CANADIAN JOURNAL of
URBAN RESEARCH
REVUE CANADIENNE de RECHERCHE URBAINE

Social Citizenship and Urban Revitalization in Canada

Vanessa Rosa
Latina/o Studies
Mount Holyoke College

Abstract
In this article, I trace how urban revitalization is tied to a rearticulation of social citizenship in Canada. While housing policy was framed as a priority under the welfare state, there is a distinct transition whereby concerns about public housing were displaced from federal and provincial agendas. Through reform, the state shifted responsibility for elements of social policy that were previously characterized as a national priority to local governments or the private sector, laying a foundation for neoliberal urban revitalization of public housing. I explore the relationality between the welfare state and neoliberal governance and the subsequent rearticulation of social citizenship in a postindustrial economic context. By providing an overview of key shifts in social/public housing policy in Canada, with particular focus on Toronto, Ontario, I argue that housing policy and the urban revitalization of public housing are tools for a neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship in Canada.

Keywords: urban revitalization, public housing, social citizenship, neoliberalism

Résumé
Dans cet article, j'analyse les liens entre la revitalisation urbaine et la réarticulation de la citoyenneté sociale au Canada. Bien que les politiques de logement aient été présentées comme une priorité de l'État providence, il y a eu une transition distincte menant au retrait du logement social de la liste de priorités des gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux. Par ses réformes, l'État a déplacé la responsabilité de certains éléments de politiques sociales autrefois considérés comme étant de priorité nationale vers les gouvernements locaux et le secteur privé, jetant ainsi les bases d'une revitalisation urbaine néolibérale du logement social. J'analyse la corrélation entre l'État providence et la gouvernance néolibérale, et la réarticulation subséquente de la citoyenneté sociale dans un contexte économique postindustriel. En présentant un aperçu général des changements majeurs dans les politiques de logement social, en particulier à Toronto, en Ontario, je soutiens que les politiques de logement et la revitalisation urbaine du logement social sont des outils permettant une réarticulation néolibérale de la citoyenneté sociale au Canada.

Mots clés : revitalisation urbaine, logement social, citoyenneté sociale, néolibéralisme

Canadian Journal of Urban Research, Winter 2018, Volume 27, Issue 2, pages 25-36.

ISSN: 2371-0292

Urban revitalization targets neighbourhoods or areas in cities that are deemed in need of "new life." While the term "revitalization" became ubiquitous in the twenty-first century for the regeneration of urban neighborhoods, it is part of a long history of slum clearance, urban renewal, rehabilitation, redevelopment, and gentrification. By providing an overview of key shifts in social/public housing policy in Canada, with particular focus on Toronto, Ontario, I argue that housing policy and urban revitalization are tools for a neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship in Canada.

I link social citizenship to housing policy to trace the connection between the deconstruction and rescaling of the welfare state and public housing redevelopment via revitalization (or neoliberal state-managed gentrification). In British sociologist T. H. Marshall's famous essay "Citizenship and Social Class" (1950), he argued for a theory of social citizenship that ensures that all members of society are entitled to a basic sense of well-being.[1] Social citizenship is based on the notion that every person in a particular society/polity deserves shared social and economic stability: economic class should not determine one's access to well-being or the ability to live a fulfilling life. Marshall's theory is a response to the exclusion of social rights from definitions of citizenship. He theorizes the evolution of civic and political citizenship in the British context and understands social citizenship to develop in relation to equality and political rights. Under the welfare state, resources that promote individual well-being are ensured by the state and not dependent on one's economic class. As Martha McCluskey (2002, 783) outlines, Marshall's view of social citizenship is based on the theory that "public well-being in a democratic society depends on rights to economic security as well as on political and civil rights." Thus, in Marshall's conceptualization of social citizenship, there is an inherent theory of the state as an actor responsible for welfare service provisions.

Social citizenship, for Marshall, recognizes that individuals exist in relation to broader society with a shared ethos of social good and order that promotes fairness and equality. However, a critical reading of social citizenship sheds light on the limitations of welfare state provisions in relation to capital, in which such provisions produce laborers to serve capital. More specifically, laborers who draw on social supports, such as housing, are then bound to the state and incorporated into the logic of capital. Frank Longstreth labels this "liberal democratic or welfare capitalism" (qtd. in Lacher 1999, 344). In line with Lacher and critics of social citizenship, I understand the possibilities of social citizenship as constrained by the inequality produced and necessitated under capitalism. That is, "well-being" cannot in fact exist apart from inequality because inequality and class/race stratification are inherent in the very structure of welfare capitalism (a paradox of liberal democratic capitalism).

This article builds from such critiques to explore social citizenship in relation to neoliberal urban revitalization. While social citizenship was promoted via public housing under the welfare state, I argue that with a neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship, it is delivered via urban revitalization. On the surface, the movement away from welfare state policies in relation to a capitalist industrial economy and toward a neoliberal order may appear to be a failure of the government to provide for collective well-being. However, this shift demonstrates a rearticulation of social citizenship where well-being is thought to be delivered via privatization and serves the interests of capital in a postindustrial economic context. By rearticulation of social citizenship, I am referring to how social citizenship is recast and can be promoted through public-private partnerships, state-managed gentrification, and an overall individualist character. I explore how urban revitalization frameworks are framed *and* understood to be a contemporary solution to the challenges of public housing (i.e., repair backlogs, waitlists, etc.) and housing affordability. A rearticulation of social citizenship materializes by shifting the nature of state interventions in housing policy through disinvestment and promotion of the free market. As McCluskey argues (2002, 784), "The powerful and pervasive neoliberal (free-market) ideology asserting that state abstention from economic protection is the foundation of a good society." Neoliberal ideology is thus similarly legitimized in the name of a "good society" and the promotion of social citizenship, and reflect a logic of government withdrawal. This article offers a theoretical intervention that explores the neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship in Canada via revitalization by exploring an overview of housing policy with focus on the transition from Keynesian to neoliberal approaches in public housing. I begin with a review of debates and scholarly research on urban revitalization and neoliberalism. I then map a brief overview of the development of national housing policy in relation to the welfare state. This provides a backdrop for the next section, which highlights several examples of Keynesian era revitalization policies from the mid-twentieth century. The final section outlines a shift from welfare state policy interventions to neoliberal urban revitalization.

Urban Revitalization and Neoliberalism

Revitalization has been widely researched and its impacts assessed across borders (Grodach and Ehrenfeucht 2015; Rosenthal 1980). Scholars have mapped approaches to revitalization as well as the transition between "phases" of renewal and revitalization (Carmon 1999; Gotham 2001b; Grodach and Ehrenfeucht 2015; Wilson 1966). By tracing approaches, eras, and characteristics of revitalization, scholars have identified general patterns of urban revitalization that have emerged as place-based strategies in relation to global economic and political trends, capitalism, the deindustrialization of cities (Harvey 1985; Sassen 1991, 1998), as well as urban decline (Carter and Polevychok 2003). Researchers have traced the evolution from slum clearance policies to neighborhood renewal and downtown urban revitalization as well as the application of different approaches in a specific cities (Carmon 1999; Gotham 2001a; Grodach and Ehrenfeucht 2015; Rosenthal 1980; Schwartz 2015; Teaford 1990, 2000; Wagner, Joder, and Mumphrey 1995). Further, research has emphasized the relationship between such policies and racial inequality, public housing development/redevelopment, and displacement (Goetz 2013). In the Canadian context, these shifts have been explored as epochs of urban development (Bunting, Filion, and Walker 2010) and across local contexts (Carter 1991; Filion 1987, 1988; Ley 1999). Others have emphasized the shift between redevelopment and state-managed gentrification or increased state intervention (as the contemporary mode of revitalization) and its effects (Hackworth and Smith 2002). Debates remain about the characteristics and impact of renewal, redevelopment, and revitalization across different eras, as well the impact of contemporary revitalization efforts. My intervention however seeks to explore the ways in which the rescaling of the welfare state is tied to urban revitalization and social citizenship. Cities, public housing, and revitalization provide a window to more critically examine the effect of socioeconomic policies across contexts.

Further, I situate my investigation in relation to extensive literature on neoliberalism and cities. Neoliberalism has profound structural effects on urban life and has very much shaped revitalization processes between 1980 and the present (in the extent to which neoliberalism has effected urban redevelopment and renewal, and how, of course, is debated). As Brenner and Theodore argue (2002, 103), neoliberalism powerfully structures the parameters for the governance of contemporary urban development—for instance, by defining the character of "appropriate" policy choices, by constraining democratic participation in political life, by diffusing dissent and oppositional mobilization, and/or by disseminating new ideological visions of social and moral order in the city.

While there is certainly no consensus on the extent of these effects, urban studies scholars warn of neoliberalism's reach. In debates on urban neoliberalism, it is framed as either having general characteristics that transcend site and scale (Beck 2000) or as contingent on site and scale. Should neoliberalism be studied as a universalizing, ubiquitous force? Or one that is contingent? My research engages with critical scholars who argue that neoliberalism and its evolution must not be framed as an all encompassing or universalizing project, despite its discursive core features (Boudreau, Keil, and Young 2009; Brenner and Theodore 2002, 107; Jessop 2002; Lipsitz 2006; Peck, Theodore, and Brenner 2009). I situate my investigation in relation to work that emphasizes the geographically contextual effects of neoliberalism or as "actually existing neoliberalism" (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Peck and Tickell 2002, 384), as well as taking into account the specificities of urban space and "contingent urban neoliberalism" (Wilson 2004, 772). These perspectives both insist upon the connection between local particularities and everyday transformations brought about by neoliberalism. Following Boudreau, Keil, and Young (2009), I insist on elaborating on this definition to consider local urban dynamics and the "local state"; in the case of urban revitalization, I look at how the state at the local level works in contextually specific ways. While scholars have explored this in the context of Toronto and Ontario (Boudreau, Keil, and Young 2009; Keil and Kipfer 2002; Hackworth and Moriah 2006), my investigation contributes to research on urban neoliberalism by focusing specifically on the relationship between housing policy, revitalization, and a rearticulation of social citizenship.

Housing Policy and the Rise of the Canadian Welfare State

During Toronto's centennial birthday celebration in 1934, Ontario's Lieutenant Governor Herbert Bruce stated:

> We have a great and beautiful city. … It is a city enviably situated, a city of fine residential areas,

> of beautiful buildings, of high standards of citizenship. That is how we see it; but I fear, in all candor one must confess that this city, in common with every large city, has acquired inevitable "slum districts." These areas of misery and degradation exert an unhappy environmental influence upon many of our citizenship. (quoted in Rose 1958, 37–38)

For Bruce and others, slum districts had a negative effect on the civic character of the city. Social reformists had long made links between housing and the production of good citizens (Purdy 2002). Of course, for reformers the links between housing and citizenship were also tied to the economy: if Canadians had good homes, they would be good citizens and productive workers—these two things went hand in hand (Purdy 2002, 135). Thus, "since the home was regarded as the principal site of social organization, it was chosen as the chief site in the battle for thoroughly 'Canadianizing' women and workers" (Purdy 2002, 139). Because the "home" played such an important role in securing a productive workforce and citizenry, it is no surprise that housing was tied to the rise of the welfare state and the promotion of social citizenship in the mid-nineteenth century.

Shortly after Lieutenant Governor Bruce described the squalor of Toronto, the city published the "Bruce Report," which examined housing conditions in Toronto. Surveying over 1,300 dwellings, the report revealed shocking cases of inadequate living conditions around the city (Rose 1958, 40). It was used to encourage publicly funded housing for the city's poor populations. Although the report focused on local housing conditions, for housing advocates, it exposed a problem that merited provincial and national attention. With the exception of one provincial housing organization in Nova Scotia, Canada lacked any housing programs (Rose, 41). The ten years following the publication of the Bruce Report saw a flurry of provincial and federal plans, reports, commissions, and conferences on housing, paving the way for housing legislation in Canada.

Federal housing policy had a direct impact on the development of public housing in Toronto. Before 1935, financial institutions were not allowed to participate in the mortgage market (Dupuis 2003, 4). In 1935, the House of Commons passed the Dominion Housing Act (DHA), which established lending and loan programs for both owners and builders. This new act deregulated the participation of financial institutions. However, it failed to make an impact because most private lending organizations were reluctant to participate in the government's joint-lending process (Oberlander and Fallick 1992, 17). Ultimately this led to a stronger federal commitment to housing in 1938, with the passage of the National Housing Act (NHA), which was more successful than the Dominion Act, primarily because for more moderate borrowers, it lowered the income requirement to apply (Oberlander and Fallick, 45). The NHA would eventually lead to important changes for the administration of public housing.

The amended National Housing Act of 1944 (NHA) moved beyond lending and funding repair to developing existing housing; it was created in the context of a national housing crisis and the formation of the post–World War II welfare state. Reflecting federal attitudes toward housing and the emphasis placed on homeownership and equitable housing for the nation's poor, the amended NHA focused on increasing the number of social housing units, loan programs, and repairs for existing housing. Albert Rose (1980, 28), a well-known twentieth-century Canadian social policy scholar, suggested that the 1944 NHA "appears like a declaration of faith in the nation's future in which housing policies would play a large role in post-war readjustment." This is particularly evident in the government's orientation to housing for low-income families (Rose, 28). The NHA included a commitment to slum clearance (a former iteration of revitalization) to address the problems outlined in the Bruce Report. The government's influence and approach toward housing helped to reorient local government's hostility around social housing (Rose, 30). Relatedly, these federal policy changes were taking place in relation to local housing initiatives that were led by ratepayer organizations and housers. The Canadian government was keenly invested in promoting policies that would care for its soldiers returning home from war and stabilizing the postwar economy and workforce, reflecting the promotion of social citizenship.

In addition to the changes to the new act, the inauguration of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) in 1945 significantly altered housing policy and legislation in Canada. The CMHC was developed to increase employment in construction, expand building construction, and repair deteriorating housing (Dupuis 2003, 2). Supplementary amendments were made in 1949 that initiated an official Canadian housing system as well as demonstrating the government's focus on social housing and the creation of lending programs with liberal regulations to increase the potential for homeownership. Homeownership was thought to be a solution to a range of social problems, including poverty as well as building a strong workforce (Garb 2005, 2; Purdy

2002). Public housing was therefore understood and constructed as a temporary and transitional option that would help low-income renters move into the private housing market.

Revitalization and the Canadian Welfare State

As Smith and Moore argue (1993, 356), for planners who were tasked with shaping the twentieth century Canadian city, early redevelopment and renewal programs generally focused on growth, slum clearance, and/or transportation. Slum clearance and renewal schemes were central to both housing policy and urban planning from the 1930s onward. The Urban Renewal Program, established in 1944, aimed to "improve deteriorating areas of cities" (Carter 1991, 10). This program lasted until the end of the 1960s when planning objectives shifted to rehabilitate housing (Carter 1991, 10). The development of Toronto's first public housing project, Regent Park, is one example that illustrates the connection between the Bruce Report, the NHA, and "urban renewal." While facilitated by the NHA, the building of Regent Park was promoted and supported via ratepayers' organizing in Toronto. In this early form of revitalization, the "slum" housing of Cabbagetown was torn down and replaced with public housing units. Similar housing projects began popping up in Toronto in the 1950s and 1960s to provide low-income *temporary* housing. However, these public housing projects were later deemed a failure, responsible for isolating residents and critiqued for their singular brick-and-mortar approach.

Amendments in 1964 offered funds for rehabilitation and redevelopment of nonresidential areas (Smith and Moore 1993, 361). With the introduction of a new initiative in the 1970s, the National Improvement Program's (NIP) emphasis moved away from slum clearance and the original building of public housing, viewed as a single-focus approach to "a form of neighborhood development that integrates housing with social, recreational, and infrastructure improvements" (Carter 1991, 11). These critiques of slum clearance mark an initial shift from slum clearance and urban renewal to revitalization. The primary aim, along with the Ontario Downtown Revitalization Program, a provincial measure implemented in 1983 that offered municipalities loans to improve neighborhoods, was to "arrest decay" and upgrade neighborhoods (Carter 1991, 19–21). These initiatives promoted a "holistic" approach that linked housing revitalization with neighborhood regeneration (including supporting commercial development, infrastructure, and services). However, the Ontario Downtown Revitalization Program centered on commercial development or regeneration. This focus on downtown redevelopment also signals the beginning of industrial decline and the emergence of the service economy. Because welfare state policies were simultaneously promoting the economy and the labor market, revitalization was easily mobilized to integrate and "take care" of those on the margins as a reflection of the commitment to social citizenship. In the report on "Urban Decline and Disinvestment," the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Company focused explicitly on revitalization as the solution to decaying urban areas. Here, declining neighborhoods, described as run-down, low-income, and in need of renewed vitality, either become extinct or can be renewed via revitalization policies.

Ultimately, what we see in this era is the ramping up of processes of gentrification (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2007). But this shift is part and parcel of a broader set of processes linked to renewal and revitalization. In the Canadian context, some urban redevelopment schemes (Africville in Halifax and Chinatown in Vancouver, for example) were clearly articulated as strategies of revitalizing spaces racialized as non-White (Anderson 1991; Nelson 2002).[2] While many public housing projects in Canada in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s were predominantly Euro-Canadian neighborhoods, as a result of immigration polices and other factors in migration, these neighborhoods experienced a shift demographically in the 1970s to predominately African, Caribbean, Latin American, Asian, and South Asian communities. As a result, the dynamics of territorial stigmatization also shift, which ultimately lays the groundwork for more redevelopment (Purdy 2002). As David Goldberg (1993) highlights, the inner city fragmented after initial slum clearance policies and the flow of immigrants infiltrated cities and the urban towers that concentrated populations of low-income communities in public housing. Public housing developments ultimately then become the "appropriate image of racialized urban space" (Goldberg, 188). White flight ensued, where white urban dwellers fled the city to the suburbs, with some only to later return and initiate the onset of gentrification/revitalization (Goldberg, 188).

Neoliberal Revitalization

National philosophy about housing and redevelopment for all Canadians shifted drastically in the 1980s and

1990s with significant changes and cuts to funding. With a rescaling of the welfare state, a new phase of revitalization emerges where public housing redevelopment is delivered via gentrification.[3] This rescaling involves changes from previous legislation that promoted and enabled public resources to be allocated to housing as well as a transformation of the administration of public housing whereby it operates as a quasiprivate business enterprise; it involves the deregulation of housing that is central to the contemporary logic of "revitalization." The dismantling of public housing is facilitated by its temporary character (public housing was always meant to be a stepping stone). Neoliberal revitalization is legitimized as a result of a lack of funding and support for public housing in Canada. While urban revitalization in the 1980s was focused on federal fiscal restraint and promoting "sporadic" gentrification and downtown development, the 1990s and 2000s urban revitalization mobilized a rhetoric of holistic placed-based strategies that stood in contrast to the failed housing projects of the twentieth century.

In Canada, neoliberal ideology infused each level of government. The federal conservative Mulroney government of the early 1980s initiated budget cuts and reorganized federal-provincial housing relations. In the 1990s the federal government took social housing off the agenda.[4] By 1993, federal funding for new housing units was literally nonexistent (Hulchanski 2002, 9). In 1993, with the exception of supports for housing on reservations for aboriginal populations, the Canadian government declared there would be no new funding for social housing (Chisholm 2003). In the following section, I focus on the case of Ontario and Toronto to explore the impact of these changes in relation to social citizenship.

Following these federal shifts in policy, the 1995 Harris government in Ontario transformed housing policy and governance in the province. His aim was to get Ontario "out of the housing business" (Hackworth 2008, 81). Not only did the Harris government cut provincial funding for social housing, the province downloaded $905 million in social housing costs to the municipalities; the municipalities became responsible for managing housing.

This restructuring was formalized in 2000 through the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA) (Hackworth and Moriah 2006, 515). The main goal of this act was to ensure that housing providers forged relationships with private investors and the private market. As such, housing providers were expected to perform more as a business (Hackworth and Moriah, 516). The provincial government not only encouraged deregulation, but they encouraged housing providers to be entrepreneurial and partner with (and function like) the private housing market (Hackworth 2008, 18). Urban neoliberalism was in full swing in Ontario (Hackworth and Moriah 2006; Keil 2002). As Keil (2002, 580) asserts, "The neoliberalization of the urban through deliberate policy decisions of a programmatically interventionist but substantively anti-statist, neoliberal government has been present in Ontario since 1995." Public housing policy became a key area where such changes were articulated.

The downloading of administration of social housing to municipalities, regulated through the SHRA, meant that local property taxes would cover social housing as opposed to government assistance; this is a dramatic shift, as the federal government previously provided seventy-five percent of funding. Further, housing providers were given more responsibility with less autonomy (Hackworth and Moriah 2006, 515). Providers had to operate in an environment of increased bureaucratic hurdles and were expected to navigate a more centralized housing system. Thus, paradoxically, even as the responsibilities of providing housing moved to the local level, housing became more centralized, as opposed to less, because of management and administrative issues.

For example, as a result of provincial downloading, the city of Toronto inherited responsibility for administering housing, with little to no aid from the province or federal government. Neoliberal restructuring had severe effects on the city's ability to provide housing and put thousands of housing units at risk of being sold to the private market. There was greater local responsibility, with less control, and a simultaneous transformation of public housing to a quasiprivate economic enterprise. The cuts in funding and restructuring created a shortage in social housing in Toronto and produced the largest homeless population per capita in North America (Hackworth and Moriah 2006, 516). While neoliberal restructuring promised to address a crisis in social housing using the language of the free market, it continues to be deceptive in its ability to provide access to equality and economic opportunities for *all* citizens. Central to the rearticulation of social citizenship is the continuation of an illusory nature of inclusivity and challenge to inequality, marked by displacement, homelessness, and a shortage of housing units.

The neoliberal shifts in policy in the 1990s and 2000s are often confused as simply state withdrawal from housing policy and contradicted by the centralization of housing and administrative structure and increase of

responsibility with less autonomy that housing providers experienced. However, the state does not merely absolve itself of responsibility from social/public housing; instead the nature and structure of state intervention shifts. It is therefore not enough to suggest that the state has "backed-out" of social policy or that these changes reflect a reconceptualization in the nature of social citizenship. Rather, this is the very neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship that this article seeks to highlight, where interventions in housing policy become increasingly aligned with the logic of capital, and neoliberal urban revitalization becomes the solution to addressing the crisis of public housing. At the local level, urban revitalization emerged as the go-to framework.

In Toronto, as a direct result of the SHRA changes, the city oversees all social housing providers. Toronto Community Housing was created in 2002 when the city merged City Home, Toronto Metropolitan Housing Corporation, and the Toronto Housing Company in an attempt to make the management of housing easier and more accessible.[5] Toronto Community Housing (TCH) Corporation is the largest public housing organization in Canada and provides affordable housing to approximately 110,000 tenants. Despite the housing shortages and a maintenance crisis, TCH claims continued commitment to maintaining and improving the housing stock via revitalization.[6] Neoliberal urban revitalization frameworks were first introduced in Toronto in the late 1990s and materialized with the small-scale revitalization of Don Mount Court in 2002, followed by the revitalization of Regent Park. In 2017, ten TCH neighborhoods were undergoing revitalization. While the historical context points to the links between the mobilization of revitalization frameworks as a tool for the rearticulation of social citizenship, the financial framework and the "holistic" approach also provide insight into how social citizenship is promised to be delivered through revitalization.

Because of a lack of federal and provincial funding and provision supports, the revitalization of public housing is dependent on private investment and public-private partnerships. Under neoliberal financial frameworks to redevelop public housing in Ontario, the private sector is responsible for redeveloping the land and selling pieces of it (including condos). TCH's financial framework is described as "leveraging social housing" in order to rebuild the housing stock (via sales of market housing, savings from maintanence of existing housing stock, and city funding for public infrastucture). Public-private partnerships generate revenue for basic maintenance, repair, and related issues. As Faranak Miraftab argues, public-private partnerships are the "trojan horse of neoliberalism" and serve to obscure power relations between the different stakeholders (Miraftab 2004). The financial framework is dependent on the privatization of the land and selling market value units to generate revenue to redevelop and is thus fundamentally neoliberal in character: it relies on liberalization, privatization, deregulation, and free competition.

Further, one main critique of twentieth-century urban renewal and redevelopment efforts, which grew out of slum clearance policies, challenged brick-and-mortar development that did not attend to the broader needs of communities. Contemporary revitalization frameworks attempt to remedy the problems generated by brick-and-mortar approaches and attempt to "integrate" public housing neighborhoods with surrounding communities via mixed-use and mixed-income developments. Neoliberal revitalization frameworks center mixed-use developments, not only as part of the financial framework but also to promote entrepreneurialism, privatization, and individual success. By introducing middle-income people to the formerly segregated neighborhoods, mixed-income revitalization is promoted as a progressive response to urban poverty. Joseph et al. (2007, 373) argues that the logic of mixed-income housing is based on four propositions: (1) social networks (middle class) will be established; (2) higher-income residents will raise the level of social control; (3) mixed-income frameworks assume that lower-class residents will be influenced by their middle-class neighbors; and (4) middle-class residents will attract "greater attention" for business development, and so on ("the political economy of place"). As Ashley Spalding (2008, 17–18) suggests, deconcentration, no doubt, is shaped by neoliberal ideologies about the culture of poverty, ignoring structural causes of poverty by focusing on individual merit as the cause of and solution to poverty. A mixing of incomes is thus deceptive in its logic and ability to actually address inequality as promised by revitalization.

The Regent Park revitalization, which began in 2005, remains a profound example that illustrates the ways in which revitalization is a tool in the neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship. The revitalization of Regent Park aims to create a "more typical Toronto neighborhood" and critiques the brick-and-mortar approach that led to its original construction (Toronto Community Housing 2003, 30; Regent Park Collaborative Team 2002). According to TCH's annual review in 2004, "after decades of need and many unsuccessful attempts, renewal is

finally coming to Regent Park" (Toronto Community Housing 2004, 10). Revitalization is posited as the solution to address the segregation of Regent Park and the deterioration of the housing stock.

The Regent Park Revitalization Study (Regent Park Collaborative Team 2002) draws attention to the holistic aspects of revitalization that challenge the brick-and-mortar approaches of the twentieth century: revitalization will bring vitality to the community by providing housing, businesses, education, recreation, green spaces, transportation, and community services. Under this revitalization framework, we see an example of how it serves as a tool for the rearticulation of social citizenship. A neoliberal rearticulation of social citizenship is exemplified by extensive calls for individual participation, a mixed-use and mixed-income framework (that makes the project financially feasible because of a lack of public funding), the role of private developers and private investment, the promotion of entrepreneurialism, and the promise of individualized and increased surveillance to ensure economic regeneration and cultural diversity in revitalization. Not only does the revitalization require the selling of public lands to the private sector and public-private partnerships, but it also obscures the structural causes of racial and class inequality with a neoliberal market-driven solution (Moore and Wright 2017).

Conclusion

In an era of neoliberal urbanism, the privatization of public space, public-private partnerships, decreases in funds to services that support the urban poor, and the link between private property and individual success are normalized in the transformation of cities and the revitalization of low-income neighborhoods. Under Toronto mayor Rob Ford's notorious reign from 2010 to 2014, the city sold twenty-two public housing units in an effort to address financial strain and a maintenance/quality crisis. In 2015, it was reported that it would cost the city $7.5 billion dollars over thirty years to address the repair backlog and housing conditions of TCH buildings and properties.[7] Approximately five hundred units have been made unavailable (and boarded up) because they were deemed uninhabitable and had not been maintained. It is estimated that by 2023, an additional 7,500 units will be added to that number. Yet, in 2016, over 82,000 households were on the waitlist for affordable housing, waiting an average of 8.4 years for a unit.[8] This housing crisis is the result of neoliberal policies and reflects the inequality (re)produced as the role of the state becomes aligned with the logic of capital under neoliberalism.

The revitalization of Toronto's Regent Park, along with multiple other public housing neighborhoods, is posited to address ongoing housing challenges. Neoliberal revitalization is tied to a rearticulation of social citizenship by shifting the delivery mechanism (from a welfare state model) and promising "well-being" and the potential of market forces to address urban poverty, housing affordability and availability, and homeownership opportunities. However, as the ongoing social/public housing crisis in Toronto demonstrates, neoliberal revitalization is a deceptive solution.

While increases in funding and resources would surely be one way to address challenges created by past housing policies, there is much to be learned from community-driven solutions that recenter those who are most directly impacted by inequality. Further, an adequate response would not simply return to welfare state policies, but rather interrogate the relations of power that posit "citizenship" as both a solution and end goal. An alternative future for housing equity will require not only challenging the intrinsic inability of free market logics to address social inequality but also a critique of liberal conceptions of citizenship. I propose that we begin to imagine new forms of subjectivity that move us beyond the limitations of (social) citizenship in a liberal democracy. While the term "revitalize" means to bring something back to life, this paper encourages us to put to rest proposals for "equality" that will always be limited in the framework of capitalism, whether liberal democratic or neoliberal.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Radhika Mongia, Stefan Kipfer, Michael Nijhawan, and Jonathan Rosa for providing critical insights and feedback on this work. Special thanks to the generous and productive feedback from the anonymous reviewers.

Notes

1 By "well-being," Marshall was broadly referring to the most basic rights to which one is entitled, such as housing, healthcare, and education. Marshall theorized that if one had basic supports and well-being, this would then promote both civic and political citizenship and allow one to contribute to the broader society.

2 However, this was not the case for the redevelopment of the old Cabbagetown or the greenfield project of Lawrence Heights.

3 Although *gentrification* is constantly changing across contexts, Neil Smith loosely defines it "as the process by which working class residential neighborhoods are rehabilitated by middle class homebuyers, landlords, and professional developers" (1982, 139). The term "gentrification" was coined in the 1960s by Ruth Glass (1964) to refer to the process by which neighborhoods are transformed from lower-class enclaves to upscale communities where houses and buildings are usually renovated and refurbished to meet the needs of middle-class residents (Smith 2005, 5); in turn, earlier residents are evicted and displaced. This perspective relies on an analysis of class division whereby gentrification is dependent on the "movement of capital, not people"; although, we see that the "movement of people" results from the movement of capital as people are displaced (Smith 2005, 5).

While gentrification was considered sporadic in the 1950s and 1960s, it is now often state-managed and facilitated through the tearing down of public housing and the retrenchment of the welfare state (Slater 2005, 55). To differentiate between early *urban renewal schemes* and *gentrification* (called revitalization in the context of this article), Smith argues that postwar renewal schemes in the United States, which indeed facilitated "scattered private-market gentrification," combined with a shift toward privatization in inner cities to establish the framework for the gentrification of today (Smith 2002, 438). These contemporary large-scale redevelopment projects are now the norm—a far reach from sporadic "white-painting" in the 1960s and 1970s. Cities all over the world record gentrification as changing the urban landscape. Positive impacts attributed to gentrification include increasing property values, reduced vacancy, and a return of populations to the city from suburban areas (Atkinson and Bridge 2005, 5) However, it is clear that for low-income communities the negative impacts of gentrification far outweigh the positive. These negative impacts include mass displacement, community divisions, conflicts, and homelessness (Atkinson and Bridge 2005).

4 In Canada, social housing and public housing are often confused as the same thing. Public housing in Canada is government-subsidized housing. Social housing, however, is housing that is managed by the private sector, but might receive support from government programs, etc. to subsidize rent and supports low-income tenants (co-op housing is an example of social housing).

5 Hackworth and Moriah argue that the SHRA actually made delivery more difficult, and waiting lists grew as a result. This is because housing providers were presented with more bureaucratic hurdles and were expected to navigate a more centralized housing system (2006, 515).

6 Despite TCH's attempt to prove its commitment to public housing, it has been repeatedly criticized for questionable management and being riddled with scandals involving fraud, kick-backs for contracts, the selling of units, and its public-private partnerships that give up public resources and power to private developers.

7 "TCHC Repair Backlog Will Require Tax Increase, Coun Perks Says," CBC, accessed December 30, 2016, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/tchc-repair-backlog-will-require-tax-increase-coun-perks-says-1.3017417

8 Laurie Monsebraaten, "Ontario's Affordable Housing Wait List Grows," *The Star*, accessed December 30, 2016, https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2016/05/25/ontarios-affordable-housing-wait-list-grows.html

References

Anderson, K. 1991. *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875–1980.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Atkinson, R. and G. Bridge, (eds). 2005. *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism.* London: Routledge.

Beck, U. 2000. *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boudreau, J., R. Keil, and D. Young. 2009. *Changing Toronto: Governing Urban Neoliberalism.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brenner, N., and N. Theodore. 2002. "Cities and the Geographies of 'Actually Existing Neoliberalism.'" *Antipode* 34(3): 49–79.

Bunting, T., P. Filion, and R. Walker. 2010. *Canadian Cities in Transition: New Directions in the Twenty-first Century*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carmon, N. 1999. "Three Generations of Urban Renewal Policies: Analysis and Policy Implications." *Geoforum* 30: 145–58.

Carter, T. 1991. "Neighborhood Improvement: The Canadian Experience." In *Neighborhood Regeneration: An International Evaluation*, edited by Rachelle Alterman and Goran Cars, 9-22. London and New York: Mansell Publishing.

Carter, T., and C. Polevychok. 2003. *Comprehensive Neighborhood Studies: Characterizing Decline*. Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg.

CBC. 2015. "TCHC Repair Backlog Will Require Tax Increase, Coun Perks Says." Accessed December 30, 2016. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/tchc-repair-backlog-will-require-tax-increase-coun-perks-says-1.3017417

Chisholm, S. 2003. *Affordable Housing in Canada's Urban Communities: A Literature Review*. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Dupuis, J. 2003. *Federal Housing Policy: A Historical Perspective.* Ottawa: Parliamentary Research Branch.

Filion, P. 1987. "Core Redevelopment, Neighbourhood Revitalization and Municipal Government Motivation: Twenty Years of Urban Renewal in Quebec City," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 2: 131–47.

———. 1988. "The Neighbourhood Improvement Plan: Montreal and Toronto: Contrasts Between a Participatory and a Centralized Approach to Urban Policy Making," *Urban History Review* 17: 16–28.

Glass, Ruth. 1964. *London: Aspects of Change, Centre for Urban Studies Report No. 3.* Edited by the Centre for Urban Studies, University College London. MacGibbon & Kee: London.

Garb, M. 2005. *City of American Dreams. A History of Home Ownership and Housing Reform in Chicago, 1871–1919.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goetz, E. 2013. *New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Goldberg, D. T. 1993. *Racist Culture.* Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Gotham, K. Fox. 2001a. "A City without Slums: Urban Renewal, Public Housing and Downtown Revitalization in Kansas City, Missouri." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 60(1): 285–316.

———. 2001b. "Urban Redevelopment, Past and Present." *Critical Perspectives on Urban Redevelopment* 6: 1–31.

Grodach, C., and R. Ehrenfeucht. 2015. *Urban Revitalization: Remaking Cities in a Changing World.* New York and Milton Park, UK: Routledge.

Hackworth, J. 2008. "The Durability of Roll-Out Neoliberalism under Center-Left Governance: The Case of Ontario's Social Housing Sector." *Studies in Political Economy* 81: 7–26.

Hackworth, J., and A. Moriah. 2006. "Neoliberalism, Contingency, and Urban Policy: The Case of Social Housing in Ontario." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30(3): 510–27.

Hackworth, J. and N. Smith. 2002. "The Changing State of Gentrificaiton." *Journal of Economic and Social Geography* 92(4): 464-477.

Harvey, D. 1985. *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History of Theory of Capitalist Urbanization.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hulchanski, D. 2002. "Housing Policy for Tomorrow's Cities." Canadian Policy Research Network (CPRN). Discussion Paper F 27.

Jessop, B. 2002. "Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective." *Antipode* 34(3): 452-472.

Joseph, M. L., R. J. Chaskin, and H.S. Webber. "The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty Through Mixed-Income Development." *Urban Affairs Review* 42(3): 369-409.

Keil, R. 2002. "'Common–Sense' Neoliberalism: Progressive Conservative Urbanism in Toronto, Canada." *Antipode* 34(3): 578–601.

Keil, R., and S. Kipfer. 2002. "Toronto Inc? Planning the Competitive City in the New Toronto." *Antipode* 34(2): 227–64.

Lacher, H. 1999. "Embedded Liberalism, Disembedded Markets: Reconceptualising the Pax Americana." *New*

Political Economy 4(3): 343–60.
Lees, L., T. Slater, and E. Wyly. 2008. *Gentrification.* New York: Routledge.
Ley, D. 1981. "Inner City Revitalisation in Canada: A Vancouver Case Study." *Canadian Geographer* 25: 124–48.
———. 1999. "Myths and Meanings of Immigration and the Metropolis." *Canadian Geographer* 43: 2–19.
Lipsitz, G. 2006. "Learning from New Orleans: The Social Warrant of Hostile Privatism and Competitive Consumer Citizenship." *Cultural Anthropology* 21(3): 451-468.
Marshall, T. H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McClusky, M. 2002. "Efficiency and Social Citizenship: Challenging the Neoliberal Attack on the Welfare State." *Indiana Law Journal* 78: 799–872.
Miraftab, F. 2004. "Public Private Partnerships: The Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(1): 89-101.
Monsebraaten, Laurie. "Ontario's Affordable Housing Wait List Grows." *The Star*. Accessed December 30, 2016. https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2016/05/25/ontarios-affordable-housing-wait-list-grows.html.
Moore, A. and J. Wright. 2017. "Toronto's market-oriented subsidised housing PPPs: A risk worth the reward?" *Cities* 69: 64-72.
Nelson, J. 2002. "The Space of Africville: Creating, Regulation, and Remembering the Urban Slum." In *Race, Space, and the Law: Unsettling a White Settler Society*, edited by Sherene Razack, 211-232 Toronto: Between the Lines.
Oberlander, P. H., and A. L. Fallick. 1992. *Housing a Nation: The Evolution of Canadian Housing Policy.* Prepared by Center for Human Settlements, The University of British Columbia for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
Peck, J., N. Theodore and N. Brenner. 2009. "Variegated neoliberalization: geographies, modalities, pathways." *Antipode* 10(2): 182-222.
Peck, J., and A. Tickell. 2002. "Neoliberalizing Space." *Antipode* 34(3): 380–404.
Purdy, S. 2002. "Scaffolding Citizenship: Housing Reform and Nation Formation in Canada, 1900–1950." In *Contesting Canadian Citizenship*, edited by Robert Adamoski, Dorothy Chunn, and Robert Menzies, 129–54. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
Regent Park Collaborative Team. 2002. *The Regent Park Revitalization Study*. Submitted to the Toronto Housing Corporation by the Regent Park Collaborative Team.
Rose, A. 1958. *Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
———. 1980. *Canadian Housing Policies, 1935–1980.* Toronto: Butterworths.
Rosenthal, D. B., ed. 1980. *Urban Revitalization*. Urban Affairs Annual Reviews, vol. 18. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Slater, T. 2005. "Gentrification in Canada's Cities: from social mixt to social tectonics?" In *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism,* edited by R. Atkinson and G. Bridge, 39-56. London: Routledge.
Sassen, S. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, and Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
———. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*. New York: The New Press.
Schwartz, A. 2015. *Housing Policy in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
Smith, N. 1982. "Gentrification and Uneven Development." *Economic Geography* 58: 139-55.
———. 2002. "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as a Global Urban Strategy." *Antipode* 34(3): 427-450.
———. 2005 (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City.* Routledge: London and New York.
Smith, P.J and P.W. Moore. 1993. "Cities as Social Responsibility: Planning and Urban Form." In *The Changing Geography of Canadian Cities*, edited by L.S. Bourne and D.F. Ley, 343-366. Kingston, ON, and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Spalding, Ashley E. 2008. "Race, Class, and Real Estate: Neoliberal Policies in a Mixed-Income Neighborhood." Dissertation. University of South Florida.
Teaford, J. C. 1990. *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940–1985.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. 2000. "Urban Renewal and its Aftermath." *Housing Policy Debate* 11(2): 443–66.

Toronto Community Housing. 2003. "Report on the Regent Park Revitalization Study." Toronto Community Housing Corporation, no. 200330.

———. 2004. Toronto Community Housing Annual Review.

Wagner, F., T. Joder, and A. Mumphrey, eds. 1995. *Urban Revitalization: Policies and Programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wilson, J. 1966, ed. 1966. *Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy.* Cambridge: M.I.T. Press