Antipode 31:2, 1999, pp. 129–162
ISSN 0066-4812

SOULLESS CITIES

ANN ARBOR, THE CUTTING EDGE OF DISCIPLINE: POSTFORDISM, POSTMODERNISM, AND THE NEW BOURGEOISIE

Corey Dolgon*

> Michigan is in the midst of a profound transition, from an industrial economy based upon the abundance of natural resources, unskilled labor, and to some degree, constrained and slowly moving domestic markets, to a knowledge-based economy characterized by intensely competitive world markets, rapid change, and—most important of all—educated people and their ideas. . . . And it is in Ann Arbor that the focus of these extraordinary changes in our society are having their most dramatic impact.
>
> — James Duderstadt, 1990

> Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past.
>
> — George Orwell, 1984

This is a story of class struggle. It covers the period from the end of World War II to the present and studies the economic, political, and cultural changes in a mid-sized Midwestern university city, Ann Arbor, Michigan. This is not, however, a simple tale of capital restructuring and creative destruction, urban growth and uneven development, or gentrification and

*Sociology Department, Worcester State College, Worcester, Massachusetts; e-mail: cdolgon @worc.mass.edu

Published by Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 108 Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 1JF, UK.

displacement, although they do comprise part of the story. Instead, I want to place these large-scale forces within a local frame to explore how a city uniquely positioned to thrive in an increasingly "knowledge-based" economy has contributed to the hegemonic task of creating social philosophies and practices that totalize and naturalize an apparently triumphant new global capitalism and its successful attendants, the professional/managerial/technocratic class (PMTC) I refer to as the "new bourgeoisie."[1]

Everywhere Ann Arbor seems to stand as a symbolic celebration of the new bourgeoisie. From the tall, mirror-windowed office complexes and research labs on the outskirts of town to the cappuccino shops, book stores, and boutiques that line the downtown streets, Ann Arbor's physical and cultural landscape tells the story of an increasingly affluent class of intellectual and scientific innovators. But this bourgeoisie represents more than just a "new class" privileged by its vital role as global economic warriors on the "post-industrial" battleground. Ann Arbor's innovators also contribute to the ideological project of solidifying corporate capital's hegemonic reign. The power of what Gramsci first called the "ruling bloc" is never total, and even Ann Arbor's success has contradictions: vacant condos and offices, a rising homeless population and crime rate, volatile public debates over panhandling and gangs, budget deficits and decreasing public services, and protests against economic development policies. Thus, corporate capital must continually struggle for power, and the new bourgeoisie must continually narrate and legitimize its triumph.[2]

These stories of global capital and new bourgeois ascendancy do more than eulogize: they exist as weapons to further the struggle itself. Examining the effects of transnationalism on cultural politics and class formation, Roger Rouse argues that rapid and large-scale economic changes in global capital have created a crisis for the authority of nation-states. Particularly unstable are traditional class relations and subjectivities as "many people have developed notions of affiliation, identity, and loyalty that run counter to established ideologies of citizenship and national allegiance" (Rouse, 1995:357–362). The rise of right-wing nationalism in the United States and Europe is evidence for part of this struggle to reaffirm "traditional" relationships and identities amidst great economic and social instability. Yet new capital relations and practices, especially the "speed and frequency with which people, goods, money, information, and ideas move across boundaries of the state" (Rouse, 1995), demand *more* flexible and fluid institutions and identities, not static, reactionary ones. Thus, while nation-states have historically had interests in producing the political arrangements and cultural affiliations that facilitate capital accumulation, bourgeois-dominated coalitions now demand more complex narratives capable of managing new market conditions, labor flows, and worker unrest amidst chaotic and diverging images and ideas. The basic contradictions of capitalism remain, but the bourgeois hegemonic project of disciplining labor *and* management now requires

new ideologies, institutions, activities, and identities to rationalize its power. It needs new stories.

Ann Arbor, Michigan, though small in size relative to the global cities of New York and Los Angeles, is rich in stories. Home to the University of Michigan (UM), one of the largest research institutions in the United States, Ann Arbor has evolved into an important geographical node in the rapidly changing economy of southeastern Michigan. Unlike most of the region that rose and fell with the fortunes of the auto industry, Ann Arbor had no significant industrial base. Instead, the city grew from a small college town of fewer than 40,000 in the early 1940s to a thriving center of over 100,000 by the late 1960s. Increasing enrollments, faculty, and support staff driven by government funding and corporate research dollars influenced massive UM expansion, including an entire North Campus addition devoted to scientific research and the College of Engineering. This rapid development inspired UM/city partnerships that evolved into a powerful growth coalition of local business, government, and university leaders who attracted high-tech companies and other "knowledge-based" industries to the area. By the 1970s, Ann Arbor's success figured in state and regional strategies for industrial development—a movement that UM technology institutes and experts predicted, lobbied for, and designed (Boyd, quoted in UM, 1975; Bacon & Bayer, 1964). As the auto industry faltered amidst global competition, deindustrialization and capital flight, research and knowledge-based production boomed, creating smaller geographically clustered cities with UM as its center. Thus, while the University's initial postwar economic role may have been cast as the kind of instrumental research and development arm of government and private industries (especially in the automotive industry), the University achieved a new status in the late 1970s and 1980s as the *primary* regional producer of a marketable commodity—knowledge in the form of research and technology. Ann Arbor was no longer a regional spoke emanating from Detroit's industrial core, but a central generator of capital investment and production. Ann Arbor's urban character is steeped in the economics, politics, and culture of contemporary economic transformation and capital restructuring—it is a postindustrial success story.[3]

The ascendancy of Ann Arbor as an important regional, national, and international center of knowledge production is also a tale about the storytellers themselves. As producers of knowledge, this "city of innovators" (as designated by the local Chamber of Commerce) has been responsible not only for the material production of new economic commodities (information technologies, managerial systems, basic scientific research/knowledge, etc.), but for the cultural production of social narratives that rationalize the hegemonic rise of new economic, social, and political relations. Rouse, echoing Gramsci's work on Fordism, reminds us that "hegemonic influence . . . involves attempts to shape people's dispositions regarding their relationship to work, their conduct as consumers, and the

discrepancies they encounter between the promises they are offered and the realities in which they live" (Rouse, 1995:58). Ann Arbor's innovators have produced both the new machinery of a postindustrial society and the disciplinary narratives of "post-Fordism," meeting what Gramsci called "the need to elaborate a new kind of man suited to a new kind of work and productive process" (Gramsci, 1992:300–310).

One can equally argue that Ann Arbor is a *new kind of place*. This is not to say that the city or the university are necessarily unique. Most major research universities have restructured during the postwar period to meet the changing demands of a knowledge-based economy and the increasing pressure on public institutions to privatize their administrative practices and social missions.[4] And places such as The Research Triangle, Silicon Valley, and Boston's Route 128 demonstrated similar geographical, economic, and cultural dynamics.[5] Yet none of these examples offer as isolated an instance of the symbiotic relationship between one city (Ann Arbor) and one major research university (Michigan). It is this convergence of shifting urbanization and institutional restructuring that makes this case such a richly textured example of postindustrial economic and cultural production.

In particular, we should examine the loosely defined but influential segments of the city's elite: the "high-tech community," downtown merchants and growth advocates, and university intellectuals and administrators. In each case, I explore the rise of new ideas and practices that shape the ways in which these people think and act. And, while these changing discursive practices and institutional formations are directly related to shifting regional, national and global political economies, one of the most important characteristics of Ann Arbor's post-Fordist narratives is their ability to obscure these dynamics. As new stories discipline scientists, politicians, merchants, consumers, and intellectuals, the stories and the storytellers themselves disappear. The most powerful forms of discipline are invisible.[6] Thus, at the same time that discipline is inscribed into the landscape of the city, it evaporates within the totalization of its narrative. Ann Arbor is no longer a story of struggle, power, influence, and triumph; it is simply the story of a natural progressive evolution. Listen to the Chamber of Commerce:

> Where once there was farmland, new kinds of seeds are planted in some of the handsomest, parklike, industrial acres of the country, and wealth is created out of less than thin air: the operation of the intellect, devoted to research. . . . [Ann Arbor] is one of the fastest growing U.S. cities, and the growth is highly selective, by choice of the individuals who planned the growth to be a kind most beneficial to the city, an industrial aristocracy of innovators. (Ann Arbor Chamber of Commerce, 1970:2)

Ann Arbor has sprouted from the soil. Yet even the Chamber admits that this development was "highly selective." What is ignored in this story of the "aristocracy of innovators" is the displacement of people victimized by "self-feeding and self-sustaining" growth. Thus, I begin by documenting the city's postwar demographic shifts and their connection not only to the university and the local elite's new bourgeois paradise but to the displacement of the city's Black working class. By placing post-Fordist narratives within a geographical context, I want to ground them in the economic, social and political conditions that influence stories and storytellers. If, according to Marx, the production of ideas derive from peoples' material activity, then Ann Arbor has been an incubator for the narratives that dominate and discipline contemporary culture and society.

Gentrification, Displacement, and the Geography of Class and Race

In the mid-1970s Garnet Johnson moved into Ann Arbor's North Central neighborhood and opened her own realty agency. After scouting the area, she noticed that "many buyers spent as much to rehab their units as they did to buy them. Convinced that people would pay far more than anyone had realized to live there," she built new condominiums with prices as high as $160,000 (Ferrall, 1988:17–20). During the same period, the predominantly African-American North Central Property Owners Association had asked Jim Chaffers, a Black UM architecture professor, to design a long-range land use plan for the area that would beautify the landscape and raise property values, but still "maintain a racially and economically diverse neighborhood." Yet, as Chaffers drew his plans, Johnson developed an upscale condominium project called "Wickliffe Place," named in honor of Letty Wickliffe, the North Central Property Owners president. And while Chaffers worried that condominiums might be a "triggering device for more upscale development," Johnson called the professor's vision "myopic. . . . It's out of the Sixties . . . [I've] made a couple hundred thousand in investment here . . . [and] there are other people making investments in the neighborhood and feeling good about it" (Ferrall, 1988:56).

For over one hundred years Ann Arbor's African-American community had invested their lives in the North Central neighborhoods. A comprehensive study of the city's Black settlements between 1860 and 1960 showed five well-defined sections (all on the Northside) where over 85% of Ann Arbor's Black population lived (Deskins, 1962). Segregation and racism limited most of the city's slow but steadily growing African-American population to these areas. Racial discrimination also characterized hiring practice: African Americans comprised a majority of the city's low-wage service sector, working mostly at the university and Ann Arbor's two major hospitals as cooks, kitchen helpers, practical nurses, nurses aids,

hospital attendants, and orderlies (Talayco, 1962). In 1962, Ann Arbor's Human Relations Commission declared that racism had created an African American ghetto with the city's highest percentage of overcrowded and dilapidated houses, lowest property values and per capita income, and highest incidence of unemployment and health problems. In 1967, the Commission described it as the "poorest, most polluted, and most dangerous section of the city" (Ann Arbor Human Relations Commission, 1967).

Still, this Northside was the heart of Ann Arbor's African-American community. Home to a significant Black business district, most of the city's Black property owners, and both organized institutions and informal networks of solidarity, this section was the foundation of African-American cultural, political, and economic life. In the mid-1960s, however, these Black working-class neighborhoods experienced political and social divisions as an older, more traditional, and politically conservative Black middle-class fought with a younger and increasingly militant civil rights movement for control. Represented by the Property Owners Association and aligned with the city's Republicans, conservative Blacks sought to improve their neighborhood through capital investment, housing codes, and beautification projects. In contrast, members of civil rights groups (most aligned with Democrats) demanded more local autonomy for community development projects, affordable housing, and control over land-use to prevent gentrification. Both sides wanted to protect the neighborhood's "integrity" against real estate speculators and developers, but the conservative agenda, steeped in middle-class notions of upward mobility and home ownership, paved the way for gentrification. Eventually, their idealized vision of a racially diverse, middle-class place gave way to developers' visions of profitable, bourgeois space (Logan and Molotch, 1987; personal interviews, 1/5–7/94 and 5/17/94; Ann Arbor HRC, 1964).[7]

But even as the Northside neighborhoods were appropriated for their exchange value, new residents created a different sense of place with another idealized image of community. Johnson's own vision, according to *Ann Arbor Observer* reporter William Ferrall, was apparent in her refined taste and eclectic lifestyle. Her townhouse included a restored fireplace and neatly arranged Victorian sofas, art prints, cherry kitchen cabinets, and highly polished antiques. Ferrall (1988:56) writes:

> In contrast to that formality, Johnson often dresses casually, and says she appreciates being able "to dress up at night, with gowns and boas, then awake the next day and toss on jeans and tennis shoes" for work or shopping around town. "What's wonderful about North Central is that it's already a *real* neighborhood. . . . We walked over to Performance Network, and to an anti-nuke rally. We go to our favorite restaurants; deliveries at Zingerman's [an upscale deli] wake us up each morning. Up here we just do things in an impromptu way."

Johnson's conception of the "real" echoes some of the city Planning Commission's Northside Survey data from the mid-1970s, where the neighborhood's "ethnic past" and "racial mix" provided a kind of commodified historical aesthetic. As cultural capital, the area's history offered an authenticity central to the process of class constitution, where taste is a classificatory system that gives socially constructed space the sense of objectified reality (Bourdieu, 1984:171–175).[8] Armed with this aesthetic, the city's elite succeeded in engineering an urban transformation.

Between 1950 and 1980 Ann Arbor's population grew from just over 48,000 to almost 108,000. The new populace was mostly employed in higher education and health care, technological research and development, financial and information service firms, and restaurants and other businesses catering to a gentrified leisure industry.[9] An employment study of Washtenaw County (of which Ann Arbor is the county seat) shows a significant growth in the workforce as well as a shift in and away from employment in manufacturing. (See Tables 1 and 2.)

While these developments exemplify U.S. Trends, in Ann Arbor they added to an occupational structure already dominated by a large professional and service-oriented labor force (Noyelle and Stanback, 1983:17). As early as 1950, most workers were employed in business, personal, professional, or public services. And although the shift toward professional and service sector work includes both high- and low-wage jobs, the percentage of city residents in "professional, technical and kindred" jobs nearly doubled, while "clerical and kindred" jobs were static.

The data in Table 2 led the planning commission to conclude that Ann Arbor's "population was primarily professional and becoming more so," while statistics on housing, the rise in median incomes and educational attainment, and the decrease in the percentage of people under 18 and over 45 years of age combined to create a picture of the city's new residents: affluent, educated, professional, or college-enrolled men and women. They were also overwhelmingly White (Ann Arbor Planning

Table 1 Washtenaw County Employment Breakdown, 1950–1980

Workers	1950	%	1960	%	1970	%	1980	%
Manufacturing	16,000	33	25,000	36.1	33,000	31.5	40,800	28.8
Non-manufacturing	15,000	31.7	19,000	26.6	27,600	26.4	41,700	29.5
Prof. & Public Services	17,000	35.3	26,700	37.3	44,100	42.1	59,000	41.7
Total	48,000	100%	71,500	100.0	104,700	100.0	141,500	100.0

Source: *Economic Activities in Washtenaw County: An Employment Study, 1960–1980.* Washtenaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission. April, 1983.

Table 2 Percent Distribution of Ann Arbor Occupations, 1950–1970

Occupation	1950	1960	1970
Professional, technical, et al.	28.3	37.4	41.6
Managers, administrators	8.1	7.9	7.4
Sales	7.2	6.0	5.7
Clerical, et al.	16.6	17.3	18.0
Craftsmen, foremen	10.2	6.8	6.2
Operatives	9.8	6.6	5.7
Private household	2.6	2.5	0.9
Service	14.9	13.6	12.5
Farm workers and managers	0.3	0.2	0.1
Laborers	2.1	1.7	1.9
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Ann Arbor Planning Commission Growth Study, 1972.

Commission, 1972, 1988; Washtenaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission, 1980).

Even more impressive was the effect of gentrification on older working-class neighborhoods in the downtown area. In the two Census tracts that comprised the North Central area (7 and 8), the percentage of White population increased from 52% in 1970 to 74% in 1980 (tract 7) and from 86% in 1960 to 95% in 1980 (tract 8). And while the total population of both areas dropped slightly, residents between the ages of 25 and 34 nearly doubled in tract 7 (from 437 to 835) and increased over 50% in tract 8 (from 524 to 791). During this same period, both tracts experienced a significant rise in the proportion of residents with four years or more of higher education (tract 7—17.1% to 40.1%; tract 8—54.9% to 76.9%). Along with this came a doubling of the average property values and median contract rental costs. Two other Census tracts (5 and 6) contained much of the city's old West Side, known for its White, working-class neighborhoods. They experienced similar demographic trends during this period: total population decreased yet increased over 50% in the age range 25-34; rents and housing values doubled; and education levels and median incomes rose. A 1976 report for the Planning Commission showed that while tracts 5, 6, 7, and 8 maintained the largest proportion of unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled operatives and service workers, these groups also left at a rate faster than anywhere else in Ann Arbor (Polk, 1977).

University expansion plans had more direct impact on the city. In 1964, the university expanded its hospital facilities and built an adjacent parking garage. The land was acquired from property owners who forced out

previous tenants in order to sell to the school. As one local housing activist, Mrs. Berle, reported to the city's Human Relations Committee: "The recent Wall St. evictions put one woman out and her three small children. Their total income is $165 a month. She was paying $65 for her apartment on Wall St. She was unable to find a place [in Ann Arbor] within the $90 allowed her under ADC" (Ann Arbor HRC, 1964).

Similar displacement occurred in the late 1960s and early 1970s as UM buildings and services encroached on the small pockets of Black residents remaining in the Northside neighborhoods nearest to the school. Meanwhile, an employment study by the Ann Arbor-Washtenaw Conference on Religion and Race found that despite the city's rapidly rising per capita income, the only gains made by African Americans involved menial, unskilled positions at UM or in personal services. One Conference member, the Reverend Terry Daily, explained the integral connection between housing and employment: "[T]he continued destruction of comparatively low-cost housing to make room for moderate rent and high rent apartment projects is forcing people out of Ann Arbor while they are in effect asked to return to fill jobs no one else will fill" (Ann Arbor HRC, 1967).

The work by groups like the Conference and the Human Rights Committee had some impact on the local politics of uneven development. In particular, they created a climate that supported some of the liberal urban policies initiated by Federal programs in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Ann Arbor established a Model Cities Program that covered much of the old Northside neighborhood. From its onset, however, conflicts over the neighborhood's autonomy handicapped the project. Black leaders of the Model Cities Policy Board wanted control over development plans within the designated Model Cities area. Ezra Rowry, chair of the local CORE (Congress on Racial Equality) chapter, and Al Wheeler, president of the city's NAACP chapter, were both on the Policy Board and had hoped to limit gentrification. The Democratic-controlled City Council supported Model Cities, but would not grant the Board such autonomy. While the Board did succeed in establishing a variety of programs (a health care clinic, day care, educational and job training programs, etc.), they lost the battle to restrict gentrification and, by the mid-1970s, the City Council terminated the effort (Personal interviews, 5/17/94 and 7/27/93; Model Cities Program Policy Board, 1969).

With the active encouragement of a pro-growth coalition, the tacit support of liberal politicians, and a growing new bourgeoisie, gentrification and displacement continued without much resistance. Between 1980 and 1988 the average household income in the city almost doubled ($22,261 to $43,022) and the percentage of those who earned $50,000 or more almost quadrupled (8.1% to 32%), while those who could still afford to live in Ann Arbor on less than $20,000 fell from 53% to 18.5%. A 1990 occupational breakdown of UM employees makes this shift very clear: 75% of the faculty and upper level administrators live within Ann Arbor, but fewer

than 50% of the noninstructional and technical staff, 40% of the office staff, and 30% of the semiskilled operatives and skilled trades reside inside the city. Thus, while the Northside showed the clearest demographic shifts, by 1990 most of Ann Arbor had become a place dominated economically, politically, and culturally by a young and affluent new bourgeoisie. Yet this transformation was neither natural nor guaranteed.

In 1945, William Brown, the city's first pro-growth Mayor, promised to" run the city like a business." He forged a partnership with the University to bring the new research and administrative headquarters of Parke Davis (one of the nation's largest pharmaceutical companies) to Ann Arbor. In pronouncing a new development strategy, Brown (1956) explained:

> The addition of Parke Davis research center would be of tremendous value to the City. . . . In addition to having the added taxes, we would have the fine people that Parke Davis & Company would bring to Ann Arbor as residents of our City. It is exactly this kind of development we want. . . .[10]

Brown's efforts eventually evolved into a larger growth coalition of government leaders, business people, and UM administrators. Under the guise of the Chamber of Commerce's Economic Development Committee, this group created an infrastructure for industrial development that culminated in the construction of the Greater Ann Arbor Research Park in 1962. Similar projects followed as boosters aggressively sought the "right type" of industry and the "fine people" they employed. Ultimately, these efforts would change not only the economic character of the city, but also its political climate and cultural landscape. Ann Arbor became home to professional, technical, and intellectual workers who would eventually inspire a new habitus where an ascendant class hegemony could reshape the urban landscape in its own image. As Johnson told the *Observer*, "some people would call me pushy" for wanting to redecorate a neighbor's house, "but I just want quality up here" (Ferrall, 1988:58).

Creating Just the Right Mood: Ann Arbor's Milieu of Innovation

The University of Michigan inspired Ann Arbor's successful postwar industrial development strategies, because the school possessed state-of-the-art research facilities and nationally acclaimed faculty and because its social and cultural life attracted highly educated professionals, technicians, and their companies. The overall climate of scientific and technological research combined with access to contemporary cultural marketplaces created what Manuel Castells has called a "milieu of innovation" (1989:82–90). This milieu is characterized by "a continuous flow of the key elements" that supports the innovative production of

information: "new scientific and technological information, high risk capital, and innovative technical labor. . . ." (Castells, 1989:82–90).

The postwar growth coalition of UM administrators, city officials, and the Chamber of Commerce first developed these elements under the guise of making Ann Arbor the "Research Center of the Midwest." Not only did large companies like Bendix and Parke Davis locate R&D facilities in the city during the late 1950s and 1960s, but some computer scientists and UM faculty took advantage of readily available capital and created dozens of spinoff companies specializing in scientific and medical technologies. As the president of one such company, Manufacturing Data Systems Inc., explained, "What Parke Davis . . . did was to create an atmosphere of high technology. As other people had ideas, they felt they were in an environment that could enhance and nurture those ideas" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a).

Although the recession of the early 1970s put a temporary halt to the availability of venture capital, economic upheaval and increased foreign competition forced U.S. companies to respond. According to David Harvey, corporations had to dismantle the rigid aspects of Fordist production (labor contracts and static processes of production and patterns of consumption) and create more flexible forms of accumulation. This restructuring included "technological change, automation, the search for new product lines and market niches" and "was characterized by the emergence of entirely new sectors of production, new ways of providing financial services, new markets, and above all, greatly intensified rates of commercial, technological, and organizational innovation" (Harvey, 1989: 140–172). To achieve this, corporations again made major investments in R&D.

The economic and political ruptures that helped dismantle Fordism affected the technocratic faith in progress. The *process* of innovation needed to be transformed; no longer could science simply be pressed into the service of capital to meet corporate needs (Noble, 1977:146). Fordism (which combined a specific pattern of mass production and social and political regulation) represented a stable "regime of innovation." In the postwar period, this stability between scientific research and its patrons—corporations and government—had been coordinated by Vannevar Bush, head of the National Defense Research Committee. He argued that universities should be centers for fundamental research because "their scientists are free to pursue the truth wherever it may lead" (Bush, 1980:12–20). This "freedom," however, would need big public and corporate grants to create a "flow of new scientific knowledge [for] those who can apply it to practical problems in Government, industry, or elsewhere" (Bush, 1980:12–20).[11] Wolfgang Fache and Edgar Grande contended that the Fordist isolation of technological innovation from other social and political processes ceased to be tenable within the structural crisis. Instead, technology needed to be framed by a wider

perspective of social transformation that considers economic, political, and social conditions as integrated matters. They explained that the "success of economic-technological innovation increasingly depends on political innovations" (such as legal regulations on both labor relations and industrial practices), while "the new production paradigm induces a transformation of the relation between work and private life [that] requires far-reaching social transformations and the relevance of social as well as political variables" (Fache and Grande, 1991:40–45).

But technology and innovation were never completely divorced from politics and culture, as even Ford himself went well beyond the confines of factory production with his infamous sociology department. Bush, too, proposed linking scientific research to national politics and corporate interests, but he was always careful to separate *basic* scholarly research from *applied* corporate research because *ideologically* universities, corporations, and government had different missions. As I argue elsewhere, however, the evolving postwar relationships among these institutions were shaped by specific forms of university and corporate restructuring that were rationalized by an ideological conflation of Cold War patriotism and social progress with economic growth (Dolgon, 1998). What changed in the throes of the Fordist crisis was not the structural links of science, politics, and economics, but the ideological perspectives integrating and legitimizing them.

The current convergence of corporate interests, scientific investigation, and concerns about global competition has resulted in an emphasis on a "culture of innovative enterprise" that naturalizes this linkage. Key to this cultural narrative is a spirit of entrepreneurialism not restricted to individual personality or business acumen but performed collectively by scientists, businessmen, and politicians. Although Fache and Grande demarcate three distinct approaches to innovation (the enterprising *person*, the organizing *state*, and the cooperative *community),* they explain that "one assumption [is] common: namely that the 'spirit of enterprise' is in some way a prerequisite for success; and it is this common sense which distinguishes [the present] from . . . that technocratic vision prevailing some thirty years ago which conceived of progress as the self-sustaining movement of a technological system" (Fache and Grande, 1991:43–50). Capitalism must be not only technologically dynamic, but culturally and ideologically dynamic, too.

Ann Arbor's postwar climate for cutting-edge R&D appeared to put the city on the high road of development. But in the late 1970s and early 1980s the city's success in providing a "milieu of innovation" faltered. Political upheavals in the 1960s and economic upheavals in the 1970s interfered with the kind of institutional and ideological focus needed to remain on the forefront of high-tech. Ann Arbor lost the coherent movement and ideology that inspired the local entrepreneurial spirit. The city also failed to shift from a research outpost for larger industrial centers

(such as Detroit) to a primary center of knowledge-based commodities. While both the UM and the city had experienced institutional and cultural changes, they had not created a synthetic effort that would position Ann Arbor and the UM to become a thriving postindustrial landscape.

In 1981, Ann Arbor's Chamber of Commerce and UM's Institute for Science and Technology co-sponsored the Michigan Technology Fair, where local and state leaders in science, business, and government came together to discuss the problems they faced. The ideology of the fair was well portrayed by the *Ann Arbor News* in a twenty-five-page feature on high technology that not only promoted the conference but helped package its meaning. By analyzing this *News* section, we can see how a mythology of collective innovative spirit and enterprise culture can be harnessed to rationalize the strategies and practices of a local elite in their struggle to compete with other regions for industrial development, as well as with other political ideologies and class interests for local hegemony.

The *News* framed the issue of local high-tech development in the context of Michigan's economy where Ann Arbor was at "the center of attention in a state crying out for industrial diversification and improved productivity" in the wake of the auto industry's decline. While city leaders agreed that a university-inspired research orientation made Ann Arbor key to Michigan's economic future, other topics, like UM's role in industrial development and the city's own "path to progress," were popular. The dominant message was clear: Before Ann Arbor could become the linchpin for regional economic development, it must "first improve access to its resources and it must create a business climate attractive to established and new high technology companies." And, although the city had experienced rapid postwar growth, Ann Arbor's success would now be measured against the nation's two major university-inspired high-tech growth centers: California's Silicon Valley and Boston's Route 128. In contrast to them, Ann Arbor lacked a vigorous organized and innovative entrepreneurial spirit. While all the elements for potential high-tech development had been in place since the early 1960s, the new common sense among local business elite was that the previous pro-growthers had "dropped the ball." Kenneth Stephanz, a CEO at Manufacturing Data Systems, explained:

> Ann Arbor is not Route 128 because [it] has consciously avoided any aggressive development of high technology, and that's a pretty obvious conclusion if you just look around. . . . It's almost an arrogance that's been misplaced. I would say business, government, chamber of commerce and the state must share in the blame that there is not an aggressive effort toward industrial development of any kind in this area. (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a)

Although once successful in attracting major R&D facilities, Ann Arbor had yet to meet its "potential" as a major research center, not because it lacked the elements of knowledge-based production or R&D capabilities, but because it lacked the "aggressive effort toward industrial development": the spirit of entrepreneurialism.[12] Many pieces in the *News* section addressed the role of UM in local development. In particular, the *News* talked to former UM president Harlan Hatcher about the postwar history of UM's high-tech research and interviewed then president Harold Shapiro on his commitment to local and regional economic growth. "The Past," as defined and packaged by the *News*, was one of massive military-sponsored research, creating a "pile of knowledge" that required private industry to use it. Thus, according to Hatcher, Ann Arbor "got a burst of companies." Hatcher portrays a kind of naturalistic evolution from patriotic scientists producing basic research to corporate application for consumer use. James Brinkerhoff, a UM Executive Officer, recalled the school's specific efforts to attract research-type companies "which would provide a buffer between industry on the Northside of the city and the UM's North Campus programs." Although Hatcher and Brinkerhoff emphasize different aspects of UM's entry into the corporate world of research and development (Hatcher, the structural conditions that provided money, motivation, and product; Brinkerhoff, the UM's agency in industrial development strategy), both construct a historical narrative that rationalizes their integration of scholarly research with corporate interests.

On the other hand, President Shapiro conveyed a sense of caution about "efforts to forge new links between corporations and the university" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a). He advocated UM's traditional role in supporting industries by training professionals for the business world and maintaining strong connections to corporate research and development interests in the School of Engineering. Yet he expressed reservations about the loss of institutional independence and the potential conflict of interest if UM efforts were too tightly integrated with the private sector. Shapiro's reluctance, however, was mostly on a practical level; he claimed that "entrepreneurship is not what universities are good at" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a). Still, he shared business professor David Brophy's view that, as a public institution, UM was "bound to return something" to the state (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a). Thus Shapiro concluded, "I do believe we should exert what leadership we can to help the state in an economic sense, to indicate our interest and concern" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a). In 1981, Shapiro helped the city woo a robotics manufacturer, Devilbiss Corporation, from Toledo to Ann Arbor, and worked with Don Smith of UM's Institute for Science and Technology to organize the Michigan Technology Fair. Using UM's role as a "state-sponsored institution," Shapiro justified its corporate connections as part of the school's public responsibilities (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a).

For all of Shapiro's ambivalence, few of his top administrators possessed any qualms about their role in inspiring regional growth through entrepreneurial endeavors. The Director of the Division of Research Development and Administration, James Lesch, said that, while some faculty believe involvement in industry "bastardizes our purposes," it was necessary for UM to take a leadership role to revitalize the local and state economy (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a). He stated: "The UM has been at best passive on encouraging economic development in the past, whereas Stanford and MIT both have been very aggressive. . . . Ann Arbor has not developed because the University has not got out and shaken the bushes" (Ann Arbor News, 1981a). According to then Engineering College Dean James Duderstadt, "the college's greatest strength —and the state's greatest need—is in manufacturing engineering, including industrial plant automation (robotics)" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a). He concludes, "The lifeblood of our program is a close relationship with industry. . . . It keeps our faculty aware of what the *real needs* of the world are" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a).

For Duderstadt, no conflict of interest exists when the "needs of the real world" are dictated by industry. As David Thorns observes, for most people research is seen "at its best when it is more directed, so the *applications* of science rather than its discoveries are now considered to be where effort and activity should be placed" (Thorns, 1992:124–126). So the interests of science and UM were conflated with the needs of private industry and regional economy to give birth to an "enterprise culture" that asserted the strategic importance of attracting entrepreneurial business capital through aggressive innovation and marketing (Thorns, 1992:124–126).

The *News* packaged this enterprise culture by devoting over one-third of the insert to a showcase of individual high-tech entrepreneurs and UM faculty who had left the academy to start their own R&D companies. In a piece entitled "Breaking Away," the *News'* science writer, Max Gates, presents the stereotype of a university researcher entering the business world: "an absent-minded professor surrounded by test tubes, microscopes, and other scientific gadgetry, diligently working away, totally oblivious to what's happening in the real world" (Gates, 1981). Once again, the academy must meet the "real world of business" in this mythological narrative that legitimizes the conflation of university research and corporate interests, which gives heroic status to the academic turned entrepreneur. Howard Diamond, a former UM engineering professor, is featured in three different articles proudly recounting his own evolution from naive professor to savvy businessman. He recalls:

> In a moment of absolute madness, I gave up a tenured position with no good business plan. . . . [At UM], I had the attitude that there was a lower caliber of people out in the big world. . . . I

> was shocked to find the contrary was true. . . . In academia, publishing means fame and fortune, and it doesn't matter whether the papers are significant or not. In business, the product is what counts; it has to work. In business, you must make more money than you spend. It takes a disciplined business plan. (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981a)

The late 1970s and early 1980s was a period when American capitalism demanded a new form of discipline from scientists and other knowledge producers, as well as the administrators of research institutions and the creators of public policy. In Ann Arbor, the ideological conflation of corporate interests, scientific research, and public institutions took on a new look that combined various forms of innovative knowledge production with an aggressive entrepreneurial spirit, and the university evolved as an economic instrument for regional competition in a shifting economy. The needs of capital no longer simply framed the intellectual pursuits of UM research, but became infused into the very lifeblood of the academy to create a new entrepreneurial mood and milieu of innovation.

The city rapidly became an incubator for a high-tech business culture in which "practical forms of knowledge about production processes and markets are socialized, and tastes and sensibilities about materials, machines, and product designs are refined" (Storper and Walker, 1989: 140–147). The rise of a high-tech enterprise narrative pervaded more than just a local industrial development strategy as the state, too, promoted "innovators" as the key to economic growth. In 1977, Michigan's governor devised a Commission on High Technology that "envisioned a southeastern Michigan version of the North Carolina Research Triangle, which would facilitate cooperative R&D ventures among the auto industry, government, and university research institutions" (Digaetano and Klemanski, 1991:147). State planners and industrial developers sought high-tech companies to make up for the deindustrialization that had decimated the regional auto industry. Meanwhile, changes in intellectual property laws allowed university faculty to increase private profits from inventions produced with government grants, thus inspiring a boom in local spinoff companies.

While the centers of the auto industry—Detroit, Ypsilanti, and Flint—continued their downward spirals, Ann Arbor ascended as the center of a select and dynamic geographical space for investment and growth, not only reflecting global economic changes, but creating them, too. As Michael Storper and Richard Walker have concluded, "territorial complexes alter industrial history" (1989:144). The triumphant narrative of this history also inspired changes that inscribe the physical landscape of commercial urban centers with new stories.

Revitalizing Downtown: Defining "What's Best" about Ann Arbor

Ann Arbor has become a seedbed for new retail strategies and public/private ventures. Just as the city's postwar economic boom was guided by Mayor William Brown, the next phase of economic development was ushered in by a mayor who campaigned as a champion of local business interests. In 1977, Republican Louis Belcher ran against Al Wheeler, a former civil rights activist and the city's first African-American mayor. In his single term in office, Wheeler had stressed government as a source of social services for human development. He had authorized the Planning Commission to do a study of the changing Northside neighborhoods to restrict gentrification and economic development in the area (Ann Arbor Planning Commision, 1975). Belcher, by contrast, rallied pro-growth interests, emphasizing cooperation between government and local business to promote economic prosperity. While Belcher won the election by a narrow margin of 2%, he went on to serve four consecutive terms and to be one of the city's most popular mayors.

Belcher knew that pro-growth policies needed to be facilitated by the physical expansion of the city's borders and the political expansion of its influence. Belcher's first major project in 1978 was a state-of-the-art water treatment plant that he used to leverage cooperation from surrounding townships. As he explained:

> we knew that outside the borders is all this land that will be developed. . . . Let's be the one to make the rules. And then establish a good partnership with the surrounding townships and control their growth because you want to have some control over what's on your borders. (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981b; personal interview, 1993)

Belcher applied a similar strategy to reshape the city's Central Business District (CBD), amassing capital for downtown renovation and then leveraging support for its use. He accomplished this by creating a Downtown Development Authority (DDA).

In 1971, the Briarwood Mall was built on the city's southern border and drew many of the downtown's largest department stores outside the CBD. Planning Commission battles over the mall had intensified earlier factions in the city's growth coalition between those supporting downtown interests and those investing in peripheral development. Although CBD merchants protested Briarwood, most of the local elite wanted to support *both* downtown and periphery development. As Belcher admits:

> I was really torn. You knew that Ann Arbor, being in a major economic center, was going to get a shopping center. The question became: are they going to locate inside the city limits or

> outside the city limits; are you gonna lose that million and a half dollar tax base or are they going to locate it here. We had to have it. But I was sad because I had watched so many downtowns go down the tubes. (Personal interview, 7/23/93)

While beating the drums for high-tech industrial development, which historically meant peripheral expansion, Belcher believed that the downtown could be revitalized to take advantage of new growth patterns. Using state laws that permitted tax increment financial plans for public/private downtown development projects, Belcher claimed a new DDA could insure "the economic vitality of the city" by giving the downtown "flexibility" (Personal interview, 7/23/93). The DDA became what Marc Levine calls a quasi-public corporation where "entrepreneurial mayors . . . bring public and private resources together to promote extensive redevelopment programs favored by each city's corporate elite" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1981b). This redevelopment was not the revitalization of a long decayed CBD, however; it was the transformation of a commercial district to meet the needs of a new economy and the tastes of the ascendant new bourgeoisie.

A refashioned downtown could take advantage of the growing secondary circuit of capital stemming from the city's vigorous economic expansion and industrial development. This process involves turning capital flows into fixed capital, the built environments essential to production (e.g., offices, factories) and to consumption (e.g., houses). State action is necessary to coordinate such large-scale real estate projects and expedite the shift of capital. Ann Arbor's DDA would facilitate this type of secondary circuit investment by producing a "public corporate entity to initiate public improvements that strengthen the downtown area and encourage and participate in . . . new private uses that clearly demonstrate the creation of new jobs, the attraction of new business, and the generation of additional tax revenues" (Ann Arbor DDA, 1982). The DDA was successful in its coordination of capital for improvements in the city's built environment, and throughout the 1980s regional investors and developers (especially from Detroit) poured money into office buildings, shopping centers, and hotels. Even more important, though, was the climate the DDA helped create. Drawing on the long- standing tradition of boosterism, the DDA promoted a "civic culture of entrepreneurialism."

The DDA also represented a mechanism that enabled the kind of commercial flexibility necessary to meet changing markets. The secondary circuit of capital involves creating new landscapes of consumption as well as production. New centers of industrial development inspire new centers of consumption that reflect the cultural tastes of a new class's rise to hegemony. Ann Arbor's downtown was in a position to exploit both the capital available from peripheral growth and the new bourgeoisie's

consumption patterns. This, however, meant refashioning the CBD. Louis Belcher explains:

> I looked at downtown like this: before, downtown Ann Arbor had a built-in market and [merchants] had a monopoly. . . . all the action was downtown. And the merchants were fat, dumb, happy and ran it like a monopoly. So the competition from Briarwood and the outlying shopping areas really pushed the downtown people to change. . . . Finally someone woke up and realized they were going to have to clean up to compete. . . . The nature of the downtown has changed. You've lost the big anchor stores, but that does leave you with a lot of little specialty stores —that's their niche. You need stores downtown that you can't find in shopping malls. So downtown's niche [became] business and restaurants. (Personal interview, 7/23/93)

Belcher's Republican successor, Jerry Jernigan, was even more pointed in his vision of what the downtown should become. Jernigan suggested, "making the downtown an entertainment district and not worry[ing] about the retailers" (Personal interview, 7/30/93). He continued:

> I was looking at the pluses and minuses: retail people were leaving; Briarwood was expanding, and the whole southwest area of the city across the expressway started to develop. . . we had to look for some other kinds of things to do downtown. I would go down to the Main Street merchants meetings and share my ideas but they didn't want to hear it. Some of them could compete but most couldn't. So we started getting all these boutiques and now it's becoming a diner place. (Personal interview, 7/30/93)

Eventually, even the Main Street Merchants Association understood that a healthy downtown required a "critical mass of retail, underpinned with a variety of distinctive high-quality shops (anchor, boutique, and specialty)." The DDA's new marketing district would be designed to appeal to different tastes and consumer practices. Like scientists, politicians, and UM administrators, local shop owners adapted to the changing configuration of global capitalism and consumption practices, and this transformation was negotiated with the leadership of the local political elite (Main Street Merchants Association, 1982).

In an article for *Detroit Engineer* magazine, City Planning Director Martin Overhiser was asked to discuss the "Ann Arbor phenomenon": how the city "flourishes while the adjacent communities remain depressed?" (Overhiser, 1970). Overhiser explained that, unlike most of southeastern Michigan, Ann Arbor was "not heavily dependent on the auto industry"

and, instead, had successfully created a "great technological future" (Overhiser, 1970). He emphasized that the city owed its "uniqueness" to the "ingenuity, wisdom, and interest of Ann Arbor's residents. . . . they are young, highly educated, wealthier than average, and very aware about their physical, social and economic surroundings" (Overhiser, 1970). In essence, Ann Arborites had the economic and cultural capital to influence the regional flow of investment and to create an urban landscape that reflected their interests. And this success was as much an identity, a lifestyle, and a culture for the new bourgeoisie as it was a development strategy. The DDA, with its emphasis on pedestrian improvements, gentrification projects, and highly stylized consumption environments, mirrored the symbolic forms of this growing class. This preoccupation with the symbolic landscape is evident in the DDA's "guiding values" that include maintaining a sense of "neighborhood and community," establishing a "profitable climate," and preserving historic buildings and natural assets as a "positive image and marketable identity" (Ann Arbor DDA, 1988).

As these values were incorporated in revitalizing downtown, the urban landscape helped solidify and rationalize the new bourgeoisie's rise to power. Particularly important in this process is the role that "history" plays in creating a marketable environment. The DDA's emphasis on historic conservation and the traditional character of the downtown at the same time that its projects displaced historically working-class and African-American neighborhoods was an effort to retain the legitimacy that history could offer. A claim on history is a vital narrative that naturalizes one's position of power or another's subordination. Those affluent and "sophisticated" enough to participate in the new consumption landscape could simultaneously invest in history and purchase legitimacy. Whether historic preservation creates continuity or represents a cultural habitus, the new bourgeoisie's ability to reclaim, repackage, revitalize, and purchase the past was an important element of its rise to power.

For example, Braun Court, a Northside CBD cul-de-sac of ten small dwellings built in 1910 to house immigrant German brewery workers, had become by the 1950s a predominantely African-American, moderate-income housing area. In the 1960s, a local realtor acquired these properties, raised the rents, forced families out, and welcomed professionals and students onto the court. When another local developer bought the land in the 1970s, he converted the houses into a multiethnic restaurant strip which currently includes Mexican, Thai, Japanese, Ethiopian, and Greek eateries. This commercial conversion was made possible in part by pedestrian improvements and beautification projects (stylish lampposts, cobblestone paths, and increased parking) funded by the DDA to provide an upscale ambiance. The gentrification of the Northside also drew an affluent clientele with a taste for exotic cuisine.

The DDA's emphasis on creating a profitable urban landscape reflects capitalism's processes of uneven development and creative destruction. Capital investment has flowed from old industrial centers into new commercial centers to build trendy ethnic restaurants, bistros, and taverns where once low-income housing stood, while around the block upscale townhouses and condominiums displace working-class bars and cheap diners. The experiences of those displaced are erased as history while the old landscape retains profound cultural capital for its sense of authenticity. All it takes is glossy paint, refinished woodwork, and new residents to turn history to a profit.

The gentrification of local history has an international dimension as well. The 1991 *Ann Arbor Guide* reminded us that "many immigrants have made their way in their new country by starting restaurants." Thus, "Americans are fortunate that we do not necessarily have to travel far to experience another culture, for the world has so persistently come to us." Ann Arborites can patronize any of the city's ethnic eateries and, with "an adventurous attitude and a little imagination, traverse continents" (*Ann Arbor Guide*, 1991). From images of the "urban frontier" and "urban pioneer" to the laissez-faire tale of "sweat equity," the story of revitalization is a morality play about hard work, conquest, and discipline. The DDA deploys investment capital from tax dollars while entrepreneurs with innovative ideas apply their labor and business acumen to create a new urban landscape. But the real point is still consumption. According to the Main Street Merchants Association:

> The critical variable that makes all of this work is the density of shoppers in the area. This total inter-related retail/office/service fabric promotes a vibrant and unique downtown that is . . . the definition of all that is best of Ann Arbor; that is a high-quality, people oriented environment with a multiplicity of activities, goods and services designed to meet the needs of all who live in and visit the community. (Main Street Merchants Association, 1982)

Sharon Zukin writes that "gentrification and new cuisine represent a new organization of consumption." She explains:

> Both imply a new landscape of power based, in turn, on changing patterns of capital investment and new relations between investment, production, and consumption. A new international division of labor, greater trade and more travel, the abstraction or removal of traditional activities from local communities: all these consequences of the global economy make available a new range and quality of experience. At the same time, the disappearance of old sources of regional and local identity

> impoverishes others, leading to a new pursuit of authenticity and individualization. (Zukin, 1991:214)

Still, the contradictions of this restructured urban landscape remain: gentrification results in displacement; a burgeoning professional class demands an increasingly low-waged service sector; the rapid flow of investment capital into new office buildings creates the largest office vacancy rate in the area's history; and the explosion of small specialty shops, espresso bars, and ethnic restaurants produces a volatile downtown where small businesses come and go at a rate that worries investors. And designing an urban landscape that "defines what is best" about Ann Arbor is a selective process that omits those who cannot afford the cost of purchase. While stories of high-tech industrial development and local commercial success pervade the halls of academe and the offices of the City Council, the tales of morality and discipline necessary to maintain order and unity amidst the contradictions and flux of such selectivity must also be told.

James Duderstadt's "Wake-Up Call to America": Discipline in the Age of Postmodern Funk

In the late 1600s, coffeehouses swept the major cities of Europe. According to Stallybrass and White, this development coincided with the rise of a bourgeois public sphere and played an important role "in the disciplining of its particular public to norms of sobriety and polite social interchange: the norms, in fact, which are the absolute precondition for the establishment of a 'democratic' domain of verbal exchange without violence and without the privileges of rank" (1986:95–100). While this sense of democracy subverted the dominant class rank of the aristocracy, it also supported the bourgeoisie's own ascendancy and excluded the expanding ranks of the "rude rabble." Coffeehouses represented places of discipline that "systematically and subtly retextured the discourses of the alehouse and other public places of assembly to accord with the goals of professionalization, productive economy and 'serious knowledge'" (Stallybrass and White, 1986:95–100). Those of the growing bourgeoisie who controlled the expanding means of capital and cultural production would redefine the public sphere in their own image.

In 1990s Ann Arbor, coffeehouses have once again proliferated as spaces where the cultural and political values of an ascendant class have converged with changing economic systems of production to inscribe the local urban landscape with a new discipline. Elsewhere, I have argued that these espresso shops represent new consumer practices and cultural tastes that reflect international shifts in commodity production and distribution and serve as a source of distinction for the city's rising

new bourgeoisie (Dolgon, 1996:22–25). Like their seventeenth-century predecessors, however, Ann Arbor's local cafés create a place where a new ideological duality is formed—on the one hand offering the pluralism of a consumer culture where patrons can "mingle with the variance of peoples found in today's coffee houses" (Diehl, 1994), and on the other hand producing a new exclusivity and elitism interconnected with downtown development strategies that intensify the policing of public spaces and the city's displacement of low-income residents—the "rabble" of the late twentieth century.

One coffee shop chain, Espresso Royal Caffe, openly declares a "political" heritage in its advertising pamphlet on "the Coffee House," recounting its legacy in Parisan cafes where "crowds filled the coffee houses . . . applauding impassioned orators as they verbally bombasted the government" (Espresso Royale Caffe, 1994). The Caffe's literature explains that American coffee houses were also centers of political discussion and, in the heat of the prerevolutionary boycott and struggle over tea and taxes, served as political and governmental headquarters—"coffee became an ally of democracy" (Espresso Royale Caffe, 1994). By investing in or declaring a historical authenticity, the shop lays claim to a political nature. Nonetheless, the politics practiced by Espresso Royale are anything but revolutionary. No longer are cafés connected to political activism or debate—in fact, according to a local reporter, the shop's staff policy "forbids employees to talk politics with customers." Instead, democracy is represented by the cafe's "socially and culturally eclectic qualities" and clientele: business person, student, slacker, professional, and homeless people. Democracy takes place in the realm of consumption, where everybody has access to the bourgeois style through the purchase of coffee and social activism becomes the work of providing commodities. As one Caffe manager (a former social worker) explains, "Maybe a thousand people came through the cafe today, and I made coffee for everyone of them, and they all smiled when they left. . . . That's kind of doing social work in a sense" (quoted in Diehl, 1994). For the reporter, it's a politics without "the bitter taste of radicalism" (Diehl, 1994).

As local businessmen sit and make deals, local politicians hatch campaign strategies, and local scholars debate the merits of Derrida and Fukiyama, the words of Montesquieu echo off the high ceilings and trendy, tall plate-glass windows of every café: "The coffeehouse is the only place where conversation may be made to come true, where extravagant plans, utopian dreams and political plots are hatched without anyone even leaving their seat" (quoted in Stallybrass and White, 1986:95). In today's cafés, economic development strategies and theories of discursive resistance take on democratic pretensions and heroic proportions, but generally remain the work of affluent and ascendant professionals. Meanwhile, the Caffe and its ilk are active members of the local merchant association

who fight to rid the streets of panhandlers and other riff-raff. According to Foucault, "Discipline is an art of rank, a technique for the transformation of arrangements" (Foucault, 1995:146). In periods of massive economic, political, and cultural transformations, new social relations require forms of discipline that normalize and naturalize changing hierarchies and spatial arrangements along with cultural practices and values. New forms of discipline pervade all aspects of economic and social life. As a "specific technology of power" discipline shapes the social construction of reality and produces "domains of objects and rituals of truth" (Foucault, 1995:195–228). But power demands agency by those whose narratives draw on history and nature to rationalize and reaffirm their power (Foucault, 1995:195–228).

In Ann Arbor, James Duderstadt is not only the UM president,[13] he represents the epitome of the scholar/businessman/technologist: He holds advanced degrees in engineering and is also a successful administrator serving on the boards of numerous local, national, and international organizations whose work combines policy-making with an understanding of science and the economy. Duderstadt heralds the links between academic research, corporate interests, and national economic competitiveness, as the "key determinants of the strength and prosperity of our state, our nation, and our world" (Duderstadt, 1992). As head of the National Science Board he commissioned a new study to revise the work of Vannevar Bush "in light of the extraordinary changes . . . [in] the world" (Duderstadt, 1992). Duderstadt's speeches to chambers of commerce, legislators, and commencement audiences call on Americans to "face up to the challenges of change." Claiming that the "nature, the very fabric of our civilization" has entered a period of change similar to the Renaissance, the Age of Discovery, and Industrial Revolution, he explains:

> Today we are evolving rapidly to a new post-industrial knowledge-based society just as a century ago our agrarian society evolved through the industrial revolution. Our economy is switching steadily away from material and labor-intensive products and processes to those that depend upon knowledge as their primary ingredient. A transition is occurring in which intellectual capital [brain power] is replacing financial and physical capital, as the key to our strength, prosperity, and social well-being. (Duderstadt, 1992)

For Duderstadt, an "aristocracy of innovators" is now ushering in a new society whose economic, political, and cultural power derives from both their control over the means of knowledge production and their ability to define what Bourdieu calls the "symbolic ordering of space and time" (Duderstadt, 1992). While creating a "culture of competence—a set of attitudes, expectations, and demands . . . often missing in America"

(Duderstadt, 1992), the new society must avoid "those age-old forces of populism—a distrust of expertise and excellence" (Duderstadt, 199?). Thus, the new bourgeoisie arbitrates not only economic and political power but the legitimacy of social meanings and activities. Democracy will not be populist, but engineered by experts with eyes on economic competitiveness and product design.

At the same time that Duderstadt emphasizes new social ruptures and the need to meet rapid transformations with innovation and entrepreneurship, he stresses the role of "fundamental institutional values" (Duderstadt, 1990:15–20). Although "academic institutions usually focus on intellectual values," Duderstadt asserts that "there are also other sets of values we must not ignore. . . . values of moral character, such as honesty, integrity, courage, tolerance, and mutual respect" (Duderstadt, 1990:15–20). He states:

> It is clear that we must all—on a personal level, as institutions, and as a nation—go through a period of sacrifice, of pulling back, of generating savings and making wise investments. We need to shift our focus from "I" to "we," take responsibility and demand accountability. We must set the highest standards of quality in what we produce and the services performed. (Duderstadt, 1990:15–20)

Here Duderstadt calls on the basic capitalist precepts of hard work, commitment, and responsibility. As in the Protestant ethic of old, Americans must be willing to sacrifice and produce while giving up "wasteful self-indulgence" and "vulgar extravagance." Thus, as an elite aristocracy of innovators and experts take the helm of the "spaceship earth," the rest of the crew is called on to pledge their allegiance, labor, and soul. This disciplinary narrative is not new: Duderstadt's words echo Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford in constructing an almost puritanical commitment to industrial production and private enterprise. To manufacture consent, however, Duderstadt must also offer something to inspire cooperation and commitment at the same time that he reconstructs a "post-industrial" hierarchy of aristocratic innovators.

In asserting that moral character that can bridge ruptures with a "spirit of renewal" (Duderstadt, 1990). Duderstadt focuses on the values of "caring and concern and compassion, or cooperation, and communication, and civility. . . . which pull us together as a community" (Duderstadt, 1990). Despite accelerated changes that "trigger misunderstanding and conflict," he claims it is "desperately important that we seek the themes of mechanisms capable of uniting us and that we resist those that pull us apart" (Duderstadt, 1990). In fact, Duderstadt continually emphasizes the necessity of diversity and pluralism to remain globally competitive. Here multiculturalism is defined as an economic and political imperative

framed within an international economy and a set of shifting demographics. As UM builds a "model of a pluralistic, multicultural community" (Duderstadt, 1990), the discourse of multiculturalism, pluralism, diversity, and community takes on a much more crucial ideological role.

In his critique of Benneton ad campaigns, Henry Giroux asserts that the international restructuring of capital markets required that "cultural differences . . . be acknowledged and depoliticized in order to be contained" (Giroux, 1994:193–196). Thus, an insurgent and politicized multiculturalism is refashioned by a sense of commercial pluralism and an "appeal to world harmony and peace," at the same time that Benetton's corporate policies continue to use post-Fordist methods of production where a flexible labor force finds their wages and benefits decreased, job security threatened and union rights dismantled (Giroux, 1994:193–196). Like Benetton, Duderstadt also creates a kind of diversity and multiculturalism far removed from real political commitments or ideologies. He offers only vague references to a democracy that finds its definition not in the political realm of policy-making but in the economic realm, where the "internationalization of America suggests that understanding cultures other than our own is necessary not only for personal enrichment and good citizenship in the global community, but necessary for our very survival as a nation" (Duderstadt, 1990:21). Duderstadt's corporate multiculturalism is inextricably linked to both the strategies of global capital and a disciplinary narrative that depoliticizes multiculturalism and erases class distinctions.

The key to understanding the disciplinary measures of this story lies in the convergence of post-Fordist and postmodernist narratives. Duderstadt constantly heralds a new society in which those with excellence and credentials—"educated people and their ideas"—will lead. Professionals schooled in knowledge technologies must become the guardians of what Toeffler termed the "third wave." While this elite will "value, welcome, and control change," Duderstadt reminds us to be careful of the "ferment and controversy" that often accompany new ideas (Duderstadt, 1990:22). To avoid these conflicts, Americans must restore their sense of community. In essence, Duderstadt's narrative synthesizes two discourses, one that naturalizes exclusivity and hierarchy and another that requires unity and cooperation. In the wake of a breakdown in Fordism (its capital/labor arrangements and its dominant ideological narratives about the American Dream and middle-class success), Duderstadt's speeches create a new tale that "generates consent through the provision of persuasive integrating narratives . . . constituting those in power as the proper or most effective guardians of imputed collective interests" (Rouse, 1992).

Unlike the Fordist "hegemonic project" that involved shaping class-specific subjects whose habits and dispositions "facilitat[ed] their insertion into a heterogeneous and hierarchical framework of occupations and

classes," the post-Fordist narrative focuses on producing "class-*related* subjectivities" (Rouse, 1992). As Roger Rouse (1992:14) concludes:

> with the massive increase in mobility . . . it is increasingly necessary for the ruling bloc to encourage in people the capacity to combine within themselves different kinds of class-related repertoires of subjectivity and to move easily back and forth between them. . . . with a significant growth in the chronically unemployed, it becomes increasingly necessary to supplement disciplinary processes of inclusion with processes of exclusion and to direct these not only at foreigners but at unemployed citizens as well. This serves simultaneously to make the victims seem responsible for their fate and to make those with access to work wary of putting their jobs at risk.

Here again is the duality of the post-Fordist disciplinary narrative: While promising and celebrating a diverse and pluralist community, Duderstadt assumes, rationalizes, and reinforces a class hierarchy that includes only those with access to new markets. And as affluent, bourgeois utopias are constructed in Ann Arbor, new landscapes of power further marginalize those whose downward mobility places them outside the marketplace of democracy, diversity, and identity except in their invocations as the hungry, the homeless, panhandlers, and the other "rude rabble." But the contradictions continue to mount with the body count.

Epilogue: Up Against the Posts in Ann Arbor

August 1995 was a tough month for the Ann Arbor Police Department. First, they came under fire for a succession of unsolved rape cases. Police suspected a serial rapist and, armed with a vague description of a young African-American male, the police rounded up over 150 Black men. These suspects were interrogated, investigated, and forced to give blood samples for DNA testing. Some men challenged the procedures and a "Coalition for Community Unity" formed to demand the 150 blood samples be returned so that each "suspect" could supervise the samples' destruction. The Coalition also demanded a citizen review board with investigatory power. At a public forum, many of the Black men tested by police said that they had been stopped, questioned, and even arrested on numerous occasions, only to be released later with no charges. In response, an officer said that he had seen great "pain and anger in the community" over the rape case (*Ann Arbor News*, 1995a). He asked, "Don't you think all of us on the force took this home every night?" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1995a).

Meanwhile, the police organized a so-called community group of their own with downtown merchants and church free-meal providers to address the "problem of homelessness." While the group stated explicitly that the "number one cause of homelessness is the lack of affordable housing," none of their suggestions or discussions involved any low-income housing solutions. Instead, meal providers sought ways to modify participants' behavior with rules of etiquette, training sessions, and better monitoring of diners. At the same time, police and merchants discussed more effective ways of addressing those "aggressive" panhandlers who support "substance abuse" habits with the change they "extort" from passersby. In response to these measures, the Ann Arbor Homeless Action Committee (HAC)[14] organized supporters from other groups—the local Industrial Workers of the World, Greens, Tenants Union, Labor Party Advocates, and Welfare Rights Organization—to attend an August meeting of the police coalition. HAC's goal was to challenge both the direction that the police group was proposing and the assumed community voice that they had appropriated. By pointing out that homelessness was a complex problem integrally linked to local gentrification and economic development policies, and by offering a different community voice with an opposing narrative about homelessness, HAC and its supporters destabilized the police organization to the point where it could no longer call itself a "community" group.

At the end of the summer, the police were called in to maintain order as employees of the Central Campus Espresso Royale Caffe walked out on strike, picketed outside the cafe, and called for a boycott of the store. Although murmurings of unionizing among cappuccinists had occurred previously, a new dress code/personal appearance policy and the exclusion of sexual orientation from the shop's nondiscrimination policy finally brought workers to engage in collective action. The company's new policies prohibited the display of nose rings and other piercings and inappropriate hair cuts or dyes, and warned against facial hair and bad complexions; while consumers could engage in the democratic politics of consumption, employees were clearly restricted from participating. After two days of mass picketing and few purchases, the shop management relented and revoked the policy. The police were relegated to onlookers as rowdy students, teen-age skateboarders, and neighborhood panhandlers enjoyed the celebration of street corner public expression and political spectacle.

Perhaps the most troubling development for police, though, was the recent rise in *alleged* gang activity in the predominantly African-American neighborhoods of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti. In particular, on July 29, a sixteen-year-old girl attending a party was caught in gun-battle crossfire and killed. The shooting brought about a flurry of *News* articles on "gang growth," which traced the evolution of "loosely knit neighborhood crowds" into more gang-like "structured organizations." Like most

current coverage on gangs, the *News* articles propagated a kind of moral panic about violence and drugs complete with a narrative that both demonized young African American males and glorified anti-gang policing. According to a multi-page Special Report, gangs were a big city problem that, spreading like a disease, had now reached Washtenaw County (*Ann Arbor News*, 1995b). With sections entitled "Knowing the Enemy" and "Problem has no Boundaries among Cities," the *News* spun out what media scholar Jimmie Reeves calls the "dominant replications of mainstream values and celebratory narratives of the police" (Reeves and Campbell, 1994:259). For the *News*, gangs were a result of poor, rebellious Black youth, with no initiative or family support and little education or commitment to civic and social norms, who found fraternity and meaning in collective violence and economic salvation in the easy money of the drug trade. Meanwhile, the heroic work of police (against such formidable opposition as groups of poor youth between the ages of twelve and twenty-five), promised to stem gang activity by better recognizing and infiltrating gang activities and improved database collection that would allow police to monitor gang members and the drug trade. The city's "anti-gang czar" declared, "The gang situation is still in its infancy here, and we will take decisive action before the problem gets bigger" (*Ann Arbor News*, 1995b).[15]

The source of the problem, however, as Reeves has stated, is not the evil mutation of a negative value system, but the "core value system that organized the entrepreneurial market culture of Reagan's America," a system reinforced by Bill Clinton (Reeves and Campbell, 1994:238). This article has been an attempt to look at some of the economic and ideological origins of this value system, how it was inscribed into the cultural landscape and institutional life of a Midwestern university city, and how the progenitors of such a system have constructed narratives that rationalize and justify the class restructuring that this value-system accompanies. In the end, however, these narratives cannot contain the economic, political, and social realities that plague Ann Arbor's new bourgeoisie, as evidenced by the controversy currently surrounding the police department. As poverty and hopelessness intensify for those disenfranchised by capitalism's shifting political allegiances and spatial arrangements, homeless people will become even more visible in public places and more aggressive in their desperate sales pitches. As unemployment, racial stereotyping, and policing increase, so will the anger and frustration of marginalized African-American youth. And as city streets grow more crowded with poor people hustling for money and battling for some semblance of control and dignity, the new bourgeoisie will realize that no enterprise culture or innovative spirit, no image of cultural pluralism or commercialized democracy, and no amount of police monitoring or institutionalized discipline can quiet the growing discontent.

If there is a promising new vision rising from Ann Arbor's streets, it is best represented by fledgling coalitions of groups whose aim is countering a culture saturated by market-driven morality and elite-centered policies. While international capital interests spin new narratives worshipping global markets, innovative technologies, and refined, commercial products, new stories of resistance are germinating in the cracks on the information superhighway. These spaces, and the struggles they represent, may be the last sites where those committed to new stories of resistance can create both powerful political coalitions and new social identities, offering marginalized groups the possibility of mainstream power and middle-class professionals the possibility of moral salvation.

Notes

1. I use the term PMTC to represent a particular socioeconomic group comprised of predominantly young (25–45), predominantly white, men and women who hold advanced degrees and occupy an economic position that places them safely within the upper echelons of the middle class. The PMTC label is closely related to the way in which Barbara Ehrenreich demarcates her structural definition for the contemporary "middle class." I will also use the term *bourgeoisie*, however, to represent the more cultural side of this class: its social practices, consumption habits, and cultural tastes. This usage resembles Bourdieu's work on culture and class distinction. By placing this class within a particular political economy and geographical case study, I am arguing that, ultimately, definitions of classes are both structural and cultural, and must be understood (as E. P. Thompson and others have written) in relation to other classes as part of particular class struggles. See Ehrenreich (1989) and Bourdieu (1984). For other partial descriptions of this class, see Lash and Urry (1987) and Walker (1979).
2. Raymond Williams reminds us that hegemony "has continually to be renewed, recreated, defended, and modified" as it is also "continually resisted, limited, altered, [and] challenged by pressures not all its own" (1977:112).
3. I use the term *postindustrial* to refer to a particular historical period where the importance of traditional industrial production has decreased both culturally and economically in the United States. Still, I recognize the problematic nature of "postindustrial" and "post-Fordist," as they emphasize what has changed, not what has remained constant. This article does not take on the debate over the primacy of continuity or rupture in analyzing current capital and class formation as much as it tries to dissect the dialectical relationship between both. For an excellent overview of these issues, see Sayer and Walker (1991).
4. For more information, see, e.g., Lucas (1994), Lowen (1997), Geiger (1993), Soley (1995), Readings (1996), and Nelson (1997).
5. For more information, see e.g., Link (1995), Saxenian (1996), and Roszak (1988).
6. For discussions of discipline and power in regards to physical urban landscape, see Foucault (1995) and DeCerteau (1984).
7. On home ownership and middle-class values, see Jackson (1985) and Perrin (1977).

8. See also Jager (1986) and Caufield (1989).
9. By "gentrified leisure" I refer to consumer practices that link local tastes with global economic shifts through what Sharon Zukin (1991) calls "new organizations of consumption."
10. For more on Ann Arbor's specific economic development plans targeting high-tech industries, see Eldersveld (1995:11–33).
11. For more on the politics of scientific research during this period, see Hewlett and Hill (1989).
12. This narrative is echoed in statewide studies on regional growth and development—see Erwin (1984). One could argue that, unlike at Stanford and MIT, UM's research was hindered by tremendous political upheaval during the 1960s, including the Students for a Democratic Society's protests against military research, and UM's impact on the community. This possible impact, however, also disappears from the corporate narrative as hegemonic stories must rationalize failures as well as success. For more on radical politics in Ann Arbor during the 1960s and early 1970s, see Kline (1995) and Eynon (1993).
13. James Duderstadt stepped down as president in 1997.
14. The Ann Arbor Homeless Action Committee (HAC) was a long-time direct action and advocacy group that fought for increased low-income housing and an equitable distribution of economic and political resources in the city. For more on the organization, see Kline (1995), especially Chapter 5 and Dolgon et al. (1995).
15. For more on the criminalization of black youth and discussions of contemporary "gang" culture and stereotypes of urban youth, see Kelley (1994), especially "Kickin reality, kickin ballistics: 'gangsta rap' and postindustrial Los Angeles."

References

Ann Arbor Chamber of Commerce (1970) "Ann Arbor Today, 1970." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority (DDA) (1982) "Ann Arbor DDA Downtown Development Plan." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority (DDA) (1988) "Downtown Development Plan." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Guide (1991).

Ann Arbor Human Relations Commission (HRC) (1964) Minutes from June 6, 1994 meeting. Norma Kraka papers, box 1, Bentley Historical Library, Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Human Relations Commission (HRC) (1967a) "Human Relations in Ann Arbor: A Community Profile." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Human Relations Commission (HRC) (1967b) "Employment Proposal." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor News (1981a) Special section on high technology, featuring the Michigan Technology Fair. April 10.

Ann Arbor News (1981b) October 10.

Ann Arbor News (1995a) August 3.

Ann Arbor News (1995b) Special report on "gang growth." August 7.

Ann Arbor Planning Commission (1972) "Ann Arbor Growth Study." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Planning Commission (1975) "Northside Character Study." Ann Arbor, MI.

Ann Arbor Planning Commission (1988) "Household Survey, 1988." Ann Arbor, MI.
Bacon, F., and K. Bayer (1964) "A Comparison of the Research Patterns of Michigan Universities with State and National Research and Industrial Trends: Research Emphasis in Michigan Universities." Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Institute of Science and Technology, Industrial Development Division.
Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinctions: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Brown, W. (1956) Letter to Ann Arbor Common Council, May 28. William Brown papers, box 7, Bentley Historical Museum, Ann Arbor, MI.
Bush, V. (1980) *Science—The Endless Frontier.* New York: Arno Press.
Castells, M. (1989) *Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban-Regional Process.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Caulfield, J. (1989) Gentrification and desire. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 24:617–629.
DeCerteau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Deskins, D. (1962) "Negro Settlement in Ann Arbor: 1860–1960." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Michigan.
Diehl, M. (1994) Cappuccino City. *Ann Arbor Observer*, January:22–25.
Digaetano, A. and J. Klemanski (1991) Restructuring the suburbs: political economy of economic development in Auburn Hills, MI. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 13: 145–158.
Dolgon, C., M. Kline, and L. Dresser (1995) House people, not cars! Economic development, political struggle, and common sense in a city of intellect. In Michael Peter Smith (Ed.) *Marginal Spaces: Comparative Urban and Community Research, Volume 5*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
Dolgon, C. (1996) Radical politics in a city of cappuccino: "drinking coffee can fight hunger." *Leftcurve*, pp. 75–72.
Dolgon, C. (1998) Rising from the ashes: The Michigan-Memorial Phoenix Project and the corporatization of university research. *Educational Studies* 23(Winter):5–37.
Duderstadt, J. (1990) *A Wake Up Call For America*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
Duderstadt, J. (1992) *The Government-University Research Partnership: Beyond the Endless Frontier . . . ?* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
Ehrenreich, B. (1989) *Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class*. New York: Harper Perennial.
Eldersveld, S. (1995) *Party Conflict and Community Development: Postwar Politics in Ann Arbor.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Erwin, M. (1984) "University Collaboration with Local Economic Development Organizations." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
Espresso Royale Caffe (1994) "Experience the World of Coffee Houses." Advertising pamphlet. Ann Arbor, MI.
Eynon, B. (1993) "Community, Democracy, and the Reconstruction of Political Life: The Civil Rights Influence on New Left Political Culture in Ann Arbor, Michigan." Ph.D dissertation, New York University.
Fache, W., and E. Grande (1991) *Regional Innovation and Decentralization: High Tech Industry and Government Policy.* London: Routledge.
Ferrall, W. (1988) Big changes for North Central. *Ann Arbor Observer*, June:17–20.
Foucault, M. (1995) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* New York: Vintage Books.
Gates, M. (1981) Breaking away. *Ann Arbor News*, April.

Geiger, R. (1993) *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities Since WWII.* London: Oxford University Press.
Giroux, H. (1994) Benneton's "world without borders": buying social change. In C. Becker (Ed.) *The Subversive Imagination: Artists, Society and Social Responsibility*. London: Routledge.
Gramsci, A. (1992) *Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Posmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Hewlett, R., and J. Hill (1989) *Atoms for Peace and War, 1953–1961: Eisenhower and the Atomic Engery Commission*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Interview with Louis Belcher (1993) Conducted by C. Dolgon, July 23.
Interview with Jerry Jernigan (1993) Conducted by C. Dolgon, July 30.
Interview with Herbert Wingo (1993) Conducted by C. Dolgon, July 27.
Interview with Ezra Rowry (1994) Conducted by C. Dolgon, May 17.
Interview with Tony Taylor (1994) Conducted by C. Dolgon, January 7.
Interview with Larry Hunter (1994) Conducted by C. Dolgon, January 6.
Interview with O. Herbert Ellis (1994) Conducted by C. Dolgon, January 5.
Jackson, K. (1985) *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Jager, M. (1986) Class definition and the esthetics of gentrification: Victoriana in Melbourne. In N. Smith and P. Willaims (Eds.) *Gentrification and the City*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, pp. 78–91.
Kelley, R. (1994) *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class.* New York: The Free Press, pp. 183–228.
Kline, M. (1995) "Politics of Knowledge in a Post-Industrial City: Intellectual Work and Political Struggle in Ann Arbor." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
Lash, S. and J. Urry (1987) *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
Link, A. (1995) *A Generosity of Spirit: The Early History of the Research Triangle Park.* Chapel Hill: Research Triangle Foundation.
Logan, J., and H. Molotch (1987) *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Lowen, R. (1997) *Creating the Cold War University*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Lucas, C. (1994) *American Higher Education: A History*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Main Street Merchants Association (1982) "Memo on Downtown Development." Louis Belcher papers, box 15, Bentley Historical Library. Ann Arbor, MI.
Model Cities Program Policy Board (1969) "Mid-Planning Statement: Model Citites Program." Ann Arbor, MI.
Nelson, C. (1997) *Will Teach For Food: Academic Labor in Crisis.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Noble, D. (1977) *America by Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Noyelle, T., and T. Stanback (1983) *The Economic Transformation of American Cities.* New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld.
Overhiser, M. (1970) Draft of article for *Detroit Engineer*. Louis Belcher papers, box 1, Bentley Historical Library, Ann Arbor, MI.
Perrin, C. (1977) *Everything in Its Place: Social Order and Land Use in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Polk, R. L. (1977) "Profiles of Change." Ann Arbor, MI.
Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Reeves, J., and D. Campbell (1994) *Cracked Coverage: Television News, The Anti-Cocaine Crusade and the Reagan Legacy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Roszak, T. (1988) *From Sartori to Silicon Valley: San Francisco and the American Counter Culture*. San Francisco: Lexikos Publishing.
Rouse, R. (1992) Power and popular culture: switching, discrimination, and the politics of flexible accumulation. Paper presented at the Power: Thinking Through the Disciplines conference, University of Michigan, January 24–26.
Rouse, R. (1995) Thinking through transnationalism: notes on the cultural politics of class relations in the contemporary United States. *Public Culture* 7: 357–362.
Sayer A., and R. Walker (1991) *The New Social Economy*. Boston: Blackwell.
Saxenian, A. (1996) *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Soley, L. (1995) *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia*. Boston: South End Press.
Stallybrass, P., and A. White (1986) *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Storper, M., and R. Walker (1989) *The Capitalist Imperative: Territory, Technology, and Industrial Growth.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
Talayco, L. (1962) "The Population Distribution of Racial Minorities in Ann Arbor, Michigan." Ann Arbor Human Relations Commission.
Thorns, D. (1992) *Fragmenting Societies: A Comparative Analysis of Regional and Urban Development*. London: Routledge.
University of Michigan (UM) (1975) *The Industrial Development Division of the Institute of Science and Technology of the University of Michigan: Fifteen Years, 1960–1974*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
Walker, P. (1979) *Between Labor and Capital: The Professional–Managerial Class*. Boston: South End Press.
Washtenaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission (1980) "Economic Activities in Washtenaw County." Ann Arbor, MI.
Washtenaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission (1980) "Economic Activities in Washtenaw County: An Employment Study, 1960–1980." Ann Arbor, MI.
Williams, R. (1977) *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Zukin, S. (1991) *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.