decades, strategic institutional investments and public-private partnerships have amplified the marketability of university neighborhoods in Philadelphia, causing increased property values and rising apartment rents. In fact, Kevin Gillen, a Penn Fels Institute of Government research consultant, found that from 2010 to 2014, University City rent prices increased by 62 percent – the greatest rate for any Philadelphia neighborhood while two adjacent neighborhoods, Cedar Park and Poweltown, came in second and third at 60 and 49 percent, respectively (Gillen, 14 January, 2014; Ruderman 23 October 2016. When speaking to the Philadelphia Public News, Gillen quipped, “and that’s just the market at work” (Ruderman 23 October 2016). But these market forces result in the displacement of lower-income residents, most often People of Color, and are driving the reorganization of wealth throughout the metropolitan. Brookings Institute fellow, Elizabeth Kneebone, found that while urban centers saw comparative growth to the suburban fringes following the “great recession,” a reversal of post-war demographic trends, cities still host the most census tracts where poverty is concentrated (Kneebone 31 July 2014). Moreover, while poverty is growing fastest in the suburbs, “it’s growing particularly fast in areas where poverty is already

concentrated” (Dews and Saxena 1 August 2014). According to a 2016 report from City Observatory, a new urbanist think tank, Philadelphia has a staggering deep poverty rate of 12.3 percent, the largest among the nation’s 10 largest cities, and an overall poverty rate of 26 percent (Romero 27 April 2016).

Beyond the outer limits of University City, just a mile west from the elite universities including Penn, almost half of all residents (who are predominantly African American) live below the poverty line and that number is growing (Moskowitz 31 December 2014). There, high vacancy rates allow lower-income individuals to move in from University City without driving rent upward and is contributing to the acceleration of *de facto* segregation in Philadelphia, which is already a leading metropolitan area in that metric (Otterbein 22 September 2015; Silver 1 May 2015). The concentration of poverty is caused by expulsion from university areas, which have become “enclaves of whiteness,” as Chad Dion Lassiter noted to Aljazeera America (Moskowitz 31 December 2014). Prior to Penn’s interest in community engagement, West Philadelphia was a majority-African American neighborhood (Brey 19 May 2016). The spatial patterns of inequality are, however, more pronounced in North Philadelphia where property values have most recently skyrocketed as a result of university investments. As of 2010 in North Philadelphia, 57 percent of residents lived in poverty, 17 percentage points above the threshold to be considered “concentrated” and up 18 percentage points from 1970 levels (Romero 27 April 2016). Researchers at *Hidden City Philadelphia*, a trust sponsored by the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts and the Philadelphia Cultural Fund, found that Temple development, in fact, accelerated residential displacement, writing in a 2016 report:

Long-term resident exodus from Temple's vicinity would have been between 10 and 20 percent. Instead, Temple vicinity's long-term resident population declined from 5,139 to 2,953, a significant decline of 42.5 percent. This suggests that there is something else at play here, namely, the suspected culprit of gentrification" (Hilbert 4 May 2016).

Contrary to declared ambitions of the consortium of Philadelphia universities, neither university-generated developments nor the knowledge economy have created effective avenues for the upward mobility of city residents as People of Color and lower-income residents are reconcentrated in areas away from the universities (Pew Charitable Trust 19 May 2016). The universities simply operate in their immediate interest, attracting affluent students from the suburban counties to improve endowments and tuition incomes, and investing in translocal research centers.

CHAPTER SEVEN THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Lux Hominum Vita

Academy on the National Edge

Discursive negotiations tend to resonate loudest in spaces of contestation, locations so competitively sought after for dueling land-uses and each with different productive values that manifest ideological incongruities that prompt inquiries against the assumptions upon which we predicate loyalty to a political-economic system. For example, the neoliberal tenant that “individual freedoms are guaranteed by freedom of the market” as David Harvey noted in his *Brief History of Neoliberalism*, evidences false in the wake of controversial university developments in the Northeast. The construction of a Manhattanville campus in West Harlem articulated two distinct expectations of an economy: profit maximization by Columbia and collectivist, but lower growth, by community groups. Market logics permeated discursive framings of university campus planning. The “marketplace of ideas,” delivering a promise of more jobs – 6,000 in both faculty and staff – and the promise of a growing industry – education versus declining manufacturing and finance – anchored university lobbying efforts at Columbia. University use of eminent domain was challenged in court and university efforts were upheld. In consequence, maximized profit extraction from the urban space was achieved only by state support. Individual liberties were thus squandered, the democratic planning process commandeered, and specific subjects granted legal advantage in the privileged education sector of industry. And in Philadelphia, where organizations of university

administrators promised that the knowledge economy would provide a conduit of upward mobility, displacement and the concentration of deep poverty followed, despite collaborative urban planning paradigms.

The preeminent test of ideological power and theoretical legitimacy is the recognition of their employ and promulgation at the limits of empire, in places removed farthest from direct control and where State sovereignty is weakest. To this task, we turn to Albuquerque, New Mexico: home to the University of New Mexico. As an institution located in a border state with a simultaneity of internal sovereignties – 19 Pueblos and 3 Native American Reservations - the university serves a diverse population and is a minority-majority institution. The university is then, per the theoretical suggestion of Michel Foucault, a heterotopia from which we can analyze the broader sea of ideological space informing our society. We find, regardless of distance from command cities and coastal wealth, the reproduction of sovereign order: the reprogramming of urban space based on the political-economic assumptions on growth and urban productivity, in addition to reaffirming citizenship predicated on labor-service.

The Public University

As the state's namesake university, the University of New Mexico operates as a wholly state-owned institution of higher education with foremost responsibility to the public. Founding legislation - House Bill 186 passed in the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico on February 28th, 1889 - ambiguously dictated that that the university should "provide inhabitants of the State of New Mexico with the means of

acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of literature, science, and arts;” however, subsequent legal reform has aligned the university governance structure more closely under immediate state jurisdiction. This occurred in 1912 upon the ascension to statehood and adoption of a new constitution when the university was “confirmed as [a] state educational institution.” The governor was granted authority to appoint members to a Board of Regents (State of New Mexico 1911). As such, the Board of Regents serve as non-elected proxies directing university policies under close supervision of the executive branch, guided by a legally mandated duty to the public. In accordance with their governing documents, the Regents however have the authority to define the parameters of a public mission, which we find emphasize the regional political-economy.

In dictating an operational framework, the current Regents stress that the university will “serve the educational needs of citizens of the state,” specifically along the lines of three principle tenets:

- 1.) UNM will provide students the values, habits of mind, knowledge, and skills that they need to be enlightened citizens, to contribute to the state and national economies, and to lead satisfying lives.
- 2.) Faculty, staff, and students create, apply, and disseminate new knowledge and creative works; they provide services that enhance New Mexicans' quality of life and promote economic development; and they advance our understanding of the world, its peoples, and cultures.
- 3.) Building on its educational, research, and creative resources, the University provides services directly to the City and State, including health care, social services, policy studies, commercialization of inventions, and cultural events. (CATALOG 2016-2017)

Previous incarnations of the institutional mission encourage student enrichment and public service; however, lack an emphasis on university-generated economic development. Now, not long after the rise of “creative class” thinking, public service is framed chiefly in the language of a financial discourse, crafted in a formal mission

statement dedicating the university towards improving the state economy. Students are trained for the workforce, knowledge production promotes economic growth, and inventions are primed for commoditization and commercialization within the city and state.

University instruction is therefore a technology of power legitimated by law and fully coopted in practice for the state. In consequence, the university is bound to regional political currents and neoliberal economic ideology is presently reflected in political conversations. Speaking before an audience at her Second Annual Higher Education Summit in mid-September, 2016, Governor Susanna Martinez presented a “Route to 66” agenda that aims for 66 percent of the working age population in New Mexico to have a post-secondary credential by the year 2030. Her plan would incentivize improved education levels in the labor force, a critical factor for competitiveness in the globally emergent knowledge economy; however, at the potential expense of a comprehensive undergraduate education. The Albuquerque Journal reported that “the governor said requirements for extra, frivolous courses put an extra financial burden on students.” Gov. Martinez jested that when enrolled as an undergraduate in Texas her “weather class wasn’t particularly relevant to her pursuit of a career in criminal justice” (McKay 2016). This kind of anti-general education rhetoric streamlines required credits for degree completion but erodes the foundation of a higher education system grounded in the well-roundedness of the traditional liberal arts.

And at the University of New Mexico, most undergraduates come from the Albuquerque and Santa Fe metropolitan areas, with 88 percent of incoming freshmen arriving from in-state and 67 percent from within the four counties, Bernalillo, Valencia,

Sandoval, and Santa Fe, and are invested in a career-centric function of the university (UNM Master Plan 2011). For students, the annually reduced state budget has relentlessly driven tuition upward and consequently increased levels of individual responsibility through debt dependency. Public college degrees are effectively reconceptualized by the state for students as monetary investments (Chatterton 2010) and when coupled together, this sustained pressure from both students and the state encourages a classroom to career pipeline that thrusts the regional purpose of the university into conflict with broader ideological concerns characteristic of a global research university.

While serving a regional mission in regards to workforce training and economic development, the University of New Mexico faculty operate in a larger, translocal network of knowledge production more closely aligned with the same logics as economically and intellectually elite, private universities such as Columbia. Indicative of this position, the university is ranked by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education – the most widely accepted authority on university research output – as an R1: Doctoral University, the highest category of research activity. Attainment of this elite classification requires an institution “Confer[s] doctorates in humanities, social sciences, STEM, & professions” (<http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/>). Thus compulsory not only to disseminate but produce new knowledge, faculty, staff, and students operate in productive networks far removed from host cities, continually engaging across regional and national boundaries so to build upon the known extent of all research within their spatially diffuse disciplines. Campus therefore exists simply as a permanent assemblage of capital, a common space physically grounded in the city, to provide the necessary means for research in globalized networks of knowledge production. For public

universities - especially those which are legally bound in service to a regional populace - institutional agendas are caught in tension between the politically ascribed public good and the functional requirements of a research intensive university. This trans-scalar simultaneity of purposes taxes finite resources and threatens existential crisis.

At the University of New Mexico, we see an attempt by the administration to navigate the complexities of state mandated economic performance and the competitive logics of global knowledge production via the strategic positioning of students at the center of institutional research capabilities. Evidenced in their discourses on growth, student identities are thus crafted to depend upon professional opportunities created through innovation infrastructure that is made possible by proposed capital improvement projects and off-campus facility expansion. In-so-doing, the university has coopted the logics of a knowledge economy to situate itself imperatively as the discursive benefactor to the city. Resulting gentrification – an anticipated *and celebrated* byproduct of the forthcoming Innovation District – is then justified because it provides opportunity for in-state student success and attracts new business. Moreover, this welding of research facilities to social reproduction perceptibly rectifies the trans-scalar incongruence inherent in a regional public research university.

Innovate ABQ

The majority of university operations have historically been confined to the main campus, located 1.5 miles east of the central business district on land zoned specifically for university use, though there has been interest in downtown student housing since the

2000 master plan (Downtown Action Team 2014). This arrangement grants the institution unique rights to self-govern its land-use and administrators are, in consequence, able to house students in non-conventional residential complexes; maintain architectural design standards distinct from the character of surrounding neighborhoods; and regulate their space with independent police forces and judicial systems. But as the University of New Mexico has grown in enrollment, now exceeding 35,000 students university-wide, few undeveloped spaces on campus remain for crucial new construction and administrators have been forced to look elsewhere in the city to expand. The 2000 Master Plan first identified Central and Broadway, the current site of university construction, as an area for potential catalytic development:

“Graduate student housing or senior housing would be a positive addition to the downtown. Service oriented shops and offices would serve the neighborhood. Shown in this plan at Central and Broadway.” (Downtown Action Team 2014)

Of the ongoing capital improvement projects including the reconstruction of the business school building, the largest involves the seven acre plot of vacant land situated at Central and Broadway. The first building opens for fall of 2017 and is the core site intended to anchor an envisioned innovation district known as *Innovate ABQ* and it is the site of interest for this case study.

University President Robert Frank was hired in 2012 by the Board of Regents with the intent of increasing university operations. Frank emphasized establishing new academic programs in the medical sciences at Kent State University and made it known at community forums that he would “drop the hammer,” ruling forcefully over resistant faculty to bring his plans to fruition (Holmen 2012). Less than a year into his administration, the president pitched the idea of an innovation campus to Albuquerque

Mayor Richard Berry and Terry Laudick, CEO of Nusenda Credit Union. Berry and Laudick eagerly partnered, the local credit union promising investment dollars, persuading to Board of Regents to adopt their proposal. However before disentangling the discourses engineered to make economic redevelopment possible, we must first deconstruct the derivation and distribution of formal power and authority exercised within this case study site. Aforementioned power structures – the Board of Regents governing on behalf of the state executive branch – hold true to on campus development; though, apply minimally to the innovation district located outside of conventional campus boundaries. When venturing beyond main campus, land management and corresponding governance structures become increasingly complex. Universities now often forge public-private partnerships - a fairly standard expectation of public institutions in a neoliberal state - that enmesh together competing logics of property and markets. As such, embryonic spaces articulate a coalescence of government and business around a shared market ethic and public rights to associated spaces are mitigated by the semi-private ownership structures.

Accordingly, InnovateABQ is simultaneously a place and organization, established in 2014 by the UNM Board of Regents as a non-profit 501(c)3 corporation to manage the seven off-campus acres of land. A thirteen member board comprised of university administrators, elected officials, and business executives oversee all operations. This board therefore aligns the university, enterprise, and state in a common commercial interest that is manifest in their formal discourses. Representing the summation of interests, the organizational mission emphasizes that Innovate ABQ is intended to “to create an integrated work, live, play community” that will produce “more

knowledge-worker jobs for graduates from our educational institutions and experienced workers in our communities” (Innovate ABQ n.d.). It fuses the commercial with the civic, linked by educational capacities, making Innovate ABQ a *de facto* extension of the university and its mission. Innovate ABQ is thus positioned to deliver upon the mandated civic promise of higher education via building an environment that anchors local graduates to the city. Nevertheless because university administrators, business leaders, and city officials entangle under a joint governance structure, their voice – that of once distinct entities – becomes a singular authority that can speak on behalf of the Board of Regents, and thus “the University.” In turn, all discourses generated by the planners and leaders of Innovate ABQ are representative of the University of New Mexico.

Creating Space

Prior to situating students, the first step in mobilizing public support for Innovate ABQ began by discursively creating space to interject a solution and this process primarily took place in the pages of master planning documents. The 2011 Consolidated Master Plan for the university, although pre-dating the actual Innovation District proposal, expressed a severe need to forge external partnership, allowing an impetus for expansion, while the 2014 Innovate ABQ Master Plan embedded university growth in a rationale for metropolitan economic development. In so doing, these documents employ a neoliberal ideology to merge university and community interests as one. The 2011 Consolidated Master Plan brought together three significant on-campus stakeholders – Deans, Administration, the Health Science Center, and UNM Hospitals – all of whom voiced a similar need for more space as indicated by a presentation of the plan given to

the Regents. On a slide titled “What we heard from the Deans,” Fine Arts desired consolidated academic space whereas the Anderson School of Business claimed to be limited by an unrecognizable location on campus. The widespread belief was that the limited academic and research facilities were a barrier to attractive “top notch faculty.” On the other hand, Administration spoke partially on behalf of students and framed housing complexes as “critical to student retention and success,” further arguing that UNM does not, but “needs to provide a campus environment that attracts the best students” (UNM Master Plan 2011)

Parking is portrayed as the common problem to facility expansion. Together, the deans, hospital, and administration frame a concern over campus access, immediately arguing a need for more space; however, the planners responsible for the consolidated master plan present public-public partnerships as a suggested resolution. Developing “transit strategies for accessing UNM/UNMH/CNM area” with MRCOG, the regional transit authority, afford the opportunity to improve mass-transit access, in turn reducing the need for on-campus parking spaces. Moreover, improved transit systems are linked to opening the city to university in-fill development (2011 Consolidated Plan).

Concurrently, the city has advanced rapid transit plans along Central Avenue and began in 2016 construction on the new system, dedicating lanes exclusively for buses in the center of the road. David Green, the principle architect behind the Innovate ABQ Master Plan, argues in a promotional video that remaking the streetscape is instrumental in decreasing “the distance between the university and downtown” and builds the Albuquerque Rapid Transit project into the master planning framework for the innovation district (Belinoff 2015). Transportation is explicitly discussed in four of five plan

principles. Livability is linked to “life without relying on an automobile;” accessibility stresses “transportation choices;” walkability requires reducing “dependency on automobiles;” and adaptability argues that “streets are the single most important element” (Innovate ABQ Master Plan). Moreover, when building support for the plan in a promotional video, Green directly ties the pedestrian aesthetic to millennial consumer tastes and economic development. He candidly proclaims:

“So it’s a generational thing, right? And so what you’re doing is you’re taking people who are now 25 graduating from college who are expecting to live in places like Boston or Chicago and you are creating those environments in places like Albuquerque.”

Green further highlights the connectedness between the university and the economy when adding that “we’re using the value – the embedded value of the university – to drive commercial development” (Belinoff 2015).

While Speaking on behalf of the Innovate ABQ organization at the first public presentation of the master plan, Green reiterated university dependence on what the plan calls appropriate urban form in an allusion to successful incubator cities. He argues that:

“For UNM, you’re not competing against University of [Texas] Austin or UCLA, you’re competing against Austin and Los Angeles. These concepts work very well in the Mission Bay district of San Francisco.”

And in the process, Green downplays social inequity, showing utter disconcert for anything aside from profit:

“Of course there are a number of people who are getting squeezed out as rents raise, and that creates issues. But, wouldn’t it be wonderful if that was your problem? That people are making too much money?” (Mayfield 2014)

The demonstrated sacrosanctity of growth is indicative of operationalized neoliberal logics within the Albuquerque innovation district. The master plan goes as far as making

direct reference to Darwinian theory, quoting Darwin in large, full page font that “it is not the strongest of the species that survive, nor the most intelligent, but the one most responsive to change,” thus applying biological competition to the success of cities (Master Plan 2013). Competition, and correspondingly a market ethic are not in their portrayal a normative belief but scientific fact.

Thus it is the perspective through which the Innovate ABQ Master Plan was sold to the community and was portrayed to the Legislative Finance Committee in pursuit of state funding. Presented on June 24, 2015 to the committee, the first two slides of content ask “what drives economic development” and continue an economic appeal to scientific legitimacy via biological analogy. Quoting Thomas Friedman of the New York Times, Innovate ABQ advocates argue “the best of these ecosystems will be cities and towns that combine a university, an educated populace, a dynamic business community, and the fastest broadband connection on earth... These will be the future job factories of the future” (Legislative Presentation 2015). The presentation then contrasts Albuquerque to the efforts already underway in cities such as Cambridge and Detroit in an effort to motivate immediate, competitive action. As evidenced, developers, government officials, and the university administrators share this goal to remake Albuquerque in the image of economically elite cities, regardless of any negative social externalities. Economic imperative – keeping pace with peer institutions and peer cities and peer profits – frames the nascent university mission to reinvigorate commerce and develop innovation infrastructure in the city of Albuquerque, but their resolution is more nuanced than state and private investment in capital improvement projects. The physical design and construction of the streetscape and innovation district simply set a foundation for

“homegrown” growth with master planning documents creating discursive space for the university and their development firms to formulate a solution to social problems through entrepreneurial student identities. Subsequent discourses are crafted to tactically situate in-state students as the lynchpin to an existing public’s betterment through the merger of higher education and economic development.

Situating Students

Without significant mention anywhere, the ills of social exclusion omnipresent in university generated redevelopment dialogues threaten public support for Innovate ABQ; however knowing gentrification is a widely recognized problem have been intentionally diminished by discursively leveraging students – residents of New Mexico - as the beneficiaries and benefactors to external investment in the city. Students’ liminal positionalities – simultaneously consumer and commodity as well as poor yet with professional potential – allow the university to conveniently frame any potential gentrification wholly as an advantage to the public since students are constituent of the body politic. Therefore, this penultimate chapter will tease apart the meanings ascribed to students in the public statements and promotional media promulgated by the university in defense of Innovate ABQ and will connect these conversations to the preemptive mitigation of potential conflict in the community. To this end, a narrative is woven together by the threads of conversation embedded throughout a series of news articles, public statements, and online television conversations. And from this, identified are two predominating characteristics of the ascribed student identity: first, that the university

trains the next generation of New Mexicans either as workers or entrepreneurs for the knowledge economy and second, that the university provides the technological infrastructure for outlier visionaries – individuals like Bill Gates, in the student body. The former is inherently cautious and seeks to provide reliable human capital for technology firms while the latter - more often celebrated in local discourses – is heralded for their unlikely but potential to accumulate magnitudinal amounts of wealth in the city. These two pillars of identity run parallel in their support for a “live work play” environment and thus prop up the economic argument for Innovate ABQ. Their in-state student positionality, moreover, gives wide-reaching and locally grounded purpose to university expansion into the central business district.

Foremost, Innovate ABQ is framed to create opportunity for homegrown college graduates. In a January 1, 2014 KRQE news story, anchor Crystal Gutierrez reported that the model for Innovate ABQ, University of Florida’s Innovation Square “has been able to create jobs, *keep graduates*, and attract business” (KRQE 2014), a point repeatedly reiterated by officials associated with the university. President Frank, has in fact related the proposed facilities to anchoring student and faculty knowledge production to local commercial capacities.

“On the university part, we want our faculty and our students – our grad students – to create tech projects that are the product of their intellectual ideas to keep them here and grow these companies that spin off and stay right here in New Mexico” (Fox Interview 2014).

In the same 2014 Fox News New Mexico interview, Mayor Berry emphasized that “it’s just important for the city as a whole” (Fox Interview 2014). The Innovate ABQ campus as envisioned will provide productive and residential space that leading stakeholders in

Albuquerque expect potential students will want. It will recreate a city where young adults will want to fiscally take root. In doing so, the city economy will blossom with basic and non-basic enterprise.

But the way these economic benefits are framed is through this very deliberate harmony between upward mobility and in-state residency. The mantra that New Mexicans profit echoes almost universally in all documented conversations. On a *New Mexico in Focus* program from April 2016, local business executive Merritt Allen intoned:

“I think the student element, where they get used to the work, live, play mindset, I do think that is the key, and that brings a different element, not just the typical downtown urbanites who are a little more sophisticated, but the 20 to 25 year old who may decide ‘this is where I want to stay in the urban center. I want to be close to things!’ And I think it’s really also neat for being a rural state and UNM being such a hub for education. People come from all over the state. How exciting to be a kid from Bard and live downtown?”

While containing a great deal to unpack in a single statement, Allen fundamentally makes an appeal to emotion, inferring that rural rags to urban riches trope validates investment in a creative class economy, that the university must create a palatable education for purchase Potential students should gravitate towards a working environment ripe with opportunity. This builds upon the logic that students are consumers seeking to purchase an education and lifestyle. It also appeals to a normative sense that the state has a duty to provide internal channels of upward mobility and the exclusive way to do so is by concentrating the ambitious in the metropolitan economy.

In reference to this assumption, on Albuquerque GovTV Dale Dekker of the local architecture firm behind the first new structure at Innovate ABQ related how paramount Innovate ABQ is to attracting students:

“There are students out there yearning for these kinds of entrepreneurial, experiential kind of opportunities, and the university is dealing with it so we’ve got a great anchor with the innovation academy” (GovTV 2016).

And then further detailed how this concentration of students could multiply corporate investment over the long-run while remarking on future use of an existing on-site building:

“The exterior appearance of the sanctuary will stay as, but we’re kind of in the process of figuring out what is the best way to reposition that building and what would the best tenants look like. But our hunch is, is again, that it will be a part of those companies that also want to participate in building up the ecosystem that is attracted by the human capital that the students represent. And access to talent that companies might want to have by being close to the innovation academy” (GovTV 2016).

Jason Perry of Signet, an international real estate developer managing Innovate ABQ, signaled his agreement on air:

The university brings that research component, and as Dale just mentioned, that they bring the student talent that a lot of these companies are looking to get close to” (GovTV 2016).

Combined, their comments elucidate the expected mechanics of a neoliberal urban economy where the university provides a labor force to the private sector, operating rather as a middle-ground between student consumption and commoditized labor reproduction. And in practice, this live, work, play culture being created in architectural form aligns very closely with Wendy Brown’s notion that neoliberal governmentalities are remaking the self – specifically the student - as an entirely economic being (Brown 2015). From the developer perspective, those who expect a maximized return on investment, this is the desired outcome for the project. Profit maximization comes from

absorbing students into spaces that large, established firms can readily identify and gravitate towards in a global landscape of mobile capital. No longer is a fully public university enough to attract corporate interest. Moreover, private enterprise can more effectively extract wealth by encouraging public-private partnership to bring these live-work-play spaces to bear.

Yet this is not the exclusive rationality mobilized in the formal discourses, and is certainly a less pervasive argument among both national and local actors affiliated with the innovation district. Because gentrification, or urban regeneration, so often articulates patterns of global investment and global wealth extraction, conversations reverberating back towards organic economic growth and immediate local advantage accentuate a perceptively positive outlook. Hence, Perry quickly pivoted his comments in a kind of rhetorical maneuver that closes off opportunity for critical counter-narratives.

“The way we’ve always approached this is, it really is a two-pronged approach. It is trying to attract business from outside the state and get them to Albuquerque, but also very importantly is to grow business organically – setting this stage, setting up the right environment, setting up the resources – [so] that students and young entrepreneurs have those resources to develop their own product, find capital for their product, advance their product moving forward, and at the same time try to attract from the outside in” (GovTV 2016)

Balancing untapped and potentially game-changing student potential within the research commodification matrix reengages an internal mobility logic and accentuates a perceptively positive outlook; however, depends greatly on high-risk speculation. Several stakeholders reiterate the monetary potential of unexpected invention and repeatedly refer to making and retaining the next Bill Gates.

A July 12, 2016 new story on local Albuquerque station KOAT TV opens with a correspondent asking “ever heard of Microsoft?,” to which she immediately reiterates the narrative university officials and local planners have put forward, reminding viewers that “Bill Gates and Paul Allen founded Microsoft in Albuquerque in the 1970s only to leave for Washington state four years later” (KOAT 2016). Applying the Microsoft vignette as the utmost exemplar of the city’s economic problems - a brain drain – Innovate ABQ is posited as the silver bullet solution. Dale Dekker elaborated in his aforementioned interview:

We’re planting seeds right now. This is a long term strategy but it could have some quick hitting [results]. Who could speculate that Bill Gates in the early seventies was in Albuquerque training and inventing the first personal computer that ultimately lead to a personal wealth for Bill Gates of over 80 billion dollars, creating 12,000 millionaires and 4 other billionaires? Think about what a different place Albuquerque would be. So, that’s the grand slam... (GovTV 2016).

Indicating the pervasiveness of this discourse, former New Mexico House Minority Whip Dan Foley corroborated:

I think this is going to start moving us in that direction where hopefully, you know, this is hindsight, but hopefully a guy like Bill Gates is able to start something, live in an apartment, work in the facility, get some people energized, and he doesn’t move to Seattle to start a company” (NM in Focus 2016).

The references to losing what became a multi-billion dollar technological empire anchors Innovate ABQ in an overly idealistic rationale and reinforces a homegrown rags-to-riches effect from investment in new university facilities. At the same time, it discounts risk and overshadows the expectation of corporate relocation that the international developers at Signet have suggested. By shaping this dominant narrative of extraordinary invention, students are discursively situated by the university administration, public officials, and local planners as the actual incubators of economic progress, the physical construction of

Innovate ABQ is relegated to an infrastructural backdrop. Per the statements made in marketing material, the construction of new buildings serve exclusively to cultivate human talent and attract new firms:

What is the impetus behind the Innovate ABQ project? It began with the economic shift that occurred during the Great Recession. The technology and human capital-based economy emerged, which highlights the need for a specialized workforce. Researchers found that four drivers of prosperity are inherent in cities that have capitalized on the new economy: human capital, infrastructure, quality of place, and innovation.

Innovate ABQ is a project that intends to bring those ideas together at a site meant to serve as the nucleus for an innovation district. Central Avenue and its neighborhoods serve as the perfect Petri dish for a 21st Century economy. Recent developments and announcements support this idea. Ultimately, Innovate ABQ will make Albuquerque more competitive in a global marketplace (Trujillo, n.d.).

The negative social processes of redevelopment – displacement of residents, increasing costs of living, etc. – are in turn deemphasized by the language of progress and gentrification is effectively eroded from conversation. Innovate ABQ therefore becomes, pursuant to this intentional framing, an investment in the existing residents of Albuquerque – or in the words of Mayor Berry, “it’s an investment in us.”

CHAPTER EIGHT TOWARDS A THEORY OF UNIVERSITY POWER

“We were merely freshmen”

Having reviewed three cases of ostensible studentification in the United States, each of the redevelopment agendas – Columbia’s Manhattanville, Temple’s Vision, and UNM’s Innovate ABQ – articulate spatial patterns of student consumption previously identified in the critical geographic literatures; however, affirm that university administrations are actively opening urban markets for reinvigorated consumption and economic production. This penultimate chapter offers an analysis of the preceding empirical work to form an overarching theory of university practice as a strategy of accumulation, merging existing theories of university-generated neighborhood change with foundational principles of political economy. Such thinking resituates the university at the center of studentification processes, recognizing market ideologies that broadly ennoble institutional authority in remaking urban space, and challenges the commonly held belief that students, as sovereign consumers, are to blame for neighborhood recommodification and displacement. Thus informed by political debates on the tenuous relationship between university financing and student-debt dependence brought to the fore during the most recent election cycle, this university-centric theoretical intervention ultimately draws a critique against the organization of knowledge – and graduate – production under the auspices of capitalism. University growth, demarcated by expanding campuses and increasing student enrollments, is understood by administrators as necessary for the survival of institutions against competition from others. At Temple, the president emphasized the relationship between the city and university ranking in his 2016

State of the University speech while administrators in the Provost's office at Columbia leveraged a series of internal studies to justify campus construction rates compared to Harvard and Princeton (Englert 2016; Bagli 2003). The University of New Mexico has developed the Innovate ABQ scheme to assist the entire City of Albuquerque in competing for investment dollars against leading knowledge economy cities such as Boston and San Francisco (Belinoff 2015).

The aforesaid case studies in higher education are not sufficiently explained by theories of neoliberal practice: state induced austerity and individual responsibility, nor post-industrial competitive advantage of a college degree. Insofar as scholars such as Neil Smith and Saskia Sassen have expounded the rescaling of global enterprise chiefly by way of consumerate versus productive commerce as an engine for such modified capital accumulation in urban centers, the revanchist urbanism thesis only provides an exceptional explanation for the embedded governmentality of institutional competition and to consumptive student behavior. The theory, however, stops short at critically accounting for what President Bollinger describes as “the marketplace of ideas” in New York or what President Rodin accurately identifies as the knowledge economy in Philadelphia (Bollinger 2003; Rodin 2007). Smith, among others, certainly deploys the understanding that neoliberal urban space has been recommodified from nodes of industrial production to global cultural and capital accumulative centers of circulation, in turn conceptually connecting working class displacement vis-à-vis petite bourgeoisie gentrification to hyper-consumption of real estate (Smith 2002; Hackworth 2007; Ong 2006). As such, social reproduction and economic production are condemned to conflict. An army of low wage workers service the affluent tastes of translocal urbanites, with no

space availed to working class residency or reproduction. And instead, poverty is rescaled to both the suburbs and urban periphery while wealth is produced in and extracted from transnational networks of cities integrated into an urban economic hinterland. But a few select cities – command cities responsible for investment and money markets - are the final recipients of unremitted capitalist expansion (Smith 2002). Saskia Sassen, professor of Sociology, reiterates; “the economic fortunes of these cities become increasingly disconnected from their broader hinterlands or even their national economies” (Sassen 2005).

If the new urbanism theory on global cities is held as valid, the existing literature on student neighborhoods endures. Studentification, what the British scholars have termed a process of reconfiguring traditional single-family neighborhoods for incoming and transient student populations, is roughly analogous to gentrification. Property developers provide apartments on lease to students who are exercising a sovereign consumer right to relocate into that urban space. In-so-doing, developers extract wealth (frequently in the form of students’ high risk credit) from elsewhere, operating in the stead of traditional basic industries. In the case of Columbia, a renowned Ivy League school located in the nation’s largest city, the university has developed a distinctively international ethos. First year students at Columbia are overwhelmingly cosmopolitan, heralding from all fifty states and over 60 countries (2020 PROFILE 2016). President Bollinger has, himself noted that more than any other institution, “you cannot help but feel the presence of every part of the globe” (Bollinger 2002). Similarly, though regionally scaled, Temple administrators began accepting more students from the suburban hinterlands relative to Philadelphia city residents during the early 2000s; and

the University of New Mexico is now discursively positioning the Albuquerque campus as a competitive opportunity for potential students from the rural areas of the state (Benner 2007; GOVTV 2016). And although the institutions are laudable for making cultural and economic opportunities available for increasingly cosmopolitan student bodies, necessary mobility remains, even with the technological compression of time and space, relatively expensive and indeed out-of-reach for the majority of potential university students (Giancola and Kahlenberg 2016). In turn, university students are highly privileged subjects, and as corporeal agents conform to the command center scale of global reurbanization, reinforcing extant theorizations of consumptive student cities.¹⁵

In addition to mobilizing the demographic reconfiguration of the regional and global metropolitan, universities are – and per their own admission – economic-powerhouses, producing value and amassing wealth immediately through exchange of patented research and human capital output in the world marketplace. According to legal documents published by Columbia:

Private colleges, universities, and other cultural institutions have grown at a rate more than three times the rate of New York State's economy, increasing employment by 16% percent between 1990 and 2005. While industrial

¹⁵ Bollinger rather effectively details this continual rescaling of capital towards the global in his 2003 op-ed, *The Idea of a University*. Writing that “just as the influence and involvements of Columbia have steadily widened over the last 250 years from the local (New York City) to the national, so will they now do so at the international level as well.” It should serve us well to additionally note that the transitions between scale have not come easily, but have resulted from crisis; first between the local and national when facing competitive decline against Johns Hopkins, the first modern American research university, and second between the national and global when students challenged President Kirk on his involvement of the university in international imperialism during the Vietnam War. At each moment, the university was under severe existential threat. These turning tides of the university, one can clearly see, are analogous to shifting scales of global economy, tethered closely to the fortunes of states on an international stage; however, in our present epoch of capital, states are becoming increasingly unmoored from the relationship between institutional actors and the economy. Cities, instead, are operating as amalgamations of independent agents in a web of global commerce. This is the current crisis of universities. “A great university,” Bollinger declared in the *Financial Times*, must continually orient itself as the world turns” (Bollinger 14 November 2003). If it does not internationalize, the university runs a risk of falling from its position. It cannot remain anchored to the diminishing power of the nation-state.

employment has been steadily decreasing in New York City, private colleges and universities annually spend \$2.1 billion in research in New York State, spurring the creation of 10,000 new jobs in the private sector. Although technological changes have shifted jobs in finance, insurance and real estate away from urban centers, the interpersonal nature of educational institutions is more difficult to replicate in cyberspace (The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York 2011).

As manufacturing declines and the financial sector faces sustained destabilization, Manhattan universities continue to grow and supplant traditional avenues of employment. Columbia is, as of 2007, the seventh largest nongovernment employer in New York City (Bollinger 7 January 2007). Writing in a 7 January 2007 edition of the *New York Daily News*, President Bollinger said:

We are a city that has always run on big ideas and that has always provided an engine of economic opportunity for people at every rung of the income ladder. Having research universities of the first rank that are a steady source of both good jobs and great minds is clearly one part of what it will mean for New York to maintain that kind of leadership (Bollinger 7 January 2007).

The idea of a knowledge economy also permeated the case studies in Philadelphia and Albuquerque, and many of the universities discussed throughout the introductory chapters (Chomsky 2016; Cruz 2016; Englert 2016; Florida 2005; 2012; Alberts 1986). Whereas aforementioned explanations do account for the commercialization of social reproduction, efficaciously disciplining students into lifestyles of elite consumption as subjects in a neoliberal state, current critical theories on political economy fail to account for the institutional ascent of universities as productive centers in urban economies and, moreover, do not readily enmesh with equally regarded theories among practitioners and mainstream economists who widely assert that economic growth is now dependent principally upon knowledge production. To make sense of this shift in accumulation, critical scholars must turn to the evolving historical-material conditions of developed

nations during the transitional period between manufacturing- and service-sector economies to reconsider how we conceive patterns of wealth production in the city.

Post-Fordist Roots to the Ideological Fix

During the frenzy of ideological warring between the developed West and East during the mid-century, economic scholars in both schools – individualistic and collectivist - chased intellectual currents that could prove potentially superior in advancing subjective perception of material conditions or future material conditions among their state citizens. The efforts, intended to produce loyalty to social systems and the state, were deployed rhetorically beyond the halls of the academe and into the homes of subjects across the empires and were especially powerful up until moments of crisis, in-which states are existentially forced to discursively reposition, in a sort-of ideological fix similar to the spatial fix (Harvey 2005; 2006). Thus exemplar, the late 1960s and early 1970s proved a fertile breeding-ground of new ideas within the state and academe, more-so out of necessity than choice. Crisis and the false promise of infinite growth, momentarily crippled Western Empire.

Citizen and student insurrection at Temple and Columbia and the University of New Mexico, in addition to universities worldwide, thrust loyalty to capitalist rule near the brink of collapse. Ten million workers occupied the streets in Paris under the leadership of rebellious students, inspired by youth in the American academe. Anti-war, anti-imperial protestors confronted government lead globalization of markets. Activists antagonized universities as complicit agents of the injustice. Factions of students stood in

solidarity with People of Color and lower-income individuals leading the charge against local conquest in the cities. And shortly thereafter, international markets collapsed, crippled by strategic oil-shortages and a fear of peak oil, augmented by destabilized state rule manifest globally and within cities. Steel foundries, automobile plants, coal mines, and textile mills shuttered. The promise of continual growth, a belief in an always better tomorrow, the very foundation upon which the American Dream and collective loyalty is predicated, decayed seemingly overnight.

As one knows, the most lucid Americans have abandoned the idea of indefinitely continued economic growth, an idea that remains with the political leaders. For these analysts of American society, growth must cross a threshold (with or without a revolution in the conventional sense), and pass into a higher stage. (Lefebvre 1995 [198]).

French philosopher and urban sociologist, Henri Lefebvre, wrote in the midst of the crisis. The ideological fix emerged within authoritative departments of economics – M.I.T., Harvard, Chicago, and Stanford.

In classical growth theory, the law of diminishing returns affords little hope in the long-run. The idea, M.I.T. economist Paul Samuelson explained, is predicated on production under a set technological conditional, and argued that increased inputs relative to fixed inputs will, until a point, increase total output, afterward returning successively reduced growth rates until each additional unit produces only enough value to cover the unit cost (Samuelson 1975). Two common scenarios, constant capital relative to expanding labor and the inverse should, in theory produce decreasing marginal productivity (Rynn 2001).

Because of its conceptual limitations, most economists had relegated the operation of this law to short-run explanation; conversely, attributing continued long-

term growth rather loosely and incongruously, to exogenous variables – meaning undefined “technological progress.” Moses Abramovits, observing first in 1956 that the United States economy developed much more rapidly than it should have considering capital and labor under neoclassical assumptions, interpolated a range of residuals as the catalysts for unexplainably accelerated growth rates in an effort to rectify the operational contradictions in classical economics (Abramovits, 1989). Most economics credited this to technological progress. Even so, the technology variable remained underdeveloped and empirically unsound; but, universally accepted in the interim of scholastic resolution (Rynn 2001).

Instead of questioning the entire volume of classical economic theory, researchers pressed into the 1980s refining technology to encapsulate knowledge more generally as a factor of production. Paul M. Romer clarifies the transition. Traditionally conceived that “economic growth occurs whenever people take resources and rearrange them in ways that make them more valuable,” thus explanatively relegating stagnation to a lack of necessary natural resources, Romer counters that accumulation rates increase when firms are equipped with the necessary human capital, knowledge essentially, to better arrange material resources than competing firms (Romer 2008). What is of fundamental significance to his endogenous postulation is the presumed opportunity for infinite growth.

Ideas don’t obey the law of diminishing returns, where adding more labor machinery or money eventually delivers less and less additional output (Wysocki 1997).

Knowledge, he argues, can be shaped in perpetuity (Romer 1990).

Notwithstanding conjectural power, the residual value of knowledge is not actually readily measured as Romer would suggest, and is neither despatialized nor intangible. Instead quantification of knowledge manifests in proxy form, most commonly in corporeal metrics of educational attainment or citizens or industrial amalgamations, with the latter observed by fellow economist Michael E. Porter who notes:

Today's economic map of the world is dominated by what I call *clusters*: critical masses – in one place – of unusual competitive success in particular fields.

And thusly accredits:

The enduring competitive advantages in a global economy lie increasingly in local things – knowledge, relationships, motivation – that distant rivals cannot match. (Porter, 1998)

It is, in the most laudatory of calculations, the very reason why cities succeed. Popular economist Edward Glaeser argues in his celebrated book *Triumph of the City* that while clustering of firms has been an ideal geographic arrangement for growth, cities are increasingly competitive when knowledge is mobilized in the utmost toward economic growth by exceptionally talented and educated labor force. He moreover associates indeterminately such ascendancy to city agency – as if they are autonomous, self-guided entities – in cultivating what is essentially an inferred loop between employment clusters and human capital; noting:

These cities create a virtuous cycle in which employers are attracted by the large pool of potential employees and workers are drawn by the abundance of potential employees (Glaeser 2011).

Explained by Harvard economist Goldin Human, capital is the measurable “the stock of skills that the labor force possesses,” therein permitting concepts of knowledge accumulation to be more immediately operationalized within grand theories of economic growth and urban development. Recognized among economists, human capital more than

physical capital is accountable for the 20th Century residual growth (Goldin 2014).

Applied theorists, such as Columbia educated Richard Florida, have even gone so far to requisition the logics of intellectual production and human capital to write specifically for an audience of corporate practitioners, urban planners, and politicians, in the process outlining a formula for readers to usher in waves of “creative class” talent to their cities, bringing with them the ideas and work ethic so sought after in a labor force by lucrative technology and design firms (Florida 2005 [87]; 2012; Florida et al. 2008).

Thus contrived as the ultimate fix to a Malthusian demise and urban decline, economic theoreticians resolutely predict that economic growth can continue – regardless of finite material resources or physical capital – and eternally add to Western – and progressively more global – civilization’s wealth within the framework of an enhanced and increasingly competitive urban intellectual network for production and idea exchange. Endogenous or new growth theory has therefore become the foundation for a reinvigorated capitalist ideology, rooted in the practice of a global knowledge economy ceaselessly expanding through seemingly limitless cyber and cerebral and city space. Endogenous economic growth has been labeled the latest, and greatest, epoch in capital accumulation. Replacing agricultural production, replacing industrial production, and in doing so largely replacing manual labor as the principle agency of accumulation, knowledge – intangible – overcomes the crisis of the mid-century manufacturing economy. And, the ideology, having reached hegemonic proportions, is now fully embedded in the operational governmentalities among state agents, corporate strategists, all levels of the petite bourgeoisie, working class subjects, *and university administrators*.

Yet knowledge is - in its ontological foundations - multiplicitously purposeful – specifically as a discursive, ideological fix. Shawn Willson wrote in his 2008 book

Research is Ceremony that:

Ontology is the theory of the nature of existence, or the nature of reality. Is there one “real” world that each of us observes differently through our own senses, or do various worlds exist, depending upon the point of view of the observer? There is no way to come to a definite answer to this question, so people develop an ontological set of beliefs and take it on faith from there. Once a set of beliefs is established regarding just what is “real,” research then follows these beliefs in an attempt to discover more about this agreed upon reality (Willson 2008).

For bourgeois-liberal economists, growth is sacrosanct – regardless of finite resources or limitations to knowledge exchange – with this assumption motivating the current theorization of perpetual accumulation and exchange in a knowledge economy. Instead, if we invert the ontological impetus of the knowledge economy through a critical lens of political economy, a contradiction of capital still emerges. David Harvey, who wrote long after the manufacturing crisis, explained that in capital’s ever necessary search for growth, the system must find more space in which it can implant its domain, extracting value from enlarging frontiers. In the process, capital roots in place, until it is again mobilized again outward by another inevitable crisis of stagnated growth. Harvey’s thoughts, however, rarely deviate from the structural sense of capital and geographic space, primarily emphasize physical fixation by means of tangible infrastructure, urban space, and previously untapped international spaces (Harvey 1989). Per the philosophies Michel Foucault explicated during his lectures at the Collège de France, knowledge is a mechanism of power (and, in turn space is) if, of course, all of human experience is contrived as war, an unending series of battles of repression and subjugation by one state actor against fellow state actors and its subjects and their own (Foucault, 1997 [173]). In this vein, politics are “the continuation of war by other means” (Foucault, 1997 [16]),

and, accordingly, the principle motive power behind the mechanics of capitalist political economy. Speaking specifically to the genealogy of knowledges, he writes:

When we look at the eighteenth century – we have to see, not this relationship between day and night, knowledge and ignorance, but something very different: an immense and multiple battle, but not one between knowledge and ignorance, but an immense and multiple battle between knowledges in the plural – knowledges that are in conflict because of their very morphology, because they are in the possession of enemies, and because they have intrinsic power-effects (Foucault, 1997 [179]).

Foucault alternatively posits that darkness followed by discovery are, counter to enlightenment expectations, a false dichotomy and unnecessary dialectic. History – the narrative stratagem portraying progress – is in turn problematized.

In light of that, the knowledge economy then has two demonstrated forms. First is a conventional form, the structural operation, what contemporary economists like Romer and Samuelson have endeavored as a resolution to perceivedly insufficient classical economic assumptions; but second and foremost is the rhetorical mobilization of knowledge economy ideals in political discourse. The concept of a knowledge economics affords persuasive expediency in its purportedly inexhaustible promise for profit. It opens space in the minds of subjects to believe in the infinite potential of capital to provide more prosperity and material gain. As universities are the production centers for knowledge, both in form of educating individuals and in providing the infrastructure necessary for research, university administrators are thus well positioned to interpose university needs in the language of a public good and in due course actualize material gains. Legislators in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania created the Keystone Innovation Zone program, giving non-profit organizations the power to manage tax-minimized districts for the benefit private enterprise (Department of Commerce 2016).

Both Penn and Temple use the program to minimize risk for their own research commoditization projects and subsidiary organizations (Rodin 2007; Lovick 2015). President Bollinger, when defending expansion of Columbia into an already occupied neighborhood on grounds of economy opportunity, acritically promised the material rewards of university growth to society, in the process ensnaring institutional logics of a knowledge economy in a larger, globalized system of commerce and beneficence. The “marketplace of ideas” he repeatedly cites predicates power over collective community planning (Bollinger 2002; 2003) and ultimately leads to state sanctioned privileging of university interests within economic development schemes.

Bollinger’s words have purchase, linguistic leverage in coaxing the state to make through law urban space available for the university, precisely because in the intellectual war waging within bourgeois ideology. The knowledge economy theory – idealized by conceptually overcoming the law of diminishing returns – has usurped traditional economic growth theory – centered principally on refining raw material through the manufacturing process for producing an accumulation of wealth. Courts ruled in favor of the private university exercising eminent domain because of the public benefit to a knowledge economy (Carlson 2010). Politicians are, moreover, imposing their ideas of the knowledge economy on land-use and education policy, investing state resources in universities, state and private, with the expectation that universities catalyze growth. Dually achieved in the short run via real estate development, commoditized and patented research, and foremost the mobilization of knowledge in the reproduction of human capital for exchange on the labor market, “the marketplace of ideas” nevertheless reveals

a more sinister machination of universities: commoditization and in-turn industrialization of social reproduction.

Whereas Neil Smith postulated that rejuvenated economies are a function of the upscaled logics of capital remade by a globalized consumerate, and whereas economic theorists portend that knowledge economies provide returns from intangible intellectual property in perpetuity; economic accumulation is still actualized in physical form – either in architectural stock or corporeal beings – but always occupying conventional geographic space. Research takes place in laboratories and libraries. Faculty members require offices and students need housing. When students graduate, they are vessels of ideas, on the job market with the competitive advantage of a degree (Florida 2005). Frequently however, college campuses are merging both the productive function of a research university with the social reproduction functions of an *in locos parentis* residential college to form a fully commercialized higher education system, growing as an extension of the city, and thus positioned at the upscaled core of global economic production *and* internationalized subject reproduction. Universities are building campuses to encourage collaboration between students, graduates, faculty, and corporate tenants. Students reside in buildings branded as “live-work-play” communities. Operation of the knowledge economy has not, contrary to popular belief and social practice, expropriated the industrial stage of capital accumulation. Thus problematizing critical interrogation by traditional conceptual terminology, the emergent educational paradigm requires we modify the Smith theory to encompass universities in globalizing identity formation although in the revised language of social reproduction. And, emergent

mechanizations of knowledge in the knowledge economy require we modify assumptions that conclude ideas have replaced industrial accumulation.

No longer does the university function as an ancillary force within bourgeois-liberal ideology nor does the university operate exclusively to perpetuate privileged



Figure 5. Banner advertising the Innovate ABQ residential complex

citizenship as it has through both the Medieval and Modern periods. The university is now fully immersed in the enduring productive, industrial capacities of society, forging working-class subjects at public universities while maintaining elite opportunities for those given rank in the most prestigious of institutions. At both scales, higher education is commoditized. Higher education also produces immense amounts of wealth and anchors contemporary urban economies. And as such, we as scholars can no longer subserviate criticisms of our higher education to that of a symptom, an academy under attack by

broader political forces, but must bring our institutions to bare full responsibility for furthering systematic social inequality and injustice. Just as Lefebvre remarked a half century ago that “the passage of commercial and banking capitalism as well as craft production to industrial production and competitive capitalism,” was crystalized by crisis, but had not been applied to “the ‘urban system,’” now, too, we can extend his logic to the university (Lefebvre 2005 [68]). The university is analogous to Lefebvrian urbanism – structural concentrations of accumulative surplus unequally shared - and functions in parallel. Similarly, accumulation is not confined to specie, but extended to the concentration of “knowledge (connaissances), techniques, and oeuvres (works of art, monuments),” and likewise born in form out of crisis (Lefebvre, 2005 [66]). As explained, we can make structural sense out of university ascendance in modern society and subsequently construct a critique extending beyond extant theoretical limits.

Lefebvre observed in the early 1970s, when witnessing the contravention of once perceivedly perpetual growth in industrial cities, what he forestalled to be a “‘post-technological’ society,” from which he developed his seminal theories on the production of space for presentation at a forum hosted by the Museum of Modern Art. Most participants, he noted, envisioned a merger of a redesigned university – one producing knowledge, singularly, and not ideology – and an experimental city – one that would radically transform social relations. Taken together, the project was termed *University and the City*. He, however, presaged nothing revolutionary about their postulates, and voiced conversely that capitalist “political economy has failed practically and theoretically,” and in that moment prophesized that the scholars were simply engaging in the “reproduction of the relations of production” (Lefebvre 1995 [201]).

To date, no academic study has evaluated this particular claim, relegated not even to a mere footnote, so what I now endeavor to elucidate is how contemporary university developments – particularly by example of Columbia at the fore and also the University of New Mexico on the imperial frontier – are the material actualization of what mainstream economists counter as theoretical fix by way of knowledge accumulation; what Henri Lefebvre argued was a preservation of existing ideological order in an instance of crisis; what David Harvey has come to specify conceptually as a spatial fix; and in what Smith partially elaborated upon as a global strategy, although augmented beyond accumulation by service consumption to encompass accumulation by knowledge production. Discourse and historical-material analyses have thus elucidated these theoretical lines to find one common thread, the perpetuation of a capitalist mode of production. Assumptions of the knowledge economy as a public good – and as an opportunity for students – legitimate the mechanics of university power that reinscribe institutional authority over urban space. As such, the recognized discourses – the politico-linguistic process through which plans are brought from blueprint to brick – crafted within a reinvigorated capital ideological lens, empower the resurrection of expansionary agendas at Columbia University and eviscerate conceptual space for resistance. These beliefs permit Temple to indirectly but intentionally influence market-rates of properties near the North Philadelphia campus and these beliefs encourage the University of New Mexico to aspire to the socio-economic conditions present in the Northeast and Silicon Valley. Displacement and indebtedness are far from serving an idealized, humanistic public good. Long-term residents are subjugated to university will and students are, subsequent to their graduation, indentured to labor until debt is replayed. In practice, the

deployment of knowledge economics in the discourses of campus expansion is, in large part, central to the process of claiming an institutional right to supplant and reprogram the post-industrial productive capacities of the city for the immediate and accumulative benefit of the university as a corporate entity.

This ideological and structural fix has only come with advancement and widespread acceptance of the theories of a knowledge economy; however as evidenced, has resulted in the perpetuation of existing of modes of production by reconfiguring urban space to industrialize the productive capacities of research infrastructure, as well as by reinvigorating the distributive capacities of productive knowledge in a corporal form of human capital. As such, universities mechanize the contemporary engines of empire in a hyper-urban age. Universities exert institutional agency over local communities by legally engineering spatial conquest within formal planning processes for the purpose of publically beneficial economic accumulation, but ascribe responsibility for social of residential displacement as the amalgamated will of markets. This, in turn, undermines critiques of neo-renewal practice and mitigates institutional fault via the neoliberal ideology of decentralized agency of individual consumers (Harvey 2005). The elevation of knowledge accumulation and promulgation to that of an inviolable public good is a deliberate attempt to circumvent a political-economic critique of academic production and to preemptively illegitimate administrative blame for the definite decrease in affordability of residential and commercial real estate in West Harlem, in North Philadelphia, and in Downtown Albuquerque – a result inherent when rent value is determined by a system privileging exchange and private property organized within the capitalist mode of production. The issues are made worse when the entire industry is

predicated on an untenable system of debt-dependent finance. University expansion projects are funded and maintained not only by state subsidy and philanthropy, but current students are increasingly called upon to pay more tuition per annum as universities try to remain competitive lure the next generation of students to campus.¹⁶

The Ivory Tower Must Crumble

Every single day you and I obediently perform our duties to the university, reaping reward for the labor that subjugates and perpetuates a bourgeois liberal order, we are complicit in the damnable machinations of capital and we are in consequence directly responsible for the students' indentured servitude upon their graduation from our academe. The mountains of wealth, credit extracted from a vapid promise found in their uncertain futures, funds our privileged intellectual enterprise – the luxuries of our near infinite libraries and digital repositories, of our embellished campus architecture towering above the surrounding community, and of our exclusive clubs that serve cocktails decided upon during meetings of the faculty senate. All the while, we, the instructors and researchers and modern day intelligentsia, gladly benefit by their benefaction and then knowingly cast those young adults into an economic landscape unable to reciprocate their sacrifice and unable to return – for all – the absolution of their debts. They will march out

¹⁶ An historical problem, Henry David Thoreau even criticized the costs of higher education when writing *Walden*. He observed:

At Cambridge College the mere rent of a student's room, which is little larger than my own, is thirty dollars each year, though the corporation had the advantage of building thirty-two side by side and under one roof, and the occupant suffers the inconvenience of many and noisy neighbors, and perhaps a residence in the fourth story. I cannot but think that if we had more true wisdom in these respects, not only less education would less education be needed, because, forsooth, more would already have been acquired, but the pecuniary expense of getting an education would in great measure vanish (Thoreau 2003).

of our ivy-clad towers into a world seeking jobs that do not exist and they will struggle to pay back the loans and their interest will mount and they will work trapped in a never-ending cycle of service to the political economic system. I suppose it seems as such fitting that we adorn ourselves in black medieval caps and velvet gowns to honor their commencement, a somber ritual harkening to feudal order and exploitive origin to our Western universities, because graduation is very much a sobering event. For students, it is the funeral of their freedom.

As the old adage goes, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions, and all too often those of us in the so-called critical vein of scholarship find false salvation in the doctrine of our decree, rather apologetically cautioning others of the dangers of capitalism, and racism, and sexism, and settler colonialism; however, still accepting the blood money of our unjust industry and our students' long, drawn-out sacrifice. We are really no different in this moment than a Coal and Iron Police officer apologizing for firing bullets in the backs of workers upon the order of a mine boss in 19th Century Pennsylvania. When we are the ones pulling the proverbial trigger, our words do not match our actions and for that there can be no redemption. Temporal distance is no resolution. Different decades do not denote *de facto* progress and simply criticizing the university without refusing our own compliance in the system cannot be considered sufficient; not when our institutional structures are predicated on extracting wealth from one group for the benefit of another and not when we know that the material conditions of millions of young adults in the United States are deteriorating as a result.

Under the pretense that an expensive baccalaureate degree would open doors otherwise unattainable during the Great Recession ultimately leading to increased

lifetime earnings compared to lesser-educated, young adults began enrolling in 4 year colleges and universities at a greater rate than prior to the economic downturn; however, the approximately 12 million students who graduated from the approximately 2.5 thousand 4 year colleges and universities between 2008 and 2014 still found themselves entering a saturated labor market upon graduation that has not lead to significantly improved employment opportunities or wage increases (Hoxby and Strange 2016; National Center for Education Statistics 2016). Innumerable academic studies and government reports have chronicled this imbalance between graduates and jobs. In New York City, the Office of the Comptroller found that while by 2015 the overall unemployment rate recovered to pre-recession levels, the rate for 18 to 29 year olds remained 1.1 percentage points higher and that the number of young adults employed, for example, by the financial sector in high wage positions declined by nearly 11,000 people from 2000 to 2014. Conversely, employment for the same group grew in hospitality, food service, and retail by 91,000 jobs, but saw real wages fall by 16 percent over the same period (Stringer, 26 April 2016). Millennials across the nation have fared similarly. Eileen Patten of the Pew Research Center observed in 2015 that although “a consistent 78% of men in the Gen X, Boomer and Silent generations were employed at ages 18 to 33,” only 68 percent of millennial men were employed at the time of the study (Patten 2015). Likewise for those in the generation who are currently employed, median incomes are now \$2,000.00 less than they were for the same age group in 1980 – even for those in the archetypally booming economy of California (Thompson 2015). And Bloomberg reported that “young job-seekers appear to be the biggest losers” in a 2017 article titled *U.S. College Grads See Slim-to-Nothing Wage Gains since Recession* (Weinstein 2017).

Thus emerges the great contradiction of our time: a college degree that no longer results in an inherently better station in life than one's parents had enjoyed a mere three decades prior. With such increasing numbers of young adults holding college degrees yet un- or under-employed, a surplus of human capital accumulates – contrary to the proselytization of knowledge economy theories – sunk into the city, driving upwards real estate consumption in already scarce spaces and reducing demand in the once higher-value suburban hinterlands, now left unwanted after 2000s era housing bubble burst. The high exchange value of a college degree has subsequently dried up much to the benefit of firms and at the expense of a once revered competitive advantage among the well-educated individuals in our society. University administrators nevertheless continue to advertise our institutions as transcending market value, esteeming higher education as magnanimous and sacrosanct and serving some infallible public good while we justify our participation on grounds of research engaging the community or aiding marginalized populations in their pursuits of better, more resilient lives. Yet as long as our ideas go uncoupled from actually improving conditions and catalyzing material gain for all those we immediately serve, and as long as we knowingly subjugate the majority of our students to a life indentured to debt, our ideological purpose has no ethical purchase. A knowledge economy, framed by the potential for infinite growth of ideas, appeared the ultimate ideological and structural fix. In consequence, universities as extensions of the state provide a spatial 'fix' for human capital in the wake of the other failing industrial sectors. Real estate went bust in 2008. Growth in finance and insurance slowed. Manufacturing faltered. Yet the material conditions of young adults – the corporeal incarnations of human capital - reinforce the Harvey thesis on capital accumulation. The

surplus, growing under ballooning debt, is bound to bust. The crisis of unpaid loans looms and the promise of perpetual growth in a knowledge economy is revealed false. Actual people are suffering – the student gentrifiers and the displaced. As the academicians thus far responsible, our principles must imbue us with the sense of duty to change directions and build a better university, if we hold those convictions to be true; moreover, motivating us in the process to cast off the contractual shackles that subserviate us to the exploitive will imbedded in our institutional structures and economic system.

Limitations of the Study

Although engaging a near-exhaustive review of known primary source material, the capacity of this research to prove universal truth claims is limited by the selective sample size of three case studies as well as the subjective bias of myself as a researcher. To the first point, this study only investigated the development practices of three Research 1 universities – large institutions with a vested interest in the output of research knowledge. No regional public colleges or private liberal arts colleges, both of which are focused preeminently on instruction. Moreover, and on the second point, the structure of this research project is informed by my own experiential biases – as suggested by my personal narrative in the introductory section – and is guided by my own ontological beliefs in historical-material method and post-structural concepts of power. Furthermore, and most significantly, this analytic method is unable to definitively isolate causality through the interrogation of university agency in the evolving cityscape. The mobilization

of the knowledge economy as an ideology for rejuvenated urban economic development emerged through a negotiative process and was both reactionary and proactive in the three case studies. This distinction of chicken or the egg, while interesting, is not crippling or necessarily fundamental to the scholastic integrity of the argument. Uncertainty of cause does not invalidate the observation that university administrators have exercised political and economic authority to reprogram urban space while also situating student identities within a neoliberal logic of belonging in the urban environment.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources, Media, and Academic Scholarship

- Adams, C. T. (2014). *From the Outside In: Suburban Elites, Third-Sector Organizations, and the Reshaping Philadelphia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press .
- Adamy, J., & Overberg, P. (2016, May 19). Population Surge in Cities Eases as Jobs Shift and Suburbs Call. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Addie, J.-P. D., Keil, R., & Olds, K. (2015). Beyond Town and Gown: Universities, Territoriality and the Mobilization of New Urban Structures in Canada. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 3(1), 27-50.
- Aiken, H. D. (Summer 1970). Can American Universities be Depoliticized. *Philosophic Exchange*, 1(1).
- Alberts, R. C. (1986). *Pitt: The Story of the University of Pittsburgh, 1787 - 1987*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Allinson, J. (2006). Over-Educated, over-Exuberant and over Here? The Impact of Students on Cities. *Planning Practice and Research*, 21(1), 79-94.
- Allison, J. (1888). *The Charter of the Temple College of Philadelphia with Amendments*. Philadelphia: Court of Common Pleas.
- Anderson, D. (2016, July 12). Partners break ground for new building at Innovate ABQ site. *UNM Newsroom*.

Anderson, J. (2013, April 25). Mayor Bloomberg Speaks at Columbia University Center on Global Energy Policy Launch. *Breaking Energy*.

Aragon, D. (2016, July 20). UNM and Innovate ABQ foster growth in entrepreneurs, creators. *Daily Lobo*.

Arenson, K. W. (2007, December 21). For a Top-Tier University, There's Now Room to Get Even Better. *The New York Times*.

Avorn, J. L. (1968). *Up Against the Ivy Wall*. New York: Atheneum.

Bachelard, G. (1994). *The Poetics of Space*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bady, A., & Konczal, M. (Fall 2012). From Master Plan to No Plan: The Slow Death of Public Higher Education. *Dissent*.

Bagli, C. V. (2003, July 30). Columbia, in a Growth Spurt, Is Buying a Swath of Harlem. *The New York Times*.

Bailey, N. (2007, August 23). *Columbia University President Bollinger Booed by Harlem Residents*. Retrieved November 2016, from Youtube:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0JpF07SOo4&t=4s>

Baldwin, D. (2008, August 15). At Harlem's Heart, an Enigmatic Neighborhood. *The New York Times*.

Ballon, H. (2002, January). The Architecture of Columbia: Educational Visions in Conflict. *Columbia College Today*.

Banham, R. (1966). *The New Brutalism: ethic or aesthetic?* Oxford: Architectural Press .

- Bansel, P., & Davies, B. (2005). The Time of Their Lives? Academic Workers in Neoliberal Time(s). *Health Sociological Review*, 14(1).
- Barker, C. (2008). Some Reflections on Student Movements of the 1960s and Early 1970s. *Revista Critica de Ciencias Sociais*, 81, 43-91.
- Barnett, T. (1989). *Social & Economic Development: an Introduction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Barrett, S. H. (2016, October 24). After Years of Opposition, Columbia University Comes to Manhattanville. *WNYC News*.
- Barros, E. R. (1993). Some Implications of New Growth Theory for Economic Development. *Journal of International Development*, 5(5), 531-558.
- Behrent, M. C. (2013). Foucault and Technology. *History and Technology: An International Journal*, 29(1), 54-104.
- Belina, B., Petzold, T., Schardt, J., & Schipper, S. (2013). Neoliberalising the Fordist University: a Tale of Two Campuses in Frankfurt A.M., Germany. *Antipode*, 45(3), 738-759.
- Belinoff, B. (2015, March 9). *David Green Talks About Innovate ABQ*. Retrieved September 2016, from Innovate ABQ.
- Benner, M. (2007, July 18). Is Temple No Longer 'Diversity University'? *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*.

- Benneworth, P., Charles, D., & Madanipour, A. (2010). Building Localized Interactions Between Universities and Cities Through Spatial Development. *European Planning Studies*, 18(10), 1611-1629.
- Bernard Wysocki, J. (1997, January 21). For Economist Paul Romer, Prosperity Depends on Ideas. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Berrthill, M. (1993, February 1). Columbia University Names George Rupp as New President. *News Releases*. Houston: Rice University .
- BioStrategy Partners. (2017). *BioLaunch 611+ KIZ at a Glance*. Retrieved March 2017, from www.biostrategypartners.org
- BioStrategy Partners. (2017). *Fact Sheet*. Retrieved March 2017, from www.biostrategypartners.org
- Bloomberg, M. R., & Paterson, D. A. (2009, May 20). Statements of Mayor Bloomberg And Governor Paterson On Final Public Approval Of General Project Plan For Columbia University Expansion. City of New York.
- Board of Trustees. (2002). *Bylaws of Temple University - of the Commonwealth System of Higher Education* . Philadelphia : Temple University .
- Board of Trustees. (2004). *Student Conduct Code*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Board of Trustees. (2016, February 8). Resolution related to on-campus stadium.
- Bohnel, S. (2016, March 15). Trustees to meet today amid ongoing stadium discussion. *Temple News*.

- Bohnel, S. (2016, March 29). University picks architect for possible stadium. *Temple News*.
- Bollinger, L. C. (2002). *Lee C. Bollinger's Inaugural Address*. New York City: Columbia University. Retrieved from Columbia University .
- Bollinger, L. C. (2003, October 15). The Idea of a University. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Bollinger, L. C. (2003, February 14). Universities Must Think Globally. *Financial Times*.
- Bollinger, L. C. (2006, January 26). New York City and the Columbia Experience . New York: Columbia University .
- Bollinger, L. C. (2007, December 19). City Council Approves Proposed Expansion in Manhattanville. New York: Columbia University .
- Bollinger, L. C. (2007, November 26). City Planning Commission Acts on Proposed Expansion Plans. New York: Columbia University .
- Bollinger, L. C. (2007, June 18). Rezoning Application for Manhattanville Proposal Certified. New York: Columbia University.
- Bollinger, L. C. (2007, December 12). Statement for the Record to the New York City Council Joint Hearing of the Land Use Subcommittees on Zoning & Franchises and Planning, Dispositions & Concessions. New York: Columbia University .
- Bollinger, L. C. (2007, January 7). Universities Power City's Economy. *New York Daily News*.
- Boston, A. (2003, October 30). KIP keeps students in Philly. *Temple News*.

- Boyer, J. W. (2015). *The University of Chicago: a history*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press .
- Bradley, S. M. (2009). *Harlem vs. Columbia University: Black Student Power in the Late 1960s*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Brandt, J. (2014, April 1). A History of Protest. *Temple News*.
- Brandt, J., Christie, J., & Brennan, K. (2017, February 21). Stadium study on hold; opposition continues. *Temple News*.
- Bregel, E. (2004, September 14). In West Harlem, Residents Feel Expansion Concerns. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Brey, J. (2016, May 19). Only a Fraction of Philly Neighborhoods Have Gentrified, Pew Says. *Philly Magazine* .
- Brinkley, I. (July 2006). *Defining the knowledge economy: knowledge economy programme report*. London: The Works Foundation.
- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York: Zone Books.
- Bryson, C. (2004). What about the Workers? The Expansion of Higher Education and the Transformation of Academic Work. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35(1), 38-57.
- Burdo, A. (2016, June 15). Report: University City Science Center Generates \$ 13B Economic Impact on Region. *Philadelphia Business Journal*.
- Callinicos, A. (2006). *Universities in a Neoliberal World*. London: Bookmarks Publications.

- Callinicos, A., & Abubakar, I. (1975). The Student Movement Today. *International Socialism*, 75, 9-15.
- Calvert, S. (2016, August 5). For More U.S. Cities, Downtown Is a Center of Economic Strength. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Campus Philly. (2010). *From Student to Resident: Findings from Campus Philly's 2010 Student Retention Survey*. Philadelphia : Knowledge Industry Partnership.
- Campus Philly. (2015). *Retaining College Talent and Spurring Job Growth*. Philadelphia: Campus Philly.
- Campus Philly. (2016/2017). *Insider Guide to Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Campus Philly .
- Campus Planning Task Force. (2010, June 6). Manhattanville and Academic Planning at Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Senate .
- Cardillo, J. (2016, June 21). Major local research lab exploring location at Innovate ABQ. *Albuquerque Business First*.
- Carhart, M. (2004, April 15). CB9 Committee Discusses Zoning For Manhattanville. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Carhart, M. (2005, January 21). Exposing Expansion. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Carlson, S. (2009, December 3). Court Blocks State Agency From Acquiring Land for Columbia U. Through Eminent Domain. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Carlson, S. (2010, June 24). New York Court Gives Go-Ahead for Controversial Expansion of Columbia U. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

- Chan, S. (2007, November 16). When the Gown Devours the Town. *The New York Times*.
- Chatterton, P. (1999). University Students and City Centres - the Formation of Exclusive Geographies: The Case of Bristol, UK. *Geoforum*, 30, 117-133.
- Chatterton, P. (2000). The Cultural Role of Universities in the Community: Revisiting the University-Community Debate. *Environment and Planning A*, 32, 165-181.
- Chatterton, P. (2010). The Student City: An Ongoing Story of Neoliberalism, Gentrification, and Commodification: The Student City Grows up. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(3), 509-514.
- Cheng, Y. (2015). Biopolitical Geographies of Student Life: Private Higher Education and Citizenship Life-Making in Singapore. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 105(5), 1078-1093.
- Chomsky, A. (2016, May 27). The Battle for the Soul of American Higher Education. *The Huffington Post*.
- City of Albuquerque GOVTV. (2016, April 28). *ABQ Business Review - Innovate ABQ*. Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M4o8iZGKxO4>
- City of Philadelphia. (2017). *Philadelphia-Area Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved 2017 March, from City of Philadelphia Resident Resources:
www.phila.gov/residents/college

Coalition to Preserve Community. (2017). *Stop Columbia*. Retrieved June 2016, from <https://stopcolumbia.wordpress.com/>

Cohen, R. (2015, October 9). Chattanooga: A Model of Urban Revitalization, or Inequality and Gentrification? *Nonprofit Quarterly*.

Columbia 1968. (2007, May 14). *Breakfast with Columbia President Lee Bollinger*. Retrieved November 2016, from <http://www.columbia1968.com/history/breakfast-with-columbia-president-lee-bollinger/>

Columbia Student Coalition Against Gentrification. (2014, October). Understanding Columbia University's Expansion into West Harlem: An Activist's Guide. New York.

Columbia University . (1959, April 6). Charters and Statutes. New York.

Columbia University. (2007). 2007 Facts. New York: Columbia University .

Columbia University. (2013, September). Growing Together: An Update on Community Services, Amenities, and Benefits of Columbia University's Manhattanville Campus in West Harlem. New York.

Columbia University. (2016). *A New Kind of Urban Campus*. Retrieved August 2016, from Columbia: Manhattanville, Media Kit: <http://manhattanville.columbia.edu/media-kit>

Columbia University. (2016, October 24). *Columbia University Dedicates Its 17-Acre Manhattanville Campus, Establishing Its Academic and Civic Aspirations for a*

- Century to Come*. Retrieved June 2016, from Columbia: Manhattanville, Media Kit: <http://manhattanville.columbia.edu/media-kit>
- Columbia University. (2016). *Economic Opportunity: Minority, Women and Local Community Commitment Construction Contracting and Workforce*. Retrieved August 2016, from Columbia: Manhattanville, Media Kit: <http://manhattanville.columbia.edu/media-kit>
- Columbia University. (2016). *Jerome L. Greene Science Center Columbia University Manhattanville Campus*. Retrieved August 2016, from Columbia: Manhattan, Media Kit: <http://manhattanville.columbia.edu/media-kit>
- Columbia University. (2016). *Lenfest Center for the Arts*. Retrieved 2016 August, from Columbia: Manhattanville, Media Kit: <http://manhattanville.columbia.edu/media-kit>
- Columbia University. (2017, March). Growing Together: Monthly Newsletter for Columbia University's Manhattanville in West Harlem Development. New York . Columbia: Facilities and Operations. (January 2017). *Growing Together: Monthly Newsletter for Columbia University's Manhattanville in West Harlem Development* . New York City: Columbia University .
- Conceição, P., & Heitor, M. V. (1998, February). On the Role of the University in the Knowledge Economy. *ic² Institute*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.
- Conwell, R. H. (1915). Acres of Diamonds. In R. Shackleton, *His Life and Achievements*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers .

- Cortes, A. (2004). Estimating the Impacts of Urban Universities on Neighborhood Housing Markets: An Empirical Analysis. *Urban Affairs Review*, 39(3), 342-375.
- Cortright, J. (2001). *New Growth Theory, Technology and Learning: A Practitioners Guide*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Economic Development Administration.
- Crowley, C. B., & Knoester, M. (2012). Chapter 7: Public Higher Education under Attack in the United States. *International Struggles for Critical Democratic Education*, 427, 111-130.
- Cruz, M. (2016, July 12). Ground breaks for new project: 'Innovate ABQ'. *KOAT 7 ABC*.
- Curcio, S. (1969, April). Reviewed Work(s): The New Brutalism. Ethic or Aesthetic by Reyner Banham. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 3(2), 171-173.
- Czekalinski, S. (2014, February 10). Rubio: Here's How to Make College Affordable. *The Atlantic*.
- Davidson-Harden, A. (2010). Interrogating the University as an Engine of Capitalism: Neoliberalism and Academic Reason d'état. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(5), 575.
- Daviet, B. (2016, July). Revisiting the Principle of Education as a Public Good. *Education Research and Foresight: Working Papers*. United Nations: Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization .
- Davis, D. (2006, December 31). Uptown Identity Crisis. *Columbia Daily News*.

- Deitrick, S., & Soska, T. (2005). The University of Pittsburgh and the Oakland Neighborhood. In D. C. Perry, & W. Wiewel, *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (pp. 25-44). New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Dekker/Perich/Sabatini. (2011, March). University of New Mexico. *Consolidated Master Plan 2011*.
- Dekker/Perich/Sabatini. (2015, June 24). Innovate ABQ. *Presentation to the Legislative Finance Committee*.
- Dekker/Perich/Sabatini. (2016). *UNM Master Plan Update*. Retrieved 2016 October, from Dekker/Perish/Sabatini: Architecture, Design, Inspiration.
- Department of Commerce. (2016). *Keystone Innovation Zones (KIZs) in Philadelphia*. Retrieved March 2017, from City of Philadelphia: www.phila.gov/smartchoice
- Development, P. D. (2016). *Keystone Innovation Zone (KIZ Tax Credit: Program Guidelines*. Harrisburg: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania .
- Dews, F., & Saxena, E. (2014, August 1). Poverty's Changing Geography Challenges Already-Poor Neighborhoods. *The Brookings Institution*.
- Dinkins, D. N. (2007, May 27). Don't Fear Columbia. *The New York Times*.
- Dober, R. P. (1963). *Campus Planning*. Reinhold Publishing Corporation.
- Dobnik, V. (2016, October 24). Columbia University Plans to Open New Campus Next Spring. *Associated Press*.
- Dolkart, A. S. (1998). *Morningside Heights: A History of its Architecture & Development*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dowling, R. (2008). Geographies of Identity: Labouring in the 'neoliberal' University. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(6), 812-820.

Downtown Action Team. (2014). *Downtown 2025: sector development plan*.
Albuquerque: Planning Department .

Duke, A.-E. (2008). *A Strong Step for Students: House Higher Education Bill Promotes Innovation and Student Success*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Duke-Benfield, A. E., & Strawn, J. (2008). *Congress Expands Student Aid and Supports Innovation in Student Success, Basic Skills, and Workforce Partnerships*.
Washington, D.C. : Center for Law and Social Policy.

Duménil, G., & Lévy, D. (2004). *Capital Resurgent: Roots of the Neoliberal Revolution*.
(D. Jeffers, Trans.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Duménil, G., & Lévy, D. (2013). *The Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Duncalf, F., & Krey, A. C. (1912). *Parallel Source Problems in Medieval History*. New York: Harpers & Brothers.

Dunlap, D. W. (2008, December 14). Columbia to Finish Section of Campus, 113 Years Later. *The New York Times*.

Durkin, E. (2005, November 16). CU Expansion Foes Go On the Record. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.

Durkin, E. (2005, April 1). Lobbying for Manhattanville. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.

- Durkin, E. (2006, February 6). Bollinger Explains M'ville Benefits. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- EarthTech. (2008). *Manhattanville Neighborhood Conditions Study*. New York City: Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP.
- Economic Policy Institute. (2016). *The top 1 percent took home the great majority of income growth since the Great Recession in 24 states*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.
- Editor. (2011, December 7). The candidates UNM needs and deserves. *Daily Lobo*.
- Education: Temple's Thanks. (1936, March 2). *Time Magazine* .
- Ehrlich, T., & Fu, E. (2015, March 23). Troubling Attacks on Public Higher Education. *Forbes*.
- Empire State Development Corporation. (2008, December 18). Modified General Project Plan: Columbia University Educational Mixed-Use Development. New York: New York State Urban Development Corporation .
- Englert, R. (2016). *State of the University* . Philadelphia : Temple University .
- Eviatar, D. (2006, May 21). The Manhattanville Project. *The New York Times*.
- Fedele, J. (2007, March 12). The Cathedral of Learning: A History. *The Pitt Chronicle*.
- Fenton, E. (2000). *Carnegie Mellon 1900-2000: A Centennial History*. Pittsburgh: Carnegie-Mellon University Press .

- Fernandez, J. (2014). Facing the Corporate University: the New Wave of Student Movements in Europe. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 12(1), 191-213.
- Ferris, D. (2003, October 9). Neighbors Voice Concerns About Columbia Expansion. *The Columbia Spectator*.
- Fish, S. (2009, March 8). Neoliberalism and Higher Education. *The New York Times*.
- Fisher, A., Zients, S., & Donnelly, G. (2015, March 25). Has Columbia honored the Community Benefits Agreement it made when it started building in Manhattanville? *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Fitzgerald, F. S. (1948). *This Side of Paradise*. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc.
- Flores, L. (2012). The American University and the Establishment of Neoliberal Hegemony: THE Persistence of Institutional Habits. *Berkeley Undergraduate Journal*, 25(2), 49-73.
- Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.
- Florida, R. (2012, August 27). America's Leading College Towns. *Citylab: From the Atlantic*.
- Florida, R. (2012). *The Rise of the Creative Class, Revisted*. New York: Basic Books.
- Florida, R., Mellander, C., & Stolarick, K. (2008). Inside the black box of regional development - human capital, the creative class and tolerance. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 8, 615-649.

- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. New York: Picador.
- Fox News New Mexico. (2014, May 1). *Innovate ABQ*. Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0sw76sAU78A&t=3s>
- Frank, R. G. (2016, September 21). Moratorium on Main and Branch Campus Hiring Actions. *UNM: Office of the President*. Albuquerque .
- Friends of Bernie Sanders. (2016). *Issues: It's Time to Make College Tuition Free and Debt Free*. Retrieved March 2017, from Bernie: berniesanders.com
- Gamino, J. (2014, October 6). University of Chicago/Hyde Park history. *Chicago Maroon*.
- Garmendia, M., Coronado, J. M., & Urena, J. M. (2012). University Students Sharing Flats: When Studentification Becomes Vertical. *Urban Studies*, 49(12), 2651-68.
- Geiger, R. L., & Sorber, N. M. (2013). *The Land-Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers .
- Gillen, K. C. (2014). State of the Philadelphia Real Estate Market. *Fels Institute of Government*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania .
- Glaeser, E. (2011). *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Glasson, J. (2001). The Widening Local and Regional Development Impacts on the Modern Universities - a Tale of Two Cities (and North-South Perspectives). *Local Economy*, 18(1), 21-37.

- Goddard, J., Coombes, J., Kempton, L., & Vallance, P. (2014). Universities as Anchor Institutions in Cities in a Turbulent Funding Environment: Vulnerable Institutions and Vulnerable Places in England. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 7(2), 307-325.
- Goldin, C. (2016). Human Capital. In C. Diebolt, & M. Hauptert, *Handbook of Cliometrics*. New York: Springer.
- Good, C. J. (2011). *The Turner and Colodny Cases: Academic Freedom at the University of Pittsburgh, 1934 & 1961*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Good, C. J. (2012). The Dismissal of Ralph Turner: A Historical Case Study of Events at the University of Pittsburgh. *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*, 3.
- Graeber, D. (2012). *Debt: the First 5,000 Years*. Brooklyn: Melville House Publishing.
- Grant, J. (1969). *Confrontations on Campus: the Columbia Pattern for the New Protest*. New York: Signet Books.
- Grasdalen, T. (2014, November 11). Fireside Chat: Graduate Students, Policy, and Expansion. *Bwog: Columbia Undergraduate Blog*.
- Gregory, S. (2013). The Radiant University: Space, Urban Redevelopment, and the Public Good. *City & Society*, 25(1), 47-69.
- Greyser, N., & Weiss, M. (2012). Introduction: Left Intellectuals and the Neoliberal University. *American Quarterly*, 64(4), 787-793.
- Guidi, L. (2015, March 26). Development plans progress. *Daily Lobo*.

- Gumprecht, B. (2007). The Campus as a Public Space in the American College Town. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 33(1), 72-103.
- Gumprecht, B. (2008). *The American College Town*. University of Massachusetts Press: Amherst.
- Guzman-Barrera, S. (2016, July 12). Innovate ABQ breaks ground, search for CEO still on. *Albuquerque Business First*.
- Guzman-Barrera, S. (2016, March 28). Innovate ABQ debuts first building phase - a \$ 35 million one. *Albuquerque Business First*.
- Guzman-Barrera, S. (2016, May 11). Innovate ABQ makes first key hire. *Albuquerque Business First*.
- Haar, S. (2011). *The City as Campus: Urbanism and Higher Education in Chicago*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hackworth, J. (2007). *The Neoliberal City: Governance, Ideology, and Development in American Urbanism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Halsey, A. H. (1982). The Decline of the Donnish Dominion? *Oxford Review of Education*, 8(3), 215-229.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1994). Flexible Accumulation through Urbanization: Reflections on 'Post-modernism' in the American City. In A. Amin, *Post-Fordism: A Reader*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2008). The Right to the City. *New Left Review*, 53, 23-40.
- Harvey, D. (2009). *Social Justice and the City: Revised Edition*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Hawkins, H. (2002). *Pioneer: A History of the Johns Hopkins University*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press .
- Hayes, R. J. (2014, February 27). Why Ivy League Schools Are So Bad at Economic Diversity. *The Atlantic*.
- Henry, D. (2014, September 3). Temple University expands security zone around campus. *6 ABC News Philadelphia*.
- Henry, S. (Spring 2005). Access as the "Kiss of Death": The New Exclusivity in Public Urban Research Universities. *WAVES: A Bulletin of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 6(2).
- Higher Education Act of 1965. (1965).
- Hilbert, D. (2016, May 4). Testing the Gentrification Narrative at Temple University. *Hidden Philadelphia*.
- Hillary for America. (2016). *Issues: Making college debt-free and taking on student debt*. Retrieved 2017 March, from Hillary Clinton : www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/college

- Hilty, J. (2010). *Temple University: 125 Years of Service to Philadelphia, the Nation, and the World*. Philadelphia: Temple Press.
- Hitch, J. (2011, December 18). Frank visits his alma mater. *Daily Lobo*.
- Hitch, J. (2011, December 12). UNM presidential candidate visits begin. *Daily Lobo*.
- Hohendahl, P. U. (2011). Humboldt Revisited: Liberal Education, University Reform, and the Opposition to the Neoliberal University. *New German Critique*, 38(2), 159-196.
- Holden, T. (2017, February 10). The Right Call: Yale Removes My Racist Ancestor's Name From Campus. *The New York Times*.
- Holdsworth, C. (2009). 'Going Away to Uni': Mobility, Modernity, and Independence of English Higher Education Students. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(8), 1849-1864.
- Holloway, S. L., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2012). Neoliberalism, Policy Localisation and Idealised Subjects: a Case Study on Educational Restructuring in England. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(4), 639-654.
- Holmen, L. (2012, January 9). Alumnus Robert Frank to succeed Schmidly. *Daily Lobo*.
- Holmen, L. (2012, January 4). Board of Regents selects Robert Frank as new president of UNM. *Daily Lobo*.
- Holohan, M. (2003, Fall). Standing Tall. *Pitt Magazine*.
- Hoover, E. (2015, March 16). Greetings from Wisconsin, Where Higher Ed Is a Love-Hate Relationship. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

- Hoover, J. E. (1969). A Study in Marxist Revolutionary Violence: Students for a Democratic Society, 1962-1969. *Fordham Law Review*, 38(2), 289-306.
- Horn, C. (1981). *The University in Turmoil and Transition: Crisis Decades at the University of New Mexico*. Albuquerque: Rocky Mountain Publishing Company.
- Hornbeck, R., & Keniston, D. (December 2014 (Forthcoming)). Creative Destruction: Barriers to Urban Growth and the Great Boston Fire of 1872. *American Economic Review*.
- Hoxby, C. M., & Stange, K. (2016). *Productivity in Higher Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- HUAC and the University. (1967, March 13). *The Harvard Crimson*.
- Hubbard, P. (2008). Regulating the Social Impacts of Studentification: A Loughborough Case Study. *Environment and Planning A*, 40, 323-341.
- Hubbard, P. (2009). Geographies of Studentification and Purpose-Built Student Accommodation: Leading Separate Lives? *Environment and Planning A*, 41, 1903-1923.
- Huffman, L. (2007/2008). Manhattanville, Meet West Harlem: An Urban Frontier. *The Morningside Review*.
- Hutt, W. H. (1940, March). The Concept of Consumers' Sovereignty. *The Economic Journal*, 50(197), 66-77.

- Hyatt, S. B. (2010). Universities and Neoliberal Models of Urban Development: Using Ethnographic Fieldwork to Understand the 'Death and Rebirth of North Central Philadelphia'. *Learning and Teaching*, 3(3), 6-31.
- Ileto, C. (2016, October 11). Richard Englert Takes Helm as New President of Temple University . *ABC 6 News*.
- Innovate ABQ, Inc. (2016). *Innovate ABQ: Development Framework*. Albuquerque.
- Innovation Philadelphia. (2003, April 3). Innovation Philadelphia and Knowledge Industry Partnership Sponsor First Minority Internship Fair. Philadelphia: PRNewswire.
- Iosifescu, A. (2003, September 12). Campus Expansion Worries Neighbors. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.
- Jones, S. (2014, March 4). The dangers of gentrification. *Axis Philly*.
- Jones, S. (2016, October 26). Behind Temple attacks, rage often comes with exclusion. *The Philadelphia Inquirer* .
- jrw. (6000). *hi*.
- Kaiser, J. (2017, March 29). Trump wants 2018 NIH cut to come from overhead payments. *Science Magazine*.
- Kaiser, K. H. (September 22, 2008). *Operating Budget Request: Fiscal Year 2009-2010*. Philadelphia: Temple University .

- Kalita, S. M., & Whelan, R. (2011, January 13). No McMansions for Millennials. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Kenny, H. (1945). *West Virginia Place names: Their Origin and Meaning, Including the Nomenclature of the Streams and Mountains*. Piedmont, WV: The Place Names Press.
- Kenyon, E. L. (1997). Seasonal Sub-Communities: the Impact of Student Households on Residential Communities. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 48(2), 286-301.
- Kertscher, T. (2016, May 25). Scott Walker, who cut funds to Wisconsin university system, says system has its largest budget ever. *Politifact*.
- Key, P. (2006, July 31). Innovation zone wins second-year funds as others form. *Philadelphia Business Journal*.
- Kiefer, P. (2008, September 3). Columbia Chief Presses for Expansion. *The New York Sun*.
- Kirbre, P. (1954). Scholarly Privileges: Their Roman Origins and Medieval Expressions. *The American Historical Review*, 59(3), 543-567.
- Kirschenbaum, K. (2010, May 29). Manhattanville expansion timeline. *The Colombia Spectator*.
- Klagge, N. (2004, January 26). Admins Hint at Expansion Plans. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.

- Knabb, K. (1968, May 16). *Sorbonne Occumpation Committee Communique*. Retrieved April 2016, from Situationalist International Online:
<http://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/si/communique.html>.
- Kneebone, E. (2014). *The Growth and Spread of Concentrated Poverty, 2000 to 2008-2012*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution .
- Knowledge Industry Partnership. (2004, August 25). 80,000 New Students Declare Philadelphia 'One Big Campus' This Month; Regional Initiative Welcomes College Students to Philadelphia with Roster of Activities. Philadelphia : PRNewswire.
- Knowledge Industry Partnership. (2004). *Philadelphia is One Big Campus*. Philadelphia: Knowledge Industry Partnership.
- Knowledge Industry Partnership. (2004). *Should I Stay or Should I Go?: Survey of Recent College Graduates*. Philadelphia : Knowledge Industry Partnership.
- Koenig, C. (2011, August 17). Rioting Over Wine Led to 90 Deaths. *The Oxford Times*.
- Kohn, I. V. (2003, June 25). Columbia Expansion Plans Discussed at CB9 Meeting. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Kostelni, N. (2016, November 16). More Jobs, Real Estate Development in University City: Report. *Philadelphia Business Journal*.
- Kotkin, J. (2014, August 4). Millennial Boomtowns: Where the Generation is Clustering (It's Not Downtown). *Forbes*.

KRQE News 13. (2014, January 1). *Innovate ABQ looks forward to 2014*. Retrieved September 2014, from Youtube:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hknbqkUWWRw>

KRQE News 13. (2014, June 13). *UNM Regents OK purchase for Innovate ABQ*.

Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R9STYo7dsMM>

KRQE News 13. (2015, April 1). *UNM School of Architecture & Planning helps in Innovating ABQ*. Retrieved 2016 September, from Youtube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MC9_XMG0J60&t=2s

Kusisto, L. (2016, June 9). Influx of Younger, Wealthier Residents Transforms U.S. Cities. *The Wall Street Journal*.

Lafer, G. (2003). Land and Labor in the Post-Industrial University Town: Remaking Social Geography. *Political Geography*, 22(1), 89-117.

Laker, B. (2016, October 23). Town, Gown, Temple Town. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*.

Lausch, B. (2014, September 3). Temple University announces extension of police patrol borders. *Temple Now*.

Lausch, B. (2016, February 24). Nine construction and renovation projects transform Temple. *Temple News*.

Lausch, B. (2016, February 8). *Temple trustees approve funding for initial designs, studies of on-campus football stadium and retail project*. Retrieved April 2017, from Temple Campus News: www.temple.edu

- Lazzeroni, M., & Piccaluga, A. (2015). Beyond 'town and gown': the role of the university in small and medium-sized cities. *Industry & Higher Education*, 29(1), 11-23.
- Lee, T. (2007, July 22). Bracing for the Lion. *The New York Times*.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writings on Cities*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Leuchtenburg, W. E. (1963). *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, 1932-1940*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Levin, J. S. (2005). The Business Culture of the Community College: Students as Consumers; Students as Commodities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 129, 11-29.
- Levy, F. (2009, October 11). Americans are not moving to the big cities. *Forbes*.
- Lichtenstein, N. (2013). *State of the Union: A Century of American Labor*. Princeton: Princeton University Press .
- Lien, A. (2016, November 15). Stadium task force on hold while study being conducted. *Temple News*.
- Lindsey, R. (1982, December 28). California Weighs End of Free College Education. *The New York Times*.

Lipartito, K. (2012, December 7). When the Army Invaded Montgomery Ward.

Bloomberg News.

Lobosco, K. (2016, August 11). Would you get free tuition under Clinton? *CNN Money.*

Lofland, J. (1968). The Youth Ghetto: a Perspective on the 'Cities of Youth' around Our Large Universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 39(3), 121-143.

Lohr, S. (2008, October 13). U.S. not always averse to nationalization, despite its free-market image. *The New York Times.*

Lovik, E. G. (2015, September). Temple: the Story of an Urban University. *Essays in Education*, 15.

Lowder, J. B. (2013, October 18). Were Brutalist Buildings on College Campuses Really Designed to Thwart Student Riots? *The Eye: Slate's Design Blog.*

MacDonald, D. (1938, August). Pittsburgh: What a City Shouldn't Be. *Forum and Century*, C(2), p. 51.

Maidenberg, M. (2013, November 18). U of C takes over Harper Court. *Chicago Business Journal.*

Manhattanville, C. S. (2003, December 5). Jacob McKean. *The Columbia Daily Spectator.*

Mantuano, N. C. (2011). *Acres of Diamonds: How Have Temple University Presidents Between 1884 and 1973 Realized the Conwellian Vision?* Ph.D. Dissertation , Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, The Graduate School of Education, New Brunswick.

- Marcuse, P., & Potter, C. (2005). Columbia University's Heights: An Ivory Tower and Its Communities. In D. C. Perry, & W. Wiewel, *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (pp. 45-64). New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Martin, L. L., Smith, H., & Phillips, W. (2005). Bridging 'Town & Gown' Through Innovative University-Community Partnership. *The Innovation Journal: the Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 10(2).
- Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Mathis, J. (2015, January 5). Three Reasons Temple's \$100 Million Stadium is Big, Bad Idea. *Philadelphia Magazine*.
- Matter of Kaur v New York State Urban Dev. Corp., NY Slip Op 08976 (Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of New York, First Department December 3, 2009).
- Matter of Kaur v New York State Urban Dev. Corp., NY Int. 123 (New York Court of Appeals June 24, 2010).
- Maurrasse, D. J. (2001). *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships with Their Communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Mayfield, D. (2014, August 6). UNM lays out master plan for Innovation District. *Albuquerque Business First*.
- Mayfield, D. (2015, July 1). International firm ready to work with Albuquerque development vets on Innovate ABQ. *Albuquerque Business First*.

- Mayor Townhall (City of Albuquerque). (2016, July 12). *Mayor Richard J. Berry, City of Albuquerque News Conference*. Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j5XMpOfhqz8&t=24s>
- Mays, J. (2013, March 22). CB9 Calls for Audit of Columbia's Promises to Harlem Community. *dnaInfo*.
- McDonald, M. (2012, April 25). Bollinger Wins Harlem Renaissance With Columbia Chasing Harvard. *Bloomberg*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, April 12). Architect meets with community. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, April 19). BRIC holds meeting about proposed stadium. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, March 10). Community Members, students meet to discuss stadium and other issues. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, March 8). Community to meet on possible stadium. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, May 3). Defining a charrette agreement. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, March 11). Hundreds oppose stadium construction in latest 'Stadium Stompers' meeting. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, February 26). Stadium Stompers, community members continue stadium discussion. *Temple News*.
- McGoldrick, G. (2016, March 16). Students, community members continue fight against proposed stadium. *Temple News*.

McKay, D. (2016, September 23). Governor announces new goal for higher education.
Albuquerque Journal.

McKee, S., & Sussman, A. (2016, June). Taking the Wheel" Getting ABQ from here ... to
there. Albuquerque: Urban Land Institute New Mexico .

McKeon, P. R. (1964). The Status of the University of Paris as Parens Scientiarum: An
Episode in the Development of Its Autonomy. *Speculum*, 39(4), 651-675.

McLaughlin, C. (2016, August 29). Eds and Meds, Plus Labs and Govs: Partnering to
Bring Innovation. *Urban Land: the Magazine of the Urban Land Institute*.

McMullen, M. (2017, March 24). Higher education bills call for Minnesota State tuition
freezes. *Grand Forks News*.

McShane, J. F. (2014, June 5). A Message to the Columbia Community from Vice
President for Public Safety James F. McShane. New York: Columbia University
Department of Public Safety.

Melhuish, C. (2015). Case Study 4: The US Models: University of Pennsylvania
(Philadelphia), New York University and Columbia University (NYC). In C.
Melhuish, *University-Led Urban Regeneration*. London: University College
London.

Mercado, D. (2017, January 12). Trump's student loan plan: pay more, but exit sooner.
CNBC.

Merrill, A. (2009, December 7). Empire State of Mind. Mercatus Center at George
Mason University .

- Miller, C. M. (1993). The St. Scholastica Day Riot: Oxford after the Black Death. *Annual Proceedings*, 1, 29-42.
- Miller, K. (2017, March 2). Legislature passes midyear budget with funding for opioid treatment, tuition freeze. *Portland Press Herald*.
- Mitchell, D. (2003). *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Moskowitz, P. (2014, December 31). Philadelphia universities' expansion drove wider gentrification, tension. *Al Jazeera English*.
- Mulcahy, R. P. (1989, January). The Dark Side of the Cathedral of Learning: The Turner Case. *The Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*.
- Mullin, J., Kotval-K, Z., & Cooper, J. (2012). The University and Local Economic Development. *Transylvania Review of Administrative Sciences*, 126-36.
- Mullins, P. R. (2006). Racializing the commonplace landscape: an archaeology of urban renewal along the color line. *World Archaeology*, 38(1), 60-71.
- Munro, M., & Livingston, M. (2012). Student Impacts on Urban Neighbourhoods: Policy, Approaches, Discourses and Dilemmas. *Urban Studies*, 49(8), 1679-1694.
- Muraida, C. (2012, July 23). New president talks challenges, objectives. *Daily Lobo*.
- Napolitano, A. (2012, November 21). UNM President Robert Frank calls for the first College of Public Health in New Mexico. *Daily Lobo*.
- Napolitano, A. (2012, November 19). UNM president Robert Frank inaugurated as the University's 21st president. *Daily Lobo*.

- Naylor, B. (2017, March 16). Trump's Budget Plan Cuts Funding for Arts, Humanities and Public Media. *National Public Radio*.
- New Mexico Constitutional Convention. (1910, November 21). The Constitution of the State of New Mexico. Santa Fe.
- New Mexico In Focus, a Production of KNME-TV. (2016, April 4). *Episode 939 / The Line: Innovate ABQ Update*. Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gu6zMfL7b1I>
- Newfield, C. (2003). *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University, 1880-1980*. Durham: Duke University Press .
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the Public University: the Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press .
- Newman, J. H. (1982). *The Idea of a University*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Nordenberg, M. A. (2013, Fall). The Splendor of a University: Remarks Delivered at the Fall 2013 Meeting of the Board of Trustees. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- O'Connor, A. (Fall 2016). Sheffield Farms, the Milk Industry, and the Public Good. *The Columbia Newsletter: News for our Neighbors*.
- Office of Admissions. (2016). *Class of 2020 Profile*. New York: Columbia University.
- Office of Institutional Research and Assessment . (2016-2017). *Fact Book*. Philadelphia: Temple University .

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment . (November 2016). *At a Glance*.
Philadelphia: Temple University.

Office of Planning and Institutional Research. (2016, November 14). Fall headcount
enrollment by school, 2007-2016. New York: Columbia University .

Office of Policy Development and Research. (Why Did Pruitt-Igoe Fail?). 2014.
Washington, D.C.: Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Office of Public Affairs. (2002, January 30). George Rupp to Become President of
International Rescue Committee This Summer. *Columbia News*. New York:
Columbia University .

Office of the Mayor. (2008, June 26). Mayor Bloomberg, New York City Global Partners
And Columbia University Host Urban Public Health And Climate Change
Summit. City of New York .

Office of the Registrar . (2012). Vision, Mission, Values, and Strategies. In *Catalog*
2012-2013. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico .

Office of the Registrar. (2010). Vision, Mission, Values, and Strategies. In *Catalog 2010-*
2011. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico .

Office of the Registrar. (2016). General Information: Mission, Vision, Goals, and Values.
In *Catalog 2016-2017*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico .

Office of the Secretary of the University. (2016). *The Trustees of Columbia University*.
Retrieved November 2016, from <http://secretary.columbia.edu/trustees-columbia-university>

- O'Mara, M. P. (2012). Beyond Town and Gown: University Economic Engagement and the Legacy of the Urban Crisis. *The Journal of Technology Crisis*, 37(2), 234-250.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Orso, A. (2016, February 10). Politicians on Temple University's on-campus stadium plans: 'Temple has run amok in North Philly. *BillyPenn*.
- Ortiz, D., & Tanen, N. (2016, October 25). Stadium Stompers screen documentary . *Temple News*.
- Osborne, A. (2013, April 8). Margaret Thatcher: one policy that led to more than 50 companies being sold or privatised. *The Telegraph*.
- Otterbein, H. (2015, September 22). Philly is the 4th Most Segregated Big City in the Country. *Philadelphia Magazine*.
- Ouimette, M. (2016, May 5). Unfunded Mandate: Columbia College, Arts and Sciences, and the Bollinger Era. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Ozden, S. (2012, October 16). Frank backs planned hospital. *Daily Lobo*.
- Ozden, S. (2012, June 11). New president still has a lot to learn. *Daily Lobo*.
- Pamer, M. (2012, December 11). City Council Approves "Truly Transformative" Development for USC. *NBC Los Angeles*.
- Partnerships take ideas from lab to market. (2010, November 4). *Temple News*.

Passaro, J. (2005, January 1). City attempts to stem exodus of college grads. *The Daily Pennsylvanian*.

Paul, B. (2010, February 28). Columbia's Manhattanville Expansion: Community Planning Confronts Institutional Elitism. New York: Hunter College: Department of Urban Affairs & Planning.

Payne, C. (2016, October 25). The School of Subcontracting. *Jacobin*.

Peleirangladien. (2015, October 30). *15 Now Statement on Temple Stadium Plans: Democracy, Funding, and Gentrification*. Retrieved April 2017, from Philadelphia 15Now: philly15now.org

Pennsylvania Department of Community & Economic Development . (2016). *Report to the General Assembly: Keystone Innovation Zone Tax Credit Sale Programs FY 2016-17*. Harrisburg: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania Department of Community & Economic Development. (2017). *Keystone Innovation Zone (KIZ) Tax Credit Program*. Retrieved April 2017, from dced.pa.gov

Pennsylvania Economy League. (Spring 2003). *Greater Philadelphia's Knowledge Industry: Driving the Region's Economic Competitiveness*. Philadelphia: Greater Philadelphia Regional Review.

Pennsylvania State Data Center. (2006). *Research Brief: Pennsylvania's High School Graduates*. Middletown: Penn State Harrisburg.

- Pennsylvania State Legislature . (1965). *Temple University - Commonwealth Act*.
Harrisburg: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania .
- Perkins+Will. Dekker/Perich/Sabatini. (2014, August 20). 1st and Central RFP Site Tour.
Innovate ABQ: Master Plan. 2014.
- Perkins+Will. Dekker/Perich/Sabatini. (2014, November 13). *Innovate ABQ. Master Plan Update*.
- Perry, D. C., & Wiewel, W. (2005). *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Perry, M., & Schaerer, J. (2005). A King's Ransom: Chattanooga's University Invests in Partnerships for Smart Growth in the Historic Martin Luther King District. In W. Wiewel, & G.-J. Knaap, *Partnerships for Smart Growth: University-Community Collaboration for Better Public Spaces* (pp. 199-215). New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Peterson, C. (2000). Turner, Harris & Colodny: Academic Freedom in Pittsburgh. *The Sloping Halls Review*, 7.
- Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation . (2017). *The Navy Yard: Impact*.
Retrieved 2016 March, from www.navyyard.org/impact
- Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation . (n.d.). *The Navy Yard Walking Tour and Visitors Guide* . Philadelphia : 2015.

- Philadelphia Research Initiative. (2016). *Philadelphia's Changing Neighborhoods: Gentrification and other shifts since 2000*. Philadelphia : The Pew Charitable Trust.
- Pickren, G. (2012). 'Where Can I Build my Student Housing?': the Politics of Studentification in Athens-Clarke County, Georgia. *Southeastern Geographer*, 52(2), 113-130.
- Porter, M. E. (1998, November-December). Clusters and the New Economics of Competition. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Powell, K. H. (2014). In the Shadow of the Ivory Tower: an Ethnographic Study of Neighborhood Relations. *Qualitative Social Work*, 13(1), 108-126.
- Powell, W. W., & Snellman, K. (2004). The Knowledge Economy. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 30, 199-220.
- President's Commission on Higher Education. (1946). *Higher Education for American Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: Office of the President.
- Radice, H. (2013). how We Got Here: UK Higher Education under Neoliberalism. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 12(3), 407-418.
- Raimondi, L. (2012). Neoliberalism and the Role of the University. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 21, 39-50.
- Reisen, M. (2016, April 1). UNM unveils phase one of Innovate ABQ. *Daily Lobo*.
- Renault, A. (2014, April 24). Fireside Chat, Graduate Edition. *Bwog: Columbia Undergraduate Blog*.

- Reyes, C., & Tolan, C. (2013, May 6). A Q&A with Bollinger: deans, donations, and developments in Manhattanville. *The Columbia Daily Spectator* .
- Ridder-Symoens, H. d. (1992). *Universities in the Middle Ages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, J. (2014, November 15). Templetown: Gentrification's Euphemism. *Her Campus*.
- Robin, C. (2016, October 28). The Limits of Liberalism at Harvard. *Jacobin*.
- Rodin, J. (2007). *The University & Urban Revival: Out of the Ivory Tower and Into the Streets*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press .
- Rohan, T. M. (2014). *The Architecture of Paul Rudolph*. New Haven: Yale University Press .
- Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technological Change. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), S71-S102.
- Romer, P. M. (2008). Economic Growth. In *The Consise Encyclopedia of Economics*. Carmel, Indiana : Library of Economics and Liberty.
- Romero, M. (2016, April 27). Report: Philly's Poverty Problem isn't Going Away. *Curbed Philadelphia*.
- Root, K. (2015, November 5). Innovatea ABQ taking shape as city's creative hub. *New Mexico News Port*.
- Rudd, M. (2009). *My Life with SDS and the Weathermen Underground*. New York: HarperCollins.

- Ruderman, W. (2016, October 23). Renters are the first to know. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American College and University: A History*. Athens: University of Georgia Press .
- Ruegg, W. (2004). *A History of the University in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell H. Conwell Foundation. (1926). *Temple & the Imperial Theme*. Philadelphia: Temple University .
- Russo, A. P., & Sans, A. A. (2009). Student Communities and Landscapes of Creativity: How Venice - 'The World's Most Touristed City' - is Changing. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 16(2), 161-175.
- Russo, A. P., & Tatjer, L. C. (2007). From Citadels of Education to Cartier Latins (and Back?): The Changing Landscapes of Student Populations in European Cities. *Geography Compass*, 1(5), 1160-1189.
- Russo, A. P., van den Berg, L., & Lavanga, M. (2007). Toward a Sustainable Relationship between City and University: A Stakeholdership Approach. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 27(2), 199-216.
- Rynn, J. (2001). *The Power to Create Wealth: A systems-based theory of the rise and decline of the Great Powers in the 20th century*. New York: City University of New York.

- Sachare, A. (2009, July/August). Manhattanville Recieves Another Approval. *Columbia College Today*.
- Sage, J., Smith, D. P., & Hubbard, P. (2012). The Diverse Geographies of Studentification: Living Alongside People Not Like Us. *Housing Studies*, 27(8), 1057-1078.
- Sage, J., Smith, D. P., & Hubbard, P. (2012). The Rapidity of Studentification and Population Change: There Goes the (Student)hood. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(5), 597-631.
- Sage, J., Smith, D. P., & Hubbard, P. (2013). New-Build Studentification: A Panacea for Balanced Communities? *Urban Studies*, 50(13), 2623-2641.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1975). The Optimum Growth Rate for Population. *International Economic Review*, 16(3), 531-538.
- Sasko, C., & Rolen, E. (2014, April 29). After history of tensions, a surge in gentrification. *Temple News*.
- Sassen, S. (2005). The Global City: Introducing a Concept. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, XI(2), 27-43.
- Saunders, D. B. (2010). Neoliberal Ideology and Public Higher Education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 8(1), 42-77.
- Savio, M. (1964). *Bodies Against the Gears*. Speech.
- Seven, P. (1995, September). Rembember the Miners Strike. *The Rossington Villager*.

- Shackleton, R. (1915). *His Life and Achievements* . New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers .
- Shapiro, E. (2012, February 6). A distant president and a mysterious McKinsey report send Columbia's liberal-arts faculty into an existential panic. *Politico*.
- Shepherd, J., Davis, J., & Wrigley, C. (Eds.). (2012). *The Second Labour Government: A reappraisal*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sheridan, J. (2008, March). Columbia University Aims to Break Down Walls to the Community. *Center for Architecture: News*.
- Sheridan, M. (2016, March 23). University City Keystone Innovation Zone to Expand Into Old City. *Philadelphia Magazine*.
- Silver, N. (2015, May 1). The Most Diverse Cities are Often the Most Segregated. *Five Thirty Eight*.
- Simmons, J., & Gordon, B. (Eds.). (1999). *The Oxford Companion to British Railway History: from 1603 to the 1990s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2000). The Neo-Liberal University. *New Labor Forum*.
- Slonecker, B. (2008). The Columbia Coalition: African Americans, New Leftists, and Counterculture at the Columbia University Protest of 1968. *Journal of Social History*, 41(4), 967-996.
- Smith, D. P. (2004). Geographies of Studentification and 'Apprentice' Gentrifiers. *University of Lesbos*. Greece.

- Smith, D. P. (2005). 'Studentification Ication': the Gentrification Factory? In *Gentrification in a Global Context* (pp. 72-89). London: Routledge.
- Smith, D. P. (2008). The Politics of Studentification and (Un)balanced Urban Populations: Lessons for Gentrification and Sustainable Communities? *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2541-2564.
- Smith, D. P., & Denholm, J. (2006). *'Studentification': a Guide to Opportunities, Challenges and Practice*. London: Universities UK.
- Smith, D. P., & Holt, L. (2007). Studentification and 'Apprentice' Gentrifiers within Britain's Provincial Towns and Cities: Extending the Meaning of Gentrification. *Environment and Planning A*, 39, 142-161.
- Smith, D. P., & Hubbard, P. (2014). The Segregation of Educated Youth and Dynamic Geographies of Studentification. *Area*, 46(1), 92-100.
- Smith, K. (2002). *What is the 'Knowledge Economy'? Knowledge Intensity and Distributed Knowledge Bases*. The United Nations University.
- Smith, N. (1977). *The Return from the Suburbs and the Structuring of Urban Space: State Involvement in Society Hill, Philadelphia*. St. Andrews: University of St. Andrews.
- Smith, N. (1982). Gentrification and Uneven Development. *Economic Geography*, 58(2), 139-155.

- Smith, N. (2003). New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. In N. Brenner, & N. Theodore, *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe*. New York: Wiley.
- SmithGroup JJR. (2014). *Visualize Temple: Temple University 2014 Campus Master Plan*. Philadelphia : Temple University .
- Snider, W. D. (2004). *Light on the Hill: A History of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. Chapel Hill : The University of North Carolina Press .
- Sokal, S. (2013, October 8). NYC That Never Was: A Gym in Morningside Park Sparks 1968 Columbia University Protests and Shutdown. *Untapped Cities*.
- Speeches, H. o. (2008, September 4). Hearing on Columbia Plan Elicits Emotional Speeches. *The New York Times*.
- Spencer, M. (2016, May 16). Engines revving for Innovate ABQ. *New Mexico News Port*.
- Sprayregen, N. (2007, December 26). Columbia's Land Grab. *New York Post*.
- Stamm, D. (2011, March 2011). Philly's Population is up for 1st Time Since 1950. *NBC 10 Philadelphia*.
- Stamm, D. (2017, April 12). Armed Robbers Target Temple University Students in Off-Campus Home. *NBC 10 Philadelphia*.
- Statistics, N. C. (2016). *Fast Facts: Back to School Statistics*. Retrieved May 7, 2017, from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>

- Steinacker, A. (2005). The Economic Effect of Urban Colleges on their Surrounding Communities. *Urban Studies*, 42(7), 1161-1175.
- Stevens, D. (2012, January 9). Frank advice for Frank: stay the course. *Daily Lobo*.
- Stevens, M. L. (2009). *Creating a Class: College Admissions and the Education of Elites*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press .
- Stone, R. (2017, March 6). Great Spaces for Innovative People doing Remarkable Things. *UNM Newsroom*.
- Strasser, S. (2015). *Albuquerque Modernism: Humanities Building*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico.
- Strom, E. (2005). The Political Strategies Behind University-Based Development. In D. C. Perry, & W. Wiewel, *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (pp. 116-130). New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Student Coalition on Expansion and Gentrification. (2011, March 12). *Student Coalition on Expansion and Gentrification*. Retrieved June 2016, from <https://scegblog.wordpress.com/>
- Students for a Democratic Society. (1962, June 11-15). The Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society. Port Huron: Office of Sen. Tom Hayden. Retrieved from Office of Sen. Tom Hayden.
- Swann, N. (2016, September 20). Stadium Stompers discuss plans for next months. *Temple News* .

- (2016). *Taking the Wheel: Getting ABQ from here ... to there*. Albuquerque: Mid-Region Council of Governments and the Urban Land Institute New Mexico.
- Tanenbaum, M. (2016, April 6). As Temple ramps up off-campus policing, one community leader sees many concerns to be addressed. *Philly Voice*.
- Tanenbaum, M. (2016, April 14). Why North Philly protesters marched on Broad Street to fight Temple's stadium plan. *Philly Voice*.
- Tarquinio, J. A. (2013, December 2013). New Campus Buildings Take Shape . *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Task Force on Inequality and American Democracy. (2004). *American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality*. Washington, D.C. : The American Political Science Association.
- Taussig, M. T. (2005). *Law in a Lawless Land: Diary of a 'Limpieza' in Columbia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Temple Elects President . (1941, September 18). *The Courier-News*, p. 3.
- Temple University . (2017). *About Temple University* . Retrieved April 2017, from www.temple.edu/about
- Temple University . (2017). *About Temple University President* . Retrieved April 2017, from www.temple.edu/about/president
- Temple University. (2017). *Good Neighbor Initiative*. Retrieved 2017 April, from goodneighbor.temple.edu

Temple University. (2017). *Off-Campus Services: Starting Your Search*. Retrieved 2017 April, from University Housing and Residential Life: housing.temple.edu

The Cox Commission. (1968). *Crisis at Columbia: Report of the Fact-Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May 1968*. New York: Random House, Inc.

The growth of growth theory. (2006, May 18). *The Economist*.

(1996). *The Knowledge-Based Economy*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development.

The Morning Brew with Friends. (2016, June 7). *Innovate ABQ Has New Project Manager*. Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_8SYDIzYaYo

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (April 1983). *A Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. (1901). *By-Laws and Rules of Order of the Trustees As Adopted March 7, 1892, With Amendments*. New York: Columbia University in the City of New York.

The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. (2009, May 18). West Harlem Community Benefits Agreement. New York.

The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. (2011, December 14). Declaration of Covenants & Restrictions. Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP.

- The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. (2015, October 15). Columbia University Educational Mixed-Use Development Project (the "Project"). New York .
- The University of Cambridge. (n.d.). *About the University: Early Records*. Retrieved May 1, 2016, from <https://www.cam.ac.uk/about-the-university/history/early-records>
- Theobald, N. D. (2015, November 10). New Stadium a natural step. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*.
- Thiem, C. H. (2008). Thinking Through Education: the Geographies of Contemporary Educational Restructuring. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(2), 154-173.
- Thomas, G. E. (2002, September/October). Building Penn's Brand: How the architecture of campus - and the coverage it received in the Gazette - has reflected the University's changing image of itself. *The Pennsylvania Gazette*.
- Thomas, G. S. (2014, January 31). Income inequality is a problem everywhere, but especially in the South. *The Business Journals*.
- Thoreau, H. D. (2003). *Walden and Civil Disobedience*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books.
- Thorpe, F. N. (1909). 1776 Constitution of North Carolina. In *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of*

- America*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. Retrieved from Yale Law School.
- Times Higher Education. (2017). *World Reputation Rankings 2016*. Retrieved 2017 March, from www.timeshighereducation.com
- Torres, C. A., & Schugurensky, D. (2002). The Political Economy of Higher Education in the Era of Globalization: Latin America in Comparative Perspective. *Higher Education*, 43, 429-455.
- Touraine, A. (1971). *The May Movement: Revolt and Reform, may 1968--the Student Rebellion and Workers' Strikes--the Birth of a Social Movement*. New York: Random House.
- Triece, M. E. (2016). *Urban renewal and resistance: race, space, and the city in the late twentieth to early twenty-first century*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Trujillo, T. (n.d.). *Innovate ABQ + Innovation Corridor*. Retrieved September 2016, from Dekker/Perich/Sabatini: <https://www.dpsdesign.org/blog/innovate-abq-innovation-corridor>
- University of New Mexico . (2015, May 15). *Innovate ABQ*. Retrieved September 2016, from Youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ggX1ywbsVVo>
- UNM: Office of the President. (2016). *About President Robert G. Frank*. Retrieved September 2016
- UNM: Policy Office. (2016). *Origin and Structure of the University*. Retrieved October 2016, from University of New Mexico: policy.unm.edu

- Vanderbilt, T. (2010). *Survival City: Adventures Among the Ruins of Atomic America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press .
- Vega, L. (2014, December 22). The history of UC tuition since 1868. *The Daily Californian: The Daily Clog*.
- Vielkind, J. (2004, October 4). Battle Over Eminent Domain Rages Around CU. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Vielkind, J. (2004, April 21). Bollinger Unveils Harlem Expansion Plans. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.
- Vitullo-Martin, J. (2006, June 1). Columbia's Planned Expansion to Manhattanville Draws Fire From Small Businesses, Community Board. *The New York Sun*.
- Waddell, H. (2000). *The Wandering Scholars of the Middle Ages*. Mineola: Dover.
- Walker, S. (February 2015). *State of Wisconsin: Budget in Brief*. Madison : Division of Budget and Finance: Department of Administration.
- Webb, M. (2013, July 11). The Long and Troubling History of Penitritification in West Philly. *Curbed: Philadelphia*.
- Weinstein, A. (2017, March 29). U.S. College Grads See Slim-to-Nothing Wage Gains Since Recession. *Bloomberg*.
- Wels, S. (1999). *Stanford: portrait of a university* . Stanford: Stanford Alumni Association .
- Wentworth, K. (2014, November 20). Innovate ABQ master planning requires community input. *UNM Newsroom*.

- Wentworth, K. (2015, March 11). UNM regents approve development framework for Innovate ABQ. *UNM Newsroom*.
- West, T. (2010, October 30). The Economic Principles of America's Founding Fathers: Property Rights, Free Markets and Sound Money. *The Heritage Foundation*.
- Wiewel, W., & Knaap, G.-J. (2005). *Partnerships for Smart Growth: University-Community Collaboration for Better Public Spaces*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Williams, T. (2006, November 20). In West Harlem Land Dispute, It's Columbia vs. Residents. *The New York Times*.
- Williams, T. (2007, December 21). Despite Earlier Defiance, Holdouts in Columbia's Expansion Zone Are Down to 3. *The New York Times*.
- Williams, T. (2008, September 20). 2 Gas Stations, and a Family's Resolve, Confront Columbia Expansion. *The New York Times*.
- Willson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Black Point: Fernwood Publishing.
- Wink, C. (2009, June 10). University City Science Center welcomes three new companies. *Technical Philly*.
- Wintz, C. D. (1996). *Black Culture and the Harlem Renaissance*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Wintz, C. D. (2007). *Harlem Speaks: A Living History of the Harlem Renaissance*. Naperville: Sourcebooks.
- Woodard, C. (2016, July 21). The Coolest Shipyard in America. *Politico*.

Woodhouse, K. (2015, September 28). Closures to Triple. *Inside Higher Ed*.

Younger, E. (2015, March 23). New vision unveiled for Albuquerque's downtown. *KRQE News 13*.

Zerlang, M. (1997). The University and the City. *GeoJournal*, 43(3), 241-246.

Zients, S. (2015, October 7). Opening next fall, first Manhattanville buildings to promote interdisciplinary activity. *The Columbia Daily Spectator*.