SAVING MAXWELL STREET: PEOPLE, POWER, AND THE POLITICS OF URBAN AESTHETICS IN CHICAGO

Janelle L. Walker

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Folklore,
Indiana University

December 2000

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of people who helped me in the course of this project. It is my pleasure to thank them now.

My most heartfelt thanks go out to the members of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. Most are not mentioned by name in this document, but all contributed by participating in informal interviews and discussions, by allowing me to tape and photograph meetings and events, and by keeping me posted about all goings-on of the Coalition. I am most grateful to the Coalition's tireless leader, Steve Balkin. His energy and passion has kept the group going for years. He is always willing to share his views, inform me about new developments, give me a tour, or listen to my latest thinking about this project. Other core members, Chuck Cowdery, Nate Duncan, James Fraher, Larry Goldberg, Lori Grove, Alan Johnson, Rev. and Mrs. John Johnson, Lorenz Joseph, Bill Lavicka, Laura Kamedulski, Alan Mammoser, Dan Marmer, Merlyn McFarland, Brian Mier, Dan Parker, Neal Pollack, Jimmie Lee Robinson, Frank Scott Jr., Joe and Guadalupe Stefanovic, Wes Wagar, Tyner White, Marni Willenson, and Elliot Zashin, contributed significantly to my understanding of the struggle for Maxwell Street.

At Indiana University I am particularly indebted to Beverly Stoeltje, who served as the chairperson of this dissertation, and has for years served as mentor and friend. Her direction and enthusiasm inspired me throughout. Thanks go out too to the other generous members of my committee, Richard Bauman, Sandra Dolby, and Robert Orsi. Each played an important role in the development and

execution of this topic. Camille Rice, as graduate secretary, also provided much needed assistance. Fellow graduate students, Cathy Brigham, Amy Craver, Peter Harle, Greg Kelley, Nicole Kousaleos, Morris Levy, Mary Magoulick, Jerry McIlvain, Jill Moniz, Janet Myers, Erika Peterson-Veatch, and Suzanne Waldenberger, were, usually without even knowing it, great support. It is they who most closely understood the experience, each step of the way.

Other friends too, have supported me in pursuit of this dissertation and degree: Anne Chodzko, Melissa Giacalone, Mary Giovinazzo, Jackie and Jim Grober, Carol Heubach, Janice Lindegard, Jennifer Roche, Andrew Roecker, Laura Witzki, and Alan Zachary. Though their support has been indirect, it was often a well-timed phone call or other diversion, an evening of babysitting, a request for a progress report, or a kind comment of encouragement that made the difference.

My family have played quite significant roles in the completion of this project. My parents, George and Faye Walker, provided support in hundreds of different ways during my graduate career, always smoothing the process with words and deeds, and usually refraining from asking when I would finish. I am forever indebted to them. Martin Grenzebach, my husband, has allowed the financial freedom for me to pursue this degree in combination with many other pursuits. He has always helped keep the task in perspective, and has always cheered me on, a great supporter of my progress, even during relatively unproductive times. My daughters, Olivia and Emma Grenzebach, have been a great help as well. Olivia survived my qualifying exams during her first year of

life, and during my dissertation field research accompanied me on dozens of trips to Maxwell Street. She attended many, many meetings, demonstrations, and other events, always with good cheer, and now at five years old, is the youngest member of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. Emma's birth in March of this year provided the impetus I needed to complete my first draft of this manuscript. She has since been quite tolerant of the revision process. All have kept me balanced and happy along the dissertation journey.

ABSTRACT

The Maxwell Street neighborhood on Chicago's near west side has existed for almost 150 years and the outdoor market which bears the same name has been around nearly as long. It has been home to immigrant and migrant populations and to an historic outdoor market and retail district. It is also the birthplace of electrified blues music. In its last decades, the place was considered rough and dirty by many.

This study looks at how Maxwell Street is being transformed to better fit with the city of Chicago's new image and new urban aesthetics, at the people who are displaced and excluded from this area of the New American City, at the power relations involved in a decade-long battle over the place, and at how a motivated and well-intentioned group fighting for the preservation of Maxwell Street's culture slowly became part of the hegemonic "clean-up" of the area. This is mainly an ethnographic study of the people of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and the people of Maxwell Street the Coalition represents – residents, vendors, business owners, employees, shoppers, and musicians – people connected in various ways and in varying degrees to the place called Maxwell Street.

The creation of the new Maxwell Street Market and the university plan for a new campustown and "University Village" are explored within the context of Chicago's recent clean-up and history of beautification efforts. The organization of production of the struggle over Maxwell Street, the discourse of beautification and displacement surrounding it, and the evolution of Maxwell Street's physical

form are examined to reveal the power relations and hegemonic forces functioning there.

Written in the last days of Maxwell Street's existence, as the buildings are being demolished and the people displaced in favor of the University of Illinois at Chicago's south campus development, this is a study of a long process of development, displacement, and resistance – as seen from the point of view of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and its members – and of the implications of that process for the people of Maxwell Street and for all of us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The first time I went for a polish sausage at Jim's Original hot dog stand it was well past midnight on a steamy summer night. I remember not only the taste of the food, and the smell of cooked onions on my friend's pork chop sandwich, but also the excitement of the place, how the vendors approached selling socks and cologne, how music blared out of car windows, how a homeless man stood too close telling me his tale of woe. Cars lined the street and people moved about in the darkness or the light from Jim's, eating, talking, dealing, hanging out. I loved the feel of Maxwell Street that night; it is firmly etched in my mind to be drawn out whenever I try to understand people's attachment to the place.

After that, I started going to Maxwell Street on a regular basis. I could spend the better part of a Sunday at the market, listening to vendors and musicians, watching shoppers, eating Mexican food and polish sausages, looking at the odd assortment of merchandise set out on tables, sidewalks, and car hoods, and hunting for bargains, treasures, and experiences in a festive and gritty atmosphere. I loved to take out of town visitors to Maxwell Street to see the "real Chicago." I bought my favorite pair of blue jeans and dozens of other cherished items there. I loved being part of the weekly ritual of Maxwell Street.

Though I lived in Chicago and shopped at the market for years, this project, which ultimately brought me closer to Maxwell Street than I ever imagined, actually took shape while I was living and studying in Bloomington, Indiana in 1994. Early that year I received word from a friend back home that something was happening at Maxwell Street, something about closing the market,

something she knew I would want to look into as I loved the place and had spent many, many Sundays there since making Chicago my home in 1987. My investigations revealed that the city was indeed planning to close the historic marketplace, to sell the land to the University of Illinois at Chicago, and to build a new market about a half-mile away. I made several trips back to Chicago and Maxwell Street, to talk with people at the market, to take photos, to absorb the place, to imprint it in my memory for after it was gone.

Though I spent a lot of time that year thinking about and lamenting the loss of the market, I owe much of the credit for developing that loss into this dissertation topic to the four members of my dissertation committee, as it was through a series of graduate courses, one with each of them as professor, that this project emerged and gathered momentum.

Robert Orsi's "Urban Religion in North America" course dealt first with the meaning of "urban," with what the environment of the city indicates for any topic explored there. It was in this course that I first read Jane Jacobs' classic work, The Death and Life of Great American Cities. This and other class readings about urban society led me to consider my own city of Chicago as an ideal location for fieldwork.

It was in Sandy Dolby's American Studies seminar that I first became interested in looking at urban-American tourist sites, historic spots reconfigured into sanitized, middle-class tourist attractions. Dr. Dolby's enthusiasm for the topic led me to investigate these sorts of attractions in Chicago and to see the New Maxwell Street Market as one such site.

In his course titled "The Ethnography of Speaking," Richard Bauman encouraged me to pursue a project on the relationship between market speech and social life at the Maxwell Street Market. I therefore spent several Sunday mornings listening to and taping vendors' calls, bargaining, and other market speech. My later research at the market, though no longer focused on vendor calls and speech, sprang directly from this first taste of doing fieldwork there.

My interest in this project became more refined as a course project for Beverly Stoeltje's "Public Culture, Power, and Ideology" graduate seminar. By that time I was aware of the controversy surrounding the proposed move of the Maxwell Street Market. The politics surrounding the market's move were perfect for my coursework on power and public culture. The project included fieldwork at the old and new markets and my attendance at many of the meetings where the move of the market was decided.

The combination of interests developed in these four courses – in the city, cleaned-up tourist attractions, the marketplace, and power relations -- led me to this folklore dissertation project, an ethnography of the people of Maxwell Street and of the process by which they have been removed from their place.

In December of 1996 I moved back to Chicago with my husband and daughter to conduct fieldwork in the Maxwell Street neighborhood. My initial fieldwork was exploratory. I spent Sundays observing and taking photos at the New Maxwell Street Market (the old market had been destroyed in 1994), and the rest of the time pondering what, if anything, I was finding – and what I was even looking for.

Then on a Sunday in May of 1997, I met Steve Balkin who was part of a then-small group of activists trying to gain public recognition of the probable destruction of the old Maxwell Street area through a website and other activities. I recognized him from the earlier, unsuccessful fight to save the outdoor market. Balkin was taking photos, handing out fliers to "Preserve Maxwell Street," and requesting that people write letters to University of Illinois at Chicago's Chancellor David Broski expressing their concerns about the university's plans to demolish the remaining buildings and businesses around the old market site. Balkin's organization was already calling itself the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, holding irregular meetings, and trying to recruit support (the Coalition at that time consisted of only four members, though they claimed a larger membership based upon letters of support). Seeing this as an extension of my work with the New Market, I exchanged a few e-mails with Balkin and attended my first meeting of the Coalition. It quickly became clear that there was a rich project here, that the battle heating up over the buildings of the old Maxwell Street neighborhood was the next, and perhaps final chapter in a long story of displacement and resistance. I realized that long-term involvement with the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition could provide a case study of how hegemonic forces are at work transforming cities across the U.S., and, of course, of how people are affected by and reacting to this transformation.

Over the next three and a half years I became very involved with the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, even serving several terms as an officer on its board of directors. As such, I attended all meetings of the Coalition

and its board, participated in dozens of rallies and demonstrations, took on mailing, phone calling, and writing projects on behalf of the Coalition, went to city and university meetings as a Coalition representative, and tracked the situation in the press and through extensive and lengthy conversations and interviews with Coalition members. Throughout, I consistently presented myself as doing dissertation research about Maxwell Street and the Coalition, and everyone was aware of this part of my purpose in being involved. My status as researcher rarely mattered; occasionally I was asked to turn my tape recorder off or to keep someone's name or comment "off the record," but Coalition members generally believe that if you love Maxwell Street and are willing to help out, you're in -- one of them. In essence, I was helpful to the Coalition as an advocate, a participating member, in return for having access to its inner workings and to the process in which they are engaged.

My fieldwork with the Coalition and the community they represent has been mainly participant-observation, ethnographic research with a group of people attached in various ways and in varying degrees to the place called Maxwell Street. In the same way that researchers over the years have traveled to other countries to gain understanding of cultures afar, I have immersed myself in a local community, in the life and culture of a place involved in a crisis that has threatened and ultimately destroyed it. I hope now to present the perspective of its people on what is happening in their lives and to their place.

This study, then, is my ethnography of the people of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and the people of Maxwell Street whom the

Coalition represents: residents, vendors, business owners, employees, shoppers, and musicians. It is a study of a process, of the struggle over Maxwell Street -- from the point of view of the Coalition. My primary contact is with members of the Coalition's leadership; they are my main "informants." It is through my relationship with them, through my long-term, hands-on involvement with the Coalition, that my understanding of this struggle comes.

Though the perspectives of the city of Chicago and the University of Illinois will be considered and do contribute to our understanding of the situation, this project, in the tradition of anthropologic and folkloristic ethnography, is not intended as a study of the crisis from all sides, but is instead the story of a people, an ethnography of the folks of the Maxwell Street Market and the Maxwell Street neighborhood, even as those institutions are systematically diminished and demolished. Some would argue that a conflict such as this must be covered objectively from both sides, but doing ethnographic studies of people not in power does not give a researcher access to university decision-making or development plans. Research access to universities and their inner workings is virtually unheard of, and that is not the goal of participant-observation or ethnographic research, and is certainly not the intent of this study.

My sympathies in the matter of Maxwell Street lie quite obviously with the Coalition and its views about "saving" Maxwell Street. My work with them will continue long after this dissertation is finished. While I have tried to reach beyond it, a romantic view of Maxwell Street cannot be entirely avoided as this is the view held by the Coalition and used by them to argue for the salvation of

Maxwell Street. In the Coalition's view, Maxwell Street is all about the good sides of diversity, ethnic and race relations, entrepreneurship, capitalism, and street life.

My field notes include observations on such things as telephone conversations, e-mail communications, and Coalition meetings and private meetings with city of Chicago representatives, while my tape recordings and transcriptions are of more formal interviews, some Coalition and all board meetings, and public university presentations. My sources also include hundreds of newspaper articles and some work done by other researchers at the old and new markets. I took hundreds of photographs of the market, old and new, and hundreds more of Coalition activities. As a Coalition member, I also became involved with a group of other members who were videotaping footage for a series of documentary videos about the "Last Days of Maxwell Street." We spent several months taping personal interviews with residents, musicians, religious leaders, business owners and workers, street vendors, shoppers and patrons of restaurants, and anyone else who would talk on tape about their memories of and experiences on Maxwell Street or their knowledge of and feelings about the university's South Campus expansion. I conducted many of these interviews myself while someone else ran the cameras; many, many more were conducted by other interviewers. All went into the Coalition's informal "archives" of video and audio tape and still photos available for any Coalition member to use for research or publicity purposes.[1] As a result, some of the interview data I use to support this project and its thesis comes from interviews taped by co-workers on the

project, but all is drawn from a taping and archival project with which I was directly involved. The interviews were intended for exactly this kind of purpose. I also conducted my own formal, audiotaped interviews with vendors at the New Market, with organizers and managers of that attraction, and with Coalition members.

Though I was already an adult when I discovered Maxwell Street, I have spent years listening to and reading other people's memories of the place, and fighting a passionate battle alongside its people, and so have formed a deeper attachment to it than is justified by my own personal experience there.

Participating in the effort to "save" Maxwell Street has been exhilarating and saddening at once. I am ecstatic to have met so many people who feel so deeply about this incredible urban space, and to have been involved in an effort that has been somewhat successful in influencing the development of the area by saving a few buildings and facades. The research was exciting, as I knew at all times that I was in the midst of a moment that is often lost to researchers; I didn't need to go back to harvest memories of the battle for Maxwell Street, as the battle was being performed right before my eyes. I am, on the other hand, saddened by the form the preservation ultimately takes and by how little difference can really be made against forces that want to sanitize the city. I am sorrowful that there are so many people who, in looking at late twentieth-century Maxwell Street, can see only drug use and pornography and dirt, a "bad area," but cannot see a community of human beings with a vital social and cultural and economic life – so many who

cannot see value in a neighborhood not modeled on the suburbs, who will never be convinced that the old Maxwell Street was beautiful while a strip-mall is not.

The district on the old Maxwell Street which will result from the process described in this dissertation will be a place where, years from now, I will take my children and grandchildren -- but not to see the quaint, nostalgic, beautified district that will be created in the outdoor market's place. Instead, I will take them there to teach them how to read the built environment, to see beyond what developers have reluctantly agreed to preserve, to understand the power relations and the politics of urban aesthetics behind the public spaces. It is where I will tell them about the history of the neighborhood and the people who came there to create businesses and music and food and lives in Chicago. I will tell them about the market and how it was transformed, and about the buildings and how the humble architecture of the place spoke volumes about the people who lived and worked and shopped there. I will tell them about how those few buildings were saved through a messy battle, and about the hundreds of other "Maxwell Streets" across the country that have not been even this fortunate.

As I write this, Maxwell Street is in its last days. Stores are closing, business owners are being evicted, buildings are being demolished; even Jim's Original hot dog stand, always the anchor of the neighborhood, is slated for removal at the end of September 2000. My mood, and that of the residents and shopkeepers of Maxwell Street is generally one of sadness and despair.

What follows is the story of how it came to this.

Chapter 1, which follows now, provides an introduction to Maxwell Street and its people, the members of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, and to the situation and process they have undergone in recent years. It briefly introduces the setting, the main characters, and a plot summary of the story of Maxwell Street.

---

[1] The Coalition "archives" are housed mainly in the home of Steve Balkin, Coalition vice president and primary collector of Maxwell Street images and texts. Plans for organizing the collection are periodically discussed and dismissed for lack of funds. Access to the unorganized files for research purposes, however, is available by contacting the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, c/o Landmarks Preservation Council of Illinois, 53 W. Jackson, Suite 752, Chicago, IL 60604-3699.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCING MAXWELL STREET AND ITS PEOPLE

Maxwell Street today is a raw and funky place. Its sidewalks are crumbling. Its storefronts, the few still open, are covered with bars. Awnings dangle from buildings that are in extreme disrepair -- boarded up, falling down, partially demolished, and covered with graffiti and handwritten posters of protest. Piles of garbage fill entryways and more is strewn over the buckling sidewalks and vacant lots. Cars along Halsted are double and triple-parked, pulling up to buy cheap sandwiches from Jim's Original. Vendors are thick around the hot dog stand, approaching potential customers from all sides, selling incense, t-shirts, socks, dishtowels, pornographic videos, jewelry and cologne. Blues music blares from the store next door. Cars honk. And the smell of grilled onions fills the air.

The remaining block of Maxwell Street, between Halsted and Union, is lined with vehicles obviously used as housing – vans, campers, tents, and an old school bus, all stuffed full with possessions. Shoes, stuffed animals, and other markers line the fences. On the northeast corner across from Jim's stands a makeshift blues stage, complete with an overstuffed couch and end tables. It, and the huge M-A-X sculpture next to it, are covered with Christmas tinsel, plastic flowers, and more handwritten signs. At the same corner is the always-dripping fire hydrant where residents of the street drink, shave, and shampoo. Vandalized and undeniably dirty, the neighborhood is unattractive and unappealing to most. It has been this way for years, really, increasingly decrepit and therefore apparently threatening.

Before it was closed and relocated in 1994, the outdoor market too was quite seedy. Always sprawling and unruly, it had become literally filthy and unsafe as the city of Chicago removed sanitation and police services to the area. It received a reputation as a good place to buy stolen goods; when my apartment was robbed in 1988, friends suggested I go to Maxwell Street to search for my grandmother's gold locket and other irreplaceable items. Once the market closed, the place continued to go downhill. The University of Illinois at Chicago bought property and tore it down or neglected it. Fires started and vandalism continued. Private owners stopped putting money into their property in anticipation of their eventual removal.

Most Chicagoans today believe Maxwell Street has been gone for years, that the market's removal in 1994 brought a swift and final shutdown of the area. People are often surprised when I describe my dissertation research to hear that anything remains.

Those who still frequent Maxwell Street take a certain pride in its disreputable image, in being associated with a place considered dangerous and gritty, in being the last survivors in a place that has been threatened with extinction for decades. They are, as one resident put it to me, "the feisty core that refuse to go away." Like Kugelmass' elderly Jews in the South Bronx (1986), the people of Maxwell Street have stayed in a place considered uninhabitable by some at least partially because they feel brave and resourceful living there – because they love to love a place which inspires such animus in outsiders. They

are stimulated by Maxwell Street and intend to hang on as long as they still recognize some part of the place.

In its last days, as I write this, the view of a literally crumbling Maxwell Street presented above is juxtaposed with that of the university's new construction of its South Campus. Construction equipment, piles of building materials, and demolition and construction crews are scattered around the neighborhood. On the southwest corner of Maxwell and Halsted, just across the narrow street from Jim's Original, new university housing is going up. More is advertised with huge bright red banners proclaiming the opening of "University Village" condominiums, lofts, and townhomes. It is obvious the end is near. Most ironically striking is the sight of the construction workers lined up to order lunch at Jim's.

This dissertation is most obviously a study of this place, Maxwell Street, as Maxwell Street is the setting for the story I will tell of the people of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. The place is central to the story as this group of people, this community, is brought together by it; it is Maxwell Street that makes this group a group.

People's reactions to region and place have long been of interest to folklorists. The regional collections of Vance Randolph, Cecil Sharp, Ben Botkin, and others were published in the first half of the twentieth century, and other "regional" collections focusing mainly on ethnicity and immigration were popular then too. Academic folklorists became more focused on region in the 1950's and after (Dorson 1952, 1959, 1964, Halpert 1947, Paredes 1958, S. Jones

1976, plus many, many more); a number of articles in Dorson's Handbook of American Folklore (1983) deal with regional culture and creation. Folklore is the product of particular regional patterns, of the shared and divergent experiences of people in a place, and folklorists have devoted much thought to the connection between place and people.

As people organize and live their lives in the context of a specific place, they develop a group consciousness, a shared conception of themselves as inhabitants and devotees of that place. Maxwell Street is a true "folk neighborhood," a place where "everyone knows who belongs and who doesn't" (Warshaver 1983: 169). Like a folk region, a folk neighborhood has an identity and a sense of belonging as people live under similar conditions and in a state of interdependence. A "region" such as the Maxwell Street neighborhood thus develops its sense of self.

Individuals also develop a sense of self based on their experience in a place, and their perceptions are shaped by that experience. "The urban self is closely tied to the urban landscape," writes Orsi (1992: 336); people's personal narratives and life stories are tied intricately to the streets, sidewalks, and other spaces of their urban folk neighborhood. To get at these packages of perceptions, the sense of place of the people of Maxwell Street, we must look from the perspective of residents and others who have considered themselves part of the place.

It is important to acknowledge that a community, a region, or a group is a complex entity. References to Maxwell Street and its people are not meant to

imply homogeneity. Such a view would be fiction at best, as Orsi suggests: "There has never been one Harlem, for example; no urban community is as homogeneous as designations such as "Little Havana" and "Chinatown" pretend" (1999: 57).

Environmental psychologists have defined "place attachment" as a psychological process which ties persons to their places with deep, somewhat inexplicable, and lasting feelings (Altman and Low 1992). For many, that psychological attachment endures long after a place is obliterated physically, creating a deep sense of loss, a grieving and mourning for a lost neighborhood or demolished building. Herbert Gans' famous study of Boston's Italian-American West Enders, The Urban Villagers, was reissued in expanded and updated form in 1982, twenty years after its original version and after the demolition and redevelopment of the West End neighborhood. In the original text he dealt with the redevelopment, displacement, and relocation process from the point of view of the West Enders, and in the new postscripts he acknowledges the emotional scars, grief, and sadness stemming from displacement and the resulting loss of place and human connections.

In the case of Chicago's Maxwell Street, a group has formed based upon its members' attachment to place. Individuals attached to Maxwell Street in different ways and degrees came together as a group, became organized, and developed a group consciousness based mainly upon threats to the place. The formation of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition was spurred by increasingly severe and apparent threats to Maxwell Street's physical space and to

the preservation of its memory. Even as they are being dispersed from the intersection of Maxwell and Halsted Streets, and even as the Coalition's goals are increasingly obviously unrealized, this is a group brought together by place; Maxwell Street and their attachments to it are what bind them together.

The Maxwell Street area was a port of entry for immigrants as early as the 1850's. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the neighborhood became home to many immigrant populations – first Germans and Italians, Bohemians and Greeks, then Russian and Eastern European Jews. Peddlers set up on the streets and eventually were able to rent frame cottages and create first-floor storefronts. In 1912, the City of Chicago officially established the Maxwell Street Market. In this century, the neighborhood and outdoor marketplace served as a settling area for African-Americans during the Great Migration, and as a starting point for a large Latino population. The neighborhood has a rich history of retail and entrepreneurship, and is known as Chicago's Ellis Island and the birthplace of Chicago electrified blues music.

Maxwell Street has been an "endangered space" (Hufford 1994) for decades, its physical space repeatedly reduced by the straightening of the Chicago River, railroad lines, the Dan Ryan expressway, housing developments, and urban renewal. Though these and other forces – immigration, the Chicago Fire, migration, suburbanization – have influenced the rise and decline of Maxwell Street, none has been as powerful and as predatory as the University of Illinois at Chicago. Combining forces with the city of Chicago, the UIC has been acquiring land in the area since the 1950's. In 1990, the UIC announced plans to acquire

the area south of Roosevelt Road which includes the Maxwell Street neighborhood, to have the historic Maxwell Street Market moved to another location, to "clean up" the land, and to build university facilities and upscale residential housing there. In 1994, after more than a hundred years of operation, the historic market was moved from its original location to become the New Maxwell Street Market about a half mile away.

Today "Maxwell Street" refers to both the new market site, a sanitized but still thriving version of the original, and to what remains of the old neighborhood and shopping district surrounding the intersection of Maxwell and Halsted Streets. What remains of the old neighborhood is today bounded roughly by the Dan Ryan expressway on the east, Roosevelt Road on the north, railroad lines on the south at 16th Street, and housing projects on the west at Morgan Street.

This dissertation is secondly a study of a very long process of change and displacement that Maxwell Street and its people have undergone. Here, in brief, is the story of that process and of the group's efforts at resistance:

In response to the University's plans, a group called the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition – made up of neighborhood residents, market and street vendors, business owners, workers, shoppers, students, and other interested parties – formed, and has used various forms of resistance and subversion against the city and university since 1993. All efforts were attempts to "save" Maxwell Street, though the definition of "saving" has changed over the years along with the situation. First, the then-small group fought the removal of the outdoor market. They passed out flyers and tried to organize vendors, but their voices

were not well-organized into a form the city or the university could hear. At the Chicago City Council meeting to officially move the outdoor market, hundreds of vendors and other interested parties showed up. They made a lot of noise and probably made council members uncomfortable and irritated, but little more. They were shushed by security staff throughout the meeting, and the market was moved.

Once the market was moved, the city and the university hoped the issue was resolved. The city hoped people would transfer their allegiance to the new market site, and the university hoped the whole Maxwell Street problem would just go away. What neither anticipated, what neither wanted to acknowledge, was peoples' attachment to place, to the actual ground and the physical fabric of the historic market and shopping district centered at the corner of Maxwell and Halsted Streets. Indeed, the effort to save Maxwell Street was not nearly over.

After the market was lost, the group working for preservation of the area turned their focus to saving buildings. They nominated the Maxwell Street Market district for the National Register of Historic Sites in an attempt to save the seventy-eight buildings which then still existed in the Maxwell-Halsted-Roosevelt district. The threat of an historic district was the group's main message – if the area were officially proclaimed an historic district, the university's hands would be tied in terms of demolition. As a result, the university worked hard against historic designation for the area and the nomination was refused. Even after the official rejection, the university continued to insure that a National Register nomination would not be successful in the future. They purchased and tore down

the legendary Nate's Deli and dozens of other buildings, erecting parking lots which are hardly ever used and many softball fields. They have knocked down as many buildings as possible, and have targeted many more.

After these two losses, the move of the market and the rejection of the National Register nomination, the group got stronger and more organized. They stated their goals of saving buildings and establishing the place as a memorial to immigrant and migrant cultures and to Chicago blues history. They came up with drawings and costs and official language to illustrate how university plans could be compatible with saving buildings and creating a historic tourist district. They forced their way into meetings with the university, they involved the mayor's office, they made general nuisances of themselves with protests and press releases and public name-calling, they started a website and letter-writing campaign directed at the Chancellor of the UIC, they gained media attention[1], and they recruited members, myself included.

The university's plans were a mystery throughout most of the battle, but suspecting the worst – destruction, displacement, and "ethnic cleansing" – the Coalition kept the pressure on as best it could. We were determined to create an uproar, to create public interest or at least the illusion thereof, to inform people about what was happening while it was happening, and about what could be lost to "progress." We opened a mini-museum and blues music store on Halsted Street, next door to Jim's Original, the world-famous hot dog stand. We gave walking tours showing the buildings and presenting the situation to interested parties. We helped blues artist Jimmie Lee Robinson release a CD titled Maxwell

Street Blues. We partnered with the neighborhood's Creative Reuse Warehouse to use recycled materials to beautify Maxwell Street with wood chips, planters, a M-A-X sculpture made out of railroad ties, the Maxwell Street Wall of Fame, and a blues performance stage for weekend blues jams. We passed out thousands of flyers. We started videotaping on the street to create a "Last Days of Maxwell Street" video. We printed hundreds of "Save Maxwell Street" t-shirts which were sold at blues jams, at the new market, and out of stores on Halsted Street, and given out to the press, the mayor, and others whose support we were courting. We partnered with other coalitions and political groups with similar agendas. We wrote press releases about every move or potential move of the university. We continually contacted aldermen, commissioners, the Chicago Department of Planning and Development, and Mayor Daley. We hung provocative banners on buildings along the expressway. We sent numerous mailings to the University's Board of Trustees. And we held protest after protest after protest.

Eventually, the Coalition's efforts led to the formation of a City of Chicago Ad-Hoc Committee, composed of UIC architects and planners, City of Chicago planning officials, two prominent consultant architects hired by the city, and members of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. The committee arrived at a compromise, an adaptive reuse plan to save thirty-six vintage buildings on Maxwell and Halsted (out of approximately sixty that then remained). The meetings resulted in a written plan and drawing which took UIC's demands for specific kinds of space into consideration and showed how the old buildings could be integrated with construction of new buildings for a win-

win situation. That plan, formed in May of 1998, was the first of a series of increasingly conservative plans forged and supported by the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. All of them, though, were essentially ignored by the UIC in favor of "The Plan," one which saves eight buildings on Halsted Street and relocates the facades of twelve others to create an historic-looking strip on Maxwell Street. The facades are to be pasted onto two parking garages joined by a turreted bridge. Some of the buildings will have new first floor retail, and other features of the plan are meant to preserve the "antique look" of the street. This campustown will be surrounded by university research buildings, student housing, and by "University Village" condominiums, lofts, and townhomes, and their parks and amenities.

Since the university Plan was unveiled, the Coalition has continually criticized it in the press, has organized a boycott of University Village, has issued another application for National Register status based on different historical data, and has continued with dozens of other forms of protest.

The transformation of Maxwell Street, its beautification, has already resulted in the displacement of many, many people, and will ultimately remove the rest. This study will closely examine the process of changing the urban landscape of this neighborhood from a historic marketplace and retail and residential district to an upscale, themed entertainment block. It is the study of a hegemonic process by which dominant forces are transforming Maxwell Street into a corporate, rational vision of how an urban area should look. The process includes the destruction not only of buildings, but also of people's lives and

livelihoods. The University of Illinois' project has gone ahead with little consideration or planning for where those people might go; in fact, a crucial part of the process includes repeated denials that any semblance of community or neighborhood even exists on Maxwell Street.

The transformation began with the creation of dirt through neglect at the Maxwell Street Market and the simultaneous creation of a rhetoric of dirt and disorder used to justify the move of the marketplace and the opening of a sanitized replacement market. Hegemonic forces were then able to claim to have "saved" the market by creating a new space for new audiences. The process continued as the city and university joined forces to implement "The Plan" for the UIC's south campus, one which "saves" the old Maxwell Street neighborhood by creating a new, clean place with an old-timey feel and a few building facades, an "appropriate memorial" which will celebrate the past in the service of confirming the superiority of the present. Though there has been extensive resistance to the city/UIC alliance, it was ignored and "The Plan" has proceeded virtually untouched, as though written in proverbial stone. This story of hegemony will be elaborated in the rest of the text. This study shows how the UIC and the City of Chicago impose their power, how this hegemonic process works.

Though the university has repeatedly denied the existence of a community, of any people in the Maxwell Street neighborhood, this is third, and most importantly, a study of a group of people, an urban folk. As such, it extends the concerns of previous scholars who have explored folklore in and of the city (Newell 1883, Botkin 1956, Abrahams 1970, Paredes and Stekert 1970, Dorson

1981, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1983b, Warshaver 1983, Orsi 1985, Kugelmass 1986, Dargan and Zeitlin 1990). The group at the heart of this study are a group of displaced persons, a marginalized folk, shoved aside to make room for a new kind of urban aesthetic, one which values order and cleanliness and middle-class audiences.

Development in urban America almost inevitably means displacement; certainly in Chicago, clearing out the poor and disadvantaged has been part of almost every major development. Maxwell Street has a history of such displacement and redefinition (see chapter 2). Arguably, the last decade of the twentieth century saw the greatest and most final changes to the area; and it is these changes, especially from 1994 on, which I have documented from the inside. As a result of the University of Illinois' development plans, a population low on the economic scale has been pushed to the margins and displaced from a marketplace, from businesses, from homes, and from street life – from all of their living spaces. When the university's plans for development are complete, even those who moved out of the neighborhood of their own volition years ago will in a sense be displaced; no longer able to visit the Maxwell Street they once knew, they too will experience a loss of place.

Maxwell Street is still literally home to many people. Merlyn McFarland, for instance, calls himself the "Mayor of Maxwell Street." He lives in the neighborhood, still vends in the outdoor market on Canal Street, and generally takes care of the place. He cleans up garbage, lays out insecticide and rodenticide in doorways, and hounds the university and the city about cleaning up the place.

He reports broken sidewalks, potholes, and dirty foyer entrances. He consults with Streets and Sanitation workers about garbage pick-up. Merlyn got the university to put up an awning over a sidewalk in front of a building from which debris was falling. And he arranged for and organized the clean-up of a vacant lot at the corner of Maxwell and Halsted; trash was picked up by neighborhood kids, and tons of wood chips from the recycling center were spread over the area. He built planters along Maxwell Street out of recycled railroad ties. Merlyn simply cares about the area where he has spent much of his life. Merlyn is the Coalition's eyes on the street; he watches the day to day happenings and reports potential demolition and whatever else he finds to Coalition leaders.

Other residents remain in the neighborhood too. A group of people constituting the Maxworks Cooperative have lived for years in two of the oldest remaining buildings on Maxwell Street, 716 and 717 W. Maxwell. The group, called simply "Maxworks," has continually changed as people took up residence there for varying lengths of time while they worked on projects for the cooperative and for the neighborhood; the place has served as a welcome station for activists from around the world who come for a few days or several years. The Maxworks building is a funky, off-beat place, with artwork and projects in varying stages of completion and piles of assorted treasure in the front display windows. Hanging on the chain link fences near the building are more art pieces and hand-written messages about working for the earth and acting locally. The group supports a community garden on 13th Street which features totem poles and other art projects displayed among plantings. There are always colorful

characters hanging around the building, usually eager to share the vision of Maxworks with interested parties.

The most eager of these is Tyner White, a tall, thin, usually barefoot man with a mane of long hair and a bag of his latest goods made from recycled materials. Tyner views himself as a spokesperson for the Maxworks Cooperative, and has been with the group since its inception more than twenty years ago. He also promotes ventures with intriguing titles like Maxwood Institute and The Reusiversity. Tyner lists his interests as the reutilization of urban lumberworks and scrap lumber carpentry. He is one of the organizers of a Lumbergarten in the backlot of a related area business called the Creative Reuse Warehouse. The Lumbergarten consists of denailed lumber gathered from buildings being torn down in the area; products such as educational toys, shelving, and furniture are then made out of the lumber.

As in any group, there has been tension over different members' approaches to and understanding of their mission, but for the most part their interest is in environmental research and issues. Maxworks works harmoniously with two other neighborhood groups, the Chicago Greens, a separate environmentally concerned group which publishes a newsletter and calendar and sponsors alternative events, and the Creative Reuse Warehouse.

In 1999, the city cracked down hard on both 716 and 717 Maxwell, sending inspectors, demanding repairs, throwing out personal property identified as "debris," and issuing vacate orders for the property. Some residents have rented space elsewhere, but many who once slept in loft spaces in their

cooperative living environment are now forced to sleep in tents, in cars and vans, and on the street. They spend their days trying to organize their personal and group possessions so, when clean-up crews come, and they will, their property will not be mistaken for trash.

Along with residents, there are still more than forty viable, active businesses operating along Maxwell and Halsted Streets. They have endured a lot up to this point, and they want to stay. The university is offering them a "relocation program," implying that some might be involved in the new development through "rental opportunities," and suggesting that this might be "a logical point to terminate their business activity."

The Federman family is still in business on the southwest corner of Roosevelt Road and Halsted Street. Irving Federman operates law offices on the top floor of 1200 S. Halsted, while Alan Federman runs clothing stores in the remainder of 1200 and in all of 1212 S. Halsted. The stores sell Dobbs and Stetson hats, Botany 500 suits and Van Heusen shirts. Their business is booming at that location. Paul, their father, still owns the buildings; he started in the area fifty years ago as a butcher and moved up to stores on Maxwell Street and then to Halsted Street, a common route for the determined immigrant. The Federmans want to stay in business in their current location; they have rehabbed their building and have promised to fix it up further if necessary. Since their building's location has been slated for a "gateway park" in the new development, they know that staying put is probably not possible. They would still like to be part of the

UIC's plan, even if it requires moving to a new location on the street. Their justified fear, of course, is that they will be excluded entirely.

Tino Rochas, "Tino the Tailor," is another businessman who wants to stay. He leases space at 1236 S. Halsted in a building that is slated for demolition. He employs eight tailors and offers inexpensive alterations. He worries while waiting to hear more from the university. Statements from the university are not direct: "There will be limited opportunities for some businesses to stay in the development," says a UIC spokesperson. Other than vague, indefinite statements like these, the business owners are being told nothing.

Reverend John Johnson owns the blues music store on Halsted right next to Jim's Original. When the old market was open he sold blues and gospel tapes on the corner of 14th and Halsted from his blue-painted school bus with bubbly graffiti-style writing on it: "Downhome Music," "Mississippi Delta Blues," "Heritage Folk Music." Music was always blasting from loudspeakers, and Rev. Johnson himself would be there in his railroad engineer's hat and overalls. When the market moved to Canal St., Johnson resisted for a while, then joined the market in one of their key positions since he and his bus are so colorful. The bus does not run anymore, but Rev. Johnson is still present on the street. He and his wife, Mrs. Johnson, run Heritage Bluesbus Music and staff the mini-museum which the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition has set up in half of the store. Business is still good, and music blares out of the store all day, livening up the street and providing entertainment for those eating at Jim's. The store is a gathering place of sorts. Musicians stop there to chat, people from the old market

and neighborhood who knew Johnson stop to reminisce, and those working to save the neighborhood meet each other there to work on projects in the area.

The Creative Reuse Warehouse, at 721 W. O'Brien, is run by Ken Dunn, a retired professor from the University of Chicago. More than twenty-five years ago Dunn started his "recycling mini-empire" (Nagel 1999). The Warehouse employs fifty people and is a wonderland of goods people or manufacturers and distributors have discarded. Dunn describes the goal of the business as combining resources society undervalues and discards. Displays in the store feature ideas for how to use the products in teaching or home crafts. Glass bottles, tubes of paint, pieces of fabric, yarn, dowel rods, cardboard – an endless array of sometimes unidentifiable, but always useful for something, products. A full shopping bag costs three dollars.

And, of course, there is Jim's.

Jim's Original Red Hots Hot Dog Stand is on the northwest corner of Maxwell and Halsted (1320 S. Halsted and 800-808 W. Maxwell). It is on this spot that the Maxwell Street polish sausage was invented, a blend of Eastern European kosher sausage spices in a special meat blend that is cooked amongst mounds of grilled onions. The stand itself is classic early-twentieth century vernacular architecture and has been written about in articles, books, poems, and songs. Of all the buildings left in the old neighborhood, Jim's can be considered the most important because it is an old and thriving family business, because it is an example of historic vernacular architecture predating the Chicago Fire, and

because it stands right at the heart of the neighborhood, the corner of Maxwell and Halsted Streets where it was once the gateway to the old marketplace.

Jim's is the oldest business operation in what remains of Chicago's oldest immigrant neighborhood; its continuous operation is representative of the neighborhood's longest-standing business type – the hot dog stand. And it is a perfect example of the path taken by many immigrant-entrepreneurs as they made their way in their new society.

People have vivid memories of Jim's:

> The most powerful smell, without question, issues from Jimmy's hot-dog stand on the main corner of Halsted and Maxwell. The enclosed stand with six open windows props against a two-story brick building. A 'Vienna Red Hots; sign tops the stand. Above it rises into the sky a great cardboard 7-Up bottle and a green, white, gray, and red sign which reads, 'Leavitt's, Famous for Sandwiches." Leavitt's has been out of business for a decade. Eight workers in Jimmy's fork out hot dogs from steamy tin bins, tuck the dogs into buns, slap on mustard, pinch in peppers, stuff in pickles, flap pork chips on the open grill, scrape the frying onions in pork fat and gristle for the Polish sausages and hamburgers. On a Sunday there a ton of onions, literally, are used. Thousands and thousands of soft drinks are consumed. The grease from the cooking is so great it seeps onto the sidewalk as customers, three and four deep, waiting to eat or eating, stand with shoes sticking to the grease. They walk away with shoes making sucking sounds. Special details are periodically sent by Jimmy to sop up the grease. Customers cough from the steam and the smell. The odor is cloying. (Berkow 1977: 27)

In 1939, Jim Stefanovic, a Romanian immigrant from Macedonia, borrowed money from friends and relatives and bought the hot dog stand located at 800-808 W. Maxwell from his Aunt Olga. Starting with only five or six employees, he built the place into a "minor empire" (Berkow 1977: 496) by

selling only the best products cooked with care. Jim's Original has always been central to the neighborhood and has played a significant part in holding the place together through the years. From staying open all night as a sort of policing agent, to providing electrical outlets to blues musicians playing on the street, to funding the organization bent on preserving the neighborhood, the hot dog stand is the core of Maxwell Street.

The prominence of hot dog stands in the neighborhood is a result of the fact that Vienna Beef was located there and made its product, the Vienna Beef hot dog, available to entrepreneurs. The Vienna Sausage Manufacturing Company rented a storefront at 1213 S. Halsted after the success of the Vienna hot dog at the Columbian Exposition of 1893. By 1907, the company purchased and moved into the building next door at 1215-1217 S. Halsted where they stayed until the 1950's, supplying ready-to-eat smoked meats and sausages to the neighborhood stands. In the 1930's, in fact, the Vienna Company actively sought hot dog stand clients, selling them inexpensive meat in exchange for advertising of the Vienna name (Grove 1998).

Jim's building itself is important as a representative sample of the earliest building-type constructed in the neighborhood before 1870 and surviving the Chicago Fire of 1871. It is a frame structure, a complex of three connecting buildings (the rear one at 808 W. Maxwell was originally a barn for horses at the back). The building has undergone a series of alterations; a one-story brick addition in 1926, and metal siding covering the original brick and frame façade in later years are just two (Grove 1998).

This corner building and the business it houses are at the center of the neighborhood's fight with the university. Jim's is at the center of the battle geographically to be sure; it is apparently the most thriving business in the neighborhood, bringing auto and foot traffic at all hours of the day and night. Street vendors in the area say they would have no livelihood there if it weren't for Jim's. Every day, dozens of vendors patrol the area around Maxwell and Halsted, using Jim's as a central point. They mill around the counter area, selling socks, cologne, videos, incense, t-shirts, jewelry, and a variety of other things. Kimberly, who is blind, sells incense sticks to people waiting at Jim's windows for their sandwiches. As one vendor told me, people don't make a special trip to Maxwell Street to buy socks, but they do come there to get a polish or a pork chop sandwich, and they might buy socks in passing. Jim's therefore employs not only its thirty or so actual employees, but also by extension dozens of street vendors who benefit from the active street traffic that is only there because of Jim's Original. It is easy to see them as bearers of a centuries-old tradition of street peddling, and to hear in their calls the voices of their forebears:

> Somebody and everybody needs cologne.
> Cologne for the man.
> Cologne for the woman.
> Some do and some don't.
> Everyone wanna' smell good.
> Just like they knew they would
> Let it be understood.
> (Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition 1999)

Most vendors still make a good living there, and are hanging on to see what will eventually become of their sales area. They don't want to leave the

neighborhood, and don't know where they will go after they are excluded entirely by redevelopment.

The vendors, of course, are a large part of the reason the university wants to get rid of Jim's. The UIC has nothing against polish sausage, but they want the vendors and much of the regular clientele of the hot dog stand gone. The university motivation for uprooting this small business can easily be read as a desire to weed out "undesirables." Jim's Original is at the center of the preservation/development battle because for the people who want to save the neighborhood it has come to represent exactly what it is they are trying to save – the people, activity, urbanity, tradition, authenticity, and even seediness of the place. Certainly it is Jim's more than any other building that allows someone who knew Maxwell Street fifty years ago to recognize it today.

The significance of Jim's has not escaped the understanding of the city and the university. They see how central Jim's is to the neighborhood, literally and figuratively. It represents for them everything they are trying to change about the place. As the UIC repeatedly leaves Jim's out of any plans for the area, the Coalition becomes more and more sure of the fact that the university is not only trying to clean up the street as it currently is, but also that they are trying to change the public memory of Maxwell Street. Of course Jim's is inextricably tied to the neighborhood's history.

It is Gus Stephanovich, current owner of Jim's, who has kept the Coalition going financially, informally giving a few thousand dollars to a Coalition representative whenever funds are needed. Since he also owns the storefront next

door to the hot dog stand, it is Gus who bankrolls the arrangement which allows the Coalition's mini-museum and Rev. Johnson's blues music store to do business there, giving them a break on rent each month. Joe Stephanovich and his wife Guadalupe have been active Coalition members, attending meetings and protests regularly, and more often than not bringing boxes of sandwiches and fries for the group to eat. Fliers addressing the cause to save Maxwell Street are always stacked on the counter at Jim's or shoved in the brown paper bags in which the food is served to customers. Musicians use electrical power from Jim's, stringing cords across Halsted Street to the blues stage to fuel their guitars and amplifiers.

The Coalition has gotten behind Jim's by writing letters to city and university officials detailing the importance of Jim's to the neighborhood and the city as an historic eatery. All plans and all statements put out by the Coalition mention Jim's . When the Ad Hoc committee left Jim's out of their plans, the Coalition petitioned scholars of vernacular architecture to get ammunition to fight for Jim's and wrote letters to the committee pointing to the oversight. Not only is Jim's a visual reminder of the past, they say, it is a living history that preserves the smells, tastes, sounds, and sights of the past.

The Coalition has tried to convince the university that Jim's can work in their favor as part of the newly developed campus town. It could be cleaned up. The business could even be housed in another building. It could be a living history exhibit of sorts at the preserved Maxwell Street. Jim's, always a Maxwell Street attraction, could become a major draw for tourists to the new entertainment and historic district. It has been made clear to the university by the Coalition and

by Gus Stephanovich himself that Jim's is willing to work with the university and is willing to make changes – they just want to stay in business on Maxwell Street.

Just as the market did before, the vendors and businesses that remain on Halsted and Maxwell Streets constitute an alternative economy. The businesspeople there offer low-cost goods that are needed by the people who shop there. Century Fashions offers fashion for big and tall men at prices that cannot be found downtown. One store still sells zoot suits, a style invented on Maxwell Street. And at Jim's, a person can still buy a full meal – polish sausage, french fries, and a drink – for just over two dollars. The eviction of these businesses will effect the demise of this economy; when Eddie Bauer replaces Jesse's, and Starbuck's replaces Jim's Original, not only the shopkeepers, but also the shoppers, will be different.

The musicians too are still there. Most Saturdays and Sundays in decent weather, the blues is played at the corner of Maxwell and Halsted. Jimmie Lee Robinson, Frank "Little Sonny" Scott Jr., Jody Noa, Johnnie Mae Dunson, and Piano C. Red are regulars there, with others sitting in or playing a set or two.

Musician Johnnie Mae Dunson Smith is now in her seventies. She came to Chicago from Alabama in the 1940's and played drums for Eddie "Pork Chop" Hines. She has written over three hundred songs, including her most famous "Boss Woman," and has played on Maxwell Street for years. For her, Maxwell Street was a way of life and a way to make her living:

> When I came to Chicago, I was here for a little while and then somebody took me to Maxwell Street. That was in the 40's and there was a guy down there, they called him Porkchop, so he was playing the drums, so I was standing

> there looking at him and I said 'Can I play the drums?' And he said, 'No, you can't play the drums, you'll mess up this band.' Said, 'I'm not going to mess up the band. Let me play.'...so he gave me the sticks and I started playing the drums and he just looked at me and stretched his eyes and said 'My goodness!'...So I stayed down there, and I played on the drums there. And later on I got me a set of drums. And I started getting jobs....I had a hard time and many things said about me because I was a female drummer, but I didn't pay that no mind, I just kept on doing what I was doing you know, and I was able to keep a job and to survive without going into the welfare. (Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition 1999)

Dunson talks passionately about the place and how she wants to see it saved so she and others can continue to live and work and shop and play music there.

Jimmie Lee Robinson, "The Lonely Traveller," started playing the blues on Maxwell Street in the 1940's as well. Inspired by a musician he saw on the street, he bought a steel guitar at a pawn shop and taught himself how to play. His family lived in the neighborhood on Roosevelt Road, he went to schools in the area, and spent most of his life playing music on the street. Today, Jimmie Lee plays at Coalition functions and protests and on Maxwell Street on weekends. He is usually accompanied by Frank "Little Sonny" Scott, Jr. who plays a chain of household keys. Robinson has pleaded with the UIC to save the neighborhood, has undertaken a 60-day fast to make his point, and has released a CD titled "Maxwell Street Blues," the title cut of which has become the anthem for those trying to save the neighborhood:

Maxwell Street Teardown Blues

I'm talking about Maxwell Street, that's right
A place of many lives and many dreams

Since you've started with that wrecking ball
Our lives, our dreams have all began to fall
You've took our houses and our homes
Now there's nothing left for us to do but roam
UIC, that wasn't smart at all

You may be big and financially tall
But that doesn't mean that you can't fall
Once again, there's that wrecking ball
Now you want to take it all
UIC, you're not so smart at all

I remember when we used to go to the 12th Street Store
There was the Earvin, Bertell's, Leavitt's and Smoky Joe's
You may be big now and financially tall
But guess what, one day you may fall
UIC, are you smart at all?

I used to take my family shopping down in Jewtown
And walk down that great street known as Maxwell Street
Here it is again, that wrecking ball
Now you want to take it all
UIC, I guess you aren't so smart at all

Since you've started with that damn wrecking ball
Our lives, our dreams, our needs will continue to fall
The great history of this area, which one stood proud and tall
Guess what UIC? You've managed to destroy it all
UIC, I guess you're not so smart after all. (Maxwell Street Blues 1998)

Two church congregations in the neighborhood do not want to leave. St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church has a long and storied history in the Maxwell Street neighborhood. The current church building was constructed in 1866 on the corner of Twelfth St. (now Roosevelt Road) and Newberry Avenue, and the German congregation was moved from the building it had outgrown at Clinton and Mather Streets. The building was completed in 1875, but was almost entirely destroyed by fire in 1904, though the sanctuary and original altars were saved and

incorporated into the existing building by architect Joseph Molitor. In 1917, the entire church was moved thirty-two feet south to accommodate the widening of what is now Roosevelt Road; the church was rolled intact on logs (Grove 1998).

By 1925, St. Francis had become the "mother church" to Chicago's Hispanic Catholic population, and is still today the "National Parish for Hispanics." It has a congregation of over five thousand parishioners, the largest and longest-standing Hispanic congregation of any Catholic church in Chicago. The church has already been threatened once by demolition. In 1994, right after the market which surrounded the church on Sundays was closed, the Archdiocese of Chicago decided to close this church and demolish it as part of the city's plan to clear all of the land south of Roosevelt Road for university purposes. The interior was stripped of many original features, including the altar, stained-glass windows, and pews. Determined to stop the wrecking ball, the congregation camped out in the church during the record-breaking sub-zero winter in February of 1996 in unified protest of the demolition. It worked. The Archdiocese reconsidered its decision and reopened the church in April of 1996. The congregation regained the original altar and continues to restore and make improvements to the church. Three of the buildings -- the main church building at 817 W. Roosevelt, the rectory at 811-13 W. Roosevelt, and the church annex on Newberry Avenue behind the church – remain the property of the Catholic Church and are thus earmarked for salvation. The University of Illinois says publicly that it has chosen to leave this property alone in its expansion.

The Gethsemane Baptist Missionary Church is on Union Street just below the Dan Ryan expressway. The building was constructed in 1863 and has held religious congregations ever since. The Baptist church started in the building in 1934 and they want to stay in the neighborhood. Though the university says they will not destroy the church, Reverend Eric Roberts says the church was not informed of public meetings at which its fate was discussed, and that he has seen university maps of the area which do not include the church. He is also concerned that he and members of his congregation will not be able to live in the neighborhood once the development occurs.

Not only does Maxwell Street hold deep emotional ties to the past for many, many people, but the area to be cleared for the South Campus expansion is still today home to many – residents, vendors, musicians, church parishes, and thriving businesses with employees and regular customers. For these people, it is not only their memories and histories which are threatened; the university also wants to clear out their livelihoods, home spaces, public spaces, and networks of friends.

The Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition includes all of these people – neighborhood residents, business owners, vendors, and others – in its ranks, and attempts to represent all of them in its efforts. By "Coalition" then, I mean the group of people who identify themselves with the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and allow themselves to be represented by the Coalition's leadership. Though individual members are often identified, the

actions and views of those who act as representatives of the Coalition membership are sometimes referred to as actions or views of the Coalition in general.

The Coalition views anyone who has written a letter of support or attended a meeting or rally as a member, and so its membership count is in the hundreds; there are no formal membership requirements or procedures. Active members who attend meetings regularly and participate in projects and demonstrations probably number fifty or so, and are always urged to bring a friend or two to meetings and other gatherings. Members include musicians, residents of the area, merchants, academics, historians, vendors from the old market, students of UIC, and other people interested in, often passionate about, Maxwell Street.

The board of directors has fifteen members. In 1998 and 1999 this leadership of the Coalition was all white, liberal, and professional or academic. On the Board were two attorneys, two journalists, an architect, a structural engineer, five graduate students, one professor, one former professor, and a curator for the Chicago Historical Society. I was elected vice president, but then, because I was taking so many notes for this project anyway, my title was switched to that of secretary; I am still the secretary today. All of us love Maxwell Street. All of us have memories of it. But none of us on the board are merchants, or vendors, or residents.

Even with the professional, academic nature of the Coalition's leadership, the university and the city have had a hard time hearing its messages. Described in the press as "a truly eclectic crew of academics, musicians, architects, and students locked in a struggle with the UIC over saving dozens of old buildings"

(Pollack 1998d), "a ragtag group of activists, citizens and blues performers," (R. Kogan 1998), and "a quixotic crew of eccentrics trying to save what remains of the old market and its culture" (Pollack 1998c), the Coalition has been generally disregarded by decision-makers.

The Coalition includes members with all different base agendas, but the reality of the "Coalition" is that it is really run by one man, Steve Balkin, the secretary (and later vice president) by title, but really the lifeblood and energy force behind almost everything that is done in the name of the Coalition. Though others may be equally passionate about saving Maxwell Street, no one is as energetic and involved as Balkin. Because he is aware of how he is perceived by university and city decision-makers, Balkin has made several attempts to dissociate his name and face from Maxwell Street to some extent so that it does not appear to be a one-man effort. He makes every effort to get others involved and to give credit to others for projects and statements. He tries to get prestigious and mainstream, respected voices associated with the Coalition's efforts: "I think it is important that people see people other than me advocating for the district. Word will get back to the UIC that this movement is not just crazy Steve Balkin, but mainstream people are also getting active" (Balkin 1997b).

Steve is certainly the face and name most associated with the Coalition's efforts. He is interviewed on television and quoted in print frequently, sends out numerous press releases, and makes hundreds of e-mail and telephone inquiries a week to legislators, preservationists, filmmakers, and anyone who might possibly interested in helping the cause to save Maxwell Street. Balkin is always

completely overextended; his style is to act on every idea quickly and evaluate it later. He describes himself as a doer, quick-acting, and prone to guerilla tactics. In the fall of 1999, his approach was to use all ammunition the coalition has, to hit the university from all sides, hoping at least one bullet would hit: "I have learned that no one thing is going to win this for us. It is the cumulative effect of the work of many people and battlefronts" (Balkin 1999). An extremely gentle and kind man, Balkin uses analogies of warfare often when explaining his ideas for Coalition strategy.

Balkin, a professor of micro-economics at Roosevelt University, is described by himself as a "troublemaker" and generally viewed as an antagonistic wacko by university leadership. Not only is his message one they do not want to hear, but he also does not have the type of personal or presentation style that appeals to them. Outfitted in Save Maxwell Street attire (handpainted t-shirt, blue jeans, ballcap facing backwards, shoulder-slung bag of anti-university propoganda), he is not saying what they want to hear through his megaphone. His presentation manner is intense and frantic; it is deeply-felt in a way that makes people used to a more corporate style nervous. He does not wear a suit; he uses inflated, inciteful language; he has sloppy, handwritten presentation materials. Even his written messages are emotional and adversarial. All of this adds up to a presence which can be easily dismissed as inappropriate and unreasoned. If only what he has to say didn't make so much sense.

Coalition meetings were often very disjointed and unfocused. It was difficult to keep such a large group with such varied sub-interests on track.

Individuals would ramble on about their smaller and often tangential concerns, while larger Coalition-wide concerns would not get the attention they needed. One of the most frustrating problems was that most members would come to present their needs and concerns to the group, but very few would volunteer to head up efforts or committees or otherwise take action. This problem was pointed out at virtually every Coalition meeting, but persisted nonetheless. As a result of the frustration of long and unfocused meetings, the Coalition's board slowly eased into a pattern of holding meetings exclusive to the board whenever issues needed discussion. Board meetings are technically only required annually, but the calling of board-only meetings became standard practice for much of 1998 and 1999, when the battle with the university and the debate over specific plans was heated. The board would invite others to attend as needed to comment on specific issues. Meetings of the board were typically much more productive and focused, run by agenda, with people speaking relatively succinctly and usually in turn. The smaller group of people, all professional or academic and thus more like-minded and used to meeting protocol, was easier to manage for officers. Also, in the smaller group people were more accountable and tended to volunteer for more projects and provide follow-up on their efforts to the group.

Throughout the summer and fall of 1999, for example, the majority of the Coalition's moves were handled by Steve Balkin and another board member, Bill Lavicka, and jokingly called "The Bill and Steve Show" by the rest of us. Lavicka is a structural engineer who has rehabilitated old buildings on Chicago's west side for decades. He runs a firm called Historic Boulevard Services, lives in

a mansion on Jackson Boulevard which he personally restored, and has been salvaging and collecting antiques and architectural gems for twenty-five years. He built and still maintains Chicago's Vietnam Memorial. Bill has many friends and even more acquaintances at City Hall. He knows friends of the mayor, commissioners, aldermen, city engineers, architects, and the mayor's son, Patrick. He is gregarious, opinionated, and passionate about saving buildings on Maxwell Street. He is able to act swiftly on behalf of the Coalition because he knows whom to call and they know who he is when he does. He gets himself invited to city meetings, speaks out at all City Council and UIC meetings, gets packets of information to the mayor's office, gets columnists and preservationists to come to coalition meetings, and has strategy lunches with one of the mayor's closest friends. During the fall of 1999 Lavicka was in close contact with the mayor's pal, Oscar d'Angelo, and with Commissioner Christopher Hill, in order to keep constant pressure on the mayor. Because the university consistently points to cost as the main stumbling block to saving more buildings, Lavicka executed a cost analysis on behalf of the Coalition comparing the actual costs associated with the university's proposed plan to the costs which would accrue if the Coalition's preservation plan were executed.

The styles of these two Coalition leaders do not always sit well with all members, especially members who are more prone to thoughtful, considered, well-planned execution of strategy and to doing things strictly according to organization bylaws. When a few members started acting quickly and brashly and making public and sometimes threatening statements on behalf of the entire

Coalition, some other members became uncomfortable (though Coalition policy was decided to be that any member can suggest and execute any idea and anyone who wants to help can, but that all members are not required to support each and every action). Since Lavicka and Balkin act so swiftly and because they are the first two to respond to most developments, their way usually prevails. Because of the differing styles of the board of directors, there developed a sort of tiered approach to Coalition action, with general Coalition membership on the largest and lowest level, the ten to fifteen board members on the next level, and Balkin and Lavicka and at times a few others on the top tier. This set-up occurred because it simply became easier to persuade those of like mind and similar style to help with whatever favor or project one was proposing. So, as the situation with the university and city became more tense, the mood of the Coalition board did too. Things sometimes needed to happen fast, and as a result decisions were made by a few that upset a different few. Through it all I tried to remain objective, to not take sides, to just listen to complaints from whoever wished to share them with me. I was usually tempted to side with Balkin primarily because he was my main contact, and I was therefore most exposed to his viewpoints.

A liberal group, the board eventually realized what had almost unwittingly happened, that they had in effect *become* the Coalition, and had in the pursuit of more efficient meetings and more productive operations blocked much of the membership of the Coalition from information and involvement. They were adapting to a corporate model, and were manifesting attributes of the very model they were trying to fight against. It was decreed that "board meetings" would be

strictly once a year, and that even the words "the board" were to be used sparingly as they had become a euphemism for our group of insiders.

In an attempt to be more than just an outside, white, liberal, activist group, the Coalition set up a partnership with Rev. John Johnson, an African-American vendor and owner of the Bluesbus, a converted schoolbus painted blue, covered with graffiti-type lettering, and outfitted inside with racks of CD's and cassette tapes of blues music. Rev. Johnson was a regular vendor at the old marketplace and for a few seasons sold at the New Maxwell Street Market as one of its anchor tenants, parking the Bus at the corner of Canal and Roosevelt Road, the first vendor most visitors would encounter, and certainly one of the easiest to spot. The partnership started when the owner of Jim's Original Hot Dogs approached the Coalition about whether a vacant storefront next door to the hot dog stand could be useful to the Coalition in any way. Brainstorming about how to best use the space brought up renting half of the space to a market vendor or businessperson connected to the neighborhood at a significant discount (Jim's Original would absorb the rent loss), and using the other half of the space as a "mini-museum" for the Coalition. Rev. Johnson was approached and accepted the arrangement. He and his wife use most of the space for their business at a reduced rent; in return they man the store and answer questions about the displays, they allow the Coalition to have space for displays in the windows and on walls, and to have access to the space for interviewing or meetings.

The arrangement was stressful from the beginning. Rev. Johnson felt the Coalition was not concerned enough about his troubles and needs, and much of

the rest of the Coalition (Rev. and Mrs. Johnson are also members) felt that the Reverend was hard to deal with and not particularly reliable in terms of staying in touch and collaborating. Discussed in a tactful way, the Coalition's relationship with the Rev. Johnson was a topic at board meetings and all general Coalition meetings where the Reverend was not present. It was felt that the store was not a priority for the Reverend, and that the museum certainly was not. Efforts were made by Coalition representatives to visit the store on a regular basis and keep the Johnsons involved and informed. One Coalition member was assigned relations with the store and Rev. Johnson as his task, but even that relationship became quickly strained. Neither party fully trusted the other, and both believed they were doing the other a large and unappreciated favor. When police raided the Johnson's store early in 1998, the Reverend clearly expected restitution of his reported $60,000 loss of merchandise to come from the Coalition, which only offered sympathy.

Another attempt to diversify the Coalition was made when the new board was selected in the fall of 1999 to serve until fall 2000. Up until then, members had often bemoaned the fact that the board was so homogenous in terms of race and ethnicity, but had been unsuccessful or unmotivated in recruiting new members. In September of 1999 four new board members were added – one African-American woman, an orthodox-Jewish blues musician, a Latino man, and another white male. All were new to active participation in the group, and were expected to bring new perspective as well as diversity.

Participation of individuals within the Coalition ebbs and flows as we lose energy, get disillusioned, and have personal, family, and professional obligations. Even the collective energy of the Coalition has seemed to vary as the group tires after each big push; comments have often focused on wanting "closure," and on "getting a life" again after the fight is over. At other times members have disagreed with the official actions of the board, or with the manner in which they were executed. There are some instances of tension over which members are devoting more time and energy to the cause, and of individual members speaking or writing on behalf of the Coalition without consulting other members. Generally, though, the Coalition members respect and cooperate with each other. When interest seems low or tensions run high, e-mails are peppered with urgings to "keep up morale" and for "intragroup solidarity." For example, when one member changed the time and place of a meeting to accommodate another meeting with city officials, there were ruffled feathers about scheduling and proper decision-making procedures followed by another member's e-mail message that "We need to respect people's constraints and notions of process, but we also need to be flexible to act strategically to accomplish our objective" (2/24/99). Though coming from very different perspectives, each of us loves Maxwell Street, believes in the cause to save whatever can be saved, and virulently dislikes the actions of the university and the city to destroy the physical fabric and the culture of the place. There are often accusations that a member is "preaching to the choir," but Coalition members seem to love to get together to

bash the university and city and to discuss the wisdom of their shared vision for Maxwell Street's future.

Those who rally around Maxwell Street, diverse in many ways, are brought together by this place. These people, Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition members and sympathizers – the residents, vendors, business owners, shoppers, and others invested in the saving of Maxwell Street – are at the heart of this study. Though it is often the buildings and physical structures of the street which seem prominent in negotiations and protests and the statements of representatives on both sides of the issue, the battle is really over a human community which has come to be represented by the buildings, and which is being shoved aside to accommodate hegemonic plans for development and beautification.

On a more abstract, general level, this study also deals with the human consequences of this sort of development and clean-up for all of us, whether we live on Maxwell Street or not. I argue that it is not just the folks from this neighborhood who are affected, not just those who will become homeless and unemployed as a direct result of UIC actions, but that all of us suffer as beautification schemes like this are downgrading and homogenizing our lives. As more and more of our time is spent in places created and operated by corporations for profit and "entertainment," and less and less is spent in contexts where people live natural social lives, speaking, exchanging, and performing for each other, our society is bound to be influenced. In other words, it affects all of us to live in a

world that values places like Disney World and the Mall of America, but tears down places like Maxwell Street.

Besides the "Coalition," described above, other characters in this story of Maxwell Street include the "City" and the "University." The "City" is meant to include Chicago's mayor, members of the Chicago Department of Planning and Development and other related departments, and the Chicago City Council. Again, though individual city employees may have differing views about Maxwell Street, the actions and statements identified herein as those of "the City" represent official city of Chicago positions, and are thus best referred to that way.

And when I refer to "the University" or "UIC," the term is intended to be inclusive of the administration, the Board of Trustees, and the South Campus Development team and its hired developers. While sometimes certain university offices or officials or spokespeople are singled out, it is the "University" as a whole which is the opponent in the minds and statements of those resisting the UIC South Campus development. In the Coalition's battle with the UIC it has not seemed to make much difference who the individual university players are; for example, when Chancellor David Broski resigned in September of 1999[2], the battle continued with interim chancellor Sylvia Manning – neither the university nor the Coalition seemed to miss a beat. As individual employees and representatives have come and gone, the university's position on south campus development has remained basically the same. Public statements by university officials also refer to the "University" as a unified whole. While there is the risk of personifying the University with these non-specific references, I believe that it

is ironically the most accurate and productive, and certainly the most understandable way to refer to it.

The battle over Maxwell Street is complex. For some university representatives it is just about keeping and executing a job, about eliminating obstacles to a development vision for a progressive university. For some it is about clearing out and cleaning up a filthy, crimeridden area that amounts to no more than an eyesore and an embarrassment to a competitive urban university. To some members of the Coalition, the issues are mainly about displacement and unemployment on a very personal level, about how to feed and clothe and house themselves and their families once their livelihood is taken away. To other Coalition members, myself included, the preservation of Maxwell Street is also about larger, yet less personal issues, such as how to save the history of the poor and disadvantaged, the place of the Blues in American culture, displacement versus balanced growth, the role of universities in communities, the role of class and race in urban geography, and the importance of a sense of place for twenty-first century cities. Indeed, the situation at Maxwell Street opens out to many important and interlaced questions.

Many writers include references to the Maxwell Street neighborhood in terms of its status as a slum (see Wirth 1928, and Suttles 1968, for example), and its Jewish history (Eastwood 1991, and Cutler 1996). The most famous publication specifically about the Maxwell Street neighborhood is Ira Berkow's Maxwell Street: Survival in a Bazaar (1977). His is a chronicle of the street, based on his own recollections and interviews with Maxwell Street's most

colorful characters, and includes the immigration and life stories and personal narratives of many people who worked, shopped, and lived there. Alfonso Morales (1993) wrote his doctoral dissertation about the Maxwell Street Market just before its closing. His is a study of the market and vending there as informal economic activity; he looks mainly at the regulatory history of the market and at vending practices and organization. The study is based upon ethnographic research with vendors and upon Morales' own participation as a vendor at the old market. Elise Martel (1996) has written her master's thesis on the New Maxwell Street Market; she explores the legitimation of the market and its new bureaucratic organization, and examines how vendors at the new market are negotiating the changes.

My study, while it does cover the old Maxwell Street neighborhood and marketplace and the New Maxwell Street Market, extends the topics of these other scholars not only chronologically, but also by exploring both Maxwell Street locations and the process of change affecting them both as a whole, and as part of an overall transformation affecting the city of Chicago. In it I tell the tale of the continuing transformation of Chicago, Illinois into what Sorkin has called a "New American City," one which is ageographic and universal, obsessed with security and cleanliness, and which appropriates and reproduces images from the generic past to create an urban theme park of sorts (1992: xiii-xv). Chicago is becoming such a place as a result of attempts by dominant forces to clean, organize and reconstruct its public spaces. As places are sanitized, people are shifted and moved away to the margins with no plan for what happens to them,

and all evidence of authentic street life is hidden from the view of audiences who would not approve and upon whose favor the city's financial and reputational success depends. The University of Illinois at Chicago's plan to whittle the Maxwell Street area down to a few building facades and a nostalgic streetscape, and how such a transformation has been effected, is used as an extended example of how these changes occur. This study, related as a drama, tells the story of a process of hegemony; it shows how the UIC and the City of Chicago have imposed power to destroy a market and a neighborhood, and to replace them with a new, clean and controlled urban "public" space.

Many studies of urban development and descriptions of specific development projects refer after the fact to resistant citizen groups and ineffective protests (Frieden and Sagalyn 1989). These mentions are brief; the opposition groups are not really discussed, rarely even named, and almost never written about as the focus of a study. This study on the other hand documents a process while it is happening, while the fight is still going on. It looks at large-scale urban issues from the point of view of the involved urban dwellers and resistors.

In this document, I tell the tale of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition all the way through from its inception in 1993 fighting the closing of the old Maxwell Street Market, to its latest efforts in the year 2000, attempts to subvert the university's plans even as buildings are literally falling down around them. It is the ethnography of a group of people as they are buffeted about by powerful forces of displacement and beautification. I explore the politics of this seemingly new (but really very, very old) late twentieth-century urban aesthetics,

and more specifically the implications of this for the people of Maxwell Street. The study contributes to conversations about what kinds of places are allowed and considered tolerable in turn of the century American cities and which are not, about who gets to decide what gets dismantled and what gets created and how those forces are organized, about how discourse and form are used to effect their hegemonic vision, and about the people who get removed, hidden, and overlooked in this new American city space. The situation at Maxwell Street provides a case study through which to explore these issues. As we will see, it is the old Maxwell Street and its marketplace that are considered intolerable, the city of Chicago and the University of Illinois at Chicago who get to decide how the place will look, the people of Maxwell Street and its Coalition who get displaced, and the University's South Campus Development and "University Village" and its new residents and shoppers who will replace them.

This study is titled Saving Maxwell Street, and it is on the word "saving" that the topic really turns. For it is how different people and different organizations see the neighborhood's salvation that sets them apart from others who would constitute salvation differently. Does saving mean leveling the place, knocking everything that is dirty and decrepit and otherwise used down, to clear out the people and save the place from itself and the mess it has become? Or does saving refer to salvaging whatever is left, whatever pieces of history and memory and physical structure can be protected from the dominant forces conspiring to demolish it? Or does saving mean taking a small piece of what was there and preserving it as if under glass, keeping it safe and preserved so people can come

look at it? The connotations of "saving" are many indeed, and they are all implicated in this study, each representative of one view of the proper course of action for Maxwell Street and places like it. Though there is of course some overlap in the visions for saving the place, in simple terms the University of Illinois at Chicago and the City of Chicago view their plans as saving in the first sense, a *rescue* mission which will turn the area around, wiping out crime and dirt and unseemliness in favor of a neat and appealing campustown. The Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, the main resistance to the university and city, ascribes to the view of saving in the second sense; theirs is a mission to *protect* and preserve whatever they can of the area, whatever can be saved from attack. The third view of saving, that of *keep*ing a chunk of the old streetscape for viewing purposes represents a compromise between the two, and perhaps the ultimate "solution" to this late twentieth-century dilemma.

The different positions on how to treat Maxwell Street ultimately come down to aesthetic sensibilities and to differences in how people see the world. A person's position on Maxwell Street depends on whether that person values real buildings in their original spots and the humble histories of real people, or whether one prefers strip malls, new construction, and Disneyfied development. If you prefer Jim's Original to Starbuck's you would find yourself squarely on the Coalition's side.

The next six chapters are intended as a narrative of the "saving" process, while each chapter is meant to tell a specific part of the overall story.

Chapter 2 is mainly historical. It tells of the Maxwell Street neighborhood's past in order to emphasize the distinctiveness of the place. Such a description is important toward an understanding of why it is that people identify so strongly with and are so attached to their space. The chapter discusses the immigrant, migrant, blues music, and retail history of the neighborhood and open-air market. It moves on to discuss the role of the University of Illinois at Chicago and the City of Chicago in shaping the area.

Chapter 3 traces the transformation of the Maxwell Street Market. It details the move of the market to a new location and the creation of the New Maxwell Street Market, showing the change from a truly spontaneous, vendor-regulated marketplace to a supervised city project, a transformation representative of our transition to the twenty-first century. The central argument in this chapter is that a hegemonic process has worked to transform the new market to follow a corporate, bureaucratic model through changes in organization, an elaborate set of rules and regulations, and a coopting of vendors. It is about the process through which the New Maxwell Street Market has achieved legitimacy and become an accepted part of a cleaned-up Chicago.

As this is certainly a study of power relations and hegemony, Chapters 4, 5, and 6 analyze how power works in the Maxwell Street situation using a model for understanding the sources of power introduced by Beverly Stoeltje (1993). Her model identifies three "sources of power" – the organization of production, discourse, and the evolution of form. One of the components of the model is used as the basis for each of the three chapters. Chapter 4 traces the situation after the

move of the market. It introduces the dialectic of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and a coalition made up of the City of Chicago and the UIC, detailing key moves made by each in their respective organizations of production. Here I describe the forms of public protest, resistance, and subversion used by the Coalition, and the ways the university used its dominance to control the process and go through with its plans for its South Campus expansion. The Coalition's basic views, methods, arguments, and desires for Maxwell Street are discussed especially as they have been adapted throughout the struggle with the University of Illinois as the result of this hegemonic process. I examine how the Coalition has been coopted to a view of the future Maxwell Street as a quaint campustown and historic retail and entertainment district, a view they previously fought against.

Chapter 5 is about the discourse circulating on both sides of the issue, but focuses mainly on the discourse of beautification and displacement. The chapter describes this purposeful and powerful rhetoric using a model of four levels of discourse – from the discourse of urban fear, to that of Chicago's history of beautification and progress, to that of Chicago's recent Big Clean-up, to the discourse surrounding the battle over Maxwell Street specifically.

Chapter 6 traces the evolution of Maxwell Street's form and reveals the process of beautification and displacement evident there. Central to this chapter's discussion is the concept of power and how it can be seen in the form of the place and the progression of the removal process. I also show how the Coalition has manipulated the neighborhood's form to protest and subvert the dominant forces.

The chapter deals specifically with how people have been physically shoved about by demolition, and with how they are otherwise excluded from the area by the introduction and implementation of building plans which will create a quaint shopping district and university village.

Chapter 7 is the conclusion of this study. It reiterates the story of Maxwell Street and discusses the implications of its transformation for the people of Maxwell Street and for all of us.

We turn now to look at the history of Maxwell Street.

---

[1] Some of the Coalition's greatest success has come through its press coverage. We were masterful at getting coverage for the cause throughout the fight. We called and faxed and e-mailed reporters and editors for the two major Chicago newspapers regularly, and sent a barrage of commentary and rebuttal any time those papers presented the university or its plan in a positive way. We assembled lists of press people and their addresses and phone numbers, and contacted the appropriate writers with each message. Protests, rallies, awards, and blues jams all were used as opportunities to alert the press. Every move or statement of the UIC was used as a chance for a press release to counter the university and deliver the Coalition's position. Operating under the assumption that bad press makes the university nervous, the Coalition worked to give them as much of it as possible. The Chicago Tribune and Sun-Times published articles regularly, as did the UIC newspaper and a popular weekly called The Reader. Real Blues and Living Blues magazines did features, as did The Delta Snake Blues webzine, WGN radio, the bilingual newspaper Extra, Streetwise, UIC Neighbors, The King Biscuit Times blues journal, Chicago Flame, UIC's independent newspaper, Near West Gazette, and many, many more. There was a Saturday morning feature on National Public Radio, a feature on WBEZ radio, Chicago's public radio station, and a full edition of the popular television show "Chicago Tonight," all focused on the struggle over Maxwell Street.

[2] David Broski is now president of Bradley University in Peoria, Illinois. His administration there has plans for the redevelopment and clean-up of Peoria's Main Street near the Bradley campus.

CHAPTER TWO

A HISTORY OF THE PLACE

"Maxwell Street," "Maxwell and Halsted," and "Jewtown," are names used to refer to an entire neighborhood on Chicago's Near West side, to the outdoor marketplace which was at its center, and to decades of rich, colorful activity that occurred there. The Maxwell Street neighborhood can be viewed as the city of Chicago in miniature, as it has been shaped, just like the city has been, by forces of industrialization, mass transportation, immigration and migration, suburbanization, and urban renewal. The area has changed persistently over the years in terms of physical structure and characteristics of the people who occupy it.

However much it has changed, Maxwell Street has been credited always with retaining "a spirit of place," a "sense of those who had come before" (Patner 1995). It is often spoken of and referred to as something animate, as a being in itself. It is said to have created famous people, to have given birth to ideas and musical styles, to have resisted outside forces, to have survived. It is credited with motivations and feelings and thoughts. It is spoken of and cried over and fought for as a beloved aunt or lifelong friend would be. This tendency to anthropomorphize places because of a deep love for them is apparently common in poor urban neighborhoods. Orsi's study of Italian Harlem states that understanding this love of place, what could be "a sensuous love, an intense sensitivity to the sounds, smells, and tastes of the neighborhood, "is essential to understanding the groups who inhabit them" (1985: 47). Like those of the Italians

in Harlem, residents' memories of Maxwell Street are filled with references to good neighbors, shared celebrations, solidarity, and racial and ethnic harmony. As Orsi suggests, we must be wary of nostalgic distortions of memory, but it is also the case that these romanticized views guide people's feelings about the present and their behavior in it.

There is, of course, a wealth of literature on the subject of place. Much of it refers to "sense of place" casually; and "sense of place," like any overused term, loses some of its usefulness as it becomes cliched. Most who use the term seem to agree with Barbara Allen that a sense of place is "a consciousness of one's physical surroundings" (1990: 1). E.V. Walter thinks the idea of place is twofold; people must feel it and grasp its meaning (1988: 2). What both are saying is that sense of place is more than a rational sense of boundaries. It requires what Allen calls "consciousness" and Walter calls "expressive intelligibility," a holistic view of place. Both ascribe to a view of sense of place as individual or psychological, a view made popular in the literature of "place" by Yi-Fu Tuan (1977), who argues that a person's sense of place is a biological as well as cultural response to physical environment. Rooted in phenomenology, Tuan's view is that an individual's relation to space and place is based on human experience and feelings. In short, the "sense" part of the phrase dominates its meaning when it is used seriously.

Perhaps the exploration of place most relevant to Maxwell Street is that of Ray Oldenburg in his study The Great Good Place (1989), in which he identifies informal public gathering places as essential to community and public life. It is

his thesis that urban growth and development in the United States has for decades been hostile to informal public life, knocking down gathering places or otherwise making them inhospitable to discourage loitering, gathering, grouping, interacting – the very things that constitute sociability and community life. These places are called "third places" by Oldenburg; the first place is where we live, the second is where we work. As we are turning into a nation of gated communities, strip malls, and subdivisions, and other "nonplaces," as we pursue the collective goal of insulating ourselves from the collective, we are losing a sense of community, a sense of place, a sense of public life.

Third places function to unite the neighborhood, as ports of entry, as neutral ground, as "sorting areas" where people can find others with similar interests, as "staging areas" where in times of crisis people can gather quickly, as "offices" for public characters, those who keep an eye on the neighborhood, as a place where youth and adults can gather together in a relaxed manner, as a support group for the elderly, as a leveling, inclusive club without formal membership criteria, as centers of conversation and entertainment, as political and intellectual fora, as the place where members of the community can be located when needed. The physical structure of such places is typically old and plain, the mood playful, and the environment warm and inviting. Though Oldenburg seems to be thinking mainly of smaller, more intimate places such as beer gardens, pubs, cafes, and coffeehouses, he also looks at a small town Main Street as containing several third places, including the street itself, along its stretch.

Maxwell Street is such a "Great Good Place," and has been for 150 years. The exact location of the core setting has shifted over the years, but always the outdoor spaces of Maxwell Street, its sidewalks, corners, empty lots, and marketplace, have served as third places where the gathering of community members occurs – places, as Oldenburg says, "where the action is."

Though this portrayal of Maxwell Street as a third place may risk romanticizing it, it is important to again note that this is how many of its current residents, shoppers, vendors, and musicians see the place. This view of Maxwell Street is what makes people fight to save their spot in it.

Not only is Maxwell Street a geographical entity with boundaries and recognizable physical characteristics. The place also has a clear identity because of its history, its distinctiveness, its cultural forms, its people and their collective awareness of themselves and the place. When asked about their feelings about Maxwell Street, people almost always refer first to its rich history and the immigrants, migrants, and ancestors who came before. They imply that an understanding of the place requires a look at the people who have lived, worked, and shopped there over the years. People also talk about how different this place was and is from any other in the city of Chicago, how its identity is unique to the city. And certainly they talk much about the blues music that developed there.

We look now at the historical forces that have shaped Maxwell Street.

Immigration

Maxwell Street served as a port of entry for newcomers as early as the 1850's, becoming home to many immigrant populations – first Germans and

Italians, Bohemians and Greeks. When waves of Russian and Eastern European Jewish immigrants started sailing to America in the 1880's, most of those who found their way to Chicago settled around Maxwell Street in what Berkow has described as "a blighted garden of promise" (1977: 4), a ghetto about a mile square. The neighborhood and market have been casually referred to as "Jewtown" ever since. The neighborhood's history of immigration sets the stage for a rich folklore of the place, as immigration involves culture shock, the clash of ethnicities, the drawing and defense of boundaries (Orsi 1992), the adaptation of traditions, and often the foregrounding of ethnicity – all of which lead to folklore production (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1983a). Certainly it is central to people's stories even generations later to tell where their people came from and how they got set up in the neighborhood. Their immigrant status was a crucial part of their experience on Maxwell Street.

Crowded conditions in the neighborhood cannot be overemphasized. It was one of the most densely populated urban areas in the world. In the latter half of the 19th century, population in the area increased rapidly as railroads moved in to the South Side, as factories opened and their workers sought housing, as the horse-drawn trolley car system expanded, and as more and more immigrants came to meet their friends and relatives in the neighborhood. By 1900, approximately thirty to forty thousand Jewish immigrants came to this area; a survey from 1891 shows sixteen thousand people living on a mile-long stretch of Maxwell Street. Louis Wirth noted that in 1911 if the whole of Chicago were as densely populated as the Maxwell Street ghetto, the city would have thirty-two million people

instead of two million. Photos from that time show the place crawling with people – with apartments at the top of the buildings, stores down below, stands on the sidewalks, and peddlers in the streets. In every building, people were living as well as working.

Along with crowding came a whole host of problems. The sanitary conditions were primitive and ventilation in the homes was virtually nonexistent. According to Berkow,

> streets were mud; sidewalks were wooden slats with nails protruding. Garbage was rarely picked up. When the lungs of an overworked peddler's horse burst in the heat of summer, the beast might lie in the street for days, a feast for flies and maggots, before the fire department got around to dragging the carcass off. For every ten people, only one toilet was available. Three and four people slept in the same bed. One small, dank, dark flat might house several families. Ventilation in bedrooms was considered a luxury, or a curse, depending on how one withstood the stink from the stables and outhouses in the alley....The noxious odors from the alleys, the close and unsanitary conditions, the lack of light and air insured the maximum probability of disease (1977: 6).

Sweatshops and child labor were a natural outgrowth of such a very poor, overcrowded area. Located almost exclusively in the tenements, sweatshops employed anyone with the barest of skills to do sewing or cutting. Men, women, and children worked long hours in unsafe and unhealthy conditions for very low wages from their employers, who often were also Jewish immigrants a little higher up on the socioeconomic ladder. Hull House chroniclers (Jane Addams' Settlement was just up Halsted Street a few blocks) investigated the living and working situations and found horrible conditions and heartbreaking stories.

One reason for the density of population in the area was the Great Chicago Fire of 1871. The fire started on DeKoven Street in the barn of Mrs. O'Leary and raged for two days, leaving most of the city in ruins.[1] The Maxwell Street neighborhood is just south of DeKoven Street, and since the winds that night blew the fire north, Maxwell Street was untouched. As Chicago rebuilt after the fire, the population of Maxwell Street grew rapidly as people from burned-out areas settled there. The area was largely Jewish, but there were ethnic enclaves all around the extended neighborhood; within the blocks surrounding Maxwell Street could be found Greeks, Italians, Polish, Lithuanians, Scandinavians, as many as seventy different nationalities according to a turn-of-the-century Hull House survey (Zashin 1998).

These immigrants were extremely poor and had limited marketable skills. Peddling was a natural occupation for many as they already had experience with peddling in Eastern Europe. It was a job that could be started easily with little capital; there was no hiring process and a person could rent a pushcart and buy goods for a small amount of money. In the Maxwell Street neighborhood peddlers also had the advantage of being able to sell to their own countrymen, whose language, habits, and needs they understood and could successfully cater to. Because housing in the area was typically in two or three-story frame buildings with rear tenements and there was a system of alleys as well as streets, vendors and housewives were in constant contact with each other; shouts for goods could be easily heard, and doors easily knocked on (Eastwood 1991: 17-8).

Peddling in the area really began on Jefferson Street, a paved street with horse-drawn trolleys. By the turn of the century, Jefferson Street was becoming so crowded that peddlers gradually moved over to Maxwell Street and started concentrating their businesses there. In 1912, the city of Chicago officially established "The Maxwell Street Market," thereby recognizing the street as a market street. By then "Maxwell Street" included the permanent stores and shops along Maxwell, Roosevelt, and Halsted, and the open-air market of peddlers and pushcart vendors. Also permanent street stalls were put along the street at curbside with awnings running from the stalls to the storefronts to create a kind of covered alley where outdoor sales could occur in all weather.

Since most people did not own cars and could not afford to ride on trolleys, the market provided their main source of goods. Peddlers sold produce, bread, butter, and milk, fresh fish, dry goods, clothing, carpets and tapestries, notions, tinware, brooms, cookbooks, ice and coal, ice cream and nuts. They sold services such as fixing utensils and mending umbrellas. And they bought rags, old iron, and other junk from customers (Eastwood 1991: 19-21). Extremely crowded housing conditions provided peddlers with the customer base they needed to eke out a living and hope to save some capital to eventually move into storefronts and become shop operators or owners. Peddling around Maxwell Street provided immigrants with what Carolyn Eastwood has described as a "toehold on the bottom rung" (1991). In addition to peddling, there were jobs available at various levels in the market and in shops; as salespersons, as manual laborers, and in positions stocking, delivering, and otherwise handling

merchandise. Certainly the market and the shops in the area were the central feature of the Maxwell Street neighborhood.

As well as a place to make a living, Maxwell Street also functioned as a classroom for the immigrant. The neighborhood consisted of many diverse groups of people, most of whom did not speak English and had limited formal education, all coming to America from far away, poor, often rural places, and settling in this small and very crowded neighborhood. Maxwell Street and the Maxwell Street Market became very important institutions for these people, all unused to American ways, all trying to figure out life in this new place. For a newcomer, Maxwell Street was a relatively comfortable nesting spot because it offered them a chance to make themselves understood in their native tongues and to see people who looked like them and people who were similarly struggling.

With the motto "We Cheat You Fair," bargaining and dealmaking were the lessons on Maxwell Street. Shoppers and vendors learned quickly to haggle and negotiate for the best deals. It was a place where virtually every kind of good and service was available – clothing, household goods, tools, food, everything. The least expensive goods were on the street and higher quality and higher prices could be found inside the shops; the range of quality and prices made it so that anyone was able to buy something. The street offered a transition between European bazaar types of markets and American stores because it had everything from peddlers, to stands, to shops, to department stores. The market thus eased newcomers into American consumerism by starting with shopping experiences they were accustomed to, and leading them into mass-produced goods, new to

most, and thus a new way of consuming. Maxwell Street also offered an introduction to American styles and conventions of dress.

The ethnic and racial mix of the market changed throughout the twentieth century. By World War II, Jews who prospered left the area for residences in the newly developing suburbs or better city neighborhoods, though many maintained business establishments on Maxwell and Halsted Streets. At the same time, during the early decades of the twentieth century, African-Americans were fleeing the south for the urban north, many settling in Chicago and putting down roots around Maxwell Street. With Jews leaving and no more Eastern European immigrants replacing them because of new U.S. immigration quotas, the neighborhood became more and more African-American, and entered the next phase of its rich history.

Migration

African-American migration began after the Civil War, steadily increased over the next decades, and turned into a "kind of stampede" (Berkow 1977: 387) after each World War. In the 1920's, Chicago's African-American population increased from 109,000 to 234,000. Migration steadily continued throughout the 1930's. In the 1940's there was a huge jump in migration as 1.6 million blacks moved from the south to the industrial cities of the north to fill defense-related positions (Chudacoff and Smith 1975: 206). Jobs were the motivation for many; American cities were constructing and enlarging basic facilities such as streets, bridges, sewers, water and gas systems, and were in need of unskilled labor. Jobs were plentiful, and people came in search of them.

Many factors contributed to the popularity of Chicago as a destination. One factor was that during WWII, the Chicago Defender, the great crusading black newspaper widely read in the South, conducted a publicity campaign to lure southern black migrants. Chicago was also a popular destination because of the many jobs available in steel mills, stockyards, foundries, and food-processing and packing plants. And, because Chicago was the end of the Illinois Central line, it was easier to get to than Detroit or Cleveland if you were from Mississippi, or parts of Tennessee, Arkansas, or Louisiana. Also, Chicago's mayor, Big Bill Thompson, was welcoming blacks to the city, as he saw them as advantageous to his political career. Perhaps another reason for Chicago's popularity among southern blacks was the fact that it was home to a large race record operation and to Sears Roebuck and Montgomery Ward, two huge mail-order firms which supplied goods to rural communities throughout the south (Rowe 1975: 35) and thus acted to keep Chicago's name prominent in people's minds. All of these factors worked together to stimulate migration to the city of Chicago.

How did the people get there? The Illinois Central railroad, referred to as 'The Smokestack' by southern blacks (Berkow 1977: 387), ran straight through Delta blues country, almost a thousand miles from New Orleans to Chicago. The main lines between 1940 and 1950 went from New Orleans to Chicago via Jackson, Mississippi; from Greenville, Mississippi to Chicago; and from Birmingham, Alabama to Chicago. 'The Creole,' 'The Louisiane,' and 'The Southern Express' were the most popular trains with travel times between twelve and twenty-four hours (Rowe 1975: 32-3). At the end of that trip passengers

arrived in the new "promised land" of cement, tall buildings, noise, cold weather, and overcrowding, to begin an acclimation process which was difficult and confusing for many. One observer described the scene in Chicago like this:

> Men in work clothes, outmoded suits carrying battered luggage, and women clutching ragged, barefooted children crowded into the Illinois Central Station on Twelfth Street looking hopefully for a familiar face. Park Row – the little drive running from Michigan Avenue to the station – was solidly packed with people. There the migrants mingled with local Negroes who came down every Sunday to meet a friend or relative or just to see who had arrived. If there was no one to meet them, the newcomers seldom knew where to go. They might ask a Red Cap to direct them to the home of a friend – unaware that without an address the porter could be of little help in a city as large as Chicago. Or they might employ one of the professional guides who, for a fee, would help them find lodging. Some of the guides were honest, others were little more than confidence men. Travellers Aid and the railroad police tried to help the migrants and prevent exploitation; but for the newcomer without friends or relatives the first few days were often a terrifying experience. (Rowe 1975: 39)

Once they got there, migrants encouraged relatives and friends to join them by supplying them with information about wages and jobs. Thus it was that there were whole areas on Chicago's south side where everyone seemed to be from the same county in Mississippi.

During the early decades of the century, Maxwell Street offered transplanted southern blacks some of the comforts of home. It was a social center where people relaxed during time off from their jobs at nearby slaughterhouses, steel mills, and factories. Street vendors specialized in southern cooking, and blues musicians played on the sidewalks. Residents would hire out extensions hooked to their light fixtures upstairs, and guitarists would plug their amps into

the cords hanging out of house windows. Maxwell Street was in many ways the center of African-American life in early twentieth- century Chicago, the same function it had served for Eastern European immigrants in the decades before – commerce, a gathering place, the center of a community's life.

Henrietta Thomas came to Chicago from Sunflower County, Mississippi in the 1970's. She remembers it as welcoming because of its resemblance to home:

> The first time I went to Maxwell Street, my brother took my dad and I on the grand tour. It was like visiting a small town. The marketplace smelled of grilled onions and pork chops and all kinds of foods. There were crowds of people, eating, laughing, talking, some dancing. I'll never forget it. There were people of all races, going in and out of stores with flung open doors. We saw street vendors up and down the way, with their booths and tables filled with anything you thought you might want to buy....You could find things on Maxwell Street you couldn't find anywhere else. It was one great big carnival....It was like a little bit of Mississippi come to Chicago! My father and I walked through the street in shock. It was just like walking along Greasy Street back home....How was it possible to take a piece of the Mississippi Delta and set it down in Chicago. But, here it was! And just like being on Greasy Street, we ran into people who we hadn't seen since they left the plantation and came North. We met old friends, we met their children and grandchildren. Sometimes we'd just break down and cry and hold onto one another....I'll never forget how amazed we were that this place was waiting for us. In this big city, far away from home, Maxwell Street had preserved a little bit of what we held very dear. (1998)

This is not to say that the Maxwell Street neighborhood became exclusively African-American. Quite the contrary. Though the influence of Mexican migration on the market has been less well documented, the number of Mexican vendors and shoppers grew steadily from the 1920's on as Mexican migrants settled in Pilsen, the neighborhood just south of Maxwell Street.

Mexican migration was particularly in response to job opportunities in midwestern industry (Morales 1993: 23). Settlement in Pilsen allowed people to be close to jobs in the meat processing industry located in an area of Chicago known as "Back of the Yards."

Maxwell Street was and is continually hailed as a melting pot, a place where all races, all ethnic groups are accepted and friendly. Reminiscences of people who lived there are peppered with comments about the inclusiveness of the place, about how everyone got along, and how that was unusual in this most segregated of cities. Bishop Walker, pastor of the Gethsemane Baptist church and member of the Coalition, grew up in the neighborhood and remembers it vividly:

> We had almost on every corner some of your more well-known blues artists, they were here, and jazz artists they were here, and gospel singers they were here. You could get whatever you wanted musicwise, just keep walking, you'd find it. And the merchants of all types, you could get anything that you wanted in Jewtown. I remember as a kid whenever we wanted ice water we went over to International Harvester, they had a huge fountain there, so we'd all run over there and get a drink of water. Or we'd go in front of the general store, they had a big water fountain. And if we wanted potato chips, we'd go over to Jay's Potato Chips and they'd give us potato chips, and the Jewish market, they'd be making bagels, we'd stand out there and beat on the door 'we want some bagels!' They'd 'get out here kids,' but we'd keep beating on that door so they'd have to give us bagels to get rid of us. We'd go to the South Water Market for instance and we could pick up leftovers that they threw out, potatoes and greens and that type of thing, the fish market for instance, day old fish they threw it out, we'd be out there in the alley waiting for them, they'd come out and they'd dump that fish and we'd scramble for the fish and that type of thing. And merchants whenever they'd clean out the stores, swept it out, whatever was edible we'd get it. Watermelons, for instance, whenever they'd break one we'd be glad that they'd busted a watermelon so we could get it. And so much so that

> some of the richer people who came by and buy slices of watermelon, they'd only eat the heart out of it and they'd throw the biggest portion of it in the garbage, and guess who got it, yours truly, and was glad to get it. It was so much a part of life that no one poked fun at you for getting it. If the Jewish people didn't throw out food for us, at night, out the back door, in the alley, in the garbage can, I don't think we could have made it. (Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition 1999)

Suburbanization and Other Forces

Between 1950 and 1970 approximately five million more African-Americans from the deep South moved into central northern cities as the demand for unskilled labor in the South continued to decline. In these same years, seven million white people moved out of central cities. In Chicago, the white total dropped thirteen percent while the black population rose sixty-five percent (Chudacoff and Smith 1975: 113, 206, 256, 262).

This population pattern was certainly how it worked around Maxwell Street. Berkow claims that by the late 1960's and early 1970's the number of residents in the Maxwell Street neighborhood had dipped to fewer than a thousand, and that most of them were poor blacks or Latinos, as whites were now fearful of the street (1977: 27-9), particularly after the riots of 1968 following Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassination. The riots and their aftermath brought a tension to the neighborhood; this, combined with the fact that folks were already fleeing the area to live in the suburbs and shop in suburban centers and malls, signaled further decline for Maxwell Street. In the 1970's several of the established stores on the street closed down or left to set up shop elsewhere: Makevich's all-purpose store; Smokey Joe's, the inventor of the zoot suit and

innovator in pork pie hats and spangled suits; Gabel's, once the largest retail mens' store in the Midwest; Ja-Mar Jewelers; Dunn's Hats; Turf's Shoes (Berkow 1977: 526-7).

Much of the change in the neighborhood can be attributed to physical changes occurring in the 1950's and 1960's. In 1957 the construction of the Dan Ryan Expressway cut the market off along its eastern edge and forced it to move westward. In 1966 the area was declared an urban renewal tract and much of the neighborhood was bulldozed. The empty spaces left by this demolition were quickly filled by the market which took on a square shape west of Halsted Street. In conjunction with the demolition came the construction of the University of Illinois, which expanded southward and took up the northern edge of the marketplace.

By 1977 when Ira Berkow's famous book about the street was published, Maxwell Street was certainly struggling. In fact Berkow begins his book with the line "There is a sense of abandonment about Maxwell Street." Stores were boarded up and buildings in general disrepair. Except on Sundays, the street hardly resembled the colorful marketplace and immigrant neighborhood for which it had been known. Viewed from above, the neighborhood has been described as having "the peculiar gaping smile of a Halloween pumpkin" (Berkow 1977: 2), and as looking "like a bomb site" (Menchaca 1997).

But even in its faltering days, Maxwell Street is described as a survivor. When the old businesses moved out, new ones moved in, though many were

thought to not be as reputable as the old, established businesses. It was still a place where the community gathered, and still a place to hear the blues.

The Chicago Blues

> I was walking down the market back on Maxwell Street
> I was walking down the market back on Maxwell Street
> Lord, I'm talking about your wagons, talking
> About your pushcarts too.
> Because Maxwell Street's so crowded on a Sunday
> you can hardly pass through.
> Hey, hey – hey, hey, hey, hey....
> If you ain't got no money, the women got nothing for you....
> The Maxwell Street women gonna' carry me to my grave....
> I got the Maxwell Street blues....
> (Papa Charlie Jackson, "Maxwell Street Blues," 1926)

Besides their suitcases, these migrants brought with them the roots of blues music in the form of field hollers, work songs, spirituals, and ballads. When they arrived in the city they found less than ideal conditions as they received inferior jobs, housing, schooling, and health care, and were excluded from many white services and establishments. In Chicago, a musical form developed which combined Delta blues music with the new urban conditions – the urban, electrified blues.

The blues was perfectly suited to Maxwell Street, especially during its transition from a Jewish enclave to a primarily African-American one. Blues mix lyrics of "endless emotion-drenched commentary on the travails of love and living poor and black" (Ennis 1992: 28) with vocal and instrumental variations which are their musical counterparts. They are indicative of a "blues consciousness" (Hay 1992: 14) and often include quite subtle forms of protest. The fundamental protest embodied in blues music is a rejection of the dominant culture; "the blues

song's meaning as social protest and negation is undeniable" (Hay 1992: 19). Those who adopt blues music as their own, as speaking to them, then, are not practicing passive acceptance of their situation, but are instead taking positive action to create and/or appreciate a sound which represents rebellion and non-acceptance. According to Fred J. Hay, blues music was a "denial of white America's view of blacks,...a rejection of the culture founded on such views,...and a celebration of those cultural characteristics that were most different from and appalling to white American culture" (1992: 15). For people living in a world which denied them social and material equality, this music could offer an affirmation of individual and group worth, and a worldview which included emotional dignity and comfort. Maxwell Street was certainly a place where difference and opposition to dominant culture and the ways of the rest of the segregated city were celebrated. Both the informal marketplace and the blues music that surrounded it can be seen as forms of cultural resistance.

Though the new, urban music may have expressed the same basic themes as before – love, hard times, etc. – the lyrics of the new urban blues songs used different details, and incorporated new technologies to amplify the instruments and voices. As the circumstances of African-American life changed, the music changed as well. So the Delta blues tradition mixed with "new learning" about the city (L. Jones 1963: 108) to create the urban blues. The influence of the Chicago blues can be heard today in virtually every style of modern popular music.

While some of the more established artists or those starting to become known sang at clubs on Chicago's South Side, those who had just arrived or who could not get accepted at the clubs played to the largest audience in Chicago at the Maxwell Street outdoor market. Jewtown was the "meeting place for all the newly arrived singers and the centre of amateur blues activity of Chicago" (Rowe 1975: 47). Singers and guitarists would set up along the crowded streets of the market close to the houses and stores Halsted Street, the main thoroughfare, and later in an empty lot off Newberry Street, each Sunday and sometimes during the week. Cords for electricity would run out of storefronts and from apartments on second floors. Almost every blues performer in Chicago from 1920 on has had some connection with Maxwell Street: "The blacks have been playing music on Maxwell Street to entertain – and some 'to sanctify' souls – from the time they arrived in Chicago....Maxwell Street would become the most important area in the most important city for modern blues in America" (Berkow 1977: 390-1).

On a Sunday there were blues artists all over the marketplace. An article by Tom Swain (1975) describes a day in the life of one of these musicians, playing for five or six hours straight without a break so as not to lose the crowd. He describes the arrangement of musicians like this:

> There is plenty of live music out here besides us. Big John Wrencher and his group with Buddy Thomas on lead and Coot on drums set up in just about the geographical center on 14th Place between Peoria and Newberry. They've been here 15 or 20 years, I imagine. Blind Jim Brewer has his group...half a block east of Big John....On that corner they stick to gospel, everybody dressed up in their Sunday go-to-meetin' clothes....Blind Arvella Gray stands alone in the street just east of us with his National steel guitar and a paper cup pinned to his lapel....This year a new group, the

> Transistors, has arrived headed up by Melvin Taylor, who learned guitar from Little Pat Rushing. The rest of the group comprises various sons of the Mason family, all black and in their teens. They get down with blues backing up somebody like Maxwell Street Jimmy, or with soul on their own. Occasionally we see organist Bobby 'Top Hat' Davis with a drummer, but that's only happened a couple of times.

Many of the Maxwell Street blues performers became locally, if not nationally, famous. Edward "Porkchop" Hines, Daddy Stovepipe, Blind James Brewer, Maxwell Street Jimmy Davis ("Jewtown Jimmy"), King David, Hound Dog Taylor, and Blind Arvella Gray all played on Maxwell Street for years. Even Muddy Waters recalls playing Maxwell Street, though he did not like the weather or passing the hat for money (Berkow 1977: 393). Papa Charlie Jackson, Little Walter, Big Walter Horton, Othum Brown, Johnny Young, Floyd and Moody Jones, Snooky Pryor, Big Bill Broonzy, One Legged Sam Norwood, One-Armed John Wrencher, John Henry Barbee, John Henry Davis, Jr., John Lee Granderson, Little Pat Rushing, John Lee Hooker, Gray Haired Bill, Sonny Boy Williamson, Howlin' Wolf, Magic Sam, Riler "Ice Man" Robinson, John Embry, Shakey Jake, Bo Diddley, and many, many more are credited with playing the blues on Maxwell Street.

Hound Dog Taylor, famous for the bottleneck blues guitar style which influenced many rock musicians, started playing on Maxwell Street as soon as he arrived from Natchez, Mississippi in 1940. He describes the scene at Maxwell Street like this:

> You used to get out on Maxwell on a Sunday morning and pick you out a good spot, babe. Dammit, we'd make more

> money than I ever looked at. Sometimes a hundred dollars, a hundred twenty dollars. Put you out a tub, you know, and put a pasteboard in there, like a newspaper?...We were all down there. Muddy Waters was down there....Howlin' Wolf was down there....Little Walter was down there....I'm over there....And Jimmy Rogers, too. We were all in Jewtown. I'm tellin' you, Jewtown was jumpin' like a champ, jumpin' like mad on Sunday morning. And I had the biggest crowd there was in Jewtown. All them cats would beat me playin', but I, you know, put on a pretty good show. (Berkow 1977: 423-4)

Blind Arvella Gray played on Maxwell Street every Sunday and often during the week for over forty-five years. He first came to Maxwell Street in July of 1923 by following the circus from the South, and describes what he saw then (he still had his sight) as a carnival – all color, action, music, and people (Berkow 1977: 429). He lived in the area for a while and found work at a restaurant. After losing his sight and two fingers, Gray returned to Maxwell Street, bought a guitar, and learned to play and sing the blues.

Robert Nighthawk played on and off on Maxwell Street for over twenty-four years, and in 1964 recorded his album Live on Maxwell Street. He kept going back because it was easy to meet other musicians, and easy to get other jobs from there. Nighthawk, too, describes the scene as a lively one: "Mostly every musician in Chicago played on Maxwell Street at one time, including Muddy Waters. Back in the 40's why there'd be one band here, one across the street, and the one that had the best music had the most people" (1979).

James "Snooky" Pryor, a harmonica player, came to Chicago from Mississippi in 1940 while still a teenager, performing at the market for the first time in 1946 (S. Sharp 1993: 34). He claims to be the first harmonica player to

use an amplifier on Maxwell Street, having gotten the idea from playing the bugle through a public address system in the Army in WWII.

One of the most famous on the street was Maxwell Street Jimmy Davis, or Jewtown Jimmy. Described as a veteran of the old southern traveling minstrel shows and studying under John Lee Hooker, Davis came to Chicago in 1953, performed regularly at the market, and opened up a restaurant there. He would often play in front of the Knotty Pine Grill to attract customers (Whiteis 1994).

Honeyboy Edwards came to Chicago in the 1940's and brought a teenaged Little Walter with him. They played on Maxwell Street together, and both made Chicago home. He remembers his arrival like many:

> In '45, me and Walter come to Chicago. We had heard all about Maxwell Street – they called it Jewtown, too – and we wanted to go there because that was where the happening was. Musicians come to Chicago from everywhere then just to play on Maxwell Street. Because they could make a living there. We got in to Chicago about eleven o'clock that night. We got off that train and come straight down Halsted and over to Maxwell Street. Maxwell Street was all the time wide open and really crowded. At that time all the steel mills and slaughterhouses, packing houses was wide open. Everybody was working two or three shifts, people was working the graveyard shifts. There was always people out on the streets, the street was full of people of all kinds, blacks, whites, Mexicans, Jews. Lots of people had come up from the South to get a job in Chicago. And about seven o'clock in the morning I heard all these musicians playing in the streets. Floyd Jones was out there, Jimmy Rogers, all them was playing in the streets....they was all playing on the corners. Some of them was down by the hot dog stands....And there was so many people in Jewtown you couldn't walk the streets. (Edwards 1997)

What these artists share is a history of migration (they all came from the South during the early decades of the twentieth century and made their way to the Maxwell Street neighborhood), a love of blues music, and fond memories of Maxwell Street as *the place* in Chicago to play it.

There was even a record company on Maxwell Street, the Ora Nelle Record Company at 831 Maxwell. Bernard Abrams' Maxwell Radio Record Company only issued two records (by Little Walter and Johnny Young) on its Ora Nelle label in the 1940's. Many other record companies kept their eyes on the Maxwell Street musicians as well, sending scouts down on Sundays to hear new talent, and talking to Abrams about who was hot.

Johnny Dollar was an African-American businessman who owned Johnny Dollar Thrift Shop on Maxwell Street. He built a platform stage on the sidewalk and street. Musicians could come to play on the Johnny Dollar Blues Stage, and he would give them free electricity. Just east of the stage was the Johnny Dollar Catfish Stand serving fried catfish and southern cooking. The music drew folks to the catfish and to the goods inside his store. A scene from the 1980 film The Blues Brothers clearly shows the way in which blues music at the market intertwined with commerce; John Lee Hooker is featured playing guitar while buying and selling occur all around him.

It is really no surprise that such a flourishing blues tradition would evolve on Maxwell Street. In African-American life, music is functional and appears wherever life is being lived; and since life usually centers around business and economic centers, black music over the years could be found in the fields, next to

the cotton gin, in the general store, or at the urban street market. According to Sterling Plumpp, another Coalition member and professor of English and African-American Studies at UIC, in African-American life over the centuries

> music turned up wherever business was being done, wherever the economy was centered. Where you'd see a cotton gin, you'd hear music; in the fields, you'd hear music; at the general store, you'd find music. To African-Americans, Maxwell Street was like a big general store....the old general store of the South was resurrected on Maxwell Street, and for African-Americans, that meant great music had to be there too. (Reich 1994)

In the 1960's, as blues styles seemed to become more sophisticated, more standardized, Maxwell Street served as "a storehouse of the folk blues," according to Paul Oliver. There, Oliver saw "the life story of the blues singer on the streets," from wide-eyed kids falling in love with the blues sound, to young musicians, to old men who have played in the street for decades through Chicago's winters (1984: 170). The blues was still thriving on Maxwell Street despite its decline elsewhere.

Years after the decline of the popularity of blues musical style, the blues still played on Maxwell Street on Sundays. One of the last days at the old market location in April of 1994, the David Lindsey blues band played all morning and much of the afternoon next to an abandoned school bus. Lindsey has been playing Maxwell Street since he was a child (Reich 1994: 1), and calls what is heard there "the real blues." Such "hard-driving performances" are a Maxwell Street tradition, "as integral a facet of the market as the haggling that goes on between those who buy and sell Maxwell Street junk (Reich 1994: 3). In the last years, the blues performances were concentrated on a dusty, vacant lot near the

center of the market. There were typically two stages there, and music would be played to a hard-drinking, hard-dancing crowd all Sunday. Starting in the summer of 1993, musician Piano C. Red and his band started Maxwell Street Blues Festivals on a stage in front of 737 Maxwell. The concerts were free and were intended to draw business to the merchants along Maxwell and Halsted, and to "bring the blues back to Maxwell Street where it started from" (Sharp 1993).

And now, in 2000, the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and musicians affiliated with us hold blues jams on a handmade wooden blues stage on the northeast corner of Maxwell and Halsted Streets. Because the urban blues is such a crucial part of Maxwell Street's history, the Coalition has foregrounded the music as a primary reason for saving the neighborhood buildings; one of the Coalition's stated demands to the UIC is for there to be a permanent outdoor blues stage built in the new development. The blues jams are used to gain media attention and to emphasize the message that there is life on Maxwell Street. For now, the street's blues tradition continues, but this will surely not be the case for much longer.

The University of Illinois at Chicago

As we have seen, many forces have shaped the Maxwell Street market and neighborhood. None, though, has influenced the area's decline as powerfully and tenaciously as the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). Combining forces with the City of Chicago, the UIC started acquiring land in the 1950's, beginning with the demolition of Little Italy. After that, it turned its sights to the Maxwell Street

Market and then to the entire Maxwell Street neighborhood. Each acquisition has been resisted. In every case the UIC has prevailed and grown larger.

Taking Little Italy

The city of Chicago played a large part in the UIC's selection of its location at Chicago Circle. In the 1950's the University of Illinois decided it needed a permanent four-year college in the Chicago area and was looking around for sites of at least 130 acres to accommodate a low-rise campus with parking, athletic, and service facilities as well as academic buildings. They needed some land relatively quickly (to open a two-year program by 1963), enough land for expansion – and they needed it to be cheap. Sixty-nine different sites were initially considered. The university favored suburban sites because of their lower cost.

In April of 1955, Richard J. Daley was elected mayor of Chicago and the fate of the UIC was swiftly diverted from the suburbs; Daley wanted to establish a public university in the city in order to strengthen the central city area and his own career, and the university realized they needed the mayor's support to select and successfully acquire a site. In 1959, after making it clear they preferred a site at the Riverside Golf Club, the university received word from the mayor's office that if they would reconsider "the city would be willing to defray any extraordinary costs which would arise out of the selection of a site in Chicago" (Rosen 1998: 428). Thus, though the final selection decision remained with the university Board of Trustees, the city of Chicago became a major player in finding a site. University officials could now assume the same purchase price for

city land as for suburban land. And the mayor had to quickly find an acceptable and available site and to come up with the city's share of the money. The Real Estate Research Corporation recommended three city sites in its commissioned report: Meigs Field on Northerly Island just east of downtown, the railroad terminal land just west of Grant Park downtown, and Garfield Park. All had obstacles. A Meigs Field location was opposed by business firms and city newspapers, the railroad terminal land was owned by the railroads who were unwilling to sell or surrender their land, and Garfield Park was owned by the Park District who wanted to keep it.

In 1959, the mayor and his advisors began to secretly discuss the possibility of the fifty-five-acre Harrison-Halsted area, which was then undergoing a residential development project. Citizens in the area had set up the Near West Side Planning Board to plan and implement development in their area. Progress was already being made, though a developer had not been found. The mayor liked this site for the UIC because the city already owned much of the land and could get more nearby, and because substantial funds could be obtained under the federal urban renewal legislation. By August, the university, Hull House Board of Trustees, and the press were unofficially aware of the site selection. In September 1959 the mayor proposed the fifty-five-acre area plus ninety surrounding acres to the university. The university Board of Trustees was aware that agreeing to this site selection would insure the support of the mayor, city officials, and others; it was the politically wise thing to do (Rosen 1998).

Until that time no objections had been heard from aldermen, from Hull House, or from the Italian-American residents of the district who would be moved from the site when the university was built. In February of 1961 opposition did emerge from the area's women led by Florence Scala, who had been very active in planning efforts and with Hull House. Over the course of about two years, the group got press coverage, held public protests and sit-ins in Daley's office, and took legal action against changing the site designation from residential to university use. The group was not successful in getting support from influential leaders (they tried politicians, the Catholic church, President Kennedy, and the Supreme Court), and opinion about the university siting was split in the neighborhood. Hull House was appeased by the university's offer to preserve and reconstruct the original mansion and dining hall (though the rest of the settlement was to be demolished). The Catholic Church accepted the siting even though a church school would be torn down. Residents living outside the displacement area were ambivalent – they didn't want to be moved and they didn't want their friends to be moved, but they hoped the construction would ultimately be good for the neighborhood. Some objected to the nature of the protest efforts. Most felt there was nothing they could do to fight the city. During her fight, Ms. Scala's home was bombed, her back porch and stairway demolished, and her life threatened (Berkow 1977: 516).

The protesters lost, Little Italy, a neighborhood described as "the melting pot of melting pots" (Berkow 1977: 515) was demolished, eight thousand people were forced form their homes (Balkin and Mier 2000), and the University of

Illinois at Chicago Circle was opened in 1965. Today only the Hull House mansion is left standing (it was built in 1857); the remainder of the settlement buildings were torn down by the university to make room for campus buildings.

It is important to remember this displacement of thousands of working class Italian and Mexican persons from the Taylor Street area when the UIC was built as the university's birth also represents the birth of an institutional culture at the UIC, one that is based on entitlement and political might -- one that says it is progress to destroy communities in order to gain land and prestige. The UIC's initial battles with community residents of Little Italy set up a pattern of confrontation and resentment which has continued each time the university wants something. They display an "us against them" mentality which leads to secrecy and unaccountability in their endeavors. It has been reported by several Coalition members and sympathizers that the milieu at the University of Illinois at Chicago is not one open to negative views of the administration, especially on the issue of the south campus development. Faculty are often nervous about expressing opposing views, and most UIC affiliates will only speak off the record. Says one Coalition member, a graduate student at UIC, "I know that a lot of the faculty in my department are supportive of me, but wouldn't ever think about talking negatively of the UIC administration. The intellectual climate at UIC is clearly tinged with an element of fear" (Marmer 1998a).

The fact that the elder Mayor Daley viewed his role in UIC's placement as one of his greatest mayoral accomplishments certainly has bearing on the younger Daley's involvement in UIC expansion almost forty years later. The Daley legacy

is intertwined with the success and growth of the university, and this has undoubtedly influenced the current mayor Daley to favor the UIC in his thinking about Maxwell Street.

Taking Maxwell Street

The younger Daley, Richard M., came to the aid of the UIC in its next acquisition attempt. He hated the Maxwell Street Market and was eager to move and regulate it – to clean it up as part of his overall clean-up plan for the city.

In 1990, the UIC announced its plans to buy land south of Roosevelt Road from the city, to evict the outdoor market, and to clean up the land. Their plan past the market's removal was vague at best, but clearly included demolition and new construction in the historic retail neighborhood, "in the neighborhood of people with the least resources to defend themselves" (Balkin and Mier 2000).

At the same time as the purchase of land from the city, the UIC was also hard at work acquiring buildings in the area. Without informing owners of the stores of future plans for their removal, the university began approaching business and building owners about selling and getting out. They were offered deals for their property, and threatened with eminent domain if they refused. Rumors were rampant: some chose to cling to visions of a remodeled shopping area or mall along Halsted; some sold out quickly in order to get as much from their property as possible; and others have hung on, have decided to stay as long as possible, some with hopes of being included in the university's development of the area.

Nate Duncan was one of the merchants who decided to sell early. For forty-nine years 807 W. Maxwell St. was home to Lyon's Delicatessen (and for

the eleven years before that the family business had been located on Jefferson Street in the same neighborhood). Then, in 1973, Ben Lyon and his wife retired and handed over the keys and ownership of the Jewish kosher deli to Nate Duncan, an African-American who had worked in the deli for twenty-five years, since he was a child. Nate changed the name of the business to Nate's Delicatessen, but most everything else remained the same. His sister, brother, and mother worked in the restaurant which served the best matso balls, kosher dills, gefilte fish, chopped liver, and schmaltz herring in the city of Chicago; Nate had been taught how to make it all by Ben Lyon's mother, and he kept the recipes secret from curious patrons who begged for them.

Though it was tough for a black family in a Jewish deli, Nate managed to keep most of the customers from the days when it was Lyon's, and his good-natured, friendly ways made Nate's a homey, neighborhood hangout with a close-knit group of patrons; the motto was "You're only a stranger once" at Nate's. At six o'clock most mornings a group of locals calling themselves "The Pumpernickel Gang" met in Nate's for breakfast and conversation and to celebrate birthdays and other happenings in the members' lives. Nate recalls a lot of "beautiful people" and how "things like that, people like that, made it good" (Berkow 1977: 399). In the back of Nate's was an empty lot with a large tree called the Blues Tree where musicians would come to play. Beside the tree sat a bus known as the Bluesbus. And until 1976 Irv Gordon, the market's last market master had his "office" at the third and last table in Nate's. Nate's Deli was used

as the Soul Food Café in the film The Blues Brothers. In that movie, John Lee Hooker and Big Walter Horton played the blues in front of Nate's.

Under pressure and with regrets, Nate sold the building to the University of Illinois in 1992, and signed a three-year lease which expired on January 31, 1995. The last day of business at Nate's Deli was January 15, 1995. On that day, hundreds of loyal, longtime customers came by for a corned beef sandwich or a cup of coffee and to wish Nate and his family well, to send them off. By then, Nate's business had really been killed by the closing of the outdoor market, and he was eager to get out. Many other business owners saw the closing of Nate's as the final blow to the area. The guardhouse to UIC's parking lot #16 was built on the site of Nate's Deli.

As the university acquired buildings, it demolished them. In a three-year period from 1990-93, the university managed to buy and raze seventeen buildings in order to erect fences and bank the land for future construction. Some of the buildings were torn down before the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency could inspect and document them as required by state law. The documentation of those buildings "just kind of fell through the bureaucratic cracks," according to a UIC spokesperson (Sloan 1993). Other buildings bought by the university remain standing, but are unused, unproductive, and often filthy and decrepit.

One move seen as particularly aggressive by merchants there is the message sent by the elimination of the market that the entire area is gone. When the city shut down the area and moved the marketplace, and when they celebrated the move of the market in the press, and when they put up banners about the new

market's opening day, they effectively sent the message out to shoppers and citizens of Chicago that the entire Maxwell-Halsted area had been destroyed. Merchants reacted by standing out in front of their stores to let customers know they were open, and by putting signs in their store windows: "We are here to stay. We're not moving. Only Sunday flea market is moving," one sign read. The merchants got together and commissioned banners to hang along the street which read "We're Here to Stay – Halsted/Maxwell Discount Shopping Center." They insist the city and the university have made the transition very difficult for them purposely. They say city services like garbage pickup and police protection have been cut even further than before. To them, it all seems like part of a plan to eliminate them next. The university can only confirm the merchants' suspicions, saying their development plans do include acquiring all the buildings in the area.

The university has spent decades in pursuit of its expansion goals. They have focused on gaining political support from the mayor and aldermen, and have approached community group leaders and professionals in the area to convince them of the strength of their vision. It is said that university employees who don't share the vision are gotten rid of or left out of the information loop. An investigative study by Carolyn Eastwood (1995) revealed that within the city too administrators and employees who were sympathetic to saving the market and/or the neighborhood have been silenced or let go. Others would not talk to Eastwood or denied knowing anything about the situation at Maxwell Street.

The history of Maxwell Street is rich and multi-layered. It can be separated rather simply into phases of immigrant, Jewish, African-American, and Latino occupation, though of course the edges of these are fuzzy, and ultimately as the old saying goes, at Maxwell Street "the only color that matters is green." The neighborhood created a thriving retail district, a world-famous outdoor market, and a distinctively American musical genre. People's memories of Maxwell Street are peppered with historical references – to the Jews, the Blues, the market, the UIC. Maxwell Street is, of course, many things to many different people, but it is invariably talked about as distinctive.

Maxwell Street's most unique component, of course, was its market. It is to the Maxwell Street Markets, old and new, that we now turn.

---

[1] Legend has it Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicked over a lantern in the barn to start the fire. Recent legal efforts, some comical, some serious, have attempted to clear the O'Leary name and the cow from blame by blaming the fire on a neighbor. In the summer of 1999, Chicago drew hundreds of thousands of tourists with a city-wide display of fiberglass cows titled "Parade of Cows," a tribute to the stockyards and to the infamous O'Leary cow.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MAXWELL STREET MARKET

> This is not a polite suburban flea market in a church parking lot where precious antiques and favored bits of junk are sold on card tables behind the tailgates of a dozen station wagons. Maxwell Street was always rough, always shouting, always cheating and lying, always jostling, always reeking of the odor of a hundred old buildings and piles of old clothes and Vienna Sausage Co. hot dogs steaming on the grills. Maxwell Street was never on the tour-bus-list of places to see. It has squatted for a century in the shadows of the rising buildings of the Loop like a bag lady asleep in the doorway of a grand hotel. (Granger 1982)

Peoples' memories of the historic Maxwell Street market typically follow a pattern – the weird stuff they saw, the variety and oddity of the merchandise, the mosaic of people and sounds and smells, the bargains and rip-offs to be had, the brushes with danger. This is what people tell me when they reflect on their experiences at the market. And this is what I remember from my own experience as a shopper and observer there. Since the old market no longer exists, these memories can be described as "after images" (Porteous 1971: 159) of the place. People retain mental maps of the place which are then projected onto their ideas about present realities (Warshaver 1983: 169). For some, a romantic view of the old market biases them toward a negative view of the market's move and the UIC's development of the area. For others who remember mainly the filth and crime, the New Maxwell Street Market is progress.

This chapter describes the old marketplace and its organization, and traces its move and its transformation to a "legitimate" and rationalized, clean and regulated market based on established, mainstream, hegemonic models. The change provides an exquisite example of how alternative places are altered and

made tolerable by the powers-that-be. This is a process by which those in power first organized the production of decay and uncleanliness at the market, then created a discourse emphasizing dirt and the temporary or transitory nature of the place. The production of dirt and the rhetoric about it were mutually reinforcing – so that what was created was a rational, naturalized transformation of the market.

The Maxwell Street Market changed a great deal over the decades since its inception in 1912. But it was always bustling. Ira Berkow recalls "the casual and regular but always unexpected encounters with the bizarre, the queer, the extraordinary, the wondrous" on Maxwell Street. He vended there starting at age eleven and still recalls vivid details like the women's nylon stockings he sold in cellophane bags, the "odd and exotic" coffee shop, the several hot-dog stands and their smells, the king of the hoboes, the horse that could write numbers on a chalkboard, a one-man band, a man with a dancing chicken, the pretty Gypsy girl, black minstrels, the three-card monte man, and the kind man named Alexander who taught him the hambone (Berkow 1977: 15-7). Descriptions of Maxwell Street consistently emphasize its carnivalesque nature.

Over the years, the market resisted many outside forces, and even in its last days at its historic location showed a vitality unparalleled in any other commercial district in Chicago. It still sprang to life every Sunday before dawn with vendors selling just about anything a person could imagine; produce, prepared foods, religious paraphernalia, plants, rugs, household products, cars and car parts, tools, furniture, and tons of miscellaneous treasure:

> The socks stand opens. The panties stand opens. The Spanish tapes and records stand opens. The wig stand sprouts. A black

> man with a small truck unloads buckets filled with ice and dead fish...At another stand, actual heads of pigs with great snouts glare from inside bloody plastic bags. There is a plastic flowers stand. A garlic stand. Old shirts, one with one sleeve; and old pants; and old steam irons, one without a handle, and old shoes without laces. There is a fringed lamp shade which looks half-eaten. Crystal chandeliers are strung between two poles on coat-hanger wire. Tires lay flumped in heaps on a curb. A screech of live chickens. A quack of ducks. A roach-killer stand. Used toothbrushes. An assortment of old toilet bowls, some cleaned, and hubcaps, some not dented. Rusty saws. Dogs barking. Good antique clocks. Oranges and lemons and apples and grapes and cabbages and grapefruits piled up. There are hundreds of stands. (Berkow 1977: 24)

Up until the end, businesses on Maxwell itself and along Halsted from Roosevelt to Maxwell were still active, most open for business seven days a week. The market itself covered eight city blocks just west of Halsted Street, and featured all different types of displays; covered spaces with awnings or tents, decorated vehicles, neat displays on tables, merchandise laid out on the sidewalk. The vendors had regular customers who relied on them for inexpensive goods. A typical low-end vendor made $100-250 a week selling household items such as cabinets, mirrors and furniture picked up from North Shore alleys. A seller of odd lots of new merchandise, such as tape measures, locks, and tools could make $350-400, according to an unofficial study by a group called "Friends of the Market." While there were not formal divisions, the market seemed to be separated into departments of sorts – an auto section along Halsted Street at the market's edge, a food section to the south, and a middle section for everything else. The market managed to draw shoppers from the suburbs and tamer areas of the city with its historic name, stories of its past, and rumors of its good deals, larcenous goods, and seedy side.

In its last few decades of existence, the market was surrounded on all sides – by train tracks on the south, the Dan Ryan expressway on the east, public housing on the west, and the University of Illinois on the north. And there it continued to thrive, springing up each Sunday despite forces trying to drag it down. The vendors allocated access to space internally and informally, though they did not own the land. They developed indigenous solutions to set-up and management problems, often independently of authorities, if not in defiance of the law itself. Through indifference to attempts at formal control by the city and the police, and through indigenous solutions to market set-up, and through alternative property arrangements, vendors were for years able to exercise some control and to subvert (or at least resist) the larger, dominant power structures in minor ways. The vendors' resistance to the authoritative images of the city and the university could be seen in the sprawling, messy, haphazard set-up of the space each week. Every Sunday, the vendors set up shop, creating for a few hours an alternative or oppositional image of the city. This use of public spaces was subversive as it transformed an area of land owned and neglected by the city into a thriving, egalitarian system of bartering, music, and bodies. This weekly "folk imprint on the built environment" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1983: 195) or entrepreneurial anarchy persisted for years as the university made plans for its own use of the land.

Alfonso Morales' 1993 study of the Maxwell Street Market discusses the market's social order and informal structure in its last days at Maxwell and Halsted. The organization of the market changed over the years as the city

became more or less involved in regulation of the place; the market evolved as the city alternately ignored, heavily regulated, and retreated from it, and different forms of power were executed by different groups involved in the market. Morales argues that the vendors resistance to formal structure and their view of it as illegitimate stem directly from the history of the city's attempts at regulation and formalization.

The history of regulation at the Maxwell Street Market goes roughly like this. Before 1912, Maxwell Street was certainly a market street, but was unregulated by the city. In 1912, the city of Chicago officially recognized the "Maxwell Street Market" and attempted to alleviate unemployment and cost of living problems through the creation and maintenance of public markets (Morales 1993: 30-1). At this time, the city also imposed a system of regulation which empowered a "Market Master" to administer the market. The market master was to collect a small fee each week from each vendor (somewhere between ten and seventeen cents), assure that ordinances regulating the sale of food be observed, maintain peace and orderliness, and keep the market clean and free of snow. Trailed by two police officers, the market master made his rounds each Sunday morning and collected fees from the vendors; keeping a good relationship with the market master was crucial to good placement and thus success at the market, and a good relationship depended on paying him what he wanted. Some paid a couple dollars, some much more; people were exploited or shown favor depending on the market master's whim. The market master's power came from his legal ability to impose fines or have people arrested. Though they were never sure how much he

would demand in payment on any particular Sunday, vendors liked the assurance that the market master would make sure the regulars got their regular vending spots. The social order, though ruled by one man, was stable. The attainment of a stable vending space, the most important transaction in a vendor's market day, was assured.

Graft and corruption are mentioned every time the market master is; in print this is true, and in my interviews with vendors and market organizers, the corrupt nature of the market master system was alluded to and talked about "off the record." The first accusations of graft came in 1921, and in 1926 reports before the city council estimated graft to be at $250,000 per year. Reports of corrupt behavior were attached to ward aldermen or political bosses, to the market master, an appointee of the mayor, and to the police officers who patrolled the market (Morales 1993: 43-4). In The Ghetto, Louis Wirth described the market's corruption problem this way:

> The Maxwell Street market has been a hotbed of local politics and graft. Rival political leaders vie with each other for control of the administration of the market. The street vendors frequently complain of extortion by politicians. Since it is very difficult to organize the Maxwell Street Merchants because of the many feuds and factions and the extreme individualism of the community and their village attitudes, it has been easy for politicians to build up a system of private patronage and 'protection.' (1928: 238)

In short, the regulations intended to make vending at the market a viable employment option instead opened up the gates to political patronage and graft. Because so much money was to be made at the market, vendors put up with the corruption for the most part.[1] Accusations and rumors of corruption continued until the system of regulation was changed in the 1975 City Code of Chicago.

The last market master died in 1973 and the position was not filled. The 1975 ordinances established licensing fees of $25 a year for vendors, raised fines for ordinance violation to $250, and made no mention of a market master to run the place. The era of the market master came thus to an end. In effect, all outside organization of the market came to an end as well, as no authority was established to take over the market master's jobs. It was not specified how the market would run, how spaces would be allocated, or how violations or disagreements would be handled by the police.

The city established a "first come, first served" rule for space allocation, but such a system did not work at Maxwell Street. In fact it completely ignored the realities of the market: it was often impossible to establish who arrived first and fights were bound to erupt, the police did not arrive at the market until long after most vendors, some vendors had had their spots for decades, and most vendors needed and already used more than one space for their goods. The city's attempts at regulation were ambiguous, unrealistic, and unevenly enforced. The city had basically abandoned the market and left vendors to organize themselves and structure a new social order without an ordained leader (Morales 1993: 52-5).

And that is exactly what they did. Disillusioned after decades of insufficient ordinances, graft, corrupt officials, and city ignorance of their needs, the vendors lost respect for city regulations and authority figures, and established a "culture of indifference toward government" (Morales 1993: 14). In the end, the form of the market became one of self-organization and self-administration, and vendors became ambivalent toward unrealistic city ordinances. They

separated themselves from the regulatory structure, and handled the organization of the market and the allocation of vending space themselves using a system of custom, seniority, payment, kinship, reciprocity, and interpersonal relationships. Borders, though not legal, were recognized by all vendors as stable and legit.

Through all the changes, vendors have remained loyal to the market itself, many vending there for decades, through two or three generations. Vendor Tom Okrie has deep ties to the market. Starting when his sons were young boys, Tom would bring them to the market on Saturday nights around midnight and they would all sleep in the back of the van with their merchandise until it was time to set up their rented tables and get their display ready for early marketgoers: "I'd go down there at midnight, I'd sleep, I had a fourteen foot box van and I would lock the front up and my kids and me would sleep in the back. Sometimes the back would be full, so I'd take something out and crawl in the back and lay down and put the door down maybe where I could see." According to Tom, the entire family has great memories of the old market: "[the market was] the greatest thing in the world to teach kids about what life is." One son later took the space right next to Tom, and paid for his own college education from his work at Maxwell Street on Sundays. Now an accountant in the suburbs, he still comes to the market frequently when "he wants to bring his old snowblower down and get rid of it or something" (Okrie 1998).

While the focus has been on vendors, regular shoppers were committed to the market as well. A study by Eastwood shows that customers had been coming to Maxwell Street for an average of twenty-one years. Half of them came every

Sunday; another twenty-five percent shopped once or twice a month. Many came in two and three-generation family groups (Eastwood 1995). On an average Sunday, the market would draw as many as twenty thousand shoppers.

Moving the Market

For years the closing of the Maxwell Street Market seemed imminent. Since its official designation as a market in 1912, it was repeatedly buffeted about and reduced in size. Even its physical structure told of its decline. The sprawl of the market, for instance, showed its relative lack of power. It was wide and messy, littered, and seemingly unorganized, compared to the skyline of the city of Chicago, with the Loop buildings jutting toward the sky. Visible from the market, downtown is crisp and neat and vertical, with a sense of corporate and civic power. Even closer to the market was the University of Illinois at Chicago campus, fortress-like and full of strong, rapidly-multiplying buildings. This "spatial articulation of values" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1983: 189), the city and university juxtaposed with the market and neighborhood, made it easy to see which would eventually dominate the land.

Markets have long been the target of rationalizing forces, administrations, and officials. They are attacked in a particularly vehement way by those who seek to create clean, legitimate, corporate spaces and attractions. The attack of them seems out of proportion to their political or economic might. Though typically populated by social categories with relatively little power – women, ethnic minorities, the poor – markets present a challenge to the modern political economy and to the corporate sense of order and progress. The exuberance, the

crowds, the carnival and festival features of the market described in Bakhtin's study of Rabelais (1984), worry authorities and call out for control. And as economic sites, markets represent a way of doing business which stands in opposition to the dominant "marketplace." Since the Middle Ages, says Bakhtin, the marketplace has been "the center of all that is unofficial; it enjoyed a certain extraterritoriality in a world of official order and official ideology, it always remained 'with the people'" (1984: 153-54). It is what markets stand for as ideological and oppositional spaces that makes them targets of social control forces.

In the 1980's, the university started feeling out possibilities for acquiring land all around its edges. Its plan included acquisition of most of Chicago's near west side, including the Maxwell Street area. Though other parties, namely the South Water Market Association, the city's produce market, and Mark IV Realty Inc., expressed interest in the land, the university requested and gained a freeze on all sales of land in the area until they decided what to do. During this period they also purchased, in the form of secret land trusts, much of the surrounding real estate, leaving only a small part of the urban renewal tract called the Roosevelt-Halsted Commercial District owned by the city ("UIC's Unconvincing Case" 1993).

In 1990 the UIC announced plans to acquire all the land south of Roosevelt Road, the entire Maxwell Street market and neighborhood. Calling the market a "poor use of available land," and "not a proper use of tax dollars" (Sharp 1993), university spokespeople laid out their Master Plan, which included

possibilities for building new police headquarters, a motor pool/vehicle maintenance facility, a telecommunications structure, a science and engineering facility, and a new stadium. An attempt to list a group of buildings to symbolize the social control agenda of the university could not be scripted better. The police headquarters as the symbol of law and order, the telecommunications tower as the ultimate symbol of mediation for our highly mediated, impersonal world, the science and engineering facility as a symbol of technological progress, and the new stadium as the symbol of corporate and urban development – one could not make up a list that could stand in more direct opposition to Maxwell Street.

Then the city and the university decided to get serious about the market's removal. Initially, they made their intentions known to those who already suspected the worst by erecting fences. Roosevelt Road had long served as a physical barrier between the university and the Maxwell Street neighborhood. In the early 1990's, as the university moved south of Roosevelt Road, it put up fences around any university-owned buildings or lots to protect them and visually separate them from the outside. University spokespeople said they wanted "to keep the land clean" (Mitra 1992). The city helped by pulling out dumpsters and other sanitation services to the area and by cutting police staff to only two officers on Sundays. The alderman for the area is quoted as saying "I hope the trash piles up to the top of the fences, so that people can see what kind of businessmen are there. This is a den of thieves right now…I've told the university to move ahead." (Longworth 1993a). Alderman Ted Mazola (1st Ward) indicated that services would be reinstated to the market as soon as it moved to Canal Street. It

was widely known that Mayor Daley and his wife Maggie personally disliked the market, and viewed its move as a crucial part of Daley's broader move to clean up the entire city.

The fences served as obvious markers of separation and sent an early and powerful message to vendors and residents: this is university land and you are not wanted here. The fences got closer and more numerous. As lots were purchased, they were surrounded by fences bearing "No Trespassing" signs. Every block in the old market area was fenced in by 1993. Fewer open lots meant less parking, and less parking meant fewer customers. Angry, but not surprised, vendors adapted by setting up on sidewalks and streets, and wedging in next to the fences, as near to their old spots as possible. They hung their wares, overcoats, and ladies' dresses on the fences for display and attached signs of protest there as well. Vendors did adapt, but setting up proper spaces and selling out of them became increasingly difficult: "it made it hard for everybody on the street when they started fencing off the lots. And they didn't have to. Like I said, I don't understand the school going so militant against the people. It was really shocking" (Okrie 1998).

Why fence off land so soon, people asked, when the money was not even yet available for construction of university buildings? The UIC spokespeople said they were trying "to keep their land clean." Cleanliness, in fact, has long been cited by the city and university as justification for action in the Maxwell Street area. It is true that the market in its old location was filthy. Trash left over from the Sunday market littered the streets for weeks and public restrooms were not

available. In the summer there were rats; in the winter black smoke from open fires and burning tires filled the air. It is also true the area was somewhat unsafe; cars were broken into and stolen routinely, and stories abound of stolen merchandise and stolen cash. In such circumstances, increased city regulation, policing, and sanitation services would seem to be in order; instead the city of Chicago removed the dumpsters and had trash pick-up discontinued. Police protection, too, was cut way back (while the market had about 850 licensed vendors, and regularly drew twenty-thousand shoppers, only two police officers were stationed there on Sundays in the end). Remove sanitation services and police protection, and Voila'!, the place is unclean and unsafe.

The city and university creation of dirt and their rhetorical focus on dirt are centrally at issue in the move of the Maxwell Street Market and in the transformation of the Maxwell Street neighborhood as a whole. In Rubbish Theory (1979), Michael Thompson has identified a process by which social value is manipulated and cultural forms are moved around in value space by those in power. Those people have the authority to impose "durability," "transience," and "rubbish" status on objects, or in this case, places and institutions. According to "rubbish theory," rubbish is socially defined, and transfers between value categories are controlled by "people near the top" (1979: 9) in order to encourage the advancement of their own objects and ideologies.

The Maxwell Street Market's categorization as rubbish, as something not to be saved, its transfer into Thompson's "rubbish" category was effected primarily through rhetoric. The market was repeatedly referred to as "a very

temporary thing" (Sharp 1993), and as dirty, grimy, crimeridden, and rat-infested. This rhetoric was effective in part because of the UIC and City of Chicago's conscious creation of dirty conditions. Cutting sanitation services and letting the trash pile up emphasized quite clearly that the place is considered rubbish; it literally became a trash heap. When people then heard the rhetoric of rubbish and dirt, it rang true.

References to dirt and disorder are powerful in a society that highly values cleanliness and order. In Mary Douglas' terms, dirt is "matter out of place," "inappropriate elements," "all the rejected elements of ordered systems" (1966: 36), "that which must not be included if a pattern is to be maintained" (1966: 41). Dirt is a relative idea according to Douglas; notions of dirt exist only in relation to an ordered system. Matter must be classified to find out which things are "dirt" in Douglas' terms or "rubbish" in Thompson's, and which are durable, valuable, appropriately placed. These symbolic classifications are cherished and powerful.

This schema extends easily beyond physical dirt to apply to people and groups identified as social "dirt." The identification of dirt becomes about making social categories. As such, the rhetoric of dirt surrounding the Maxwell Street Market was easily stretched to the vendors, shoppers, and performers of the marketplace. Nothing about the market fit within the set of ordered relations valued by the mainstream and encouraged by the city. Representing instead "a contravention of that order" (Douglas 1966: 36), the market and its people were easily labeled dirt, and just as easily swept away.

The university expansion and fencing had immediate negative effects on the market's blues music scene. A few determined artists set up despite the fences and restricted areas, but most simply stopped coming. Riler "Ice Man" Robinson, Mississippi-born slide guitarist, began playing Maxwell Street in 1972 in order to help his club career. But university fencing of what were previously vacant market lots made it so difficult to perform that he gave it up:

> I don't play there anymore because they got it all tore up and got everything fenced in. Ain't no room no more on the sidewalk. It's all messed up. I was down last Sunday trying to find a spot. I couldn't find any. Everybody had their spots. My spot was over there across Newberry – west of Newberry on 14th Street, and they tore that down and fenced it in. Then I found another one between two houses. They tore the two houses down and fenced that in, too. So I haven't found another spot that I would like to work in. I don't think I be bothering with it anymore. It's too much problems. (Sharp 1993: 38)

Opposition to the Move

In May of 1993, the UIC's Hillel Foundation sponsored a colloquium to debate the future of Maxwell Street. From it, compromises were suggested. The market could have co-existed with the university by taking a smaller space, only using the streets, using parking lots and other university-owned spaces which are vacant on Sundays, or only moving a couple blocks away – far enough for the university to carry out its expansion plans, but close enough to still be connected to the historic neighborhood.[2] A probationary period was suggested; eighteen months of shared-space co-existence and then an evaluation of satisfaction on both sides. Another suggestion was to make the market into a "living museum" and linking it to an archive of the area's past. It was even suggested that the market be allowed to remain just until the university was ready to start building

the buildings they have proposed. But the university did not want to be associated with the market. All proposals for co-existence were denied. Once enough lots were acquired, the university constructed playing fields and surface parking lots to cover and hold the land for future use.

Opposition to the market's move was for the most part too disorganized and weak to stop it. A group called "Friends of the Market" sprang up when the university first announced its plans, but they were not heard from frequently. According to one report, the organization once had three presidents, two of whom ousted the third. The market itself had no officers, or spokesperson, or leadership. Little effort was made to incorporate the storeowners along Halsted and Maxwell, who, operating with little and sometimes inaccurate information, did little to support the market. Few vendors got very involved, "so defense of the market has been left to outsiders, each with their own agendas and some of whom are screwballs" (Zotti 1993). Even finding space to meet in the neighborhood became complicated as community centers became afraid of repercussions of providing their space to market activists (Eastwood 1995).

In July of 1994 a group made up of vendors and other community advocates and calling themselves The Maxwell Street Vendors Association traveled to the state capitol in Springfield to protest state funding of the UIC's takeover. One report said while the UIC had the $4.25-4.5 million it needed to purchase the land, it still needed approximately $19.7 million in state funds to clear the land and build parking lots and recreation fields (Joravsky 1994).

In the last few weeks of the market, a bus with posters announcing rallies and workshops moved slowly through the market. People handed out flyers and put up posters urging resistance and unification. A group held a candlelight vigil on the corner of Halsted and Maxwell. And they attempted a well-intentioned, but failed attempt to march to Daley Plaza in downtown Chicago. The lack of organization has been blamed alternately on apathy, powerlessness, warring factions of vendors, too little time, lack of information, and fate.

Other opposition came from the businesses in the area of the designated relocation site. They were not told in advance of the plans for a market along Canal Street and were put off by a vision of garbage, stolen goods, and overcrowding. The city responded to business owners heated complaints by cutting the size of the market in half and promising sanitation and police services to be paid for through vendor fees. While acknowledging the fact that "twenty-five years of neglect" by the city made the old market unsavory, the Planning and Development Commissioners promised the new market would be cared for and made into a city asset. Saying they were "One hundred percent opposed to it," the Canal-Roosevelt Coalition of area merchants, said they would go along with Mayor Daley's plans anyway (Longworth 1994a).

Public hearings about the move of the market started in early 1994. Described as looking "like a scene stocked with characters from central casting," the Chicago Plan Commission's meeting in City Council chambers was attended by people on both sides of the issue: "the developers, resplendent in their shiny suits and silky ties...bearing placards highlighting the wonders of their $24

million economic development scheme," and "on the other side, clad in flannel, denim and polyester, were the protesters: a hodgepodge of activists, street vendors and radical academics" (Joravsky 1994). The plan to move the market was backed by Mayor Daley, Alderman Ted Mazola of the 1st Ward, a powerful community group called the United Neighborhood Organization, and the president of nearby St. Ignatius College Preparatory School – all said the plan would clean up the neighborhood, create jobs, and provide recreational facilities for the UIC.

Opponents said the plan would displace more jobs than it would create, and is another example of how urban renewal is used in Chicago to benefit special instead of general interests. They believed the market provided legal and healthy economic options for the poor – a training ground for entrepreneurs rather than a breeding ground for crime, that the market actually added to the surveillance of the area, and that the market promoted good human and racial relations. Some opposed the move because there were rumors that a new Central Area Circulator trolley yard or a parking lot for a riverboat gambling complex were to be built on the same site, and that the market would then be moved again, and again, and again, until it was destroyed. Others, mainly non-vendors, appealed to history and nostalgia in their arguments. Despite all objections, the proposal to sell the land to the UIC for their development passed easily through the Plan Commission that day, and moved on to a vote by the whole city council.

Another public hearing in front of the Community Development Commission went about the same. Five hours of emotional debate ended in an 8-1 vote to advise the City Council to sell the land to the UIC.

On April 13, 1994, the full Chicago City Council met in council chambers to debate and ultimately approve Mayor Daley's longtime effort to get rid of the market on Maxwell Street. There the scene was much the same. The audience of vendors and rabid supporters was vocal and angry, and the debate on the floor was heated as well. Though common knowledge was that the council would not oppose Daley's wishes on this matter, debate went on for hours. Vendors and other audience members were threatened with eviction from council chambers as they applauded aldermen who opposed the market's move. The most exciting moment came when two aldermen, Ted Mazola, the alderman for the 1st ward, and Alderman Dexter Watson from the 27th ward, almost came to blows during debate. The incident began with Watson criticizing Mazola for being insensitive to poor minorities. When Mazola jumped up to respond, his microphone had been turned off. He lunged for Watson's microphone instead, grabbing it out of his hands. There was a red-faced, screaming tussle over the mike, with onlookers shouting support for Watson, until the police broke up the aldermen. Order was restored, but not until each man got his say in front of the press stand.

In the end, by a 33-10 vote, the council agreed to sell 11.7 acres of city-owned land to the University of Illinois at Chicago for $4.25 million. They understood the agreement included the eviction of more than 800 vendors by Labor Day of 1994 and that only about half of them would be accommodated at

the new version of the market on Canal Street. As part of the agreement, the city paid for the evacuation and clean-up of the market area. The same meeting of the council also saw a vote for the expansion of an existing ban on street peddling in the 1st Ward, which includes all of downtown Chicago.

In mid-August the clean-up began with the eviction of the three vendors who sold tires, rims, and hubcaps on vacant lots along Halsted between Maxwell and 14th Streets. These merchants had set up makeshift shanties or moved into trailers which they surrounded with wood fences and filled with their merchandise. Some lived there full-time with their families. (Whiteis 1994). Two dozen Chicago police officers came to the area before dawn on a Monday, sealed off the area, served eviction notices. They were followed by city workers with crowbars and bulldozers, and dog catchers catching strays. Notices of the eviction were posted in the area beforehand, but the tire sellers still found the eviction quite harsh and frightening. The vendors were moved to locations of their choosing in other areas of the city (Longworth 1994c). And then, on Labor Day weekend, the rest of the market was moved out.

The New Maxwell Street Market

"The New Maxwell Street Market" opened on Canal Street on September 4, 1994 as the City of Chicago's cleaner, safer, more marketable version of the original. A city office controls and regulates it in an effort to rid the market of "bad elements," while hired special events planners attempt to recreate what they see as the "good parts" of the old market with music, food, banners, and careful placement of vendors. This chapter will explore how "Maxwell Street" has been

(NO PAGE 102)

adding portable toilets and sinks and garbage cans and parking lots, and by setting up the space in one straight line with regimented sizes for booths. Safety is signaled through the presence of private security staff and crossing guards, and lots of guys with walkie-talkies looking official. All of these things signal "clean" and "safe" and "legitimate" – they are markers borrowed from other kinds of places that appeal to middle-class, suburban, tourist audiences – namely flea markets and festival marketplaces. These places, which the desired audiences are already familiar with, all have the same basic facilities, parking, products, regulations, and formal structure, so a flea market set-up makes sense and appeals to the right people. An urban space that was previously unvisited by certain groups of people has thus been tamed for their approval – it is clean enough and safe enough.

But what about festive? The people, the same ones who value safe and clean and rational, also want to think they are having a real urban, ethnic, or festive experience. So some elements of the old market have to be retained to create a certain ambiance. The special events company has tried to retain the character and some of the chaos of the old market. They do this in part by not charging musicians or entertainers or sketch artists, the ones considered by management to be "attractive and vibrant," for spaces in order to encourage them to come out. They encourage ethnic products and ethnic food. They position the more colorful vendors, or anchor tenants, at key spots and try to keep them happy (the "Bluesbus," a blue schoolbus which sells blues music tapes, a large volume produce vendor, an auctioneer). Fliers distributed by the new market office tell

people to "come and enjoy the bargains, food, music and fun of shopping outdoors at the New Maxwell Street Market." Elise Martel describes what has happened at the new market, the emphasis on cleanliness and festivity, as the "taming" and "theming" of the market (1996).

The director of public relations for the market emphasizes the new market's emphasis on tourism, safety, and family values when she describes the city's objective this way:

> What we wanted to do was very simple. We wanted to take everything that was good and all the fine traditions, the rich flavor of the market, and move it to the new location minus all the negatives. And we have been, by all accounts, very successful in doing that....what we've seen is that this has become not only a renewed tourist attraction because [people] know they can go out there and they won't get their pockets picked or ripped off or people won't be throwing pornographic videos in their face....we've seen a lot of kids go out there. This is a family tourist attraction now for people who live in Chicago and for people who visit Chicago. On any given day you will see grandmothers and grandfathers, and parents and kids walking the market knowing that it is a nice place to be and that their kids will not be influenced by anything that they don't want them to see. (Buscemi 1997)

Vendor Tom Okrie has been selling at the Maxwell Street Market for more than thirty years and describes the difference between the old and the new like this:

> This market now, this new market, is a one hundred eighty degree turn in the old one. The old one used to be, it could be freezing out, if they stopped and looked at your stuff, they're gonna buy it. Over here, they don't even come. This new market seems like more of a flea market than a Maxwell Street market like it used to be....The old market used to have more antiques in it and more different product, more junk. This one here is, I mean it seems like it's just Taiwan-bought stuff. (1998)

Okrie got started at the old market by chance when he and his wife moved into a new house where the previous owners had left a lot of toys and other junk in the garage; she wanted it cleaned up, and a friend showed Tom how to get rid of the stuff at Maxwell Street. He made $127.50 that first day and has been hooked on the market ever since. The next week he bought out a school supply store and started with his own four-by-four foot space selling school paper and spiral notebooks.

Over the years, Okrie developed different ways of obtaining merchandise for his stand, buying overruns of merchandise or damaged and returned goods from chain stores or goods from stores going out of business. He has thus sold a variety of products, from soap to big pieces of carpet. He settled eventually on a "niche" in household goods as the way to make the best profit. When the old market closed, Tom had a whole corner at 14th Place and Sangamon, about 190 feet of frontage.

Now at the new market, Okrie runs spot #203 with about twenty feet of frontage to the market, enough to park his white van on the sidewalk, put up an awning to fight the sun, and neatly display his wares. He still goes to the market on Sundays by about 3:30 or 4:00 am, a habit he has not broken since the days in the old market space. His early arrival gives him time to have his coffee and leisurely set up his roof/awning, a touch that he feels really spruces up his display and improves his image with shoppers. After the roof, he sets up the tables which he has rented in advance and which are usually leaning against the fence which runs behind his spot. Then he unloads the van, sometimes with the help of one of

two young helpers he employs, and sorts through his banana boxes full of goods for what will go on display to start out that particular day. In the summertime the market starts at 5:30 am and is really heated up with customers before 8:00. The tourists and folks from the suburbs come around 10:00. Tom makes three-quarters of the money he will make for the day by noon, and closes up shop by about 2:30. He rarely misses a Sunday, except on the coldest of winter days when business will not be good, or when he visits his daughter and her family in Florida once a year.

Tom will probably never give up the market. He says, "It's always been a passion of mine, the market. I'm stuck on it. I can't get away. Now that my wife is gone, I don't have a hobby. I look forward to it. It's a fun thing in my life. I make money and I'm happy about it. It's something that's a passion in my life that I want to do" (Okrie 1998).

Certainly there were some vendors from the old market who never made the transition to the new space. Some, called "junkers" by others at the market, did not have official spaces, but either set up their sparse goods on a piece of sidewalk or street or on a car hood on the outskirts of the market, or carried what they had to sell in a bag or box. Most of these extremely low-overhead vendors would only make a few dollars in a market day, and could thus not afford the transition to the new market space with its higher vending fees. While the fees were ostensibly increased in order to pay for increased security and other services, it seems another purpose of stricter regulation and fees was to get rid of those

vendors considered to be undesirable by market management who speak positively about the elimination of this level of vendor.

Others were simply nervous about the tightened regulations and accountability for taxation. Still others did not trust the city to keep the new market opened; common suspicion was that the move was simply a first step toward closing the market down or moving it yet again. As Tom Okrie says, "See a lot of people didn't go....They were mad and they were scared and they didn't know how the new market would turn out....They were scared of UIC. They were scared of the city. That's my opinion. Because UIC pushed so hard, and pushed so fast" (1998). At the time of the market relocation, vendors who were deemed unable to make the transition to the new market were offered the following by the Department of Consumer Services: (1) counseling/workshops, (2) information on other market opportunities in the Chicago area, and (3) business assistance from the University of Illinois at Chicago. I was unable to find any people who had even heard of anyone who had received any of these forms of assistance.

Handling vendors during the transition and convincing them of the attributes of the new space was part of the city's market manager's job in the beginning. He was to go to the old market space in its last weeks and recruit vendors to join the new market. Many were adamant then about not coming, as they were still operating at Maxwell and Halsted albeit in a marginalized and threatened space. Once the new space was ready the new market office held a dress rehearsal:

> When we first came over and we brought over the vendors to show them their spaces, oh boy. We came over, we had a test run, on Friday or Saturday, we just came out here, we brought their cars, we closed the street down and they didn't have to bring their merchandise but they brought their trucks or cars and we tried to set them up in the spaces and they were oh 'I'm never going up there. Blah, blah, blah.' I thought they were gonna', I was in fear of my life. They kept getting close to me and I'm trying to explain to them and we were arguing. All those vendors arguing with me! (Menchaca 1997)

Many of the ones who did not come along at first, joined up after a while, and "They love it now. They love it" (Menchaca 1997).

The Market's New Form

Even a cursory look at the old versus the new market, a quick before and after glance, reveals that the market has most definitely taken on a new order and a new form. The market layout, the shoppers, and somehow even the mood of the place seems different. A closer examination of a series of changes in the market reveals change at a very deep level, a switch from a laissez-faire marketplace, informally organized and ruled by traditional authority, to a highly controlled and regulated market, ruled by a corporate model and bureaucratic authority.

Formal organization is dominant in modern society and most people accept it as the way things are properly done. Thus, new and aspiring organizations adopt the bureaucratic structure, a formal organization borrowed or copied from and existing organization. And existing organizations continually reorganize to incorporate new and accepted bureaucratic elements. John Kenneth Galbraith points out that organization is "the most important source of power in modern societies" (1986: 215). It works, he says, through "conditioned" power, which involves the changing of belief rather than direct punishment or reward. It

is "persuasion, education, or the social commitment to what seems natural, proper, or right [which] causes the individual to submit to the will of another or of others" (1986: 214). The "organization" provides the persuasion needed to exercise power, to get people to submit to the will of the organization. Galbraith refers to ours as "the age of organization," as we have been conditioned to accept its influence at every level of our lives.

A formal market system has been put in practice as the new market (and by "the market" I mean market management, city administration, and the vendors themselves) strives for legitimacy. The new rules and policies allow the market to be recognized as official, to fit into the city's model for legitimate and supportable markets and events. The market thus sustains itself by following an accepted formal structure. It endures by patterning itself after models which are understandable and acceptable to appropriate and powerful audiences. At Maxwell Street the evidence of how influential the institutionalized, rationalized, organizational model is can be seen in increased city support, increased attendance, and vendor cooperation.

We look now at the elements of formal organization at the New Maxwell Street Market – modeling, regulatory policies, licensing, fees, and space allocation, formal accounting system, and emphasis on teamwork and the creation of a positive image -- to see how this has worked.

Modeling

From the beginning planning stages, the new market has been following hegemonic models. One of the initial proposals for the New Maxwell Street

Market included drawings of how the proposed market would look on Canal Street, diagrams of how pedestrian and vehicular traffic would flow, a skeletal outline of the new rules and regulations at the market, a diagram of sponsorship and management of the market, an explanation of the new formal features of the market including parking, security and sanitation, and a letter from the Commissioners of the Departments of Planning and Development and Consumer Services. The letter emphasizes that there will be "sound management structure" which will make the market a "well-managed" "economic engine," and that the new organization plan "responds to the concerns of vendors, area business and property owners and market customers" ("New Maxwell Street Market"). This official document, like any good business proposal, outlines what management feels are the positive aspects of this new, legitimate organization.

As an aspiring organization, the new market adapted to existing and accepted models as it set itself up for business. Martel describes how the New Maxwell Street Market has become congruent with Weber's "rational-legal" model of authority, and how processes of "institutional isomorphism" have led the Maxwell Street Market to resemble other flea markets and special events. She describes it as a natural and unavoidable morphing process whereby these powerful models cannot help but be followed because "they are so pervasive and taken-for-granted in modern society as the way things are and should be" (1996: 7). The market follows the established models and then sets up markers to signal its adherence to the models; the audiences need to know, through the use of signs, which models are being followed and how.

The influence of the flea market model had influence at the New Maxwell Street market at its conception when a consulting company from New York, specializing in flea market design, was hired to do a study and give suggestions. Thus the market was modeled after other existing flea markets, and has essentially become one, with all the characteristics of flea markets – fees charged for vending space rental, infrastructure including sanitation, security, parking, relatively upscale and somewhat uniform merchandise, and uniform vending spaces. It is these characteristics which act as signs to marketgoers that this is a flea market. Many of the vendors, including Tom Okrie, also sell at other flea markets in the area, and the New Market office has fliers advertising other flea markets around Chicago. The use of the flea market as a model was logical in the beginning when the newly organizing marketplace was faced with uncertainty about how to proceed. The flea market model was already established, understood, and easy to follow. And while the new market's flea market components – security, sanitation, and formal management -- confer legitimacy upon it, its overall status as a flea market works to legitimate it as well. People understand the flea market model and feel comfortable visiting it, because they know what to expect from it.

The influence of another powerful model, that of the special event, can also be felt at the New Maxwell Street Market. This model has also been present since very early in the new market's history, when Ravenswood Special Events was selected from a number of competitors for the job of managing the market, and was hired by the City's Department of Consumer Services. Ralph Concepcion, the owner of Ravenswood Special Events, was chosen because of his

previous and ongoing successful work on large Chicago special events such as the Taste of Chicago, the large summer music festivals in Grant Park, and the Chicago Marathon. The market resembles these events in that it is outdoors on city streets, is open to the public, and it mimics the atmosphere of a festival through the inclusion of elements of food, music, flags, ethnic products, all meant to emphasize "fun." Much of the management needs for the market are therefore the same – crowd control, food vending, suppliers, clean-up staff.

Part of the special events model, the part Concepcion calls "chaos," seems to run counter to any efforts at organization, but is actually a crucial part of it; it is in fact central to the special events model Ravenswood Special Events is implementing at the market. By "chaos" Concepcion means two things. First is that the market, according to his plan, must remain market-driven. There was talk at the beginning of the New Market of limiting the number of certain types of vendors and doing a very formal placement of stands selling different types of goods, but Concepcion convinced the Department of Consumer Services that "if a taco guy winds up next to a guy selling tool boxes well then that's the way it is....it's an organic thing, the market changes...." The other part of the created chaos is "that feeling that it sort of runs itself, that there needs to be a feeling that the market is kind of alive, that it is its own thing" (Concepcion 1997). Initially, the city wanted to set up rules for specific times when certain space numbers would be allowed to set up and break down their spaces for the day, but instead market management decided to follow the advice of Ravenswood Special Events

and tolerate high levels of apparent chaos at the beginning and end of each Sunday. As Concepcion explains,

> I mean everybody's there at once, there's traffic jams, people are setting things up in the middle of the street, there's problems with accessing, it's chaotic, it's very chaotic....you reach a sort of level where it seems like everything is out of control, but there's really no way to control it, so you just sort of have to let it happen. (1997)

Both the flea market and the special events models are influential at Maxwell Street not only because of the guidance they offer producers making decisions about structure and organization, but also because of the audiences to which these model appeal. According to the assistant commissioner:

> [The new market] has its own character....this is a market at a new location....it does have the qualities of the old market, but it also emphasizes different attractions. We want to attract people of all ages, of all economic backgrounds.... People who would have never gone out to Maxwell Street five years ago go out there today. (Buscemi 1997)

The market is pressured to conform more and more closely to organizational and bureaucratic models of operation because they suit the tastes of middle-class and affluent classes of potential shoppers. The market needs to please both the city and these potential upscale shoppers in order to survive in its new legitimated form. The more affluent shoppers, including suburbanites, out-of-town tourists, and those from Chicago's wealthier neighborhoods, are attracted to places of leisure which seem to give priority to the things they value. To this, the New Maxwell Street Market emphasizes convenience and cleanliness and security and fun. Convenience is signaled to the new audiences by the location of the market which was chosen for its proximity to the Loop. While the new

spot on Canal Street is less convenient to Chicago Housing Authority residents and neighborhood people, it is more convenient for those arriving via the expressways or coming from the downtown area. Parking is located adjacent to the center of the market, giving those who drive there the convenience they demand. Garbage cans, toilets, and sinks serve to actually make the place cleaner, while they also act as signals of cleanliness; they make the place *seem* clean. Security forces too, act literally and figuratively; they serve to reinforce the rhetoric of law and order surrounding the creation of the new market.

Many tours geared to more affluent, less ethnic audiences are offered at the new market. These lead the curious through the marketplace on Sunday mornings and point out merchandise and vendors relating to a particular theme, usually Mexican cooking and shopping. One such tour/class I attended began at a west side Mexican restaurant around 9:00 am and, after a brief and skeletal narration on the history of the Maxwell Street market and the Mexican presence there, proceeded to the New Market. There we wandered as a group, sampling different prepared Mexican foods from different stands with our guide pointing out the best places at the market to get tacos, chalupas, burritos, and more. He then pointed out specific stands where particular cooking items or spices or produce could be purchased – ingredients the tour group would soon need to cook a full Mexican meal back at the kitchen of Hacienda Tecalitlan, the restaurant where our guide is chef. Such tours are offered through various sources; this one was a continuing education course through a private high school. Because these tours are billed as "classes" and are in essence chaperoned by a teacher/chef, they

offer novice marketgoers (no one else on the tour I attended had ever been to Maxwell Street before) a legitimate and safe way to explore the crowded, ethnic marketplace.

The focus on tourism is actually hurting some of the vendors. So many people come to browse, to buy one or two trinkets (as opposed to larger purchases or weekly shopping), to absorb some of the "flavor," and then go home. But even though the 'tourists' and more affluent customers are not buying as much, they have more power and resources, and their presence gives the place the legitimacy the city desires.

The recreation of the Maxwell Street Market for tourist audiences follows a pattern first pointed out by Dean MacCannell in The Tourist (1976). Modern society has, according to MacCannell, become a touristic complex through a process by which work and leisure are strictly divided, basic social relations are dematerialized, the past is celebrated nostalgically in order to elevate the present, everything is made public, and the rights of outsiders are institutionalized. The conscious creation of a tourist attraction to replace a marketplace, and the less conscious tourist attendance at such sites, is indicative of significant changes in social structure and the development of culture in the modern world.

Regulations: Fees, Licensing, and Space Allocation

While the city of Chicago has intermittently regulated the Maxwell Street market to varying degrees (see Morales 1993), it has never before done so to the extent it does today – nor has it done so in such a bureaucratized manner. The New Maxwell Street Market Handbook includes rules and regulations for vendors

about entering and exiting the market, unloading and loading merchandise, hours of operation, cleaning up one's space, licensing, space allocation, size of spaces, fees, hearing procedures for violations, fines, vehicular access, what can and cannot be sold, sanitation, weights and measures, general appearance of the market, number of workers, behavior and conduct at the market, trading and sharing of spaces, vendor permits, receipts, and extensive health regulations.

At the old market a person interested in vending could learn about it and even secure space through an informal system which involved casual networking with friends and relatives. Spaces were acquired through seniority or interpersonal relations, or could be borrowed or bought from other vendors (Morales 1993). Contrarily, a person interested in vending today starts by going to the New Maxwell Street Market office and picking up a copy of The Handbook, which explains all the official regulations about vending.

It becomes immediately apparent from the handbook that the barriers to vending at the new market are many, with increased fees at the forefront. Vending fees increased from twenty-five dollars a year at the old market to thirty dollars a week at the new market. New Market vendors who vend every Sunday could pay more than thirteen hundred dollars a year for permits alone. An informal survey of vendors (B. Mier 1998) shows seventy-three percent of those who sold at both the old and new markets say they make less money at the new market; most of them blame the decrease on the substantially increased vendors' fees.

Acquiring all the documents and approvals needed for vending is quite complicated and time-consuming. One must first get a State of Illinois business

sales tax number from the Illinois Department of Revenue. This, plus two pieces of identification, two passport-size photographs, a list of items to be sold regularly, and a twenty-five dollar yearly application fee, are required to apply for a vendor's license at the Department of Consumer Services. Permanent and alternate vendors are responsible for renewing their licenses each year; if a license is allowed to expire, the vendor loses all acquired seniority at the market (uninterrupted accumulated license time is used to allocate permanent licenses when they become available). If a vendor is planning on selling food at the market, he or she first needs a Food Service Sanitation Certificate from the City's Department of Health. To get the certificate, an applicant must take and pass "The Professional Sanitation Seminar for Summer Festival Food Vendors," a three-hour course which is offered between April and September at Harold Washington College for thirty dollars. Once the applicant has passed the course and received the certificate, he or she needs to complete a separate application which lists the food to be sold at the market. He or she is also responsible for following all of the market's health regulations which are listed on eight full pages of the twenty-one-page handbook. With these approvals and their corresponding paperwork in hand, a vendor is ready to go through the process of space procurement, an equally confusing and time-consuming process.

The New Maxwell Street Market has about eight hundred registered vendors, including "permanents" and "alternates." There are 479 vending spots in all, separated into spots of four different sizes. "A" spots are ten by thirty feet, "B" spots are twelve by twenty-four feet, and "D" spots are eighteen by nineteen

feet. All of these cost thirty dollars April through November, and fifteen dollars in the winter. A, B, and D spots allow for vehicle parking in the space. "C" spots are only nine by ten feet, cost ten dollars per week all year round, and cars are prohibited. Each spot is clearly marked with yellow painted lines and numbers on the pavement.

Before the new market opened in 1994, a lottery was held in which licensed vendors who had operated at the old market could participate. A large turning barrel held balls which were marked with vendor's license numbers. As numbers were drawn, vendors advanced to a large map of the new market and allowed to choose a permanent space. Approximately fifty percent of the market was filled on that lottery day.

Once a vendor has been assigned a permanent spot, he or she must still secure daily permits for each Sunday. Each vendor has from Wednesday to Friday each week to secure the spot for that Sunday (on Saturday mornings, whatever spots are not yet paid for are sold to alternate vendors for that week). Permanent vendors are able to pay in advance for as many weeks as they wish in order to avoid coming in to the office each week to pay, but this payment must be made by check or money order. There are no longer any permanent licenses available.

The procurement of space is even more difficult for alternate vendors, those with valid licenses but without permanent space assignments, as they are responsible for seeking vending space each week. One vendor estimates she spends about three hours a week trying to secure a space at the market, time

calling on the phone, driving to the office, and waiting in line (Martel 1996). On the first Thursday of each month licensed alternate vendors are to call the market office between the hours of 3:00 pm and 6:00 pm in order to receive a line number which will allow them to stand in line on Saturday mornings for the rest of the month. There is only one phone line into the office, so it can take hours of redialing to receive one's number. Line numbers are given out in the order calls are received; the first successful caller gets #1 and so on. Then on Saturday mornings at 7:00 am, all the numbered licensees go to the market office to stand in line until their numbers are called. Every so often a market office employee lets fifteen or so people in to choose their spaces from what is left on the market map. Then each person stands in the cashier's line to pay for the spot with check or money order and to receive a receipt which will act as a daily permit the next day. As an alternate vendor, a person would go through this process every Saturday.

At the old market claims to space were legitimate and respected among participants, but were not recognized by the city. Today rights to the space are all owned by the city and vendors must engage in formal contract to use it. The newer system is understood and respected by a larger audience -- namely the city, the market administration, and society and its legal system as a whole -- as the logical way things should be done. And the market thus takes one more step toward legitimation.

This process of gaining permission to vend at the new market provides an especially neat example of how the forces of power have organized to bring about

change. The bureaucratic process vendors must now go through to pay fees, get licenses, and acquire market spaces brings about a quick filtering of vendors and a change in the ways they conduct business. This bureaucratizing of the vending experience allows the city to impose its power, to dominate the culture of the new marketplace.

Accounting System

Martel points out that one of the important effects of the entire licensing and space procurement process is that vendors are gradually acquiring papers and files of their own. They are required to have the correct forms and pieces of identification. They are required to save receipts and copies of applications and other paperwork. And they are thus incorporated into the formal, bureaucratic system. They are accountable in every sense of the word. The paperwork trail, then, becomes part vendor education; according to Martel, the system at the new market is "formally divorced from social relationships" and "the vendor is learning to become a bureaucrat" (1996: 33).

Another part of the formalized legitimation of the market was the adoption of a formal accounting system. The city's market liaison, Job Menchaca, oversees the economic aspects of running the market. With a bachelor's degree in accounting and previous city job experience with the Internal Audits Department, he was recruited to the new market to monitor costs of administration, keep track of revenues, and make sure these costs stay within contract amounts. Much of the accounting is also overseen by Ralph Concepcion of Ravenswood Special Events. The city pays him and he hires and pays for security services, portable toilets and

sinks, insurance, market and office staff, maintenance and trash hauling. His payroll includes the market manager, the zone managers, the cashier, and the other person on his Ravenswood staff. The accounting system, along with the paper trail that results from the process of bestowing and checking all the permits, licenses, and certificates, functions as external assessment of the market; it says that the market makes economic sense, that it can follow and be successfully monitored by the same sort of rational, legitimate, widely-recognized set of criteria as most other businesses and bureaucracies. The New Maxwell Street market can now compete within the larger system.

Presentation of the Organization

Though organizations are not individuals, they are nonetheless involved in a presentation of self. It is important for any organization, and in this case the market, to give the impression of legitimacy. This is done at the New Market through the appearance of the market space itself, and through a campaign which emphasizes that everything is as it should be and everyone is happy and convinced of the market's success; the space has to look right and the city and vendors have to talk about it positively.

The official position of the city's Department of Consumer Services is that the new market has been an overwhelming success. Representatives put off any questions about the move of the market or the old market location, and focus instead on presenting a wholly positive picture of the New Maxwell Street. The assistant commissioner in charge of public relations for the department of

Consumer Services, Connie Buscemi, when asked about the most successful and least successful aspects of the new market, says this:

> I don't think that there is a least successful. I feel very positive about it. There was a lot of controversy over this move, and there were a lot of critics and many of the initial critics are now some of out strongest supporters. This market has truly proven itself, and that is something that the people who have worked on it, and not just this department but the vendors and the area businesses deserve a lot of credit; it's something that they can truly be proud of. It is their accomplishment. And to see it flourish every single week speaks volumes for this market. So I don't think that there is a downside to it. I think that everyone who has been at this market, whether a regular customer or whether they're just somebody who decides that it might be a good thing to go to once or is a tourist, has really come away with very positive impressions of it. (1997)

The vendors are encouraged to be partners in keeping up the façade, the public image of the New Maxwell Street. Vendors are told to talk favorably about the new space without mentioning or verbally longing for the old. No sense chasing away customers, they are told, by talking about how much you miss the old market. Vendors are continually told that talking nostalgically about the old market, or complaining about aspects of the new market, is a defeatist attitude and a big mistake for business. They are encouraged instead to promote the cleaner, safer, less hassled image of the new market when talking about it. Says Concepcion,

> When we talk to the vendors at meetings, like when we had our first anniversary, we said OK the market's been here a year, it's gone well, the market was never closed, so let's get the press here, and let's try to do a story about the New Maxwell Street Market. Well, what happened, all the vendors said, 'Oooh, we miss the old market. The old market was so much better.' Then we get in the meeting afterwards and say, 'Well, why would you say that? I mean you're basically telling people to stay away, it was better before. You're chasing away your own customers.' So then at the

> second anniversary we didn't do anything, we just sort of let it pass. And at the third anniversary, by the time we got to the third anniversary, the market was very well-established, things were going well, and so we brought the press out again, and for the most part, people were 'Yeah, this is great, it's cleaner and safer.' I mean that's the image that they have to keep going....if you get a guy out there that says, 'This market sucks. The city takes all my money,' it's a defeatist attitude that cannot possibly help them....and now, most of them get it. (1997)

Co-opting of Vendors

The support of vendors is crucial to the success of the market and the city has succeeded in winning over many of the vendors to their overwhelmingly positive view of the market. As a legitimated institution, the market sets rules for behavior and offers justification of those rules; this is to make sure that legitimacy is recognized by the vendors as well as the market's administration. The more management authorizes and vendors endorse the rules, the structure, the organization, the greater the chances of stability and success. Of course the ideal is to have the vendors view the regulations and the regulatory power as legitimate, so they will follow the rules gladly. To this end, the city has employed a multi-layered strategy of convincing all participants of the legitimacy and correctness of the new organization.

A system has been set up wherein vendors and the vendors' advisory council suggest things for the market and the department of consumer services picks which suggestions to incorporate. Tom Okrie is on the vendors' advisory council, a group of six to eight vendors who act as liaison between Carolyn Shoenberger in the city's Department of Consumer Services and the New Maxwell Street Market vendors. Whenever decisions are to be made about the

market, market management meets with this group to see "what the buzz is in the market."

The council is appointed by the Department of Consumer Services. Says Okrie,

> They pick the most cooperative vendors, and the ones that seem to be the most involved and the most connected, and that don't have a personal agenda to either get rich or control the market in some way...they're like lifers, you know, they're hard-core vendors... I think every one of them was at the old market and now at this market and they know large groups of vendors and what people are saying. (1998)

The existence of the council gives the vendors a feeling of participation and ownership, while really not giving them much control. But if vendors believe they helped make the rules, they will presumably be more likely to follow them. Likewise, if there is some sense of leniency from the rules, they will be more likely to cooperate. Part of the market management's plan is to let the vendors make some choices, to create their own social order within the larger social order. As long as they are not too blatant, are not doing anything illegal or that could taint the market's reputation, much of what they do is ignored. This is another way to keep things running smoothly. There is less chance of rebellion if vendors feel they are in control to some degree.

The city seems quick to incorporate the vendors' suggestions – as long as they make the right suggestions. When vendors expressed interest in security and a system of space allocation, the city responded; these requests fit in with the flea market model from which they were working. But, for example, when vendors wanted to discuss the city's rules about what forms of heating are allowed at the

market (burn barrels were allowed and common at the old market, whereas at the new market only propane, gas, and electric heaters are allowed), they were met with swift and absolute authority from the Commissioner: "We want your input, but the department makes the rules....You cannot participate in business if you cannot follow the rules!" (Martel 1996: 51). Thus the organization will use the threat of adverse consequences and the offer of affirmative reward to convince vendors of its legitimacy. The message then is if you can't follow the rules, you can't do business here, but if you can, we will support you and help you make money. In this case, vendors may concede to authority for reasons of self-interest as opposed to newfound respect for impersonal, legal authority.

Most of the larger organizational decisions are simply made by the Commissioner or the Department of Consumer Services though they are still couched in terms of decisions that are somehow by and for the whole organization. For instance, when an old building and a series of viaducts were to be torn down to make way for the development of a Dominick's grocery store and other retail in a mini-mall, the market was expanded north and south to accommodate the vendors who had previously been positioned on offshoots of the main drag. The market now runs in a straight line on Canal Street from Taylor Street at the north to Depot Place on the south. Though vendors complained that the customers will not walk the entire market, that their purchases are limited by how much they can carry such a distance, and that getting them to shop in the new section north of Roosevelt Road is a challenge, the city contends that the market was "enhanced" because "it was determined that the customer base really

preferred a linear market." (Buscemi 1997). How "it was determined" remains unclear.

The city's stance on their control of the market is certainly that the city and the vendors have worked and are working together with common goals. Says the assistant commissioner:

> It was a joint project. It was their market as much as it was ours. And they wanted to be part of it just as much as we did. They didn't like the fact that their market was getting, that a great market of years ago was getting a bad rap, that people didn't want to go there because there were pornographic tapes at every table. That it was dirty, that they had a good chance of getting gold chains ripped off their neck or being pickpocketed. Because it kept the people away. And there were a lot of good people out there. And it was in their best interests just as much as ours. We had an opportunity to create something and we could do it either the right way or the wrong way. And we all banded together to do it the right way....we wanted everyone to work together. We wanted everyone to know that we were all in this together. (Buscemi 1997)

Though the new market has certainly not become a perfectly neat organization where all participants agree on an overriding ideology, it is clear that many vendors have been convinced that the new market system is good business, the right way to conduct a respectable market, and those who have not been convinced either resign themselves, or grumble quietly, or sublet space to avoid the space allocation procedures,[3] or leave the market altogether. The city and market management have set up a system in which dissent can be handled easily and does not affect the operations or presentation of the market.

Many of the vendors like the more structured, businesslike atmosphere of the new market. The feeling among many is that any vendor who complains about the new regulations or fees is not a true businessperson. They like being

approved of and sanctioned by the city. They like the market's status as a flea market and its festive atmosphere because they feel it spruces the place up and gives the public a good impression. These vendors are then participants in the transition of the social order at the market. Some vendors, mainly those who buy regularly through suppliers and sell newer merchandise, according to Martel, are more easily able to locate themselves "within the plausibility structure that the city is providing as a rationale for the way things work in the New Market" (1996: 52). In other words, some vendors buy the city line, while others don't. Those who do will sell the right merchandise in the right way, will follow the rules, will attract the right customers, and will thrive at the new market. Those who don't are usually selling used and found goods obtained through less formal means. Their merchandise is priced lower and they cannot sell as much of it to the new, and more affluent, customer base of the new market. What results is a sort of natural selection process for vendors resulting in a bureaucratized market based on a corporate model wherein those who are able to play along and keep up will thrive, and those who aren't will be eliminated.

Though Tom Okrie loves the old market and prefers the flavor it had and the way people shopped there, he is a proponent of the changes that have been made. He does not believe the market could have been kept at the old location

> because the old market had an attitude and the new one has a different attitude....[the old market] was old. It was rat-filled. It was past its time, OK, because it was, I was there a long time and I seen a lot of things go on, OK, and it had to straighten up if the market was going to continue. And you couldn't straighten that market up because it was so, so way out of whack over there....it had to get better because it was just sliding down more and more, it was just, fruit peddlers would leave their fruit in the middle of the

> street and the city didn't want to do nothing about cleaning it up. I seen a lot of that. There was nobody running the market like it is now. It's run very well.

He goes on,

> I mean the old one was good, don't get me wrong, I made a lot of money and it was a lot of fun, but the idea is it turned out to be terrible. I mean, would you like to have rats running across your feet at all times? You know, and stuff like that. When you see there's rats there now, in the new market, OK, they come from the railroad yard, but when we tell [the commissioner] about it she has the pest people out there taking care of it and putting bait out for them anyway. At the old market who would you tell? Nobody. (Okrie 1998)

How Hegemony Works at the New Market

The process by which everyone at the market becomes convinced that the new system is better, that it is the right way to do business, is multi-layered. The city, the market administration, the vendors, the shoppers, and society at large are involved – all members of "the market" must be somewhat united by an ideology that guides how they think about the New Maxwell Street and places like it.

Examples of struggles over how things will be presented, how spaces or events will be shaped, are everywhere. Different political or cultural or ethnic groups with different amounts of power argue for different realities and for how stories will be told in the public sphere to best enhance their power. While examples of resistance abound, it seems more and more that such struggles are about a dominant group presenting its version of reality as the right or authentic one and then forcing or coopting those less powerful to follow suit.

In Abner Cohen's study of the structure and development of the Notting Hill London Carnival (1993) he explores how a public event like street carnival

can be changed from a local, polyethnic fair to a highly structured event made safe and clean to appeal to its primarily affluent and semiprofessional audience. When Masquerade Politics was published, Cohen predicted the carnival would become primarily tourist-oriented, citing increased police intervention, an organizational and financial report by hired consultants, a public relations push to improve the public image of the carnival by dissociating it from its past, and corporate sponsorship of the participating steel bands. The Notting Hill Carnival will thus go the way of many contested cultural movements. The same progression and forces can be seen at Maxwell Street – they are, according to Cohen, part of any public event. Though he is talking about carnival, we can easily see a description of the situation at Maxwell Street in his words:

> A cultural movement would soon clash with the dominant culture, whether this is rooted in consensus or in the interests of the politically dominant group. This group would try to contain the movement by incorporating it within its structure. The movement would therefore become contested politically as well as culturally, on a continuum from a predominantly resistance movement to a predominantly coopted one. Thus a carnival movement may succeed in realising its main goals or may end up becoming an opium of the masses, a cathartic mechanism serving as a safety valve which may even be inspired and cultivated by the dominant group in its bid for hegemony. (1993: 154)

Thus it is at Maxwell Street. Indeed, one way of seeing the situation at the Maxwell Street market is as an example of how hegemonic forces work. The process began early on, when dominant forces in city government, namely the mayor and supporting aldermen, badmouthed the old marketplace and weakened it by halting sanitation services and police protection to the area. The move of the market further weakened its status as it loosened people's hold on the place and

began to deflate their hope of resisting the powers that be. The next step was to transform the market by following models of more legitimate or respected types of public gatherings like flea markets and special events. Another step was to reward vendors who signed on right away for the new market space (and to thus punish those who did not) by setting up a time-consuming space allocation system.[4] Other steps included charging substantially higher fees which effectively eliminated those least likely to eventually support the dominant ideology and the new regulated system, setting up an elaborate system of rules and regulations, a set of hoops which vendors must continually leap through which will make them eventually support the system to avoid the cognitive dissonance associated with jumping through hoops for a system they don't support, handpicking a group of vendor representatives and holding general vendor meetings so the case can be made that "we're all in this together," convincing participants that the way to be a "good businessman" is to have paper files, sell certain kinds of merchandise, talk very positively about the organization, and to value cleanliness and security and order, things that the desired middle-class audience values highly.

Through this process the New Maxwell Street Market has been transformed; it has been organized and regulated and legitimated for success and acceptance in the larger world of corporate Chicago. The New Maxwell Street Market is indeed a more conventional, more rational, tamer, themed version of the old. Its producers have created a safe, clean way to explore the city and sample its excitement without getting too close to any negative aspects of the urban.

They have attempted to save just enough of the old "flavor" of the place to make it seem fun, but to not be too flavorful. The creation of the New Maxwell Street Market allowed the city to clean up the market and clear the land for use by the University of Illinois, while still claiming to have kept the market alive.

The force behind the demolition and reconstruction of the Maxwell Street market is a corporate-driven, rational, legalistic vision for urban America. This vision "rejects the idea that in a modern, first-world city, a market such as Maxwell Street could continue to fulfill the same functions that it had for 120 years – i.e. giving people with meager means, resourcefulness, and a will to work, a chance to support their families" (Eastwood 1995). The old Maxwell Street Market existed as a celebration of the fact that people of modest means want to and can support themselves; it represented a ten million dollar minority business (R. Mier 1994), and provided customers with bargains and long-term relationships. The new – city, university, and corporate – vision for Maxwell Street, the new market and streetscape, denies all this.

I still go frequently to the Maxwell Street Market, the new one, and still love to take out of town guests there. On my most recent excursion I bought a pair of green tennis shoes, a talking doll for my daughter, and, as always, a gordita from the stand on the west side about halfway down. The new market still has a festive feel. It is crowded and noisy and there is a lot to see and hear and smell. The crowd has changed significantly; vendors and shoppers are much more Latino and much less black. The displays are neater and the merchandise is more homogenous. It is highly regulated, and many of the most interesting

vendors are no longer there, but it is still thriving and more vital and colorful than any shopping mall.

The fate of the Maxwell Street Market is thus sealed for now. But back at the intersection of Halsted and Maxwell, the original market site, the battle continues over the ultimate form of that space and the implications for those who inhabit it. They too are the victims of this same hegemonic process. Our narrative turns now to the struggle between the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and another coalition made up of the City of Chicago and the University of Illinois at Chicago.

[1] There is, though, at least one report of a market master being attacked by angry vendors, an effort by Jewish leaders to abolish the market in 1938, and a call for modernization and reorganization led by the Maxwell Street Merchants Association in 1939 (Morales 1993: 46-50).
[2] A 1989 plan commissioned by City Hall which suggested market/university co-existence was hidden (Eastwood 1995) presumably because it did not fit with the university's wishes to get rid of the market.
[3] There are, in effect three ways to bypass waiting in line each week as an "alternate" vendor. One is by subletting a space from a permanent vendor. Another is by buying a space on Sunday morning from a space broker, someone who is able to acquire several spaces to sell. And the third is by bringing a few items to another vendor to sell on his or her table and then giving that vendor a cut of the sale. All three of these are technically against the rules, but are generally overlooked if they are kept in the background. Those who use one of these alternative methods for acquiring

space are punished only in that their seniority at the market does not accumulate and will not be recognized in any future lottery for permanent spaces because they will not have the paper trail required to prove their attendance at the market.

[4] Vendors from the old market who submitted an application for a New Maxwell Street Market license on or before July 19, 1994, received status as "permanent" vendors. As long as they keep up with their license renewals, they do not have to stand in line each week to receive a space. Those vendors who did not sign up right away, who did not enter the first lottery for spaces, are assigned "alternate" vendor status and must stand in line each Saturday morning to get their spots. Thus, those who hesitated in their support of the new organization are penalized.

CHAPTER FOUR

COALITION V. COALITION

AND THE ORGANIZATION OF PRODUCTION

After the move of the historic outdoor market at Maxwell Street, a reconstituted Coalition, including many of the same people who had fought the unorganized and ineffective battle to save the market, found a new, but related mission – to preserve the remnants of old Maxwell Street. The group's new goals were to save as many of the remaining sixty-plus buildings as possible, to allow existing businesses to remain in the rehabbed retail district, and to insure that affordable housing was provided for those low-income residents who wished to stay. Keeping the buildings, the businesses, and the people, even within the context of a cleaned-up university campustown, was what the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition saw as "Saving Maxwell Street."

In what was often described in the press as a "pitched battle" and a "Hatfields and McCoys" situation ("Maxwell Street Blues Beat" 1999), the grassroots Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition battled for years against another, more powerful coalition, that of the UIC and the City of Chicago. The powerful city and the particularly powerful mayor created an alliance with a powerful university, one which has in effect become a new kind of corporation. Though the university retains a protected status because of its not-for-profit and educational claims, it behaves like a large corporate power and operates under corporate models and rules. These two institutions of power, city and university,

accountable only to each other, became united by their common goal of clearing land around Maxwell Street.

As outlined in chapter 1, the "City" is meant to refer to Mayor Daley, members of the city's Department of Planning and Development, other hired employees, and the Chicago City Council. The "University" or "UIC" includes the administration, board of trustees, South Campus Development team and developers.

Over the course of the battle, the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition alternately placed blame for the Maxwell Street situation – sometimes on the city, sometimes on the university, sometimes both. Attempts were made at different times to side with one force against the other, to ally the Coalition with an entity of power. Of course neither the city nor the university was trusted throughout the entire struggle, and it was suspected that secret deals were made between the two. In the end, the Coalition leaders maintain that the whole process is the result of collusion on the parts of the city and the university, with each of those entities claiming the other to be the villain. City officials say they would like to see more whole buildings saved, but that the UIC planners do not want it. UIC trustees say they want to see more buildings in the plan, but that the mayor's office stands in their way. The same stance, which amounts to a resigned cooperation and shifting of blame, was exhibited by both groups in 1994 before the move of the Maxwell Street Market.

Both coalitions wanted to "save" the area; the disagreement was over what mix of demolition, preservation, relocation, and reconstruction would do that. As

the reader has surely already gathered, it is the University/City coalition's plan which prevails. This chapter begins our exploration of how power and hegemony function in the transformation of Maxwell Street.

The concept of "power" is today looked at as a component, indeed a prominent feature, in all of social life (see Stoeltje 1993 for a discussion of evolution of the term "power" in scholarship). Definitions and explanations of the term abound; a look at Steven Lukes' Power, for example, gives us at least thirteen different takes on its meaning and function (1986). As power, dominance, resistance, and hegemony have become buzzwords in the human sciences, it is necessary to establish exactly how they are central to this project. The Maxwell Street story is certainly one of domination – of how the desires of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition and the Maxwell Street neighborhood people get subverted, denied, and overrun by those in positions of power in the university and city. But it cannot be viewed as one-directional, as Foucault has pointed out; power must not be thought of simply as being imposed exclusively by one group onto others who do not possess it. Instead, and although it is by no means democratically distributed,

> Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. (1986: 234)

The story is, therefore, also one of resistance. That resistance, as we will see, comes in many forms and in varying strengths. Many express their feelings of opposition to the university and the city, but relatively few have joined in the organized efforts to formally resist change in the neighborhood. Those few have emerged as the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, a group that has been actively involved in trying to define themselves and to carve out a piece of the university's project so that they can in some way be present and represented in the new Maxwell Street. My involvement and fieldwork with the Coalition allows me to tell the story of this group of people, and how they have responded and struggled and acted with agency to resist the displacement of their marketplace, their businesses, their homes, their people, and their history. This dissertation is at base an ethnography of how this group has spent many years trying to save their historic and by some accounts thriving urban neighborhood.

Inherent in any study of resistance is the tendency to romanticize that resistance; Abu-Lughod has pointed to this proclivity of researchers "to read all forms of resistance as signs of the ineffectiveness of systems of power and of the resilience and creativity of the human spirit in its refusal to be dominated" (1990: 42). This study attempts to avoid such a tendency by looking at the situation as a dialectic, as mentioned above, by examining the forms of power as well as the forms of resistance involved. Foucault has said that "where there is power, there is resistance" (1978: 95-6), and Abu-Lughod has asserted that the opposite is also

true, "where there is resistance, there is power" (1990: 42). Power and resistance are so intertwined that it is considered an oversimplification to view them as separate entities.

Romanticization is also avoided in this project by the realization up front that the resistance on Maxwell Street never really had a chance for success; the efforts and activities of the Coalition have ultimately failed to make much difference in the actions and development plans of the university. This makes the resistance no less real however. And it makes documentation of the resistance even more important, as the strategy of the powers-that-be is to erase, to simply wipe out all evidence of any alternative approaches and to reconstruct the events of history in such a way that no one ever knows about the battle and the resistance. Resistance is present, and its documentation is crucial, not only for how it has affected the dominant forces, but also in and of itself, as a record of a struggle that some would rather have us forget.

The power functioning in the struggle over Maxwell Street, I have found, cannot be adequately described by viewing its components simply as "dominance" or "resistance," though certainly each of these is an active force. The term that really most accurately captures how power is functioning in this situation is *hegemony*. As Raymond Williams has outlined it, hegemony includes a recognition of "the wholeness of the process"; "it sees the relations of domination and subordination, in their forms as practical consciousness, as in effect a saturation of the whole process of living" (1977: 108-110). The concept of hegemony, then, includes not only an ideology or manipulation or other aspects

of control; instead it functions by its virtual unidentifiability and naturalness in people's lives. Hegemony is

> a lived system of meanings and values – constitutive and constituting – which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of the society to move, in most areas of their lives. It is, that is to say, in the strongest sense a 'culture', but a culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes. (Williams 1977: 110)

To understand how power works in the Maxwell Street situation I have incorporated a model for the analysis of power proposed by Beverly Stoeltje (1993). The model identifies three "sources of power" – form, discourse, and the organization of production – which offer the route to understanding power in the performance of the ritual genres, which she applied to the analysis of rodeo. The Maxwell Street Market itself can be included in the concept of ritual genres in that it is a regularized performance of a group of people, one in which transformations have taken place which need to be explored. This study looks at what happens to people when the space in which they engage in performance and exchange on a ritualized basis is threatened and destroyed. The transformation of Maxwell Street will be explored using Stoeltje's model in the following way.

The first component of the model, the evolution of form, I have taken to mean the changing physical structure or landscape of the place. The changing form of the Maxwell Street neighborhood – physical changes implemented by both sides of the battle – and its implications for our discussion of power are dealt with in chapter 6. The second component of the model is discourse. The

discourse surrounding the Maxwell Street situation, that of power and displacement, as well as that of resistance, are discussed in chapter 5. The model's third component, the organization of production, will be used in this chapter. It refers to the organization of all that constitutes the actual production of a ritual or other event. Though the situation at Maxwell Street is not an event as such, "power is circulated, claimed, displayed, created, disputed, and exercised" as Stoeltje has described (1993: 141). I am reading the situation at Maxwell Street as a "dialectic" in Gramscian terms, as a struggle between the neighborhood and Coalition representatives on one hand, and the university and city of Chicago on the other. Adapting the model slightly, I look at the organization of both sides of this struggle, those with power and those without. The production is really the battle itself, how each side has organized its moves to obtain power over the situation and the space. It is in seeing all the moves, in tracing how the struggle has evolved, that we see the power relations functioning. "It is in the organization of production that the symbols of power are constructed and manipulated," writes Stoeltje (1993: 12), indicating that decisionmakers, often behind the scenes, attempt to control the circulation of power through a calculated orchestration of moves. In the Maxwell Street battle, university and city planners and decisionmakers have expressed the dominance of their institutions through a series of moves that consistently deliver the message most clearly stated by their spokesperson Mark Rosati, "we're moving forward with the plan" (Luh 2000). The Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition leaders,

the board of directors, also made calculated strategic moves intended to advance their cause.

We look now to the series of efforts by the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition to influence the future of Maxwell Street – a series of actions and adaptations meant to appeal to city and university decisionmakers. These will be examined alongside the moves made by the university/city coalition leading up to its final plan for South Campus development. I here outline the Coalition's basic views and arguments and how they have been adapted as a result of refined thinking or the realities of UIC's power and the undeniable inequities of urban development. Throughout, it is important to keep in mind that power is constructed and imposed through production – the moves of both groups help us to view the circulation of influence.

Until late 1997 the Coalition had mainly been involved in "internet activism" through the maintenance of a website, www.openair.org/maxwell/preserve,[1] and through a letter-writing campaign to UIC Chancellor David Broski. Our mission was described to me as to educate and perhaps embarrass UIC, to convince them of the benefits of preserving blocks of old buildings, and to convince them of the public image problems of not doing so. Though we had already "lost the biggest prize" in the outdoor market relocation, we maintained hope of creating a Maxwell Street Historic District. The Coalition started its appeals with a push to create an historic district at Maxwell and Halsted in order to celebrate the history of the neighborhood from its inception through to the present. What we wanted was to preserve the

authentic flavor of Maxwell Street, to keep the buildings and adapt them to new uses instead of tearing them down, to keep the area retail, full of people, full of music and the scent of polish sausage and grilled onions. As a Coalition, we wanted to give future generations a backdrop for imagining and studying the history of the place, complete with blemishes, instead of creating a nostalgic version which is attractive but fake. We wanted to facilitate the future of Maxwell Street instead of locking it in the past and trivializing or theming it. Our goal was to conserve the built environment in ways consistent with contemporary demands. The idea was that while buildings are serving the needs of the university by housing students, departmental offices, labs, retail, etc., they would also be there, standing as reminders of the past. They are the physical link between the past and present. If they are standing, even if Muddy Waters and Hound Dog Taylor aren't playing on the corner, even if elderly Jewish men aren't peddling out of pushcarts, people can still come and see the area, the buildings, and can still say "see this coffee shop? This used to be Flukey's," and a story can follow.

Coalition messages emphasized the place as a business incubator and alternative economy, an ethnic and low-income neighborhood, a racially-mixed community, a seemingly insignificant folk neighborhood that deserves to be celebrated as much as the old mansions and military battlefields that are more typically saved from the wrecking ball. The Coalition wished to accurately emphasize the folk nature of the place -- its focus on participation, performance, face-to-face interaction, and status as a living place -- rather than on tourism,

spectatorship, and mediation. Coalition members relate to Maxwell Street as a *place*. They identify with it; they feel morally accountable to it and the other people in the Maxwell Street community.

We tried to influence decisionmakers with what we saw as powerful messages of group and community and folk. These messages were far from persuasive to the UIC/City coalition, a set of individuals with institutional but not group consciousness, who have no affiliation with the place, and who view the Maxwell Street neighborhood as *land* for development rather than *place*. What became clear is that the Coalition's moral appeals about this very special neighborhood and folk community where people know each other, perform on the streets, loan money, share food, support an alternative economy and lifestyle, etc. were counterproductive with authorities invested in a different model of modernity. The UIC/City coalition's actions are based on a completely different morality, one based on cleanliness, progress, order, and rational use. The Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition's morality, on the other hand, is one of people, place, and tradition. Each party operates according to its own principles; each feels morally upright in the struggle – and the conversation can never advance because the terms are not agreed upon.

When it became obvious that the university and the city weren't to be swayed by the idea of celebrating a low-income, African-American neighborhood, the Coalition focused efforts on Maxwell Street's buildings and tried to drop the references to its people. Saving old buildings is a mission people can get their minds around, and so this is where we focused our messages.

Historic preservation has emerged as a symbol in the battle, one that works for the Coalition as an established and accepted middle-class goal, and one that can easily be understood by university officials and developers, one that is not too antagonistic or too far removed from the thinking of city and university administrators. It is a cause that makes sense to everyone and has few complications. In thinking about old buildings, people have few prejudices, few disagreements. What's not to like about a building?

During the battle between the Coalition and the university/city coalition, only a few blocks of the original district remained, but they contained a collection that included frame cottages from before the 1871 Chicago Fire, 1880's tenements, classic nineteenth-century storefronts, early Art Deco, and commercial block architecture. The physical structure of approximately forty of the two and three-story storefront buildings remained intact. Many were designed by well-known architects. Many thrived as family businesses for decades. Many of the buildings have vaulted ceilings and glassy arcade entranceways or vestibules with mosaic inlaid tile floors, the kind of "shop architecture" said to be disappearing from around the city (Bey 1998b). Other buildings, especially the tenement buildings and ones which include apartment spaces, are examples of vernacular architecture from as far back as the Civil War.

The case made for the importance of the buildings is threefold. First, some of the buildings are architecturally or historically significant individually – either designed by important architects, or particularly aesthetically appealing, or representative of a certain type of significant building or design style or period in

history. Second, the buildings along Maxwell and Halsted are significant as a group – together they constitute a historic district, a grouping of buildings which show the growth of the neighborhood and the progression of architectural styles. Even the more plain and insignificant buildings gain significance through their inclusion in this group. And third, the preservation of the buildings is crucial so that they may serve as a reminder of the historical and spiritual significance of the place. They are the physical fabric that will trigger memories and questions about the past.

The Coalition thus urged the university to jump on the bandwagon of historic preservation. Some of us consulted with preservationists about what sorts of terminology and official language would be most effective in describing possibilities for the area and were directed by the Chicago Programs Committee of the Landmarks Preservation Council of Illinois to call our wishes "adaptive reuse." Research into historic preservation revealed adaptive reuse to be not only a buzzword, but also pretty standard thinking among preservationists. The trend in preservation (since the late 1970's) is that buildings should be saved, not as quaint museum pieces, but for uses appropriate to present needs. Says Barbaralee Diamonstein, author of Buildings Reborn and Remaking America, "Probably the single most important aspect of the preservation movement is the recycling of old buildings – adapting them to uses different from the ones for which they were originally intended...Successful revitalization demonstrates that the forms and materials devised in the past are still valid when properly adapted to the functions of today's life" (1978: 13). Promotion of adaptive reuse to the UIC was intended

to emphasize how widespread the rehabilitation trend is across the country, and how they would really be missing a significant opportunity to ignore it.
The Coalition made every attempt not to get sucked too far into any arguments about historical significance of any particular building. A few of the buildings have historic and architectural significance independent of their context on Maxwell Street, but most do not. Instead we focused discussion on the historic significance of the neighborhood and the buildings' importance to that neighborhood, an argument we could always win.

The Coalition was able to remain relatively unified by this mission of saving the buildings. With the foregrounded argument being the salvation of old buildings, individual Coalition members could have their own personal underlying causes, their real, though often unstated missions. For some it was keeping the people there. This could not be used with the university of course, as it would shut any negotiations down immediately, and because against this could be leveled arguments of crime, dirt, pornography, and drugs. The Coalition as a whole could not have such a large mission as preventing the creation or exacerbation of poverty or the displacement of people. This, though a background hope of many of its members, could not function as a unifying vision for battling the University of Illinois. What the Coalition did instead was adopt a strategy of "incrementalism," foregrounding the buildings as a way to negotiate with the university, to interest the city in tourism, and if some buildings get saved, to establish a foothold in the area through which it might gain another important victory – the chance to influence the public memory of the Maxwell Street market

and neighborhood, to be involved in documenting its history and displaying it to the public. What the Coalition did in effect was stop fighting for the direct interests of current residents, shoppers, and businesspersons, and instead fight for how those people, and the decades of people who came before them, will be remembered. And those very people, the people on the street at Maxwell and Halsted, became some of the most involved activists for saving the buildings. The Coalition also tried to save buildings by telling the university of its "rare opportunity" to create a unique historic campus district, something that would stand out in the city of Chicago, that would attract tourists, something beyond the typical performing arts center, parks, and shops. The buildings, they said, are the one thing that could make the university's plan a success. And the historically-oriented campustown would allow the university to correct the mistakes it made in the design of what is widely thought to be a cold, vacant, inwardly-turned college campus. The place, if properly viewed as a cultural asset, could be used by the university as a laboratory for students of architecture, engineering, history, art, anthropology, urban planning, and geography; it could provide an opportunity for interdisciplinary projects, studies, and theses.

Giving examples of other projects in other cities was intended to show that adaptive reuse can be done successfully and that the UIC would be heartily praised and respected for similar preservation efforts. Examples of rehabbed buildings and areas in Chicago were mentioned repeatedly with the message "Nobody tears down old buildings anymore!" Often the Coalition tried to compare the situation at Maxwell Street to the rehabilitation of Memphis' Beale

Street. There the street was in a similar state of decay, and the city was equally prepared to tear it all down. There was not, however, a major university interested in demolition and land acquisition. The Lower East Side Tenement Museum at 97 Orchard Street in New York City was also frequently cited as an example of the kind of project the Coalition would love to see on Maxwell Street. Opened in 1988, the restored tenement apartments, in conjunction with historical tours and events, gives a view of the immigrant and migrant experience and celebrates the ordinary lives of the people who settled in Manhattan's Lower East Side neighborhood. Of course, much of the reason the Tenement Museum works so well in helping us achieve an understanding of the past is that most of the old buildings on Orchard Street are still standing and in use, and the street still serves as a market street and bargain retail district. And the Coalition used the example of Boston University, which acquired, preserved, refurbished, adapted, and occupied existing buildings to form their campus. The campuses of the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan, and Chicago's DePaul University were cited as well for the integration of older buildings.

Once it became clear that the university would not leave all the buildings in their original places, that they required large parcels of land to build large buildings (especially along the west side of Halsted), the Coalition focused efforts on convincing them that buildings could be moved without too much effort or expense. The idea of building relocation was immediately dismissed by the university as unfeasible, so the Coalition set about coming up with a site plan and a budget which would indicate that there is reality to the scheme, that it can be

done at less that astronomical cost and bother. Examples of large buildings moved in Chicago and other cities, and the positive public and press reaction from such efforts, were directed toward the university in an attempt to convince them of how romantic it is to move buildings and of what superb public relations could result from a series of building-moving events.

The Coalition also tried suggestions of how to make a new "Campustown" more textured and interesting in contrast to the current sterile and unappealing campus, but made a strategic decision not to "take potshots" at the UIC's proposed gateway park, though all members find it to be a ridiculous use of space and totally antithetical to the authentic nature of the neighborhood. Sensing -- from communications with the city and the university and from the appearance of and comments about the "gateway" in all of UIC's public statements -- that the park was a permanent feature in UIC's plans, the Coalition decided not to oppose it or try to fight for buildings which stand in its way, though they are some of the most beautiful in the area and still house vital businesses. Since it was obvious that those could not be saved in their original locations because of the gateway park, the Coalition did not waste energy fighting for that; instead they suggested moving the buildings from the gateway-earmarked land to other locations on the street.

Throughout, the university sent its own powerful messages about the saving of buildings. After assuring the rejection of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition's first bid for National Register status in 1994 by entering into an agreement with the Illinois Historic Preservation Association (IHPA), the

university purchased dozens of buildings from the city and tore them down. They targeted many more for demolition, including in March of 1998 a group of buildings now know as "the Maxwell Street Six," six buildings located right at the intersection of Halsted and Maxwell Streets, buildings that would logically make up the core of any future historic district or attraction. The destruction of buildings and the known threat to others was crucial to the success of the university's power. Throughout the process of transformation of the neighborhood it was consistently made clear who had the ultimate power to decide the fate of Maxwell Street.

Around the same time as the Maxwell Street Six, a fire started in another building, this one right at the corner of Halsted and Maxwell, and the fire spread to the building next to it. The nature of the fire is suspicious at best, though the university says it was started by "squatters" (B. Mier 1998a: B3). Demolition crews showed up immediately and started ripping down the wrong building.[2] Before anything could be done, the rear two-thirds of the wrong building and all of the more severely burned building were gone. Ironically, the fire burned the metal siding off the fronts of a couple buildings, revealing facades of patterned brick work with limestone detailing, and strengthening the Coalition's arguments of architectural integrity and significance. The Coalition tried to negotiate with the city to halt the demolition of this, the Feinberg building, 1311-1313 S. Halsted, and then proceeded to file a stay of demolition in demolition court, which left the front third of the building standing.

In response to the demolition orders for the Maxwell Six, the Coalition held a blues jam and protest rally on the corner of Maxwell and Halsted on a sunny Saturday morning in April. Live blues was performed by Piano C. Red, the Flat Foot Boogie Band, and Jimmie Lee Robinson. The Coalition turned out en force – area religious leaders, community leaders and activists, current and former residents, merchants, blues lovers and musicians – to express its anger toward the UIC for going back on earlier land use plans which indicated that many of the buildings and the retail character of the neighborhood could be saved. Dozens signed a list indicating they were willing to form a "human chain" if bulldozers arrived again to tear down buildings.

When the Coalition protests demolition of specific buildings, the university's main argument is that the buildings are a fire hazard and therefore a liability to the university as owner. The Coalition says this could be resolved much more economically than through demolition and debris removal if the university were to instead properly board up the structures in their backs and second-story windows and to remove flammable debris from their interiors and entryways. It is, as the Coalition sees it, part of the overall plan for destruction of the area; neglect of the buildings leads to disrepair and potential hazard, which in turn feeds the argument that the buildings must come down because they are decrepit past the point of rehabilitation. As neglected buildings stand as eyesores, or are demolished in favor of vacant lots, the blight of the neighborhood is increased. Then businesses falter and are more eager to sell out to the UIC. And UIC's plan to clear cut the area is thus accelerated.

The university of course understands that wiping out the architecture of the past is crucial to completely changing the neighborhood. The buildings allow people to recognize the place and situate themselves within it; a crucial step toward getting rid of the people is getting rid of the buildings they feel connected to. They know that the more they harm the "physical integrity"[3] of the structures through demolition and neglect, the slimmer the chances of any future historic nomination being successful. "They are merely trying to create facts on the ground so they can later claim that there are not enough extant structures to justify creating a historic district," says one Coalition member (Marmer 1998a).

The physical destruction of Maxwell Street is essential to the powerful city/university coalition's goal of destroying the social relations of the place. As MacCannell has suggested, the "dematerialization of basic social relations" is central to the mainstream model of modernity (1976: 85). While the Coalition consistently tried to maintain the social relations of Maxwell Street – through attempts to save the market, the businesses, the buildings, the memory, even through the construction of the Coalition itself – the UIC/City coalition was engaged in a process of dematerializing the community and its history in order to later construct a modern vision of the past, uncomplicated by existing social relations and memories.

Sensing that the historic preservation angle, the push to save buildings, had run its course, the Coalition decided to foreground blues music as its next argument for saving the neighborhood. Maxwell Street, as we have seen, is the birthplace of the blues and thus the birthplace of all popular music. It is the

Coalition's position that Maxwell Street was not only home and stage to dozens of important blues musicians, but also that the characteristics of the neighborhood – the buildings, businesses, market, crowds, and diverse population – formed the music. An obstacle to the Coalition's message that Maxwell Street could be a natural home to blues clubs and blues-related tourist attractions is the fact that Dorothy Tillman, a powerful alderperson on Chicago's south side, has designs on starting Chicago's official blues district and "African Village" on 47th Street in her own ward. According to mayoral aides there would thus be "very strong resistance" to any other competing blues district in the city.

The Coalition appealed to the mayor and the city by showing how a revitalized Maxwell Street with museums and historic buildings and blues music would be a component of Chicago's status as a world-class city, something the mayor has been oft-quoted as striving toward.

At Chicago's lakefront Bluesfest each year starting in 1997, the Coalition put up a booth and used the spot for leafletting and talking to interested passersby. They shared the spot with the Foundation for the Advancement of the Blues and the Chicago Public Library Blues Archive, thus positioning themselves in the blues music movement, but were unsuccessful in getting the other blues organizations in Chicago to join forces with them in the fight to preserve Maxwell Street. The Coalition's idea was to convince these groups that the creation of a Maxwell Street Historic District would help make Chicago into the "Woodfield Mall of Blues Music," that is all blues groups would benefit because people would be drawn to the whole collection of blues-related attractions; a person who

might not make a special trip to Chicago just to see the Chicago Blues Museum might make the trip to see the museum, plus Chess Records, plus Maxwell Street and a handful of other blues attractions. Though the missions of the various blues organizations sound remarkably the same – to promote the preservation, evolution, education, and appreciation of the blues and blues culture – they gave the Maxwell Street cause little attention. According to Balkin, "few wanted to back a cause that did not have the endorsement of the mayor, as he gave subsidies to favored organizations and ran the annual Chicago Blues festival" (Balkin and Mier 2000).

The blues angle was also pushed to legislators who were told through letters or over the phone about the "Blues Heritage Corridor" or "Blues Highway," a federally-funded heritage tourism trail which could run from the South up to Chicago tracing the path of blues music and musicians from the Delta. Our message is that Chicago has the opportunity to participate in programs such as this, and thus gain tourist dollars, but only if they stop the UIC from demolishing the resources needed. Coalition members knowledgeable about blues music applied for and received on behalf of the Coalition the Blues Foundation's "Keeping the Blues Alive" award, which was helpful in getting the group and its cause noticed by blues organizations around the world.

The blues message was most effectively delivered through a series of blues jams at the New Maxwell Street Market and on the corner of Maxwell and Halsted. In September 1998, the Coalition held what was to be the last of its many protest blues jams. Called "The Maxwell Street Heritage Festival," it was organized to

resemble an earlier blues jam at the old market. A small stage was set up next to the Maxwell Street Wall of Fame and the M-A-X sculpture made out of railroad ties, and electrical cords hung out of the windows of a partially demolished building and across Halsted Street from Jim's Original, the world-famous hot dog stand. Blues artists Jody Noa and Johnnie Mae Dunson played to a diverse crowd, many holding cans of beer in paper sacks, most agreeing to hold one of the Coalition's protest signs: We Want to Stay, Home of the Blues, I (heart) Jim's, UIC – University Insensitive to Culture, Save Our Street, No TIF, just to name a few. Rev. Johnson offered a prayer, a peanut salesman sang a song in Hebrew, poet Sterling Plumpp read a new poem about Maxwell Street, and several members of the Coalition spoke about the battle against the university, while other members urged people to stand very close to the stage so that if any reporters came there would be the illusion of a crowd. Of course, blues jams were held frequently after this one, almost every weekend in the summers of 1999 and 2000, and always with the warning that "this may be the last time live Blues is heard on Maxwell Street." Though the blues jams did not really attract more than fifty or so people at once, they did serve to create a buzz about the Coalition and to give the Coalition reasons to issue press releases and internet notices.

The Coalition's blues message has been largely ignored by the UIC/City coalition, there is not much hope that blues music will play a part in the new development. Along with other aspects of Maxwell Street's history, the blues has been targeted for elimination as its tradition runs completely counter to the corporate interests and the mainstreaming forces taking over on Maxwell Street.

Their power would be compromised by the inclusion of the blues, which could serve as a reminder of what has been destroyed. The blues voice, and by extension the African-American voice, rather than being credited by the UIC and the City as a reason for preservation, will be silenced.

Near the end of 1997 the Coalition got serious about their status as an organization and decided more formality could serve them well in terms of gaining respect and legitimacy. Two members pursued and gained 501C3 status for the organization – it is now registered with the IRS, can legally accept charitable donations, and has "official status." Its next move was to elect officers and a board of directors, to make sure they all were accessible by e-mail, and to set up corporation bylaws, an annual budget, reimbursement procedures, and a plan for fundraising.

The next step toward legitimacy was to draft and adopt the "Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition Statement of Principles." It was an attempt to focus and guide the group's efforts and public statements and to define its core beliefs, in effect to discover what it is this diverse group with diverse agendas really shares. Ten basic principles, listed below, are guided by this disclaimer:

> The purpose of this statement is to establish guidelines as to our common beliefs as members of a diverse Coalition. This statement is not intended to produce or enforce orthodoxy. Especially as some members of the Coalition choose to take some of these principles further, they are entitled to that opinion, but they should recognize that it is not necessarily shared by all other members of the Coalition nor, and most importantly, is that disagreement fatal to Coalition solidarity on core beliefs.

Statement of Principles

1. The century-long historical importance of the Maxwell Street neighborhood must be acknowledged and commemorated.

2. The remaining physical fabric of Maxwell, Halsted, and Roosevelt Rd. should be retained and restored, to display the built environment of a period of significance in the neighborhood's history, dating from the late-19th to mid-20th century.

3. The retail character of the Maxwell Street neighborhood should be retained.

4. The heritage of the Maxwell Street neighborhood as a marketplace that transcends two centuries should be commemorated.

5. The heritage of the Maxwell Street neighborhood as hospitable to low cost, easy-entry entrepreneurship should be commemorated.

6. The heritage of the Maxwell Street neighborhood as the Midwest's largest and most important "port of entry" for immigrant groups should be commemorated, especially as to its Jewish, African-American and Mexican-American components.

7. The heritage of the Maxwell Street neighborhood as a place where key events occurred in the development of the musical style know as "Chicago Blues" should be commemorated.

8. The nationally-known businesses and individuals which developed from the immigrant neighborhood, should be recognized and commemorated.

9. Its extant religious and manufacturing buildings should be retained.

10. We believe these principles are compatible with the legitimate needs and goals of the University of Illinois at Chicago and can be accommodated within the university's plan for redevelopment of the south campus in the Maxwell Street neighborhood.*

*The Maxwell Street neighborhood is defined as and is inclusive of: the south side of Roosevelt Rd. from Union Street to Newberry Street; the east

side of Halsted Street from Roosevelt Rd. to Liberty Street and the west side of Halsted Street to Maxwell Street; the north side of Maxwell Street from Union Street to the west side of Halsted St. and the south side of Maxwell Street to the east side of Halsted St.; the north side of Liberty Street, the north and south sides of 13th Street, and the south side of O'Brien Street from Union Street to Halsted Street; and the west side of Union Street from Roosevelt Rd. to 14th Street.

At this time much of the Coalition's actions took on a decidedly more formal, legitimized flavor. Discussion among Coalition members focused continually on the stance it should assume toward the entities and the tone it should use in delivering its messages. Though all members of the Coalition feel overwhelmingly negative toward the university, strategy has usually dictated relatively moderate statements and sometimes even veiled support or applause rather than a rabidly adversarial anti-UIC stance. Members urge other members not to use intemperate language in their public messages to avoid being "pigeonholed as crazy," to "make a good impression on them" by being "on our best conservative behavior."

In an effort to make their ideas for the rehab and preservation of the area tangible to outside audiences, namely the city and the university and anyone who might have an influence on either, the Coalition started in late 1997 using what became known as the "hot dog poster." The poster was printed in 1996 by the Vienna Beef Company, the maker of the "Maxwell Street Polish Sausage," and a company with its roots on old Maxwell Street. The poster was intended for promotional use by restaurants who sell Vienna Beef products. It shows a street scene at the corner of Maxwell and Halsted Streets circa 1945, complete with cobblestone street, sidewalk vendors, and active streetlife. The street is lined with

the old buildings, and signs of actual area merchants can be clearly seen: Jim's Original, Leavitts, Smokey Joe's, Bartels, Dekoven Drugs, Victory Cloth, and Three Sisters Ladies Clothing. The most prominent feature of the poster is a gigantic polish sausage on a trailer being wheeled down Halsted Street to the delight of residents and passersby. The spire of St. Francis church can be seen, as can the skyscrapers in Chicago's downtown.

In the belief that most people have a hard time looking at what remains on Maxwell Street today and successfully imagining what could be there in the way of adapted and rehabbed buildings and renewed streetlife, the Coalition started using the hot dog poster as the centerpiece of its presentations to city and university officials. The poster was often unveiled to the comment "We want this without the huge hot dog." We really wanted to produce a similar colorful poster minus the hot dog, but could not afford such an elaborate illustration. Instead, one Coalition member's friend, an artist, was hired to produce a simple line drawing which could be reproduced in various sizes for handouts and presentation boards. Extensive discussion about what the drawing should show led to a concept drawing which integrates UIC's stated needs with the Coalition's view of what the street could and should look like. It shows the same view as the hot dog poster, north on Halsted from Maxwell, and features many of the same old buildings used as businesses. It shows the university's science research center, some student residences, and a five-level parking garage, all in the locations then said to be desired by the university. The Coalition's desires were fit around these. The sidewalks have been widened to allow for cafés, increased foot traffic, and

tourist appeal. Jim's Original is in its original location, and the street is peppered with new businesses: Marlin Café, Bakery Shack, Black Café. First-floor retail runs the length of the street. A gateway was included at the entrance to Halsted on Roosevelt per the university's wishes for a gateway park, and another was added onto Maxwell Street which mimics a gateway which actually once marked the entrance to the outdoor marketplace. Architectural details were borrowed from existing buildings or historic photos of the area and added to the academic buildings to create a consistent look. Antique streetlights line the street.

In the minds of some Coalition members the place had the potential to become a festival marketplace of sorts. They talked about setting up outdoor stalls for vendors, parking old-time cars along the street, paving the street with granite cobblestones, and incorporating street musicians, mimes, and other street entertainment into the scene.

Another set of drawings was created which showed elevations of buildings the coalition wanted saved. The drawings were of individual buildings straight from the front, pasted together to give a view of what one side of the street might look like if some buildings were relocated and all were rehabbed. The Coalition's packet of sketches, elevations, and land use plans together made up a proposal to preserve approximately forty of the remaining sixty buildings in the neighborhood.

The drawings were used at several meetings with city and university decisionmakers. They did make our Coalition's vision more concrete, and audiences were superficially supportive and interested. When advisors suggested

that drawings are not official enough without costs and figures attached to them, Coalition members agreed to an appeal based on economics.

Cost has all along been the university's main argument against pursuing any of the plans proposed by the city, the Coalition, or outside consultants. The Coalition has thus worked hard to combat the cost argument, preparing memos and reports about ways the university could preserve the buildings in a cost-effective manner. We have prepared and commissioned many cost comparison reports, using sample buildings to compare rehab costs to new construction. Plus, we have proposed ways in which Maxwell Street could generate revenue. For instance, all along we have suggested private investors as a source of funding, suggesting corporations with roots in Maxwell Street (such as Vienna Beef, CBS, Ron Popeil Industries, Bigsby and Kruthers, RJR Nabisco, and others), prominent families with roots in the neighborhood (families of Benny Goodman, Morrie Mages, William Paley, Seymour Persky, Barney Balaban, and many more), other corporations that would be interested in ties to a blues or historic district (record and entertainment companies), prominent musicians (Rolling Stones, John Lee Hooker, Eric Clapton, Buddy Guy, etc.), merchants in the Maxwell Street area willing to undertake development (the Stephanovic family, the Federman family, the Annareno family, and others), and a network of developers who would be interested in developing a building or string of buildings in a historic/touristic district thought to be "the last gold mine in the city" (McAloon 1998). We have also suggested that the university could get funding through various government initiatives: the White House's Save America's Treasures program, the Local

Legacies project of the Library of Congress, saleable tax credits for rehabbing unofficial historic buildings, and the U.S. National Blues Corridor project to name a few. We cite cities such as Seattle, Detroit, Cleveland, and New York which have preserved and restored their old public market areas and are reaping a windfall of tourism and community development benefits. We reference the French Quarter in New Orleans and Beale Street in Memphis as preserved music heritage areas, tourism magnets, and generators of economic development.

The Coalition continually points out that even the highest estimates for adaptive reuse of buildings would represent a very small fraction of the total expenditures for the south campus expansion (the university says the expansion will cost $525 million and that the McClier Plan would add $10.5 million to that – Coalition members say the expansion price will be closer to one billion dollars and that the preservation costs are closer to nine million). And even if cost for generating usable space is similar for rehab versus new construction, tax credits available for rehab would serve to make rehab less expensive.

Even if the university wants to spend nothing at all on the rehab, says the Coalition, they could open it up to private investors and rehabbers, letting these parties buy the buildings, fix them up, and lease them for university compatible uses. Their argument has been that Chicago's near west side is one of the hottest real estate markets in the city, and that development would have occurred years ago, and the city's tax base would have thus increased, if the UIC had not gotten control of the area and let it sit deteriorating. It has been the Coalition's position all along that if the onus of the wrecking ball were removed from Maxwell Street,

the market would take over and the area would immediately be redeveloped by private parties, as has happened almost everywhere within two miles of the Loop in the last decade. The neighborhood has remained decrepit because building and business owners do not want to invest money in their places only to have them taken away by the university. The threat of takeover and demolition has been so thick in the air around Maxwell Street for many years that it is no longer only the university that is neglecting buildings, letting the facades look bad with broken windows and hanging awnings. They have created a ghetto by frightening businessowners and landlords from keeping up their property. The Coalition feels the university's refusal to listen to pro-preservation consultants and to options for privatization is simply a deliberate decision to ignore preservation opportunities while using cost as an excuse to follow the path of new construction they want.[4]

The Plans for Maxwell Street

Eventually, the Coalition's efforts led to the formation of a City of Chicago Ad-Hoc Committee, composed of UIC architects and planners, City of Chicago planning officials, two prominent consultant architects hired by the city, and members of the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. The committee met in April and May of 1998 and arrived at a compromise, an adaptive reuse plan to save thirty-six vintage buildings on Maxwell and Halsted (out of approximately sixty remaining at the time). At the meetings the city pushed on the UIC to abandon their all-new construction plan and their plan to make new buildings look old. The city called the meetings and showed the UIC how they could get their footage needs met and still keep many old buildings.

The meetings resulted in a written plan and drawing which took UIC's demands for specific kinds of space into consideration and showed how the old buildings could be integrated with construction of new buildings for a win-win situation. The plan was known as the Daley-Decker-Vinci Plan, reflecting the contributions of the city and the two architects hired by the city to come up with a plan to suit every party's needs.

Three clumps of buildings were proposed for salvation: the entire block of the south side of Maxwell Street east of Halsted, entire blocks of east side of Halsted from Maxwell to O'Brien, and an entire part block of the west side of Halsted from Roosevelt to O'Brien. Though concerned that the saved buildings were now split into non-contiguous chunks which could weaken the argument for a historic "district," the Coalition was happy with the plan and certainly with the interest shown by the city. Once the Daley-Decker-Vinci Plan was on the table, the city ordered the university to hold off on all demolition in the Maxwell Street area. The Daley-Decker-Vinci Plan became the first in a series of plans or agreements for the university to reject or alter beyond recognition.

The first indication of their reneging on what the Coalition thought was an "agreement" was their application, along with their private development partner, Mesirow Stein Real Estate[5] for status as a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district. TIF is a property tax program that provides incentives to private developers for developing areas identified as "blighted," and considered to be "vacant" or "underused" by the city of Chicago. They are areas identified as "not living up to their potential" by the Chicago Planning and Development Department. A TIF

area must be blighted to qualify, and the university has done its best through neglect and demolition to make sure it does. The university-owned buildings in the neighborhood are not properly boarded up, have broken windows, unswept entryways, and rats.

In a TIF, residential and commercial property tax money, instead of going to schools and park districts, goes to the university to be used for infrastructure improvements like sidewalks and sewers. The money can also be used for property acquisition and demolition and for subsidies to developers.[6] The university stated over and over that no TIF money would go toward private development or university buildings. They intend instead to use the funds to demolish existing buildings and businesses in order to have vacant land available to build new commercial structures whenever they get enough money to do it. The UIC's project will start with a $150 million residential development of mid-priced lofts, townhomes, and condominiums which will fuel the tax-increment financing district and will pay most of the $64.5 million cost for new infrastructure and land acquisition. A bond issue backed by the property tax revenues will help the developers get the funds they need up front. Student residence halls along Halsted Street will also be financed with bonds backed by room and board fees; these bonds will also finance the retail development in the area (Corfman 1999).

TIF designation is significant to the university because it is the only way to proceed with the South Campus Development plan. And it is significant to the Coalition because they know that TIF designation allows the university to acquire

buildings through eminent domain[7] and to demolish them though they won't be prepared for years, if ever, to build anything in their place – the university, even with a TIF, doesn't have the money it needs to build its dorms or other campus buildings, says the Coalition. It calls the university's TIF-based plans the worst sort of landbanking, saying the TIF is not being used just for development, but also for displacement and ethnic cleansing.

TIF is to be used to redevelop blighted areas which could and would not develop BUT FOR the use of TIF. It has always been the Coalition's message that the Near West side, some of the most valuable real estate in the city of Chicago, does not need the help of a TIF to spur its development. The district is close to Chicago's Loop, the Chicago River, Lake Michigan, and a Metra train station. Developers and investors would be clamoring to spend money there if not for the UIC's predatory involvement and exclusion of private real estate interests. The Coalition has this to say about the Roosevelt-Union TIF: "[the developers] will be using tax revenues to subsidize upscale townhouses, a windfall for them, and, at the same time, exclude existing businesses in the neighborhood from the new campustown....In effect, they are using enormous sums of taxpayers money to replace current businesses – some dating back over 80 years – with new businesses" (Coalition press release 8/25/98). David Peterson (1997) gives an even more sinister view, calling TIFs "the ultimate in regressive tax policy" and stating that "TIFs enable those real estate investors that are wealthy enough to create even more wealth to capture what wealth they create, and keep it for themselves, thus preventing any of it from trickling down to the lower orders, or

being spent on socially useless ends such as public schools, public health care, and public transportation." TIF gives municipalities the unilateral authority to make financial decisions which directly affect the tax bases of other taxing districts; if one district is not contributing to education and other budget areas, the money still must come from somewhere, and that is from other districts. TIF is often misused and overused by cities in their eagerness to spur economic development.

The Coalition knew there was no stopping the TIF, that Mayor Daley has Tifitis, and that the city has a huge apparatus in place to defend TIF designation against detractors (as of November 1997 the city of Chicago had 44 TIF's (Washburn and Martin 1997). What they hoped to do is get the city to place restrictions or conditions on the TIF that require the saving and incorporation of historic buildings. The city was really the last hope, the only ones with the power to influence UIC's plans. At this point, the Coalition presented reasoned arguments about economics, the value of tourism, architecture, and great urban spaces, and consciously tried to avoid emotional and inflated appeals about how the TIF is "stealing money from our children's education to subsidize rich people's townhomes" and the like. These arguments were used to influence city thinking about the area and what UIC might do with it if given free reign with a TIF. The Coalition hoped to gain media coverage in order to pressure the city to slow the TIF designation down enough to make UIC nervous and more willing to deal on saving buildings. Handouts, press releases, and demonstrations against the TIF focused on the public harm it would cause in the form of destruction of

historic buildings, diversion of tax dollars away from the schools and park district, acceleration of gentrification in surrounding areas, and the loss of businesses, jobs, community life, shopping, hot dog stands, culture, and homes for current residents. We suggested spending some of the TIF dollars on the "public purpose" of preserving buildings. University statements, on the other hand, focused on the "Public Benefits of the TIF" which include construction jobs for minorities, women, and community-based businesses, job readiness training and workshops, affordable housing, continued support of the Great Cities Initiative at the UIC, a new Park District community center, and "creating a neighborhood sensitive to the character of Maxwell Street" (flier advertising UIC's community meeting on the TIF). The TIF meetings were delayed as a result of Coalition efforts.

Another clear indication of the university's denial of the 36-building plan was that the university finally issued a press release about the South Campus expansion. Their future plans call for more parking, more softball fields, a performing arts center, residence halls, some upscale retail, and townhouses valued from $125,000 to $400,000. Plans also include a gateway park, a preserved police station, and a street with a "turn-of-the-century character." The plan revealed in this release was much more vague than the Daley-Decker-Vinci plan; it did not mention specific buildings or how many buildings would be saved and did not reference the meetings with the city and its advisors. The May 1998 statement by the university made the Coalition very suspicious of the university's

real versus stated plans; they decided to present a demeanor of "cautious optimism."

The university's plans were formally unveiled at public (and legally required) meetings about the TIF designation.[8] One hearing before the Community Development Commission was held on November 18, 1998 on the UIC campus[9] and featured the university's South Campus Development Team explaining a series of polished presentation boards to a roomful of heckling, sign-waving, and passionately angry Maxwell Street supporters. Frank "Little Sonny" Scott, Jr. sold "Save Maxwell Street" hats for five dollars each and reminded everyone of the true spirit of Maxwell Street – every interaction is an opportunity to sell something. Dozens of people gave impassioned speeches about their feelings for Maxwell Street and the university's insensitivity. Shouts of "You are doing this on stolen land!" and "You lousy goddamned liars!" were common. People screamed and cried. And the Development Team alternated between looking agitated and looking bored. Revealed at this meeting were boards outlining the UIC's master development plan, including residential area views, clean and safe-looking streetscapes with lots of purposeful and well-spaced pedestrians, and lawn and parkscapes featuring frolicking, ball-playing children and strolling parents. The room laughed and jeered at the Team's promises of "affordable housing" in the $200,000 range, based on "average salaries" of $64,000 a year. To the development team's descriptions of awnings, signage, wrought iron, brick and other "rich materials," the audience responded with shouts of "Rich? Yeah, rich like you!"

The public meetings are frustrating. University and city officials sit in the front of the room and have unlimited time to display their foamcore boards, and present bulletpoint handouts. The public sits in the back of the room, is shushed repeatedly, and is at the end of the meeting given a few minutes each to step forward with questions. Very little commentary is offered in response to the questions. Planning officials take no notes on the audience input. The meetings are a legal requirement, and there is every appearance that the development team and others are just trying to get them over with. These sorts of silencing strategies were used throughout the process; Coalition members were repeatedly reminded that those in power were moving ahead with their hegemonic plan, that the debate was essentially one-sided.

The plan revealed at this meeting includes a collage of photos showing the "retail area design character" planned for South Campus; this board features photos of urban design features like fountains, wrought iron or chain borders, banners, old-timey street lights, flowerboxes, and the storefronts of a Starbuck's Coffee and a Talbot's. Contrasted with this is a display of photos of "existing area conditions" on Maxwell Street; this shows eight of the dreariest, most depressing photos ever taken of the area. There is not street or sidewalk traffic – not a person to be seen -- and the photos were taken on a dark, foggy day when there was dirty snow piled on everything. This is the stuff they want to get rid of, and it is easy in these photos to see why. In contrast, another display board shows five photos of existing buildings taken on a bright, sunny day. Here the buildings look strong and usable; these are the ones labeled "buildings under evaluation for

adaptive reuse." Another display board shows UIC's plans for a "gateway park" at the corner of Roosevelt and Halsted to serve as the entrance to the new campustown. This "park" includes a large fountain, special pavers, trees, flags, and two large stone-carved UIC signs.

The rest of what was revealed to the public on this date deals mainly with the UIC's goals for hiring minority, women-owned, and local businesses. This "Covenant with South Campus Development Team and South Campus Development Community Committee," along with the "Public Benefits" and "Affordable Housing Program" sections of the presentation were met with laughter and raucous heckling.

Another required public meeting about the plans was held at Chicago's City Hall City Council chambers before the Community Development Commission. The Coalition held an anti-TIF demonstration in front of City Hall beforehand. Participants marched with signs, musicians Jimmie Lee Robinson and Frank Scott Jr. played the blues, and George and Joe from Original Jim's handed out free polish sausages to passersby. Coalition members and other opponents of the TIF were shushed in an organized manner throughout, the chairperson sternly reprimanded anyone causing disruption, and police security walked through the audience and threatened to escort people out of chambers. After two hours of presentation by city and university officials (focusing mainly on how anyone who questioned this TIF was anti-higher education and anti-jobs), and three hours of testimony from concerned citizens, residents, and businesspeople, the Community Development Commission took only five

minutes to approve the creation of a TIF district which is expected to provide $45-55 million for the project (Chase 1998). In their proposal to the CDC, the university "promised" to preserve nine buildings on Halsted (only five full buildings – four of the "saved" buildings would be reduced to facades under the university plan). The CDC passed the university proposal with the stipulation that an investigation be made into how to go about saving more than nine buildings. Naturally, fighting for more than nine buildings became the Coalition's next mission. In the early months of 1999, the Coalition finally attracted the positive attention of the city of Chicago, including some people in the Department of Planning and Development, Commissioner Christopher Hill, a key advisor to and close friend of the mayor, and Mayor Daley himself. This was effected through a coalition strategy to directly target and befriend some insiders to the mayor, to in effect ally the Coalition with the mayor.

In March of 1999, city planners commissioned a new study by the McClier Corporation that calls for saving twenty-seven buildings, eleven of which would be moved from Halsted and Roosevelt to vacant lots on Maxwell, creating a one-block long entertainment and retail district using the old buildings and some facades. The City became interested in the economic and touristic potential of an urban entertainment district with historic ties. The Coalition came out in favor of the plan on the advice of a Daley insider even though elements of the plan were not pleasing. The Coalition made the strategic decision to follow this insider's advice and to make the City its only ally in the struggle. The City (which ultimately means Daley) can control the outcome of Maxwell Street still as they

control the allotment of TIF money central to all the university's plans for South Campus. All appearances were that the McClier 27-building Plan was it, that the city would likely pressure the university into accepting the outcome of the McClier study. The Coalition officially backed the plan as its last hope.

The Coalition's decision to vigorously endorse the McClier Plan was meant to put them squarely on the side of the city, with the UIC on the other side alone. They sent their own press releases announcing their connection to "a powerful, new ally: the City of Chicago."

A couple of months went by with no word from the university or the city about the McClier Plan. Nervous about the silence, the Coalition started pressing the Department of Planning and Development for information about the status of McClier. They were informed that the Plan was not a *plan* at all, but simply a study, and as such was unavailable to the public for viewing or copying. But, they were assured, as they have been many times throughout the struggle, when the final plan was finally revealed it would be something everyone would like. The Coalition was able, through other city connections, to acquire a copy of the university's new plans, a revision of what they had publicly revealed at the earlier TIF meetings. They are most definitely, and surely not surprisingly, *not* something everyone likes. One Coalition member responded this way:

> [The UIC plans] are terrible. Absolutely everything on Maxwell is torn down, and then, eventually (phase 3), some facades will be slapped on this huge parking structure that takes up almost the entire street. It's an abomination. The renderings show people walking around, walking pets, etc., but the reality is that the area would be deserted. What is anyone gonna do down there except park their car?! A huge leap backward. (Willenson 1999)

On September 1, 1999, the University's relocation and façade plan was printed in the Chicago Tribune (Jones and Washburn 1999a). The next day, Mayor Richard Daley publicly endorsed the UIC relocation/façade plan to save eight old buildings and the facades of thirteen more. Alderman Madeline Haithcock, whose 2nd ward includes the UIC site, was quoted in the same article as being in support of the plan: "I think UIC has really extended itself to try to save a lot of [buildings]. The facades I think will make a big difference....A lot of times, you can't save these old buildings. People have to understand that" (Jones and Washburn 1999b). Daley's public statement called the UIC plan "a good compromise" and dealt a real blow to the Coalition who had hoped for city support as a last stronghold. With Daley's blessing, the chances of Chicago City Council approval increased exponentially.

This long-dreaded turn of events led the Coalition to step up their efforts in a public campaign against the façade plan. We held "no facades" protests, bombarded Governor Ryan, the UIC board of trustees, and Mayor Daley with petitions and letters, issued a reapplication for National Register status based on new historical data, got two representatives on the widely-viewed "Chicago Tonight" television interview show opposite Stanton Delaney of the UIC's South Campus Development team and Burton Bledstein, a pro-university historian from UIC, and commissioned a feasibility report to show that saving whole buildings is less costly than a façade approach. On October 15, 1999 the UIC board of trustees authorized the south campus project, and on November 10, 1999, the Chicago City Council gave final approval to the UIC expansion plan for Maxwell

Street. Construction of the new South Campus began in March 2000. As would be expected in a story of hegemony, "The Plan" changed very little as a result of the "negotiations" between the two coalitions.

Over the course of the struggle with the university and the city, the Coalition has maintained its goal of "Saving Maxwell Street," though the definition of "saving" has changed significantly along with the situation. First they wanted to save the marketplace. When that was lost they focused on preserving a living Maxwell Street, complete with businesses, residents, vendors, and street life. Once it became clear that the university was intent upon creating a whole new kind of place, a sterile campustown, the Coalition focused on setting up a memorial to immigrant, migrant, and blues culture. Realizing that these arguments were not persuasive to the university, they turned their focus to something more tangible, the preservation of buildings. And as it became clear that the university does not intend to save many whole buildings, and is instead focusing on relocation and facades to create a quaint campustown, the Coalition turned some of its energy to at least saving the memory of the place through documentation.

Since it is apparent that not much of the current culture and flavor of Maxwell Street will be saved in the UIC's development, the Coalition made part of its mission the preservation of memory. To that end, we applied for and received a grant from the Illinois Arts Council for a video project and set about recording video and audio footage that would be made into a video titled The Last Days of Maxwell Street. Hours of interviews and street scenes were recorded in

1999, including interviews with persons who still work and live in the area, business and property owners, persons familiar with its history and architecture, and city and university officials whose decisions have affected the pending demise, as well as footage of the last remaining buildings and remnants of the historic ambiance. The primary objective is to provide future viewers, who will not be able to visit the real Maxwell Street, with a sense of the area's vitality even as its century-long history comes to an end. The video footage is an attempt to preserve something for when the physical presence of the buildings and the people is obliterated.

The Last Days project was also intended to try to prevent a last days in reality. The first product to come out of the effort was a ten-minute video which was sent out to key players in the struggle: Mayor Daley, commissioners, and the press. The video was also aired on the "Chicago Public Access" cable television show. Plans were made to put together different versions of the video featuring various aspects of the area; one plan was for a feature-length documentary which could serve to put added pressure on the UIC, to be a view of Maxwell Street for a wide audience, and to create a buzz in the neighborhood while it is being made. Nineteen ninety-nine also brought a film crew from England who spent a couple weeks here with the Coalition's Steve Balkin, conducting interviews and shooting film on the street. They produced a 58-minute audio tape, The Struggle for Maxwell Street (Baldwin and Nimmer 1999), which features mainly the blues aspect of the place. The Coalition used it to gain media coverage from blues

music radio stations across the U.S. by offering free audio tapes to them through a mass mailing.

The Coalition continues to generate, collect, and store archival audio and video footage of the people of Maxwell Street, present and past, for use at a later time by researchers, historians, or film and documentary producers. Their application for the federal "Save America's Treasures" program emphasizes their wish to create a museum project (displays, archives, educational materials, video documentaries, and tours) to be part of the rehabbed commercial district.
A group that started out trying to save it all, the outdoor market, seventy-eight buildings, the businesses, and the people, the Coalition now takes "save" to mean influencing the university to keep as many of the buildings as possible even if it means that many won't even be in their original locations, and that the resulting block will be a themed district with "turn-of-the-century" flavor. That's not the ideal, of course, but so much has already been lost, and the threat of total demolition is so devastating, that it's turned into an "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em" sort of approach because the Coalition knows "the 'establishment' will only accept it if it is sterile and Disnified" (Balkin 1997a). The Coalition has come now to support any kind of development if it includes saving some buildings – because saving the buildings, they say, allows people to remember. To talk about how and why Maxwell Street was great and how it changed and how culture is affected by policy. Even when Maxwell Street is reduced to a symbolic representation of its former self, at least some buildings will be there. Not for this generation, says the Coalition's leader, Steve Balkin, maybe not even for the next,

but years from now, if the buildings are still standing, perhaps people more visionary than those who are currently the power-holders and decision-makers will resurrect the place and make it right. It's not a very good scenario for a best-case scenario, we say, but it's better than more empty parking lots.

The university on the other hand, surely feels they have come a long way toward compromise with the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. Indeed, their original plans showed all the land surrounding Maxwell Street on the east side of Halsted to be covered with parking lots and parking garages: no retail, no fountains, no "outdoor dining opportunities," and no facades of old buildings. They appear to have agreed to preserve some of old Maxwell Street, albeit in a corporate sort of way.

In the beginning of the process, the university planned to just tear it all down and perhaps put up a plaque commemorating the market and the history of the area. And of course they may still do this. But they claim that years of Coalition effort have resulted in some public discussion and some controversy and some possibility that the university will preserve more of the physical structure of the area than it once would have. University South Campus development spokesperson Stanton Delaney says he is

> optimistic it will be resolved. I'm not sure that everyone will be satisfied, but I think everyone will be clear on the matter that everyone compromised. I think that will be evident that everyone, and I mean the university of course too, compromised beyond what they were originally going to do. I don't know who is going to be happy, but that's not really what I'm trying to administer. (Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition 1999)

The university has made a gesture toward creating a themed historic entertainment district as part of their campustown, but the area will still follow the university's initial agenda, a cleaned-up, sanitized, safe public zone, finally rid of the dirt and nastiness of the "bad elements" who inhabited the area before. The focus of the Plan on clearing out businesses and residents through demolition and a long waiting or fallow period is still the same, and the focus on parking remains, though now the facades of buildings are to be pasted on the surface, creating a faux historic street scene cobbled together from building fronts that the planners consider to be the most beautiful. Planners have decided to keep a few facades to serve as touchstones of the gap between the past and present. In the new tourist-oriented area, these pieces of the past will serve, as MacCannell has identified, as vehicles for people's acceptance of the superiority of the present. The facades have been elevated to the status of durables, in Thompson's terms, while the rest, all of it – the buildings, market, businesses, people – are classified as rubbish and eliminated. The hegemonic view of modern urban public space is thus advanced.

Though what we see on the surface of the Maxwell Street scenario is a battle over land, over the control of a marketplace and a neighborhood, it is really much weightier. The battle over Maxwell Street is a case study of hegemonic control of human experience and reality. Hegemonic control exists when those in power not only desire control, but also wish to convert, incorporate, or coopt those they are controlling to their way of thinking. It is as Williams has warned,

> any hegemonic process must be especially alert and responsive to the alternatives and opposition which question or threaten its dominance. The reality of cultural process must then always include the efforts and contributions of those who are in one way

> or another outside or at the edge of the terms of the specific hegemony. (1997: 113)

This can be seen in the city's creation and control of the New Maxwell Street Market (chapter 3), in the university's attempts to achieve a "compromise" with the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, and mostly in the progression (or deterioration, depending on your view) of the Coalition's approaches to the Maxwell Street problem and its visions for saving Maxwell Street.

Just as hegemony has been seen in the organization of production of the two coalitions, in the respective moves of the two groups in the battle over Maxwell Street, so too can we see it operating in the discourse surrounding the battle. Indeed, discourse is closely linked to the organization of production. We look next at discourse – at the language of power and displacement couched in terms of progress, beautification, and clean-up.

---

[1] The Coalition's website is available in German, French, Spanish, Swedish, and Tagalog, and was set up to make information about the area readily available and to collect statements of support from individuals all over the world. Social and cultural historians, blues specialists, preservationists, visitors from faraway places, and residents of Chicago have responded; there are hundreds of letters on the site from supporters related to Maxwell Street in every conceivable way. The Coalition attempts to get letters from famous or otherwise influential people so that the university, who the Coalition assumes is checking on the website from time to time, will be swayed by their words. Letters are included from Studs Terkel, Alan Lomax, state representative Judy Erwin, professor Chris Koziol of the Architectural Preservation Institute, Bill Ferris, head of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Bo Diddley, Congressmen Danny Davis and John Conyers, Jr., Judge Abraham Lincoln Marovitz, Dr. Irving Cutler, Philip Chess, and Ira Berkow, just to name a very few. The website also includes notices of and texts from broadcasts, blues music, announcements of Coalition awards, reports on all UIC actions, announcements of and reports on meetings of the Coalition, the university, and the city, fundraising efforts, photos of the street, essays, tours, notices for and descriptions and photos of rallies and demonstrations, poems about Maxwell Street, a bibliography, the Coalition's mission statement, the Coalition's latest press releases, requests for help and letters, and links to other information, friends, and supporters.

[2] Many in the coalition feel that demolition in the area has been done stealthily throughout. In May of 1997 a building at 730 W. Maxwell which had housed Mr. Lee's Restaurant was demolished though the Coalition had been told by Chancellor David Broski that no action would be taken on buildings until after a developer was chosen (which did not happen until months later). The Coalition tried to stop this demolition, but to no avail. The Chicago Green Party and Maxworks Cooperative, both neighborhood action groups, videotaped unsafe and polluting demolition practices and later filed case PCB 97-50 with the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

[3] "Integrity" of the buildings is one component evaluated by the Illinois Historic Preservation Association in consideration of landmark status.

4 This years-long process of landbanking and dealmaking for the south campus development project is not atypical. Urban development projects all over the country follow a similar pattern. Frieden and Sagalyn's Downtown Inc. (1989), for example, looks at the development of Plaza Pasadena in Pasadena, California. The development team for that project used an approach similar to the South Campus Development Team's approach to getting land, getting money, and disregarding opposition to the project. Those in power wanted the thing built, and oppositional forces such as community action groups were thus viewed simply as obstacles to overcome, not as voices to be listened to or considered and perhaps incorporated. Plaza Pasadena developers also used a TIF and phased development for their project.

[5] Early in 1998, the UIC hired Mesirow Stein and Company as its official developer for the South Campus Expansion. The board of trustees approved of the whole South Campus Development Team in July of 1998, hiring them in a $15 million, 10-year agreement to guide and execute the entire project.

Developers for the area, the members of the "South Campus Development Team," are described as "a politically powerful trio" (Corfman 1999): Chicago-based Mesirow Stein Real Estate Inc., Springfield-based real estate firm New Frontier Companies, and Harlem Irving Companies of Norridge, IL. The presidents of all three companies have political ties in Chicago and downstate. Added to these is consultant firm, the Wight Company of Downers Grove, IL.

Allegations of conflict of interest surround the firms involved in the south campus development team. Mike Marchese, president of Harlem Irving Companies is a personal friend of Mayor Daley and has been under fire in 1999 for underbidding but receiving rights to develop land in Chicago's Lincoln Park. New Frontiers president William Cellini is married to Julie Cellini, president of the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency which denied landmark status to the Maxwell Street area. Richard Stein of Mesirow Stein Real Estate is also married to a member of the board of directors for the IHPA, Carol Stein. And there were certainly accusations that Mayor Daley would not interfere too much because of his political and personal interests in the development of the area – that he helped the university acquire the land, and is determined to let his friends develop it. Added to this, the Wight Company, which handles only new construction projects and has no experience with preservation or rehab, has a spotty record – they are accused of knowingly installing a faulty ventilation system in the DuPage County courthouse and of botching projects and billing high for projects in Lake in the Hills, IL. The Coalition feels the selection of this architectural advisor biased everything toward demolition.

[6] First an Equalized Assessed Value or EAV is determined for all properties by the Cook County Assessor. The current physical characteristics of a potential TIF district give each a low EAV, a determinant of the property tax a piece of land must pay based on current condition and productivity. In a TIF, the city continues to collect only the EAV or baseline taxes from each property for a specified number of years, and any additional tax revenue, which will of course be significant once development occurs in such an area, goes back to the area for development.

[7] Questions were raised about the university's use of eminent domain for the area. Eminent domain is intended to be used by institutions for the public good; they can acquire land and property at fair market value when it is needed to advance the good of the community.

[8] The five step process for obtaining a TIF includes these steps: (1) an introduction to the Community Development Commission, (2) arguing for eligibility before the Joint Review Board Committee made up of taxing districts, (3) a public hearing before the Community Development Commission, (4) approval by the Finance Committee of the Chicago City Council, and (5) vote in the City Council.

[9] This was the fourth of four required "community meetings" which the UIC held on the south campus development: May 26, June 26, September 3, and November 18, 1998.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE DISCOURSE OF BEAUTIFICATION AND DISPLACEMENT

Discourse, purposeful language containing an ideological stance, is crucial to an understanding of the situation at Maxwell Street, as it is with discourse and rhetoric that the process of urban transformation begins: "In a society such as ours, but basically any society," says Foucault, "there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (1986: 229). The discourse surrounding Maxwell Street, which is a discourse of beautification used to justify displacement, will be described here as a set of four concentric circles, each representing a level or arena of discourse connected increasingly firmly to Maxwell Street. Starting with the outermost circle, we look now at the discourse of beautification and displacement as it is seen (1) in American attitudes toward the urban in general, (2) in the history of the City of Chicago's efforts at beautification, (3) in Chicago's recent transformation or clean-up, and (4) in the discourse of Maxwell Street specifically. It is essential to understand the multi-layered discourse of power, as the voices of the UIC and the city of Chicago are imbedded there; it is through this discourse that this hegemonic transformation of Maxwell Street is propelled, legitimated, and seamlessly achieved. It is against this discourse that the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition has been reacting.

Circles of Discourse: American Attitudes Toward the Urban

Around the outside of the model, the largest circle includes the rhetoric of progress and growth which permeates the mainstream "history" of American urban development and urban planning movements. Much of the history of urban development is described using a narrative pattern which celebrates progress. Dolores Hayden describes how city biography "projected a single narrative of how city leaders or city fathers – almost always white, upper and middle-class men – forged the city's spatial and economic structure, making fortunes by building downtowns and imposing order on chaotic immigrant populations" (1997: 131). Bearing many similarities to the conquest stories of the American West and manifest destiny, these narratives are steeped in a discourse of progress, development, improvement, growth, and expansion. In fairness, much of the more recent social history of the city is more inclusive, dealing with women, ethnic groups, and race relations. Still, the narrative strain exists and can be called upon to support or naturalize the actions of developers and planners who are only attempting to control urban disorder.

Much of the narrative is based upon hatred for the city. Orsi discusses this as the "discourse of the alien city" (1999: 12), a paranoia that developed as industrial American cities did throughout the nineteenth century. The city was seen as dangerous, filthy, unsightly, spiritually decayed, out of control – extremely Other. The fearsome city was set up in opposition to the rural, the moral, the essentially American. Religious reform movements, and later secular progressive efforts, were intended to save the city. All were based upon an

animus toward the city deeply imbedded in the American culture. Progressive efforts to transform or clean up urban spaces were based upon the idea that improved conditions could make people into more upstanding citizens (Orsi 1999: 30). Later manifestations of this same hatred of the city include urban renewal and a series of urban planning efforts; all can be seen as attempts to control the urban Other.

Fear of the city has certainly been a crucial part of efforts to control and plan the modern city since its beginning. Jacobs (1961) points to a line of orthodox city planning ideas starting with Ebenezer Howard's Garden City. This was followed by Sir Patrick Geddes' regional planning efforts which were adopted by a group called the Decentrists which included Lewis Mumford and his ideas about urban chaos (1938); all of these saw the "solution" to cities as the thinning out and breaking down of cities in favor of scattered towns. Le Corbusier's Radiant City followed, essentially making a park of the city. Next came Burnham's City Beautiful movement, which created cities full of monuments and civic centers. Over the years, these schools or variations and combinations of them have influenced almost every city's planning and design. All share the view that a "solution" is needed, that the city is at base a "problem."

Certainly UIC and City of Chicago planners have this view of Maxwell Street. It has been described in the same basic terms as the late nineteenth-century slums of London and other problem areas against which planners have planned. Through their discourse of power – mainly couched in terms of

beautification, progress, advancement, and natural growth – we can see their hatred of the urban neighborhood and its seeming disorder.

This circle also contains the discourse of beautification and revitalization included in the media and in urban planning literature in recent years. Here, the ongoing transformation of American cities is discussed in news reports which describe the revivals, reclamations, restorations, renaissances, and rebirths of cities of all sizes across the U.S. These projects are primarily heralded in the media as ways to bring people back to downtown, to spur economic growth, to recruit tourist dollars, and to "clean up" after hard times.

Included here too is the more scholarly literature on the American city and downtown beautification. Most of these intend to evaluate the success or failure of specific projects: civic centers, parks, neighborhood revitalizations, waterfront attractions, festival marketplaces, stadiums, cultural centers, etc. Many of these studies, written by urban planners, architects, developers, and scholars of urban planning, evaluate the projects mainly in terms of financial concerns, real estate activity, tourist appeal, and private market reaction to public development (see Breen and Rigby 1994, Gratz 1994, and Garvin 1996, for example). The studies attempt to create a blueprint or guide to how best to build and rebuild America's cities by looking at plans and attempts from the past, from foreign cities, and at how U.S. cities in recent decades have succeeded or failed with individual development and redevelopment projects. Typically, the people of the city are mentioned only in terms of "pedestrian traffic" or " relocation" problems or "critics."

To counter this mainstream celebration of the omnipresence of urban beautification projects, another literature on urban space, a countervoice, has been developing in recent years, one which proclaims and bemoans the end of urban public space and its replacement with malls, festival marketplaces, and other themed and Disneyfied places. This controversial literature leads off with Michael Sorkin's popular edited volume Variations on a Theme Park (1992). He asserts that the city is *becoming* a theme park, a place of endless simulations, where pleasure is regulated and fake places are substituted for an authentic "democratic public realm" (1992: xv). And the public, the very people who should be fighting to maintain public spaces, buy into the transformation because the theme park appealingly offers places free from dirt, crime, and the poor. Cleanliness and order are the main messages used to convince people of the wisdom of this urban transformation.

The transformation of cities and towns and landscapes all over the U.S. has also been commented on by James Howard Kunstler, who focuses attention mainly on the corruption of the American built environment or "crisis of human habitat" (1993: 59) by the automobile, developers, and other corporate interests, the ease with which Americans have apparently agreed to a landscape of homogenized housing, malls, privatized spaces, and unchecked growth, and the inevitable loss of a sense of place Americans feel even if they do not realize that is what they are feeling. Says Kunstler, "Eighty percent of everything ever built in America has been built in the last fifty years, and most of it is depressing, brutal, ugly, unhealthy, and spiritually degrading" (1993: 10). What he has

identified as this nation's destruction of the public realm has resulted in the absence of a spirit of community and the creation of "a landscape of scary places, the geography of nowhere" (1993: 15).

Circles of Discourse: From City of Big Shoulders to City Beautiful

The next circle in includes the discourse of the city of Chicago stretching as far back as the Columbian Exposition of 1893. It is this discourse which set up a pattern of progress and beautification in Chicago, and thus legitimized big changes to the city in recent years. Through the following discussion of Chicago's history of beautification discourse I contextualize contemporary circumstances, Chicago's current clean-up efforts.

The city of Chicago has always been masterful at representing itself; it is called "The Windy City" not only for its blustery weather and the verbosity of its politicians, but also for its unabashed self-promotion. Probably the most well-known description of its early character was offered by Carl Sandburg in his 1916 poem *Chicago*:

> Hog Butcher for the World,
> Tool Maker, Stacker of Wheat,
> Player with Railroads and the Nation's Freight Handler;
> Stormy, husky, brawling,
> City of the Big Shoulders:...

We will look briefly now at the elements of that early image, at how the ideas of progess got planted and the discourse of beautification became central to the city's development.

Chicago spent most of the nineteenth century building itself up and getting noticed. By mid-century it was well-established as a gateway city, and as the hub

for the nation's waterways, railroad traffic, and freight handling; because Chicago marked the division between eastern and western railroads, all freight and passengers had to switch lines in Chicago. It was also the center of grain trade with its elevator warehouses, telegraph lines, market reports, and the Chicago Board of Trade. The relatively new city emerged as the greatest lumber market in the world in the 1850's (Cronon 1991: 169). It also had its meat packing industry, stockyards, slaughterhouses, and steel mills on the south side of town. Chicago boomed because of its ability to transform commodities into money, to take raw materials like animals and grains and lumber, and process, store, and sell them to market. Chicago was also home to radio broadcasts, mail-order houses like Montgomery Ward and Company, an infamous crime scene, street cars, and tall buildings; all of these combined to put Chicago in the world's eye as a great metropolis.

After the Great Fire of 1871, Chicago began to rebuild immediately, bigger than ever. By the time of the World's Fair in 1893, the city was rebuilt and ready to show itself off. Studies of Chicago's history and development are often focused around this major event, seen as the turning point in the city's history, a logical stopping and starting point for thinking about eras of rebuilding and representation and progress. Ostensibly to mark the four-hundredth anniversary of Columbus' discovery of the Americas, the Columbian Exposition seems to have actually been more about the world celebrating technology and progress, and about Chicago announcing itself to the world. The fairgrounds were beautiful and

enchanting and clean and progressive; everything about the fair was to be better, brighter, bigger, and more wondrous than any previous display.

The displays of technology, science, machinery, midway entertainments, and ethnological exhibits were spoken of highly, but the Fair's chief marvel was its architecture, the buildings and environs of the "White City," created by some of the greatest architects of the day; Frederick Law Olmsted, Louis Sullivan, and John Wellborn Root were among those led by Daniel Burnham. The Columbian Exposition has been described as the fulfillment of Chicago's destiny, an end to decades of building and rebuilding to arrive at a perfect urban vision, the city at its most beautiful and civilized. It is fitting that Chicago's presentation of itself and its prominence to the world be linked to a grand architectural display and the creation of a great tourist attraction, as the city's reliance on these two continues today.

It is important to consider the Columbian Exposition here because it can be seen to have started off Chicago's push for progress, tourism, and for fashioning itself properly for the eyes of the rest of the country and the world. The 1893 Fair was the first attempt to "clean up" the city for outside consumption; negative elements were corralled on the Midway Plaisance, popular entertainments were controlled and imbued with symbolic and relational meaning, progress and growth and technology and corporate thinking were heralded as the way to utopia, and a view of the perfect city was shown to all the world.

Designed for more than beauty, the buildings and outdoor spaces of the exposition were intended to deliver the message that the ills of the modern city

could be solved through the right kind of development. The environment of the White City was clean, safe, uncongested, and well-run. The architecture was designed by Burnham as "an antidote to social disorder" (D. Miller 1996: 492), part of what became known as The City Beautiful movement wherein the combination of civic architecture and landscaped urban spaces operated to make the public well-behaved.

The displays inside the City Beautiful buildings were arranged to deliver messages of the benefits of Progress. According to Robert W. Rydell, who has written extensively about World's Fairs and expositions and the idea of Progress, the fairs were heavily symbolic environments created under the guise of entertainment and education with the purpose of influencing and organizing society according to the views of established leaders and a certain class perspective: "World's fairs performed a hegemonic function precisely because they propogated the ideas and values of the country's political, financial, corporate, and intellectual leaders and offered these ideas as the proper interpretation of social and political reality" (1984: 3). The fairs were used to convince the American people of the triumph of technology, the scientific logic of racism and American nationalism, and the importance of progress -- all leading directly to utopia symbolized in Chicago by the White City. It is Rydell's view that the expositions were appealing to people between 1876 and 1916 because Americans were engaged in a "search for order" and a "drive to organize experience" resulting from industrialization, cyclical depressions, class warfare, and the discovery of the "multiplicity in the universe." Fairs were timely,

offering people the chance to shed widespread anxiety and "to reaffirm their collective national identity in an updated synthesis of progress and white supremacy that suffused the blueprints of future perfection offered by the fairs" (Rydell 1984: 4). In a nation plagued by insecurities, the Chicago World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 provided escape, amusement, and utopian vision.

The fair at Chicago was the first in which popular entertainments were allowed inside the fair boundaries.[1] Only months before the fair opened in Chicago, it was conveniently decided that most midway attractions had ethnological or historical significance and that entertainment could comfortably mix with education. In fact, fair directors discovered that they could advance their messages much more effectively by placing the "ethnological" displays right next to the Ferris wheel and other popular entertainments, that by appealing to common tastes, their messages of a natural progression from savage animalism to civilization and eventually utopia could best be delivered to every fairgoer. The Chicago Fairgrounds gave Americans a visual representation of how things could be if only they placed their faith in evolution, imperialism, economic development, corporatism, and the status quo. Midway entertainments developed as central aspects of future fairs and expositions as upper class fair directors and developers saw them as a way to influence the content of popular culture and get their messages and priorities across.

The city of Chicago itself was also on display in 1893. When visitors came to the Fair, and an estimated twenty-seven million did (D. Miller 1996: 490), they experienced the White City and the City of Chicago together. The Fair

and the rebuilt downtown symbolized the birth of a new and better Chicago emerging after the Fire. But the contrast between the White City and what became known as the "Gray City" were striking: "Where the American metropolis was chaotic and disorganized, the Exposition was planned and orderly; while the real city was private and commercial, the ideal was public and monumental; where Chicago was sooty and gray, the White City was clean and sparkling" (Mayer and Wade 1969: 193). The Fair could be seen as a rejection of the real city and a blueprint for the future of Chicago.

After the Fair, Daniel Burnham took many of his ideas from it and applied them to his grand plan for the redesigning of the entire city of Chicago, his 1909 Plan of Chicago. The plan, with its emphasis on beauty, order, and public buildings and spaces, became the guideline for official Chicago planning policy. Many of the elements of Burnham and Edward H. Bennett's Plan were incorporated over the years, and, as Burnham predicted, The Plan is still referred to by planners, developers, and the mayor today. The White City can be recognized in many of the pieces of the plan chosen for construction in Chicago before WWII: a network of urban lakefront parks including Lincoln, Jackson, and Grant Parks, all built on landfill, South Shore and Lake Shore Drives, Navy Pier, the straightening of the Chicago River, Soldier Field outdoor stadium, Northerly Island (now a peninsula) in Lake Michigan, a network of bascule bridges spanning the Chicago River, Wacker Drive's double-deck system to alleviate traffic, North Michigan Avenue as a grand boulevard and shopping district, a civic center for the city with impressive groupings of public buildings, a greenbelt

of forest preserves around the city, a system of beaches, marinas, and recreational facilities, and a cultural center consisting of the Field Museum of Natural History, the Shedd Aquarium, and the Adler Planetarium. Many of the buildings that went up in the first half of the twentieth century are majestic and architecturally significant as the Plan suggested: the Wrigley Building, the Tribune Tower, the Civic Opera Building, the Merchandise Mart, the Chicago Post Office, and Union Station just to name a few.

After WWII, American cities spent thirty years, approximately 1950 through 1980, rebuilding and revitalizing themselves by wiping out manufacturing districts, warehouses, freight terminals, working class neighborhoods, and anything that looked blighted. In place of all that they put modern office complexes, civic centers, hotels, malls, and freeways (Frieden and Sagalyn 1989: 287). In Chicago at that time, Richard J. Daley, known as "Daley the Builder," was six-term mayor. His clean-up of Chicago included moving poor and African-American residents into new and immediately dilapidated public housing away from downtown. This Chicago Housing Authority housing was built on land once occupied by residential neighborhoods, and by the mid-1960's housed more than 140,000 people (D. Miller 1996: 9). Full-scale commercial redevelopment was the elder Daley's plan for Chicago's Loop, a complete rebuilding of all thirty-five square blocks at Chicago's core; to this end, and with the most powerful of big-city "machine" governments, he facilitated the building of office towers, expressways, the McCormick Place convention center on the

lakefront, the Chicago Civic Center, a modern steel and glass skyscraper later named the Richard J. Daley Center, and much, much more.

As we begin to look at the next level of discourse of beautification and clean-up in the city of Chicago, it is important to keep in mind that the more recent rhetoric is imbedded in the earlier layers. The language of hegemony gets some of its power from our long exposure to it and our long history of acceptance of it.

Circles of Discourse: Chicago's Big Clean-up

Chicago is undergoing another major change at the moment, developing and refining its character as a city – this time under the multi-term mayorship of Richard *M.* Daley. It still wants to be "stormy, husky, brawling," to indulge its past of progressive, big, and bold buildings and projects, but it wants to do it all in a sanitized way. Chicago's turn-of-the-millenium transformation is being advanced mainly through the development of large-scale beautification projects and through efforts at surface beautification or "cleaning up." Together these projects result in a makeover for the city, one which hides what planners, officials, and developers see as blemishes while accenting the city's best and newest features.

The discourse surrounding this transformation constitutes the third circle of discourse in our model. It contains the younger Mayor Daley's statements about the beautification of the city of Chicago and all press coverage of the city's recent beautification schemes and clean-up efforts. I discuss the transformation

and its discourse here in order to situate the redevelopment of Maxwell Street in the overall Chicago scene.

Many large-scale beautification projects have appeared in Chicago in the last years of the twentieth century. The ones listed and described briefly here illustrate the scope of Chicago's investment in its transformation. The expansion and renovation of McCormick Place, for instance, opened in early 1997 and made it the largest convention center in North America under one roof. Chicago is now in the lead aggressively courting events, conventions, and trade shows of all sizes.

Mayor Richard M. Daley has also presided over the relocation of Lake Shore Drive and the creation of the newly monikered "Museum Campus," a grassy landscaped lakefront area joining three downtown museums, the Field Museum of Natural History, the Adler Planetarium, and the Shedd Aquarium. The Museum of Science and Industry received an extensive facelift as well, including new underground parking and landscaping. And an entirely new Nature Museum was built on the near north side just across from the also improved Lincoln Park Zoo.

The remodeled Roosevelt Street Bridge was completed in 1995. It links the University of Illinois at Chicago on the west with the Museum Campus on the east. Original bridge plans were said to resemble a giant erector set, all exposed steel and concrete, but under Daley's supervision the finished bridge is decorated with obelisks, planters, fluted lampposts, and sculptures representative of the different cultural institutions served by the bridge: books, mastodons, dolphins, and instruments of celestial navigation. An overpass bridge over the Kennedy

Expressway at Madison Street includes blue neon lights and carved pedestals. And the new Damen Street bridge over the Chicago River, made of steel tubes resembling hot dogs, is being called "An American Landmark" and "a wholly unique bridge for North America" by Daley and its other backers (Kamin 1999a).

In 1996 State Street was renovated. The intent was to make a cold and colorless bus mall into an inviting retail district and public space by adding historic street lights, antique subway entrances, shrubs and flowers. The project's chief designer sees the renovation of the street as a return to Daniel Burnham's Plan of Chicago as it focuses on traditional elements. Also on State Street, Block 37, site of one of the biggest boondoggles in urban American history,[2] is now promoted heavily as Gallery 37, a summer art fair and workshop site. In winter, the block is used for an outdoor skating rink and warming house. State Street's Chicago Theatre was leased by Disney, and prime spots at the corners of State and Randolph were acquired by the city; the plan is to move the existing businesses, raze the buildings, and make way for upscale shopping, hotels, and residences, all as part of the "reemergence of State Street" identified by the Department of Planning and Development.

In 1997, Daley's transportation department did a remake of central Michigan Avenue. And the summer of 1999 saw the remake of Wacker Drive, which made the road "attach" better to the Chicago River. The new riverwalk features riverfront cafes. And from those cafes, diners will periodically be able to see "Bridge Art," huge paintings attached to the undersides of Chicago's opening river bridges. The plan for turning the entire riverfront into a pathway and

playground for walkers, joggers, and bikers extends past the confines of the downtown area, and includes new docks for boaters, scenic overlooks, landscaping, and neighborhood parks all along a seventeen-mile stretch.

In the city's primary lakefront park, Grant Park, a new Lakefront Millenium Park is being built above working railroads just north of the Art Institute. This park-within-a-park, set to open in 2000, will include an outdoor theatre for large events, a smaller indoor music and dance theater, an ice skating rink, a parking garage, a "Great Lawn" and other open green spaces; parts of it are to be designed by famous architect Frank Gehry.

On Chicago's South Shore, tax increment financing and infrastructure improvements through Gov. Ryan's "Illinois First" infrastructure spending program will transform the former home of the South Works steel mill into a residential and commercial community.

Rumors of a new "World's Tallest Building" to rise above the Sears Tower have circulated for years; since the title was taken away from Chicago in 1996 by the Petronas Towers in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Chicago developers and city planning officials have been discussing the idea of winning it back. Currently in the works is a proposed building at 7 S. Dearborn which would be two thousand feet tall compared to the Petronas' 1483 and Sears' Tower's 1450 (Allen 1998b). Considerations of financing, tenant agreements, and the like need to be worked out of course, but the building would certainly fit in with Chicago's tradition of making "no small plans."

The city of Chicago has been very aggressive in terms of demolition in recent years. Approximately six thousand buildings were torn down between 1989 and 1998 (Martin 1998a). In 1993 the city announced the Fast Track Demolition Program which allows the city to order owners to board up or repair buildings that are vacant or hazardous. Failure to comply gives the city demolition rights. Proponents of the program claim fast track demolition cuts crime, gets rid of unsound and unsightly structures, and eliminates the need for costly rehabilitation. Critics complain that the city is gutting its low-income housing stock, clearing its neighborhoods of low-income people, and putting the architectural and historical integrity of its neighborhoods in jeopardy. A similar program, Daley's Tax Reactivation Program is another part of the effort to confiscate unsightly property and redevelop it. A stated goal of both programs is to clear land and make conditions right for developers and gentrification. City-sponsored demolition is happening all over Chicago. For example, on the city's South Side, next to the old Chicago stockyards, the historic International Amphitheatre, site of the 1969 Democratic Convention and the Beatles' Chicago debut among other events, was acquired by the city and demolished to make room for developers (Spencer and Davis 1999).

At the same time the city is supporting widespread demolition, it is also ironically supportive of preservation for certain types of structures. Mayor Daley and the City Council are behind multi-million dollar tax breaks to encourage the preservation and restoration of historic buildings such as the Blackstone and Allerton Hotels. Daley forced the City Council to grant landmark status to

twenty-nine endangered sites in 1996, and passed other pro-landmarks measures through the council.

The preservation, of course, needs to go along with goals of beautification and development. For instance, the city has been instrumental in the preservation of the façade of the Mc-Graw Hill Building, which will become the front door of North Michigan Avenue's North Bridge project, which is to include a Nordstrom store, a Walt Disney virtual reality park, three hotels, and an upscale retail mall. This development, supported by City Hall, will help with the city's goal of creating a fun-oriented tourist district extending all the way from Navy Pier through the tourist corridor known as River East, a project which includes apartments, a suites hotel, and another entertainment center with megaplex cinema, to the southern end of the Magnificent Mile near the Michigan Avenue Bridge. The entertainment district will then include such entertainment spots as DisneyQuest, Official All-Star Café, ESPN Zone, Viacom, Cineplex Odeon, Niketown, and the Virgin Entertainment Megastore, along with new hotels and residential buildings. These join with other "architainment" (Kamin 1997c) and "eatertainment" attractions in River North such as the Rainforest Café, Planet Hollywood, Michael Jordan's restaurant, Ed Debevic's, and the Hard Rock Café. Perhaps the best example of Chicago's joining of architecture and consumerism is the new Disney store on Michigan Avenue with a façade of swirling, intricate ornamentation reminiscent of Louis Sullivan's work, but where the swirls are actually dozens of pairs of mouse ears. The entire stretch from the Navy Pier

ferris wheel to these entertainment eateries and shops has been called "our modern equivalent of the fair's Midway Plaisance" (Papajohn 1999).

Navy Pier

Described as the "jewel in the crown" of the city of Chicago, Navy Pier has become the city's most popular tourist attraction, and perhaps its most obvious attempt at beautification. Right downtown, convenient to anyone visiting the other main attractions in the city, the pier has a position of prominence, jutting out into the lake, which also functions to keep it clean. Surrounded on three sides by Lake Michigan, the pier is free from most of the "dirt" of the city. The view of the city afforded form there is spectacular, but one does not have to come into contact with any of the city's "mess," figurative or literal.

The new Navy Pier is a perfect example of a "festival marketplace,"[3] a form of urban development and revitalization that has extended to nearly every city in the U.S. Such attractions provide an environment removed from everyday life, a place to spend surplus income and leisure time. They offer people, mainly tourists and non-city dwellers, a safe, clean way to explore the city and sample its excitement without getting too close to any negative aspects of the urban. They include primarily small vendors, kiosks, and pushcarts selling specialty and impulse items, and quick, specialized, sometimes exotic food and drink. They are neat, clean, and pedestrian-oriented, and are often themed. They are different from the standard shopping mall in that they usually seek to capitalize on nostalgia for the past through the use of displays, architecture, and other symbols; their visual décor and atmosphere are cleverly staged to encourage consumption.

Described as "spectacles of consumption," "true nonplaces," "and "hollowed out urban remnants" (Boyer 1992), these attractions are wildly successful.

Navy Pier provides a neat example of how Chicago is reimaging itself. Built as part of Burnham's Plan of Chicago, it opened to the public in the summer of 1916 as, of course, the largest structure of its kind. After a brief "Golden Age" from approximately 1918 to 1930, the pier was riddled with periods of decline, disuse, and abandonment alternating with efforts to establish new uses, revitalize the pier, and bring people back.[4] In early 1995 it opened as the new Navy Pier, a festival marketplace which also features an IMAX theater, the Chicago Children's Museum, and several rides including a ferris wheel modeled after the original one at the 1893 Columbian Exposition. The new Navy Pier is probably the most obvious example of how the city of Chicago is cleaning up the lakefront and downtown by focusing on safe, sanitized attractions intended to attract middle-class tourist audiences. It also provides a look back to the beginnings of Chicago's image construction, as it can be seen as a modern day world's fair; like the White City, it has mainstream appeal, attracts throngs of people, provides an image of safe, clean public and urban life, delivers simple, yet powerful messages to visitors, uses architecture and symbols to convey those messages, provides an escape from everyday life, and is meant to enhance the image of the city of Chicago for outside audiences. Even its most noticeable and powerful symbol, the Ferris Wheel, urges us to draw a connection between this attraction and Chicago's first attempt to impress the world.

(MISSING 202)

bigger projects like a new airport, a downtown light-rail system, a new football stadium, and casinos on the Chicago River, now works instead on beautifying the city, imagining how a bridge could look more like one he saw in Europe or how an ethnic neighborhood could be demarcated by entrance gates. A Chicago Reader cover story, "How Does Richie Rate? Opening Up the Mayor's Report Card," (Moberg 1999) graded the mayor in a number of areas such as education, government administration and political leadership, crime and police, civil liberties, civil rights, jobs and economic development, transportation, housing, parks, culture, and participatory democracy. It was only in the area of "image maintenance and enhancement" that Daley received an A:

> It's amazing what a few flowerpots can do. Wrought iron fences may not please all sensibilities, but the mayor has spiffed up the city – mainly but not only along the north lakefront and downtown. He's found a relatively cheap way to make people feel better about their neighborhoods. He's also helped polish Chicago's image to the nation and the world, contributing to tourism and even to business-location decisions....If image were everything, Daley would be a solid performer.

Daley's push for a beautiful Chicago includes the ornamental fences around public buildings, schools, playgrounds, and parks, plus planter boxes, grassy lawns, elegant signage proclaiming "Chicago's Historical Boulevards," and more than seven thousand trees a year (Washburn 1998c). Daley has been celebrated in the press for having an unprecedented number of architects on his staff. They are charged with the indirect mission of making sure aesthetics and design considerations stay in the foreground of public policy decisions, and with the direct mission of making the city look good so the mayor looks good (Kamin 1998b).

"Streetscaping" is what Daley and his people are calling the push to clean up Chicago's neighborhoods. In Little Italy on the Near West Side, for example, at the intersection of Bishop and Taylor, the city is beautifying the neighborhood by building DiMaggio Piazza right across the street from where the new National Italian-American Sports Hall of Fame is to be built. The centerpiece of the piazza is a statue of New York Yankee Hall of Famer Joe DiMaggio. Residents, not consulted in the beautification process, are concerned about the removal of cul-de-sacs and the increased flow of traffic to their once-serene neighborhood (Boylan 1998).

In 1998, the City executed the streetscaping of Chinatown, complete with light fixtures featuring Chinese dragons, new landscaping, flower planters, new sidewalks with special Asian-design pavers, and columns decorated with Chinese art (Washburn 1998b). He has concentrated effort on this near South area in an effort to get conventioneers at McCormick Place to feel safe enough to walk to Chinatown, which is within walking distance, but has in the past seemed too threatening. The streetscaping of Division Street included two steel arches stylized in the form of the Puerto Rican flag, and at least twenty-three other neighborhood beautification projects were slated for the same year.

The summer of 1999 brought the streetscaping of the Old Town neighborhood. This project included six art nouveau-inspired wrought iron arched gateways, vintage street lamps, four-by-twelve foot park "pods" with garden furniture, historic plaques, planters and a directory of Wells Street sites, and sidewalk and curb renewal.

The most publicized neighborhood beautification or streetscaping project is that which transformed a six-block stretch of North Halsted Street into an area easily identifiable as a gay community. The controversial project involved the widening of sidewalks, the planting of trees, the addition of gathering places with benches, and the erection of tall copper colored pylon sculptures encircled with metal bands of color from the gay-pride rainbow (Kamin 1997b).

Daley pushed for new designs at Chicago Transit Authority stations in ethnic or historic neighborhoods; Chinatown, Bronzeville, Wrigleyville, and Comiskey Park were to get special treatment.

Another element in Daley's streetscaping scheme is the development of a prototype fountain. Daley wants to put fountains in neighborhoods and at key intersections throughout the city, and he wants to do it efficiently and inexpensively. The solution is a thirteen-foot tall cast concrete fountain with squares and stripes of blue tile, designed by a Department of Transportation engineer. It has two scalloped bowls and in some cases a shallow basin around the bottom. The pumping mechanism and filters and controls are encased above ground so maintenance is relatively easy. The city plans to pay for installation of the first one, and to urge community groups to pay for and maintain the others throughout the city. Critics see the plan for prototype fountains as just another well-intentioned, but misguided effort, one intended to beautify which instead further homogenizes the city. The same generic fountain design, they say, no matter how cheap and efficient, is simply not suited to every neighborhood, to every space. (Kamin 1997a).

The city's "streetscaping" efforts have been criticized as uncreative; most of the public works under Daley are aesthetically conservative. His improvements and projects all have retro appeal. They are aesthetically and politically safe. Says Blair Kamin, the Chicago Tribune's architecture critic, "With all the historical lampposts, subway canopies and planters going into the Loop these days, you have to wonder if Daley wants to turn back the clock and transform the Loop into a 1920s stage set. What's next, Model Ts?" (1998a). In the belief that it is the little touches that make the city livable, Daley is quoted as saying he urges downtown businesses to put flags over their entrances because "the decorative touch 'softens people' and shows them that 'life in the city is not just the heavy steel and concrete and cars and honking.'" (Kamin 1998d). Critics see his beautification and streetscaping as "the Martha Stewartization" of Chicago, as nostalgia, as the treating the city as a suburb, and as an attempt to distract residents and voters from the very real problems the city faces.

On a 1996 trip to Paris, Daley got the idea for making Chicago into a "City of Light." In early 1998 he commissioned the "Chicago Downtown Lighting Master Plan," a plan for illuminating the buildings of downtown Chicago by the year 2000; almost one hundred high-rises were to be bathed in light. Bridges and bridge houses were also to be lit up, and hundreds of city streetlights replaced with turn-of-the-century ornamental lights. The illuminated nighttime Chicago is to send the message that the city is no longer unsafe and gloomy, that it is a desirable place to be.

Lighting has also been key in the revitalization of Chicago's theatre district which includes the Cadillac Palace, the Ford Oriental Theatre, the Chicago Theatre, the Steppenwolf, the Goodman, and the Chicago Shakespeare Theatre. Highly lighted theatre signs grace the entrances to all of these. The rebirth of the theatre district was signaled by the city's complete makeover of Randolph Street between Michigan Avenue and Wacker Drive; this eight-block section is to be Chicago's Broadway. The city officially declared the Theatre District with banners, electric mini-marquees that say "Chicago Theatre District," landscaping, hanging baskets, new sidewalk treatments with inlaid theatre district logos, new vintage street lamps, vintage-design kiosks with maps of all Chicago theatre offerings, eighty new trees, and sidewalk planters. The district is part of Daley's longtime dream of transforming the North Loop into a center of culture and tourism.

Another beautification project supported by the City of Chicago is an effort by the Chicago Gateway Green Committee to beautify the expressways around the city with landscaping, flowers, ornamental trees, and public art. Every mile of the highways, every exit and entrance, have been targeted for beautification as they are the gateways to the city, spaces visitors see first when they arrive. The Ohio Street exit ramp off the Kennedy Expressway was transformed with a landscaped park and stainless steel sculpture in 1996 (Chiem 1999).

Similarly, O'Hare International Airport, another of Chicago's main gateways, has been spruced up. Downtown restaurants famous to Chicago

(Gino's East pizza, the Berghoff, Gold Coast hot dogs, Lou Mitchell's, and the Billy Goat Tavern) and many more retail shops have been added to the terminals so travelers can have a quick taste of Chicago consumption without even heading downtown. Outdoors, O'Hare has been beautified with new landscaping, planters, and hundreds of hanging flower pots.

Michael Thompson's Rubbish Theory (1979) is useful in understanding all of these efforts at beautification and the purposeful discourse of clean-up surrounding them. What is happening in Chicago is that the Daley administration is involved in the symbolic construction of value for its public spaces. Those places deemed valuable are transferred to the arena of "durability" through their rehabilitation and enhancement -- the movement toward beautification described above. Others, deemed "rubbish" by those in power, are wrapped in a rhetoric of dirt and disorder a la Mary Douglas, and are allowed to decay further or are eliminated completely. This construction and manipulation of value is purposeful and is propelled by discourse. The current beautification of Chicago and transformation of Maxwell Street is hegemonic and unstoppable; those in power, in this case Mayor Daley and his administration, "have the power to make things durable and to make things transient, so they can ensure that their own objects are always durable and that those of others are always transient. They are like a football team whose center-forward also happens to be the referee; they cannot lose" (Thompson 1979: 9).

"Cleaning Up"

While still cloaked in terms of cleanliness, order, and betterment, some of the beautification schemes are more obviously efforts to remove people, the social "dirt." Starting in 1990, for example, the city, under the new Mayor Daley, cracked down on "buskers," musicians playing on the streets and subway and elevated train platforms. In 1996, the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) started its own program to "clean up" the system. Its campaign against panhandlers and peddlers involves citations and arrests for peddling and illegal begging (Pollack 1999).

Similarly, a city crackdown on street vending, particularly elote stands in Little Village and Pilsen, started in 1991 when aldermen began banning street vending in their wards. The Chicago Park District banned sales on park district property in the summer of 1996, and early in 1997 the city departments of Health, Police, Revenue, and Streets and Sanitation became authorized to impound any food vehicle in violation of the city health code (Pollack 1997). A variety of creative arguments were used: vendors don't wash their hands enough, they litter, the carts could force children off the sidewalks and into traffic, the carts are in the way of senior citizens trying to use the sidewalks, they are a health hazard, etc. (one alderman even said one of his aides had a dog that died after eating a popsicle bought from a street vendor). Cracking down on this Mexican vending tradition became the goal of many in the city council, though the arguments about sanitation seem to many to be a thinly veiled plot to put eloteros out of business just because certain people prefer sterile streets to this kind of street life. A group

of predominantly Hispanic vendors protested at City Hall and were able to delay action that would shut them down. In the summer of 1999, the crackdown was revived through an ordinance which requires licensing, prohibits late-night operation, and bans bells, horns, music, and other noise-making devices from the carts (Washburn 1999).

The city has even cleaned up the newsstands around town. Rick's News was located outside the Chicago Cultural Center on Randolph Street for seventy years until it was closed by the city and replaced by café tables (Kass 1997). According to John Kass, a Chicago Tribune columnist often critical of the Daley administration, the closing of Rick's News

> represents the final changing of the democratic city, from coffee and a doughnut and a newspaper to biscotti and grand latte. It tells you what Chicago's become....To be fair to Mayor Richard Daley, downtown is beautiful and has never been cleaner; he doesn't like things messy. But it's clean the way white tile is clean after ammonia and a vigorous brushing....When what remains of the peddlers is pushed out and broken, City Hall will take over. Companies will buy the carts and antique them up, and employees will sit at the carts like clerks at the mall, like the new flower sellers. It'll look cute and quaint. But it won't be real. (1998)

Chicago puts special emphasis on cleaning up the city in preparation for large events that put Chicago in the world eye. During the summer of 1994, when the World Cup came to town, arrests for petty crimes skyrocketed, and harassment and removal of the homeless was intense, particularly in Grant Park, according to Streetwise, a newspaper sold by homeless persons (Baltazar and Randag 1994). Another sprucing up occurred just before the Democratic National Convention came to town in 1996. Policing also intensifies each summer around

the time of downtown festivals like Taste of Chicago and Bluesfest, times when the public space becomes very public and the city is attempting to display itself in the most positive light.

A clean-up of Lower Wacker Drive occurred at the end of January 1999 when the city and a group of building owners evicted dozens of homeless people from the street and built fences all around the area, ostensibly to deal with the problem of illegally parked cars. The clean-up became a coordinated lockdown which keeps the homeless out and permits the building owners to use security forces or the Chicago police to enforce property rights (Richards and Struzzi 1999). Periodic evictions of Lower Wacker, a relatively protected area under Wacker Drive, have been conducted since it opened in 1926 and was dubbed "Hoover Hotel." The "clean-ups" have gotten increasingly aggressive in recent years.

The city is also instituting a plan to restrict street musicians. Though Alderman Burton Natarus (his 42nd ward includes the downtown Loop and tony near-north Gold Coast) has been battling legislatively with the street performers in Chicago since the 1980's, he introduced the most restrictive measures in the summer of 1999. The regulations fill six pages. The ordinance calls the performances "sometimes annoying, disturbing, and even unhealthful," and says they can cause safety hazards. It limits the volume of performances, limits where performers can be and for how long in a particular spot, and it bans street performers altogether during peak hours, on Sundays, and from Thanksgiving until the day after Christmas.

Most recently, Mayor Daley is working on a new ordinance to restrict loitering on Chicago streets. Billed as an attempt to restrict gang activity, it disallows "congregating in a public place with no apparent purpose" (Washburn 2000).

Neal Pollack, staff writer for the Chicago Reader, has written extensively on the trend to regulate and disinfect the city. In one short article he talks about a group of women who used to have a permanent junk sale in the basement of their Rogers Park apartment building. A 1997 law passed by the Chicago City Council put their traditional May through October sale out of business by requiring permits, restricting advertising, and limiting the sale to a three-day maximum. Pollack uses the example of these women and the city yard-sale law which shut down their summer business to illustrate the kinds of activities that are routinely regulated or eliminated under the Daley administration:

> The yard-sale law typifies the policy priorities of the Daley Administration. Any activity that exists outside the city's regulatory purview, anything that's done without the mayor's office's written "consent," anything that has any independent spirit at all, is anathema. From attempts to crack down on Mexican corn vendors to a draconian CTA policy regarding street musicians, to restricting the number of game machines that a neighborhood bar can operate, the Daley Administration has waged a nearly-decade-long war on the entertainments and activities of ordinary Chicagoans. These "busybody laws," as City Hall reporters like to call them, strike mostly at the lives of working- or lower-middle-class neighborhood residents. At their apogee lies the brutal and unnecessary 1994 shutting down of the Maxwell Street Market, the heart of the social and cultural life for many of Chicago's working people. Certain activities with a "family" cachet – like ice skating, museum-going, and holiday decorating – go untouched, but all other aspects of daily life in this city are increasingly regulated and restricted nearly to the point of invisibility. Taken apart, these laws are silly, almost completely meaningless. But in total, they have a chilling effect on city life. (Pollack 1998a)

Beautification and rehabilitation schemes are externally attractive, appealing, and seductive. They are seemingly benign projects; who wouldn't be in favor of cleanliness and orderliness? A new park here, a quaint shopping district there, a festival marketplace here, a little tweaking of the waterfront there, and pretty soon the place is cleaned up and nice to look at. But pretty soon, too, the nature of public space is altered – some groups are welcomed, while others are excluded. It is only upon looking more deeply into what the plans are really suggesting in terms of people that we see the less positive sides of urban beautification.

What seems to be forgotten in much of the discussion of these beautification schemes is that they are not just about cleanliness and orderliness and making the city neat and accessible and fun. Changing, organizing, and dictating city spaces and uses of them, as city officials, planners, and developers do, essentially and effectively changes and dictates who will be tolerated and comfortable in these new urban spaces. Development and redevelopment necessarily relegates some people to the margins of urban life. And as we accept, unquestioningly, small changes and an overall transformation of the city, cloaked in the language of beautification and improved public space, we also risk accepting new representations of urban life, an organization of the city which values and gives more and more power to a corporate, bureaucratic, legitimized view of the world.

"Daleyland" is a term used by columnists in the Chicago Tribune to describe the transformation of Chicago. It means "the sterilized and cute new theme park that the entire downtown Chicago has become. Tourists think of it as the city....which is starting to look like a big Naperville with more money. And poor scruffy people don't belong there any more" (Kass 1997). Indeed, the message of "you don't belong" is being sent to many Chicagoans as the public spaces in the city are transformed into more attractive, but less usable, venues. The North Avenue beachhouse, a Works Project Administration project and Chicago landmark since 1938, was razed in 1998; a new one, with restaurants and retail was built a hundred feet from the original spot. Many other places along the lakefront have simply been eliminated: the fish cleaning station at Diversey Harbor, the fried fish shack next to the Chicago Locks and Navy Pier, the skeet shooting range off Fullerton Avenue's lakefront, a casting pier in Lincoln Park. The strategy seems to be to eliminate unwanted people by eliminating the spaces those people used and designing new spaces to attract new, desirable audiences. The strategy can be easily seen at all the spots and attractions discussed in this chapter – the components of the building, beautifying, and cleaning-up that Chicago has been doing to transform itself. Certainly, one of the best examples of the strategy can be seen in the story of Maxwell Street.

Circles of Discourse: The Discourse of Maxwell Street

The innermost circle of the model I am using here includes the discourse of the Maxwell Street situation. This includes public statements made by university and city officials specifically about the acquisition of the land, the

move of the marketplace, and the proposed South Campus expansion and development. This is the discourse by which the transformation of Maxwell Street is directly propelled and legitimated.

The discourse of Maxwell Street also includes the discourse of resistance. Statements about history, place, preservation, heritage, community, culture, ethnicity, and authenticity are sprinkled liberally throughout the rhetoric of the Coalition. And some of these key terms have been coopted by the university for use in their statements about the development of the area; by using some of the Coalition's terminology, the discourse of power seeks to incorporate the resistance movement to achieve its own goals, while appearing to want many of the same things the resistance does. Likewise, the Coalition, as we have seen already, consciously adapts its own rhetoric to appeal more to the dominant university, to make its voice more likely to be heard by those in power.

University and city statements are mainly delivered through the press and in public meetings or presentations. During the course of this research, I closely tracked coverage of the Maxwell Street situation in the Chicago media and attended most city or university-sponsored public meetings where plans were presented or discussed. Other private meetings between our Coalition and city and university officials or representatives, I attended as a representative of the Coalition. University statements at these closed-door meetings typically stuck to the official, simply reiterating their publicly-known plans and their intention to move forward with it. City representatives in similarly private meetings gave us

advice for communicating effectively with the university, strategies for altering our own discourse so as to start a dialogue with the university.

Statements surrounding the move of the marketplace and clean-up of the neighborhood focus on dirt and danger. Maxwell Street was and is continually presented as filthy, overcrowded, unsanitary, decrepit, as well as crime-ridden and unsafe. These messages were used to justify the move of the market as the only possible way to adequately clean up the area. It needed to be bulldozed and resurrected elsewhere if it was to ever be uncontaminated. The area, already suffering from sanitation and safety problems, was helped along by the city of Chicago when it stopped garbage removal and cut way back on police services to the area. The city's messages of dirt and danger were particularly effective after that. It is the conditions they created which allow their discourse of beautification to work, as described in chapter 3.

Messages of decay and "blight" were crucial to the University's discourse as they lobbied to gain TIF (tax increment financing) status for the district containing Maxwell Street in 1998. Following the city's lead, the university bought buildings and neglected them in order to accelerate the blight already in evidence on Maxwell Street.

Discourse of blight in America today is often racialized or class-based discourse. Messages of dirt, danger, threat, chaos, and fear can be read as messages about racial groups or economic classes. This coded language becomes quite obvious at times; one Coalition member reports "UIC administrators asked me 'would you want your (white) daughter to walk through Maxwell Street on

their [sic] way to classes?'" (Balkin and Mier 2000). The Coalition too uses guarded and coded language to talk about race and class in relation to Maxwell Street. We consciously talk about "the Blues" instead of black people and the "alternative economy" instead of poor vendors and shoppers, for example.

The area was also depicted repeatedly as "underused" and "vacant" in order to qualify for a TIF. The message that there is nothing there was continually used to deny the existence of any community, of any people, of any neighborhood at all around Maxwell Street. Said university spokesperson, John Camper, in 1993, "We're not talking about destroying a neighborhood where people live. These are vacant lots where people bring their trucks and sell things" (Sloan 1993). And Stanton Delaney, who oversees the development of the south campus for the UIC, when asked what was in the area before the UIC began its expansion, answered "Well, there wasn't much of anything here....There are certainly no homes or a neighborhood as you would normally perceive it" (Baldwin and Nimmer 1999). Certainly Maxwell Street is not a tree-lined street with two-car garages and basketball hoops, so perhaps it does not fit the image that university and city officials have when they hear the word "neighborhood."

Going along with the rhetoric of blight, is the university's repeated insistence that the buildings and area around Maxwell Street are "not historically significant"; most public statements by the university contain this phrase, a key component of its discourse. Referring to the 1994 National Register rejection, the university says things like "these buildings did not merit official designation as landmarks" (B. Mier 1998a). The Coalition sees these statements as deliberate

overstatements or misstatements of what happened in 1994,[6] and believes the university uses such statements as cover for destruction. The university used this, for example, when it put out demolition orders on "the Maxwell Street Six" in March of 1998. The Maxwell Street Six included an 1860's frame building at 721 W. Maxwell considered to be from the Civil War era and to be reflective of the area's immigrant and retail heritage, an 1899 manufacturing building built by the then newly formed National Biscuit Company, Nabisco, at 720-24 W. Maxwell, and 733-37 W. Maxwell, which was the site of the popular Gabel's Clothing Store in the 1940's. On Halsted, they included one of the first Kresge stores (1335-37 Halsted). The 1994 Illinois Historic Preservation Agency's "Archaeological and Historical Evaluation of the Maxwell Street Area" report indicates that all would likely be deemed "contributing features" to a potential historical district. Though the buildings are known to have been built between 1860 and 1926, the university identified them as in disrepair and "not historically significant."

The only building officially designated a landmark in the 1994 decision was the Maxwell Street police station; the university is required to preserve it according to an agreement with the IHPA (Illinois Historic Preservation Association). University reports about their development plans repeatedly mention the preservation of the police station; they mention its listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the plans for restoring it in all their statements about the South Campus expansion, emphasizing again, of course, that "no other building in the development area qualified for historic preservation" (Delaney 1998). A photo exhibit depicting the history and culture of Maxwell

Street during various eras will be placed inside the famous building they say. The building will also serve as headquarters for UIC police.

The university's focus on this one particular building is very telling, says the Coalition. In 1994, the UIC had to offer some token of historic preservation as they moved the marketplace and arranged to demolish buildings. We feel the police station was chosen because it reflects UIC's social control agenda – and this is not a difficult stretch to make. The building is isolated geographically from the rest of the old Maxwell Street neighborhood, even more so since the university erected fences which truncated Maxwell Streeet before the police station. The more the university focuses on the police station in its comments, the more fearful the Coalition becomes that all that will ultimately remain of the old Maxwell Street area will be a photo exhibit.

The university has stated hundreds of times that it understands and respects the heritage of Maxwell Street. The university's proposals for the redevelopment of Maxwell and Halsted are filled with the rhetoric of nostalgia and progress. But even their most positive statements are at base about destruction. Statements by the UIC's Chancellor David Broski talk about ensuring that "Maxwell Street retains its nineteenth-century flavor and vitality" (Mielecki 1998: 1). The UIC wants to "preserve the character and heritage of the area" and to "do what [they] can to retain an historic feeling," according to their PR director (B. Mier 1998a), by using designs for new construction that are reminiscent of the way the area once looked as well as preserving building facades to incorporate into new development. The director of the South Campus

Development, Stanton Delaney, talks about looking at "options to preserve and recreate the look and feel of Maxwell Street for generations to come." Using words like "commemorate" and "celebrate," he talks about "educat[ing] the public about the character of Maxwell Street in its heyday" (Delaney 1998). The forces of power are thus able to use the rhetoric of nostalgia and preservation to effect their own ends and further propel their hegemonic vision.

When university planners use words like "in its heyday" and "turn-of-the-century character" the Coalition fears a flowery, nostalgic reframing of urban reality. Its members understand from these phrases that developers and designers will pick the nicest, tamest, most emotionally satisfying images of bygone times to stand for the whole history of the place. Maxwell Street, like so many other "historic" districts, will be portrayed in a "good old days," late nineteenth-century sort of way. But those "good old days" were often hard for the residents, peddlers, and shopkeepers of the area. And what about the people who live and work and shop there now? How do they fit in? Places that are museumized or otherwise frozen in time (places with "turn-of-the-century flavor") run the risk of being permanently segregated from the present. We start to see them as novelties, historic remnants, quaint but dead places, and we lose sight of their relation to our own lives. The history of Maxwell Street is crucial to understanding ourselves as urban-Americans, but to be effective, the reconstructed place must encourage us to focus on the connections between then and now, to see the power of the past in the present.

UIC seems to believe the neighborhood's heyday was during the period of Jewish settlement. They find the current residents and shoppers to be repulsive, focusing in their comments on the dirt and the presence of X-rated materials. They don't see black men selling socks and shoelaces on the street as continuing a century-old practice. They don't see a connectivity between African-Americans and Latinos and earlier European immigrants. The university focus on a "heyday" places one group as an object of nostalgia and the rest as aberrations of the "original" market (Marmer 1998b). Asked what plans the university has for commemoration of the area and specifically the blues, Stanton Delaney, who oversees the south campus development for the UIC had this to say:

> I'm not sure we have a plan in place right now to address that specifically. We do have a number of negotiations in progress in terms of how this final retail/business mix will look. The whole issue of restaurants, blues clubs, etc. I think is a major issue that's on the table right now. Back to that, the police station issue, we are going to do some activities in that police station to commemorate all aspects of activity that occurred historically on Maxwell Street which include the blues aspect. And I think, I hope to see some recognition of the blues history through how we program the retail facilities....I think the university has shown quite a bit of sensitivity on all aspects of what Maxwell Street represents which includes the blues, mainly through the initial adaptive reuse program and the approximately $12-13 million that we've already committed to the buildings. (Baldwin and Nimmer 1999).

The university has claimed repeatedly that its plan is "respectful of the social architecture and historical significance of the entire Maxwell Street area" (Lawrence 1999b). It is continually touting its involvement in and support of such endeavors as the "Great Cities Program," the "Urban Design Center," and the "Natalie Voorheis Neighborhoods Initiative." Their support of such pro-

urban-sounding organizations allows them to pay lip service to their efforts at neighborhood development and entrepreneurship, while at the same time deliberately blighting a neighborhood, putting people out of homes and businesses, and demolishing a historic marketplace and urban melting pot.

What the Coalition wants is for the UIC to understand that its land acquisition and development plans have made it the steward of that heritage, and to show evidence that they have taken responsibility for preserving it. The university claims they will "properly memorialize" Maxwell Street, but the Coalition is certain they will not properly take up this task, especially when they appear unwilling, in fact repulsed, by the idea of consulting all parties with an interest in the area.

As part of its agreement with the IHPA, for example, the UIC is funding a research project to document the history of the neighborhood. Thus they have given a grant of $500,000 to UIC professor Burton Bledstein to create a website of the history of the near west side. Bledstein's research includes no oral histories, and his portrayal of the area stops at 1930; the era of African-American settlement and blues music is completely ignored.

Much of the university's language is powerful simply because it sounds official (which often just means vague) and final. They cannot use existing buildings, for example, because those buildings are "not suitable for university purposes." Many Coalition suggestions are simply "not within the constraints of our planning" (Pollack 1998b). They are "moving ahead with our plan," and all questions about heritage, displacement, authenticity, preservation, about anything

really, are referred to The Plan. The UIC's public statements about their Plan talk about the economic activity and all the wonderful facilities and the lively environment they will create, but very little about what if anything they will save. "We have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for the university to take a leading role in building a new community almost from ground zero," says UIC's Vice-Chancellor Stanton Delaney (1998). The talk of the "new community" means of course a centrally-planned and controlled student environment. Though much of the newly developed space would be ostensibly public, it would really be highly orchestrated, and people would in effect be told how they are to experience the place.

The university has throughout the process claimed that their expansion plans are supported by the community, and that the entire process has been the product of diverse groups of people united in a "growing partnership" in favor of expansion (Nelson 1998). It is true they held the required community meetings, but those were certainly viewed and handled as obligatory rather than participatory. And they did have the support of a few representatives of the area (such as the United Neighborhood Organization, the Hispanic American Construction Industry Association, and St. Ignatius college preparatory school) who they organized into a dissent-free group and called the South Campus UIC-Community Committee, composed of seventeen leaders of community groups and three university administrators all in favor of the expansion, but overwhelming sentiment in the area from residents, merchants, shoppers, and activists was negative toward the university's overall vision of new construction and a new

neighborhood. Those interested in participating and offering advice and ideas were treated as nuisances and outsiders, and were routinely put off while decisions were made secretly and released strategically. The university's master plan has been dictated by developers and administrators since the beginning, though various attempts have been made to give the appearance of negotiation and compromise.

Though the university claims in the press and its statements to have talked to many of the businesses, merchants say they are lying. When South Development team member Larry Justice said it at the November 1998 community meeting, he was met with shouts of "You never talked to me, not once!" and "Liar!" and "You keep on saying that, but that's not true. That's not true!" Merchants affiliated with the Coalition complain that the university and its development team have made no attempt to get any input from the ongoing businesses in the area to see how they could be incorporated into the plan. Even the buildings that are incorporated into the plan on paper, they say, will not realistically be included as new businesses and new clientele are programmed into the district. They reference how new retail on similar scale as the existing retail is to replace it, how developers are deciding "up in some ivory tower" who will get to conduct business in the neighborhood and who will not. Says Irving Federman of Adam Joseph's clothing, "it seems to me that there seems to be an overall vision here that...the idea here is to displace the businesses, the people that buy things at those businesses, for another group of consumers and another group of business owners" (UIC community meeting, 11/18/98). At community meetings,

university officials make presentations and then pretend to take input, but are not even taking notes on the suggestions they receive; the meetings are obviously pro forma and nothing more. It is this secrecy and non-cooperation that bothers merchants the most.

Throughout the battle over Maxwell Street, the Coalition's discourse of resistance has focused on authenticity, historic preservation, place and history. Their messages have become less emotional and more reasoned and corporate (arguments based on costs and measurements, for instance) in order to appeal to university decisionmakers and other members of the establishment. Extreme actions of the university, however, evoke powerful discourse from the Coalition. When the university's façade-based Plan was revealed, for instance, the Coalition made its main message that the university is practicing "facadism."

Facadism as a phenomenon is very controversial in the fields of architecture and preservation – it is expensive, and it is artificial. According to David Bahlman, executive director of the Landmarks Preservation Council of Illinois,

> A building is an organism and has a three-dimensional mass to it. We're getting to the point where developers get the dumb notion that all they have to do is save the façade and they'll satisfy everybody, but it's a compromise where nobody wins. The preservationists don't win because there's nothing left and the developers don't win because it costs them money. (Mendell 1999)

With electronic cries of "A line must be drawn in the sand to stop facadism!," the Coalition made "facadism" its rallying call, the issue used to fight against the university's September 1, 1999 final Plan for Maxwell Street. A "facadectomy" is a "modern architectural operation in which the outer skin of a building is

preserved while the interior is either renovated substantially or replaced entirely" (Mendell 1999). In the most extreme cases, the facades are removed, catalogued, placed in storage, and then slapped onto new structures in new locations – this is the approach proposed by the UIC. Execution of such a process requires some special knowledge and experience, not to mention space for storage of very large and sensitive pieces of buildings. There has been no discussion of how the UIC plans to handle such an elaborate scheme.

The university has proposed the use of facades for two main reasons: to placate the ad-hoc advisory committee and the city by "preserving" some of the flavor of the original historic structures, and to allow for flexibility in floor location, height of buildings, and the placement of mechanicals and electricals.

In a position paper sent out to the press, the Coalition presented many arguments against facadism. First, the destruction of the buildings behind the facades will result in the throwing away of useful structural floors and walls and original materials and finishes. Not only is it wasteful, but it is much more expensive than saving whole buildings when one considers the costs of demolition, landfill, and rebuilding serviceable space. Also, the pasting on of original facades over taller buildings or structures of differing proportions will most assuredly result in a visual mess or a street that looks like a film set. Third, the practice of facadism amounts to tokenism, a way for developers to tip their hat to preservation while not really saving buildings. And last, they argue simply that facades are fake, that something called a "façade" cannot be authentic; it is by definition empty and false. Facadism, its connotation suggests, hides something –

according to the coalition what it is hiding in this case is the ugly truth that the University of Illinois at Chicago cares not at all for the real history of Maxwell Street or the conservation of culture in the area.

Most of the Coalition's arguments to battle facadism have not been effective with a university bent on a façade approach primarily because they are subjective in nature. They point out, for instance, that one of the first five principles of heritage tourism as set out by the National Trust is a "focus on authenticity and quality." Discussion and debate about authenticity rages on in many disciplines. What makes something authentic? How do we establish authenticity? Questions like these have plagued scholars for decades.

Other arguments against the facades are equally intangible, reasons that are universally accepted among the historically and preservation-minded, but which are hard to sell to others: sense of place, respect for history, the energy and long-term contribution of old buildings, cultural conservation, tradition, aesthetics, the integrity of full buildings, sensitivity to scale, and architectural heritage. But even if university decision-makers do not give credence to any of these or care about the immigrant or blues history of Maxwell Street, they should still favor saving full buildings for the sake of tourism and profit, says the Coalition. Tourists who are in search of authentic sites to visit will not come to see facades, but they will flock to places where they feel they can have a brush with history and heritage.

Similar to the way we used the term "facadism" negatively, the Coalition repeatedly used references to a western Chicago suburb, Naperville. It was only

after hearing its name dropped scathingly dozens of times that I took notice and started thinking seriously about the connection of Naperville to issues of urban space. "Naperville" was intended to encapsulate a whole set of ideas and negative feelings about beautification.

Naperville, Illinois is in DuPage County, about thirty minutes from downtown Chicago. It is a fairly typical upper-middle class suburb of about 125,000 persons, priding itself on "having a contagious 'family-spirit' atmosphere"; there is even a Naperville Family Spirit Commission according to the Naperville "Family Spirit" brochure sent out to prospective residents. Its most publicized feature is The Riverwalk, billed as "meandering brick pathways dotted by old-fashioned benches, covered bridges and antique-style light poles"; Naperville's downtown, shopping district, and parks have been fashioned in the same pleasant style. It is a suburb based on the mainstream principles of privacy, cleanliness, and a corporate economy. As such, it stands in opposition to Maxwell Street.

Naperville is invoked when Coalition members want to show their disgust for the university and the administrators and planners who are threatening Maxwell Street, as in "They want to turn Maxwell Street into Naperville in the city." When they say Naperville, they mean "any sterile, uninteresting suburb-type place." Then Chancellor of the University of Illinois at Chicago, David Broski, actually lived in Naperville, so that may explain its invocation in relation to Maxwell Street, since he is seen as the kingpin behind the university's South Campus expansion. But that doesn't explain its use in the press. When Tribune

writers refer to the redeveloping, beautifying city as "Daleyland," "the sterilized and cute new theme park that the entire downtown Chicago has become," they say it "is starting to look like a big Naperville" (Kass 7/21/97). The name Naperville has come to stand for all the preservationists and cultural conservationists hate about what the university is trying to do to Maxwell Street and all the City of Chicago is trying to do to, well, the city of Chicago. It stands too for people's quiet acceptance, and therefore endorsement, of the city's clean-up practices in all their iterations all over the city.

Naperville means a different aesthetic, something not of the city, indeed something anti-urban. Saying things such as "they actually *like* Naperville," while seemingly just a flippant inside joke against the university, really gets to the heart of the matter; if someone likes and appreciates Naperville and how architecture and streetlife looks and feels there, that same someone cannot possibly like and appreciate the real Maxwell Street, the one filled with the smell of grilled onions, the sound of the blues, many different languages and colors of skin, and people haggling over goods on the street. People have very developed and essential tastes about the kind of places they like and feel comfortable in, how they think businesses and houses and streetscapes should look, what kind of people they feel comfortable around. Naperville has come to represent one extreme on a continuum of urban aesthetics.

The discourse of resistance also includes frequent references to the fact that they are engaged against the university and /or city in a fight, a war, a struggle or battle. Says Coalition member, Bill Lavicka, "We're fighting a war.

We're urban guerillas fighting a war against our city. And it's sad. The University of Illinois at Chicago has waged war on history. Sad."

Another powerful rhetorical move on the part of the Coalition is the use of a very fatalistic language in reference to Maxwell Street. All events are referred to as "the last"; every blues jams is potentially "the last time the blues will play on Maxwell Street," for instance. The making and publicity of the Last Days of Maxwell Street video is another example of this.

The discourse of displacement is, as we have seen, composed here of the discourse of American urban planning, of Chicago's history of "progress" and beautification, of Chicago's big clean-up, and of the blight, underuse, and historical insignificance of Maxwell Street, along with plans for commemoration of the area's history and heritage. It is at base a discourse focused on progress and the elimination of dirt. These four levels, here illustrated by four concentric circles, comprise an encompassing discourse, one made up of what Bakhtin would see as types and degrees of "authoritative discourse" (1981: 342). This authoritiative discourse is composed of various contents, and while it is, as he says "indissolubly fused with its authority," it is also surrounded by and in conversation with other types of discourses which comment on it, counter it, resist it, "interpret it, praise it, apply it in various ways" (1981: 343). The countervoice to the authoritative discourse of Maxwell Street comes from positive portrayals of city life and vitality like that of Jane Jacobs (1961), from the literature which counters the mainstream narrative of wholly positive urban development, from media criticism of Chicago's beautification efforts, from the discourse of the

Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition as they criticize and respond to the powerful discourse of displacement of the City and University.

Recent and decades-old components reinforce each other and make up a tight package of authoritative discourse which struggles to become "internally persuasive discourse" (Bahktin 1981: 342) for those who hear and absorb it. When this transformation is complete, when people accept the university's "Plan" as good and right, or at least inevitable, then the discourse is truly hegemonic; people buy into it without even knowing there is anything to buy into. The hegemonic discourse of beautification and displacement surrounding Maxwell Street works because messages of urban fear, progress, cleaning up, historical insignificance, and other powerful statements combine to create an image of Maxwell Street as a place needful of intervention and change.

We move now to look at the evolution of the form of the place called Maxwell Street. There too can be seen power and hegemony functioning to beautify the place and displace its people.

---

[1] After the Philadelphia exposition of 1876, honky-tonk amusements built outside the fairgrounds were condemned and burned by city officials.

[2] Richard J. Daley's failed efforts to make the deals required to turn Chicago's infamous Block 37 from a group of low-rise marginal businesses into a glittering tower of office space and retail are entertainingly chronicled in Ross Miller's 1996 book Here's the Deal: The Buying and Selling of a Great American City.

[3] The term "festival marketplace" is what the Rouse Company, headed by developer James Rouse before his death, calls the product it creates. The Rouse Company, along with architects Benjamin Thompson and Associates, is responsible for many of the most successful festival marketplaces: New York's South Street Seaport, Quincy Market and Faneuil Hall in Boston, Miami's Bayside Marketplace, and Harborplace in Baltimore (Garvin 1996: 116). There are others too, designed by other firms, but based on the same general plans: Ghirardelli Square and Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco, the Torpedo Factory in Alexandria, Virginia, Union Station in Indianapolis or St. Louis, Horton Plaza in San Diego, Grand Avenue in Milwaukee, just to name a few. Almost every large U.S. city has at least one, each unique in its history, its development, and its presentation to the public. As the name implies, "festival marketplaces" are designed to present a

festival atmosphere to the public. Through the use of bright colors, music, food, entertainers, and the attraction of crowds of people, marketplace planners attempt to create a festival/carnival mood.
[4] During World War II the entire pier was taken over by the U.S. Navy for a training center, and after the war the pier was used as a satellite campus of the University of Illinois to educate ex-servicemen coming in under the GI Bill. Other uses have included art shows, a convention center, Great Lakes shipping, International Trade Fairs, and a Bicentennial celebration.
[5] A more complete discussion of Navy Pier and its dual message of History and Progress are contained in my 1997 presentation "What are They Really Selling?: Chicago's Navy Pier as Festival Marketplace" to the American Folklore Society, and in an unpublished manuscript (1996) titled "History and Progress for Sale: Chicago's Navy Pier as Festival Marketplace."
6 In 1993, two people from what is now the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition prepared a nomination of a Maxwell Street Market district for the National Register of Historic Sites, in an attempt to save the seventy-eight buildings then extant in the Maxwell-Halsted-Roosevelt district. Their submission included testimony from area merchants and others, and emphasized the period of Jewish immigration and settlement in the area. The Illinois Historic sites Advisory Council (IHSAC) voted unanimously that the district was eligible for listing (the nomination was submitted in December 1993, and was amended and resubmitted in March 1994). In November 1994, it was rejected by William Wheeler, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), who stated: "In my opinion, the property does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant locally." His opinion rejected the findings of the state advisory committee which voted 9-0 in favor of the nomination.

After this highly irregular judgment (it is unusual that the SHPO not follow the recommendation of the IHSAC committee who are his advisors), the university Board of Trustees entered into negotiations with the IHPA (the two preparers of the nomination were blocked out of these negotiations) which resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement between the two bodies. The memorandum committed the UIC to prepare a minimal level of documentation of buildings before they are demolished, to nominate the Maxwell Street police station to the National Register, to rehabilitate the police station according to recommended approaches in "The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings," to create an interpretive exhibit at an undefined time and place to commemorate the market, and to submit written progress reports to the IHPA every six months until all provisions have been met. In the years that have passed since the memorandum, the university has not officially violated the agreement, but they have made little progress toward honoring the spirit of a preservation agreement: pre-demolition documentation of buildings has been conducted at the third, and lowest, level of specification; the police station was nominated and listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1996, though no rehabilitation has been done; and there has been no development of or even discussion of any interpretive exhibit.

The IHPA's official explanation for rejection is that a building or group of buildings must have both historic significance and physical integrity to be considered. The National Register Coordinator for the IHPA and the Illinois Historic Sites Advisory Council gave greater weight to significance, while the SHPO (Wheeler) gave greater weight to physical integrity and reasoned that the proposed district had already lost the open-air market and too many buildings to justify National Register listing. The "significance v. integrity" argument in National Register evaluation is standard and valid and certainly would play a role in the evaluation of any National Register nomination. But it is doubtful that this is the only reason the nomination was ultimately rejected. Unofficially, the Coalition was informed that members of the state agency thought the nomination met the official criteria, but the university threatened total non-cooperation with the state agency if it supported the Maxwell Street nomination. If this is true, the agency apparently decided it was preferable to have limited cooperation in terms of documenting buildings before demolition. In any case the decision was made by a politically influenced state administrator in a highly charged political atmosphere.

In any National Register nomination of buildings within the City of Chicago's jurisdiction, the Office of the Mayor and the Commission on Chicago Landmarks (CCL) are allowed to make comments. Both offices opposed the Maxwell Street nomination of 1994. It is not a surprise that the Mayor's office opposed the nomination. Mayor Daley and his wife Maggie

wanted the Maxwell Street Market moved at any cost. The mayor saw the nomination of remaining buildings as an effort to keep the market in place, which he vehemently opposed. As long as the two were linked in the mayor's mind, no support was going to come from his office. A complete rejection of the old market site and the importance of anything connected to it was necessary to effect the move of the market and creation of the New Maxwell Street Market so that the area could be "cleaned-up" as part of Daley's effort to create a world-class city.

The opposition by the CCL (part of the Landmarks Division of the Chicago Department of Planning and Development) is more complicated. Initially the Program Committee of the CCL, which is the committee that deals with National Register nominations among other things, voted in favor of the nomination, but the full commission chose to oppose it. The staff of the CCL raised questions about the physical integrity of the proposed district, pointing out the loss of many buildings in the area. They also noted that the Chicago Historic Resources Survey identified only a few buildings in the proposed district that possessed both physical integrity and above-average architectural interest. An investigator hired by the Coalition put it this way in a document of advice concerning the Coalition's handling of the different organizations that can influence the outcome of preservation in the area:

> Did the mayor's office place pressure on the CCL to oppose listing? Of course! But there's no way to document that. Certainly Landmarks Division staff will not state that for the record. Frankly, they don't have to. Using the standard evaluation tools of "historical significance" and "physical integrity," the proposed district looked weak in their eyes. Why fight Mayor Daley when there were other preservation battles that were, in their eyes, more important, battles where they might need his clout.

Even after rejection, threat of an official historic district continued to be one of the Coalition's main cards to play against the university. If the area were, in the future, officially proclaimed an historic district, put on the National Register, the university's hands would be tied. They would have a hard time doing almost anything because they would be constrained by official restrictions.

Lori Grove and Elliot Zashin, the same two Coalition members who filed the 1993 application, submitted a new application in 2000 to gain status on the National Register. Basing the application on new historical data, with an emphasis on the years after 1930, after the period of Jewish settlement and during the period of electrified blues music, they hoped to rate higher on "significance" as more of the remaining buildings are from that era. Again, the state advisory council voted unanimously to recognize the site for national status. Again, the state preservation officer, William Wheeler, in a highly unusual move, ignored his council's advice and advised the Keeper of the Register, Carol Shull, not to place it on the Register as the district does not have the "integrity of setting, design, materials and feeling" to warrant its inclusion. The Keeper delayed her decision while more buildings were torn down, and ultimately rejected the 2000 application.

CHAPTER SIX

READING THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT:

THE EVOLUTION OF MAXWELL STREET'S FORM

> There is a quality even meaner than outright ugliness or disorder, and this meaner quality is the dishonest mask of pretended order, achieved by ignoring or suppressing the real order that is struggling to exist and to be served.
> (Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities)

Power is evident in Maxwell Street's landscape. It is clear to Merlyn McFarland, the "mayor of Maxwell Street," that the fences, boarded up buildings, and vacant lots are meant to send the message that he isn't welcome on Maxwell Street anymore. The demolition crews and construction sites tell him and other residents, vendors, business owners, and shoppers that the end is near – that they should pack up and go elsewhere. This message has been sent through the form of the place, through its changing built environment, for years, but has become more insistent since 1993.

Sorkin has pointed out that "social order has long been legible in urban form" (1992: xiii); status and power or lack thereof are imprinted on the spaces of the city. Others too have investigated how the built environment can be read in terms of power and authority. Sharon Zukin, for example, in her books The Cultures of Cities (1995) and Landscapes of Power (1991), looks at how the urban landscape and public space is manipulated to exclude some people and their voices and to entitle others, at how "public spaces are becoming progressively less public" (1995: 28). City spaces and public culture are influenced by what Zukin calls "the symbolic economy," the intertwining of economic forces such as

land, labor, and capital with the symbolic structuring of space. Public culture is enacted in public spaces, and as such, those who control the design and usage of such spaces control our public culture through an "implicit code of inclusion and exclusion" (Zukin 1995: 25). Though public space is by definition democratic, "people with economic and political power have the greatest opportunity to shape public culture by controlling the building of the city's public spaces in stone and concrete" (Zukin 1995: 11). Using the example of Bryant Park in New York City, Zukin shows how its renovation has led to a controlled, exclusive, privatized example of public space, "a visual and spatial representation of a middle-class public culture" (1995: 32).

Form is a great tool for looking at power, as Sorkin and Zukin indicate. But even more effective here is an investigation of the evolution of that form. Stoeltje has suggested that an examination of the "evolution of form" provides a way to look at the construction and exercise of power and its symbols, as it "reveals key points in the process of production, the points at which decisions were made affecting the aesthetic organization and access to production, and thus control of its meaning" (1993: 142). For the purposes of this investigation, then, I have taken "evolution of form" to mean the changing physical structure of the landscape of the place.[1]

Dolores Hayden too writes about how urban landscape history can be read by looking at the evolution of the built environment. She suggests ways in which power and authority can be analyzed by looking at the form of entire cities or urban centers, of urban residential neighborhoods, and of individual ordinary

buildings. According to Hayden, urban places can be investigated as politically "contested territory" (1997: 133) by looking at how power struggles appear in the planning, design, construction, and demolition of buildings and other physical structures. Certainly Maxwell Street is "contested"; as such, its changing form involves physical changes implemented by both sides of the battle.

We look in this chapter at the evolution of Maxwell Street's form, and discuss how the power relations of the struggle between the city and university and the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition are illustrated on the landscape. By examining the key changes in the neighborhood's form – the early immigrant ghetto and marketplace, the sprawling marketplace in its late years, the deteriorating neighborhood after the market's removal, and the UIC's Plan for the future design of the street – we can see the city and university's evolving goals for the place. And on the landscape too, we can see the imprint of Maxwell Street's people, how they have acted upon and remapped the space to make it their own despite the obvious messages of exclusion all around them. A view of it all – the efforts of both sides to mark the space – shows how economic and real estate development has transformed the physical landscape of the place, and thus affected the social environment, eliciting the development of "counterspaces" as people contest the site.

The form of the Maxwell Street market and neighborhood in its early days is as described in chapter 2, an overcrowded, dirty ghetto area filled with immigrants and a thriving marketplace. Commerce was conducted on city streets and people "lived" on sidewalks and in the other open spaces of the area. In its

last years, the market as described in chapter 3 was sprawling, messy, seemingly unorganized. It sprang to life for several hours every Sunday, and though sanctioned by, or at least tolerated by the city, official regulation was not effective there, and so the market was really oppositional space, a folk interpretation of the built environment. As merchandise was displayed on fences and sidewalks, and on the streets themselves, the official landscape was altered temporarily, but regularly, its form constituting a weekly ritual of space interpretation.

Official Alterations of Maxwell Street's Form

As the University of Illinois at Chicago acquired property and prepared to move the market off its land, it altered the form of the place to reflect its agenda, to send the message to vendors and shoppers that it had power over the market and would soon shut it down. Buildings were demolished, the famous Nate's Deli among them, and a surface parking lot was constructed along the south side of Maxwell Street where Nate's had stood. Parking lots, vacant lots, softball fields, and fences with "No Trespassing" signs multiplied. It was made clear through the evolution of the form of the place the market would soon be completely gone.

After the market's move, the form of Maxwell Street was altered still further. The university, as discussed in Chapter Four, continued the purchase, demolition, and neglect of buildings in the area, creating a condition of blight severe enough to gain TIF status from the City of Chicago which had sold them the land in the first place. As vacant lots, surface parking, and softball fields proliferated on the site of the historic marketplace, Maxwell Street itself was blocked off with recreation fields and a wrought-iron fence, permanently

truncated at Newberry Street, just past Jim's Original. It is certainly significant in the evolution of the Maxwell Street neighborhood's form that Maxwell Street itself is now only two blocks long. The Maxwell Street police station, supposedly the future site of an historic display about the market and neighborhood, is now completely separated from the neighborhood about which its display is to be.

Along with demolition and neglect, fire has destroyed many buildings in the neighborhood since 1994. Because the university-owned buildings were for so long not properly boarded up, fires were an obvious risk. The fires, usually well-timed for university purposes, provided opportunities for further demolition, often of strategically located buildings. On the last day of the millennium, December 31, 1999, for example, a large fire occurred at the historic Nabisco Building, 720-24 W. Maxwell Street. The Nabisco Corporation building was the last remaining manufacturing building in the neighborhood and the largest of the then remaining sixty historic buildings.

The form of Maxwell Street today includes construction crews and equipment, a student housing unit going up at the corner of Maxwell and Halsted, and the continuing demolition of buildings. Crews can be observed clearing asbestos from other buildings slated for demolition. Curiously, one of the buildings slated for demolition by the university, 731 W. Maxwell, is also on the list of buildings they claim they are going to save. Several enormous red banners proclaiming the construction of "University Village" are posted on buildings throughout the neighborhood – buildings which will soon be torn down. The banners assert that the UIC has claimed the territory for their own uses.

Counterspace

These alterations of Maxwell Street's form effected by the city and university have been accompanied by a series of alterations made by the people of Maxwell Street and the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. In hundreds of different ways, people used manipulations of the built environment to comment upon the university's actions, to create a "counter-space" (LeFebvre 1991) to or "counter-story" (Orsi 1999: 41) of the space.

People of the city have always acted on and with the spaces of the city. They have, according to Orsi, "appropriated public spaces for themselves and transformed them into venues for shaping, displaying, and celebrating their inherited and emergent ways of life and understandings of the world. They have remapped the city, superimposing their own coordinates of meaning on official cartographies" (1999: 47).

The Coalition altered public spaces to express its views about university and city uses and misuses of land and property in the neighborhood. They created a "marked culturescape," as Santino identified in his work on Ulster, by shaping the land and marking the environment with graffiti, murals, and highly charged words and symbols (1999: 517). Built forms of protest provide commentary about who really has rights to the spaces of Maxwell Street. For instance, the Coalition partnered with the neighborhood's Creative Reuse Warehouse to use recycled marterials to beautify the street with wood chips, planter boxes, an elaborate though makeshift blues jam stage for musicians to play outdoors, a massive M-A-X sculpture made out of railroad ties, and the Maxwell Street Wall

of Fame. All were constructed on land and on part of a building which are not owned by any of the people who constructed them. The 13th Street community garden next to the building at 716 Maxwell includes plantings, sculptures, totems, and other examples of "outsider art" put in place by residents of the neighborhood and members of the Coalition. Banners of "We're Here to Stay," commissioned by the merchants, line Halsted Street, while others proclaiming "Stop UIC Rape of Maxwell Street" hang from buildings so as to be visible from the highway. Boarded up buildings provide perfect surfaces for messages of protest and other graffiti, handwritten signs are taped up everywhere, wooden sculptures and art of assemblage line the university's fences, and former residents sleep in tents in an empty lot or in vans and buses on the street. All of these provide examples of alternative productions of spaces which, mainly through juxtaposition, offer critique of the surrounding spaces and entire urban environment. In such a context of contestation as Maxwell Street, these examples of public symbolic display are used by both sides, as Santino has described, "to assert territoriality and identity, to welcome or warn, and, frequently, to offend" (1999: 520). The counter-spaces set up along Maxwell Street, the folk imprint on the landscape, are consciously meant to remark upon the battle over property and its use.

In a variation on the creation of counterspace, the Coalition has all through the battle been collecting literal pieces of Maxwell Street, remnants of the physical structure of the neighborhood, artifacts to be saved and used to create counterspace later. The artifacts are housed all over: at the Chicago Architecture Foundation, in the Creative Reuse Warehouse, in people's basements, in the

storeroom at Jim's Original, and in the Heritage Bluesbus music store and museum. We have saved whatever could be carried away from demolition sites – pieces, some very large, of terra cotta and limestone, tiles, signs, etc. We even managed to preserve three of the wooden stalls used at the old marketplace.[2] Other "artifacts" are photos of buildings and streetscenes, taped recordings of people talking and playing music, and clippings from newspapers and magazines. Some were used in the Chicago Architecture Foundation's exhibit on the Near West Side which included a section about Maxwell Street; the curators used the original signage from Nate's Deli, menus, transcribed quotations on display boards, and photos of the old market.

As mentioned in previous chapters, the Coalition established a mini-museum at 1318 S. Halsted, next door to Jim's Original, in conjunction with a blues music store run by Coalition members Reverend and Mrs. John Johnson. The Coalition covered the walls with xeroxes of photos and written material in support of their cause. They bought a combination video cassette player and television and put it in the window of the store to continually play footage from old Maxwell Street. Posters and other propaganda lined the windows. A special section of one wall was set up to honor blues musicians in times of trouble (Jimmy Rogers died around the time the museum opened, for example, and a crepe paper memorial was set up in his honor). The "museum" has a very earthy, grassroots feel. As an extension of the museum space, signs were also placed on buildings around the neighborhood explaining the history of the buildings. There was discussion of setting up more permanent-looking displays, with actual framed

photographs, photo albums, photo wallpaper, and artifacts from the area's history (such as the sign from Nate's Deli which is in the Coalition's possession), but issues of security and the best use of the Coalition's time prevented more serious museum involvement. Coalition interest in the grassroots museum waned after only a few months though the music store remains, a fixture of counterspace in the neighborhood, catering to the same customers as Jim's and blaring blues music from outdoor speakers during business hours.

The Coalition manipulates Maxwell Street's environment too simply by creating foot traffic in the area. Coalition members gave hundreds of walking tours[3], not only to inform tourtakers about the existing buildings and social history of the place, but also to gain exposure for the Coalition's name and the timeliness of its cause, to make the university nervous that people were coming to view their handiwork and getting exposed to the story of the neighborhood and to how much of it could still be saved, and to create activity in the neighborhood – large groups of people walking around, looking at buildings and stopping at Jim's to eat. Protests, blues jams, boycott marches, and press conferences were used to bring people to the neighborhood, to emphasize the life of the place. Images, then, of a crowded Maxwell Street, one filled with protesters, musicians, and concerned tour groups were delivered by the media to viewers and readers who then saw the area as not only still in existence, but also as contested space.

The more the spaces of Maxwell Street are formally designed or consciously deteriorated to exclude them, the more the people of Maxwell Street and the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition put themselves into the

place through the creation of counterspaces and other manipulations of the built environment. Their verbal demands and protests are thus coupled with their imprint on the landscape of Maxwell Street.

Maxwell Street's Virtual Form

With the University's Plan for its South Campus expansion – its University Village, research buildings, student housing, and campustown – the form of Maxwell Street takes its most dramatic turn. This key point in the evolution of Maxwell Street's form, though still unbuilt, is a powerful image.

The UIC Plan for the retail area, referred to repeatedly and ominously as "The Plan," saves eight buildings and includes the facades of thirteen more. These facades are to be stripped from their buildings on Halsted, Maxwell, and Roosevelt, and lined up on both sides of a one-block length of Maxwell Street between Union and Halsted. The facades would be pasted onto two parking structures and some would have retail on the street level. The two parking garages, one on the south side of Maxwell and one on the north, are joined by a drive-over, turreted bridge which also functions as an arched entrance to the street from Union Street. One façade from a Halsted Street building (ironically the one revealed by a 1998 fire) is kept in place and also reproduced – an identical one will be placed on the building's side which faces Maxwell Street. The Plan features things like special paver treatment on sidewalks, streets, and especially intersections, ornamental street lights with banners proclaiming one hundred years on Maxwell Street, commemorative fountains with flowering trees, street furniture (benches, bollards, kiosks, and "outdoor dining opportunities," colorful

awnings and signage featuring stores and restaurants with names such as Panache, Zia, Italia Rosa, Sabre, and Luna. The drawings are visually attractive, neat and clean, with lots of purposeful and fun-looking pedestrian traffic. The plan includes two student residences halls on Halsted, 850 units of for-sale housing, a new college of business administration, and other academic buildings. Again the university says "this plan adaptively reuses twenty-one buildings and facades and is respectful of the historical, architectural, and social significance of the district" (Lawrence 1999c). It is thought by the university to be a compromise plan in that it allows them to save money by using new construction almost entirely, but provides a shortcut way to preserve the "antique look" of the street.

The city responded to the university's final plan by adding upper windows to the facades on the parking garages, with the effect of emphasizing the ridiculousness of the university's façade plan. City planners believe displays in upper windows will make the building fronts seem less fake; the displays "will depict active second- and third-floor tenants and mitigate the appearance of a false façade" (Kamin 1999d). The Coalition and others have criticized the façade plan and have offered options to counter the university's insistence that facades are the only way. Says Blair Kamin, architecture critic for the Chicago Tribune,

> This is a classic case of one urban planning mistake leading inexorably to another. Without the fake storefronts, there is no need for fake activity above them. As an attempt to preserve a district whose lore is largely, but not soley, Jewish, this plan is anything but kosher. (1999d)

Critics feel many of the design elements in the university plan are unappealing and that the plan for commercial activity in the form of

multinationals like The Gap and Starbuck's is wholly inappropriate for an area built by small businesspeople. Though planters will line the sidewalks and small parks are planned for the residential area, the notion of truly public space is absent from the plans. It is as though the designers, consultants, and their client are afraid of what and who such gathering spaces might attract, afraid that their new development could not be kept "clean" and structured if the space encouraged people to gather, barter, play music and hang around as they please.

The Plan constitutes Maxwell Street's future or "virtual" form. It is illustrated with maps and artist's renderings and displayed at public meetings, in the University Village development office, and printed in Chicago's major newspapers. It has a power as though it already exists. For university and city officials, it is the vision they are working toward. For Coalition members it is a vision to react against. For all, it has the strength of eventuality; put on paper, talked about in certain terms, and juxtaposed with a crumbling street scene, it is the foregone conclusion. It is the form to which Maxwell Street has already evolved in people's minds.

Business owners look at the Plan to see that they no longer exist. Those interested in buildings can see which ones have vanished with the simple swipe of a pen. And the people of Maxwell Street – vendors, musicians, residents, and shoppers – can no longer find themselves on the street. Their faces have been replaced with the planners' idealized occupants of the space. When I visited the University Village sales office, I was shown not only models of the new townhome I could buy, but also drawings of the campustown space at Maxwell

and Halsted. Pointing to the illustrations of the "improved" retail area, the salesperson said, "Of course all of what is there now is gone." Her use of tense, "is gone," is very telling; it illustrates the power of the Plan in people's minds. All of current Maxwell Street – buildings, businesses, and people – is already gone, virtually – replaced with new construction, new stores, new people. The future form of Maxwell Street illustrated in the Plan uses facades, excessive parking space, and extended periods of vacancy to send an overall message of displacement and exclusion.

The façade approach illustrates in bricks and mortar (or lack thereof) that, in the university's view, whole buildings and original placement of them are not important. Moving the fronts of buildings around the neighborhood, while intended to cheaply preserve an antique feel for the new retail district, also shows how the physical fabric of the neighborhood can be moved around like Monopoly pieces to create exactly the look desired by the powerful university. Pasting those facades onto a parking garage shows a real lack of respect for the context of those buildings and the businesses, people, and activities they once contained. The landscape is no more than something to be manipulated for university ends, the facades say. The facades provide a remnant of the past, a piece saved from Thompson's "rubbish" category and made durable, a distressed, but collectable piece like his Queen Anne tallboy, a touchstone to the past that reminds us of our progress as a society. As MacCannell has pointed out, "Restored remnants of dead traditions are essential components of the modern community and

consciousness. They are reminders of our break with the past and with tradition, even our own tradition" (1976: 83).

The Plan for Maxwell Street centers on yet another parking structure in an area that already has too much parking; indeed, the parking garage is the focus of the plan for the historic district as a turreted bridge joining the sections of the garage serves as the focal point and arched entry for the street. The university's obsession with parking in its plans is particularly distressing to the Coalition. After clearing the market in 1994, the university built surface parking lots to hold the land for future use. Then, for a while, plans showed parking lots to be against the already unsightly expressway, but after the fight against preservationists began, the university's August 1998 master plan shifted the parking structures back to the heart of Maxwell Street. The September 1999 "final" Plan extends parking to an even greater degree, with structures on both sides of the one block section of Maxwell Street. The Coalition's argument with all this parking is twofold. First, so much parking is simply bad urban planning. Maxwell Street is not in the low-density suburbs where land for parking is abundant. In the city, people don't need to be able to park right next to everything. Are people really going to pay to park in a garage to visit a shopping area as small as the one planned?

Secondly, the focus on parking is in all probability an effort to eradicate buildings and claim space on Maxwell Street. When parking lots are built, taking the place of residences and businesses, and remain empty or underused as was the case with the surface lots in the old market area, it adds insult to injury. It says

even these ugly and empty lots are more important to the new development than other things – residences, museum space, outdoor performance stages, retail space for current shopkeepers – that could have been left or built in the same locations. The lots will literally displace the people of Maxwell Street and their presence will continually send a message of exclusion. There is, according to the Coalition, clearly enough land to build all of the facilities the university wants and more without tearing down any of the historic buildings on Roosevelt, Halsted, or Maxwell. Their insistence on using space occupied by existing buildings and businesses, as well as their pursuit of demolition prior to the necessary approvals and funding for new construction, demonstrates definitively to the Coalition the UIC's desire to bleach the color and culture out of the area regardless of whether or not they fulfill their South Campus expansion plans. For example, early iterations of the university's plans showed much of the land to be needed for research labs. As plans progressed, research and other academic purposes largely disappeared from the drawings and descriptions. The final south campus development plans include no research facilities.

The fact that the Plan involves three "phases" of development also makes it clear that demolition and thus displacement are central and immediate goals of the university. The first phase involves mainly demolition; all three blocks east of Halsted, including the blocks on both sides of Maxwell Street, would be leveled and covered with landscaping and surface parking. This demolition will include all buildings on Maxwell Street except one – all remaining businesses and residents, including the residents at Maxworks and Chicago Greens, will be

removed as their homes are torn down. This first phase is of undisclosed length, but much of the business activity in the area will effectively be shut down as no business can sustain itself through a removal from the area which will surely last years. This phase of "development" essentially leaves much of the land to lie fallow for a period of many years, though student apartments will be built west of Halsted with new retail below. During this time, the facades of eleven buildings will need to be stored until they are needed to front the Maxwell Street parking structure. It is in the second phase that the parking structure on the south side of Maxwell and the turreted bridge will be built. The street level of the parking garage on the south side of Maxwell will be open to retail at this time, and the north side of Maxwell will continue to be covered by a monstrous surface parking lot. The third phase is intended to tie it all together: the rest of the parking structure will be built, as will all the buildings marked "University Uses," and the rest of the retail on Maxwell Street. The townhouses, condominiums, and lofts, as well as what the university planning consultants are calling "community amenities" are subject to the phased nature of the plan as well.

The implications of this three-phase plan are many. Some of its negatives have already been touched upon: the fallow period, the elimination of thriving businesses, the demolition of buildings, the problem of storing massive facades of buildings in such a way that they remain intact for later use. The most serious implication of the phased plan, however, is the very real possibility that the university will do what it has done many times in the past, that is start the phased plan, but run out of money or somehow else change the plan so that the later

phases, the ones that involve building Maxwelltown back to a retail district, never get completed. The University of Illinois at Chicago has a long history of landbanking, clearing land for some essential future project which gets forgotten after clearance has been executed. The Coalition fears, and can never really know, that the university has no intention of ever building Maxwelltown, that Phase One and part of Phase Two will be it, that somehow the facades will be ruined, that the university will let the phases string out so long that no one will care about the area anymore, that their plan is a lie, an evil deceit used to give them time to wipe the slate clean, a cover for demolition with no intention to ever follow through on even the weak attempt at preservation they have proposed. The university's past record gives plenty cause for concern that the plan may never get implemented at all past the demolition phase.

The best case scenario for the campustown, one which really follows the Plan to move a few buildings, save some facades, and create an antique streetscape to celebrate Maxwell Street's heritage, has become -- with the passage of time, a series of disappointments, and a process of hegemonic control of the planning process -- a vision many members of the Coalition can stomach. This new, and as yet virtual form represents a significant departure from the Coalition's original vision, however.

Part of the reason this virtual vision of the new Maxwell Street works so well for the university is that it is not a new vision, but a recognizable form. Hegemony is hard at work in the projected form of Maxwell Street as all of its components, and indeed the overall view of the planned shopping area, has been

seen before hundreds of times by all of us. We are used to such places. We like them. Even in my own city, even with heightened sensitivity to issues of beautification, and all of my prejudices and negative impulses toward such highly regulated "public" spaces, I frequently find myself at such attractions.

Places all over the country have become cliched versions of their former selves. Look at South Street Seaport, at Baltimore's Harborplace, at Ghirardelli Square, at Fanneuil Hall and Quincy Market in Boston, at Chicago's own Navy Pier. These may be extreme examples, but they make a point. At these attractions a clean, simplified version, easy to digest in a quick visit, comes to stand for the place and all its history. For example, when the Fulton Fish Market in New York was redeveloped, the original market sheds were hidden from view and a pavilion with a historic flavor was constructed instead. To evoke the historic fish market, fish and exotic foods were sold at first, but this discouraged visitors. It wasn't until fast food concessions were brought in and the fish were taken away that the development became commercially successful (Boyer 1992: 203).

These places are endlessly repeated – recycled warehouses, Main St. revitalizations, waterfront renovations, recreated train stations, etc. – every city has at least one. They have enormous touristic potential. People flock to places like Chicago's Navy Pier to shop and eat in an environment that they consider historic. Though most visitors don't try to learn about the history of the place while they are there (and couldn't learn much even if they did try), the idea is that it is an environment reminiscent of a bygone era, and this minimal level of

historic interest is enough to meet the average tourist's idea of what is authentic. These "festival marketplaces" are neat and clean and the pleasure and simplicity of the view serves to suspend critical judgment for a while.

There are varying views about the aesthetics of such redevelopments and urban revitalizations, but the fact is that they are in most cases wildly successful and popular. Chicago's Navy Pier is the largest draw in the city though it is not aesthetically pleasing by all accounts. Like Navy Pier and the others, the reconstruction of Maxwell Street will allow those in positions of power to influence how people will shop, eat, live, do business, and how they will experience the place. It will allow them to control disorder and to engage in a sort of social engineering to create the right mix of people.

The new Maxwell Street will surely reflect mainstream, middle-class ideas about place and group as planners, designers, developers, and other professionals are trained within a paradigm that privileges them (Altman and Low 1992: 68). These people, as individuals or as representatives of larger institutions like the UIC, dictate how places should look and who should be included in or excluded from them. As such, places like the reconstructed Maxwell Street reinforce existing power relations and political and economic inequalities. And so the pattern continues.

The reconstructed Maxwell Street will also allow those in power to forever influence the history of the place. As Hobsbawm has noted, history is really "what has been selected, written, pictured, popularized, and institutionalized by those whose function it is to do so" (1983:13). Ideas about

the relationship between power and public memory (Norkunas 1990, Wallace 1996) and about how the past can be molded to suit political purposes (Bodnar 1992) are important to consider when we think about the UIC's Plan. The university's development team ultimately has an incredible amount of power over the "history" of the place, as whatever is ultimately constructed at Maxwell Street will be the vision carried forward for future generations to see, and whatever "historic" narrative is told through "official" writings and exhibits will be Maxwell Street's story. While not all of the privileging of mainstream ideas or the legitimating of particular ideologies is conscious or intentional, when one group's values dominate definitions of and decisions about place and public memory, it is cause for concern. Indeed, there is a lot at stake at Maxwell Street, for

> whoever controls the processes of re-creation effectively redefines reality for everyone else, and creates the entire world of human experience, our field of knowledge. We become subject to them. The confinement of our experience becomes the basis of their control of us. (Mander 1990: 320)

At its core, the UIC's development is about the displacement of poor people – the university Plan denies their place in this place, and effectively their very existence. The people of Maxwell Street have been and continue to be literally removed as their homes, businesses, shopping places, and gathering spots are torn down, and as police crack down on parking and vending violations. People are also displaced as new places are designed that do not seek to attract them and quite obviously do not include them.

Beautifying and transforming urban spaces like Maxwell Street serves in essence to exclude certain groups of people while entitling others, and to let city and corporate and university forces dictate how people will use what is supposedly public space, the streets and sidewalks of the city. The process that is transforming Maxwell Street represents a hegemonic pattern that is omnipresent, very powerful, seductive and scary. It works by pushing some people aside, moving them out, either through literal removal or by making them feel so uncomfortable and unwanted that they leave, and by persuading others to buy into these urban revitalization and development schemes, to adopt the models of corporatism, to want a cleaned-up, sanitized city.

Maxwell Street has been variously shaped over the years, with changes in its layout and form always indicating something about what those in power want for the space. In the past decade especially, Maxwell Street has been shaped by the powers of the university and the city, control of its built environment regulated from the top down. Also part of the landscape of Maxwell Street are the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition's efforts at subversion and resistance, its creation of counterspace. In Maxwell Street's evolving form are etched the outcomes of the ongoing battle over place and culture.

---

[1] Groth and Bressi (1997) present an excellent discussion of "landscape."

[2] In early November 1999 the UIC destroyed the three market sheds from the old market that were being saved by the Coalition, with university approval, near the edge of a parking lot on O'Brien Street. The Coaliiton's stated plan was to use the sheds in a future museum display. They had obtained verbal approval to store them unharmed by university demolition. The sheds were dismantled and placed in a dumpster, and workers claimed they were acting on university orders.

[3] Tours were mainly the domain of one Coalition member, Lori Grove, but were often led by other members she recruited as tour guides. Tours were offered through the Chicago Architectural Foundation, and were set up in conjunction with various conferences which came to town (dozens of people from the 1998 National Conference on Heritage Development and Tourism toured the new market and the historic neighborhood with one Coalition member/tour leader, and the Culinary Historians of Chicago took a tour there as one of their meetings in 1998, for example). The Coalition led a series of tours of Maxwell Street

on the weekend of the Chicago Bluesfest annually, and tours were held every day during National Preservation Week each year. A sample text for tours was prepared by Grove (an informative description of the development of the historic neighborhood followed by extensive and detailed descriptions of each building in the neighborhood, each building's architectural, social, and business history), but tour leaders were free to include or disregard whatever parts they wished. The few times I led tours, I would follow the general outline of the script, highlighting buildings along Maxwell Street and part of Halsted, and wrapping up with a description of the University's involvement in and plans for the neighborhood. Each Coalition tour leader would put his or her own spin on the tour, but would be sure to discuss the goals of the Coalition and the potential for the area's rejuvenation. Each tour would include stops at Jim's Original, the Heritage Blues Bus music store, Maxworks Cooperative, and the Wall of Fame. At each of these, people from the neighborhood would be available to talk to tour attendees about their store, their home, or their experiences on Maxwell Street. The blues music blasting out of the music store provided a sort of soundtrack to these tours. Grove also prepared a handout for a self-guided walking tour that was given to interested tourists on Maxwell Street and at various Coalition functions. Coalition members also gave frequent one-on-one tours to interested members of the media, photographers, and visiting scholars.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS OF A DOMINANT URBAN AESTHETICS

> Ever-busy, ever-building, ever-in-motion, ever-throwing-out the old for the new, we have hardly paused to think about what we are so busy building, and what we have thrown away.
> (James Kunstler, The Geography of Nowhere)

On a recent trip to New York City, I heard myself exclaiming about how clean the city has become, how pleasant the subways and taxicabs are now after that city's push to make itself more tourist-friendly. It dawned on me then that visitors to Chicago are surely saying the same things – that people love the new museum campus and Navy Pier, and that they will probably like the recreated Maxwell Street too. I won't, because I know intimately the story of the UIC's South Campus development and the people who are most closely and deeply affected by it. In this study I have described that long process of development, one situated in the context of a big clean-up in Chicago, a long history of beautification and progress in that city, and powerful discourses of progress, rational order, and fear of the city and its dirt.

The story I have told is one of hegemony. I have chosen to tell that story in a chronological fashion, as a dramatic narrative of a process. This study shows, emphasizes, and analyzes the process by which two powerful institutions, the University of Illinois at Chicago and the City of Chicago, have wielded their power; it shows how power is circulated, and how it has destroyed and transformed an urban neighborhood. In narrative form, this project provides a case study of the large-scale and hegemonic urban transformation affecting most American cities.

The Maxwell Street transformation began decades ago as the UIC grabbed land from other neighborhoods surrounding its urban campus. The university's messages of progress and educational mission propelled its expansion forward. This rhetoric of rational and natural progress was combined with a focus on "dirt," as the UIC set its sights on the acquisition of land surrounding Maxwell and Halsted Streets, land then occupied by the famous and historic Maxwell Street Market and the businesses and residences of the Maxwell Street neighborhood. The City of Chicago joined forces with the university to create, through neglect and withholding of city services, a dirty, crimeridden marketplace. This literal dirt was surrounded by a powerful discourse of dirt and transience which served to justify the clean-up of the market. The city then moved in to "save" the market by closing it and creating a new, sanitized version of it in a different location, thus leaving the land clear for university purchase and development of its south campus.

In the following years the New Maxwell Street Market was legitimated through a hegemonic process, transformed, as we have seen, into a sanitized and rationalized, city-sponsored market based on mainstream models. It was made tolerable by the city; it now fits into the Daley administration's vision for a cleaned-up Chicago.

The process of transformation continued after the market's removal as the city and university joined forces to implement "The Plan" for the Maxwell Street campustown, a plan which eliminates the businesses, vendors, buildings, residents, shoppers, and musicians of the old Maxwell Street and replaces them

with a corporatized, sanitized vision. It saves a few building facades as touchstones to the past and promises "an historic feeling" (B. Mier 1998a). The Plan moved steadily ahead though challenged at every turn by the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. This unstoppable hegemonic process and the relatively ineffectual challenges to it have been explored through a story of the circulation of power.

In order to understand this process of changes – the destruction and transformation of a neighborhood – I have examined the circulation of power through its elements of (1) the organization of production of the transformation, (2) the powerful discourses surrounding the transformation, and (3) purposeful changes to the physical form of the Maxwell Street space. Taken together, these bring a clear view of the operations of hegemony at Maxwell Street.

On the university and city side of the battle the organization of production, the discourse of power surrounding their actions, and the evolution of the physical form of Maxwell Street into a place tolerable in the new American city are all constructed to move The Plan, the hegemonic vision, forward. Through bureaucratic action, media commentary and neglect, and destruction of Maxwell Street's physical form, the UIC/City coalition was able to move the plan ahead while giving the appearance of negotiation and consideration of community opinions.

The Coalition was involved in the construction of its own discourse and its own manipulations of the built environment of Maxwell Street. Their countervoice could be heard throughout the battle, their counterspaces seen all

over the neighborhood. The Coalition has responded too with its own organization of production, its own strategies of resistance and reaction. Its actions and attitudes have been adapted over the years of the struggle as a result of UIC's dominance and a process and culture of hegemony that is all-encompassing. They came in the end to a reasoned, corporate approach to the struggle – though their passionate, grassroots nature reappears from time to time. And they came in the end too to a view of the redevelopment far removed from the one with which they started.

UIC's South Campus development follows a process of what Dorst (1989) has called "postmodern hegemony"; it is powerful because it "has the potential of penetrating more deeply and colonizing more completely every sphere of experience than those orders of dominance that require visible forces of coercion and external control to sustain themselves." This hegemony is "almost entirely a matter of texts or images" (Dorst 1989: 176), as seen in our study of discourse and form. Thus, the university's actions, discourse, and Plan for Maxwell Street are seen as appropriate and positive – even the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition, the staunchest resistance to the university and city, have come to support some aspects of the Plan and to accept still others as inevitable. Because the attitudes behind the displacement of people who are seen as undesirable and the demolition of places seen as intolerable are so widespread and so infused in American ideology, the situation at Maxwell Street is naturalized, and the destruction and displacement seen as acceptable consequences. Urban power

need only create a symbolic system and a rhetoric focused on progress and the elimination of "dirt" to propel its vision in a relatively unchallenged way.

This transformation, ostensibly focused on the clean and orderly and progressive, also has at its center the dematerialization of social relations. People are removed as their place is steadily altered beyond recognition. Once the community is destroyed, those in power are free to build whatever vision will support their ideology with no opposition or complications. The slate is thus clear to construct the present and a vision of the past exactly according to their hegemonic vision.

The New Maxwell Street Market and the new Maxwell Street campustown represented in the UIC's Plan both ascribe to an urban aesthetics which privileges the mainstream and middle-class. Those are the audiences planners and organizers want to attract, and those are the people who accept and authorize the new spaces. Like other reconstructed sites, the future Maxwell Street has been "selectively interpreted and constructed to affirm and legitimate particular ideologies and sociocultural values" (Norkunas 1990: 24). The process described herein is all about how forces of urban power manage easily to create the kinds of spaces that will eliminate challenge to their values and ideals, and will instead celebrate them.

"The Plan" reinforces existing power relations and political inequalities. But who gets left out – removed, hidden, overlooked – in this new American city space? In the case of Maxwell Street, as in other similar areas, it is the poor, the elderly, racial minorities, the powerless – those least equipped to resist the

hegemonic process of displacement and clean-up. This story of struggle for place is really a narrative of those displaced people, of the people of Maxwell Street and the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition as they are buffeted about by a process of beautification and development. They are controlled by a powerful urban aesthetics that does not recognize them, but instead pushes ahead, intent upon removal, clean-up, and the creation of regulated, orchestrated urban space.

The development of Maxwell Street is so devastating to its people because they are displaced by it in four ways. First, they will be removed literally from their homes, shops, and public spaces. Many have left already of course, and the rest are contemplating their near future. Street vendors say they will stay as long as they can, as long as Jim's is there to bring in customers. There is talk of Jim's relocating to a new spot in Pilsen, the neighborhood south of the Maxwell Street area. Building owners are thinking over purchase offers from the university. Reverend Johnson and other businesspeople are talking about the relocation assistance packages they are eligible to receive from the university and where they will go from here. Twenty thousand dollars in assistance does not go very far in setting up a new business, and it does even less to assuage the hurt and anger felt by merchants kicked out of spaces occupied by their families for decades. Maxworks residents continue to move possessions out of 716 W. Maxwell in anticipation of their assured and quickly upcoming removal; many have already relocated to vehicles parked outside their former home.

The next phase of displacement is that the place as they have known it will vanish, its buildings destroyed and land cleared to make way for new

construction, for progress. This part of the displacement process affects people by making it "all but impossible to anchor values, create new cultural practices, and establish existential priorities" (Orsi 1999: 61). Without a place, in short, it is extraordinarily difficult to have a sense of yourself and where you came from. This part of the process serves too to displace those who left Maxwell Street years ago. Though their literal removal was not forced by the UIC, the elimination of their place, the destruction of the physical fabric of their stories and memories and future visits, will be.

The third part of this four-phase displacement occurs as the new campustown retail district and University Village are planned and built. As we have seen, the new space is designed to attract new audiences, to make mainstream, middle-class audiences comfortable. As such, they stand against the current people of Maxwell Street; the new businesses and neighborhood spaces are meant to exclude them. Ironically the proposed "public spaces" are only intended for *some* publics.

And fourth, through the university's Plan for creating an antique streetscene of Maxwell Street "in its heyday," the memory of the place will be dictated, the history of many of the displaced effectively erased by omission from the official history as written and displayed by the UIC. If the UIC honors its agreement and creates a narrative history and public display of the history of Maxwell Street, and if they do it in the manner they have described in the press and at public meetings, the "history" will be of the Jewish immigrant and market experience, a nostalgic portrayal of late nineteenth-century Maxwell Street.

Those who came later, primarily African-Americans and Mexicans, will be overlooked, hidden, removed from the public memory of the place soon after they have been literally removed from it.

Certainly the destruction and redevelopment of Maxwell Street has dire implications for its people – residents, vendors, building and business owners, shoppers, musicians, and other occupants. They are the most immediately and crucially affected by the process. But it cannot be ignored that the process of displacement and beautification, the creation of places that ascribe to a dominant urban aesthetics, has implications for us all, whether we care specifically about Maxwell Street or not.

The situation at Maxwell Street is part of the ongoing transformation of the city of Chicago and other American cities into what Michael Sorkin has called a "New American city," one which is ageographic and universal, obsessed with security and cleanliness, and which appropriates and reproduces images from the generic past to create an urban theme park of sorts. We are building (or allowing to be built) what Boyer has called "true nonplaces" or "hollowed out urban remnants" (1992: 191), and thus creating a "crisis of human habitat," "a landscape of scary places" (Kunstler 1993: 59, 15). Maxwell Street is a unique place, but its situation is all too familiar.

As we have developed into a nation obsessed with security, where gated communities and private security systems proliferate, we have become increasingly comfortable in commercially orchestrated places. As Boyer has suggested, our "feeling of social insecurity seems to breed a love of simulation"

(1992: 187). People like how clean and safe these controlled places feel; suburbanites and tourists will visit the city if they are made to feel comfortable there. It has been suggested that this is the reason why so many indoor and themed environments play on urban images and replicate central city spaces in their décor (Gottdiener 1997: 112). The design of our urban spaces is obsessed with reproduction: "Whether in its master incarnation at the ersatz Main Street of Disneyland, in the phony historic festivity of a Rouse marketplace, or the gentrified architecture of the "reborn" Lower East Side, this elaborate apparatus is at pains to assert its ties to the kind of city life it is in the process of obliterating" (Sorkin 1992: xiv). At such attractions, visitors can pretend to wander the city, but can remain safe and clean doing so. Disney's "Main Street USA" and Universal Studios' "City Walk" (and the main court of Chicago's Navy Pier) are prime examples of this. The new Maxwell Street, whether planners intend it or not, is based on the theme park model of the city.

Spaces and attractions based on this model, like the New Maxwell Street Market and the historic retail district the old Maxwell Street will become, present a regulated vision of the city. In them, there is no dirt, no chaos, no poor people, no class distinctions, ethnicities, vices; essentially all of the variety and mess that makes a city a city is wiped out. "Cleaning-up" has come to mean not just getting rid of the actual dirt and mess in urban areas, but also getting rid of the complexities of the city. In these cleaned-up areas and attractions, tourists get a simplified, sanitized experience to replace the undisciplined complexities of city life and city history. These places, then, are not constructed based upon the

reality of the city, but are instead selectively constructed to affirm a particular ideology. They tell us not to look at the real city with all its problems and vices. Instead we are to look at a different idea of the city, one bounded and controlled, without any of the things we don't want to think about. The clean, commercial entertainment of festival marketplaces and sanitized shopping districts is replacing real markets and street vendors because they are too messy, and might not appeal correctly or sufficiently to tourists. The big clean-up is attracting new people, and thus money, to the city at the same time it is sweeping others to the side.

Much urban planning today seems to rebel against the faceless, non-interactive type of building from decades ago. The attempt now is to instead create public spaces, interaction, people-centered areas. But this new space is often so heavily orchestrated and controlled that while it appears to attract large numbers of people, it really excludes large populations. These new places are viewed as "public"; there is the illusion that anyone is welcome. What we forget is how many people have been filtered out in subtle ways: price and type of goods offered for sale, dress code, transportation issues, the design of lounging/loitering spots, etc. This kind of planning results in the "privatization of public space" where

> public ways and communal spaces are being designed by the private sector as interior shopping streets within large corporate skyscrapers, or festival markets where public admittance is carefully controlled. The private sphere of nostalgic desires and imagination is increasingly manipulated by stage sets and city tableaux set up to stimulate our acts of consumption, by the spectacle of history made false. (Boyer 1992: 204)

Late twentieth-century public places are no longer really "public"; they are corporate-driven and exclusionary.

The historic streetscape which will probably result from the university's "compromise" with the Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition will be a district where space and time are conflated, where the long, rich history of the place is collapsed and historical complexities blurred until the place is no longer unique or even representative of the real past. It instead will be made to look like every other redeveloped and formulaic historic retail district, with its exposed brick and nostalgic building facades and plaques telling of bygone days. The signs, benches, streetlights, and cobblestones will be understood to stand for the history of the place. And, of course, there will be an attempt to create street life, as long as it is the right kind. There may be an illusion of chaos, but really people will be directed to experience the place in certain ways. Maxwell Street will assuredly become another of the "new urban zones [characterized by] the reiteration and recycling of already-known symbolic codes and historic forms to the point of cliché" (Boyer 1992: 188); indeed it will be laden with symbols and historical allusions to the traditional city. But, as is the point of most critical scholars of these spaces, it will not *be* the city.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Carl. 1984. "The Facadism Fad: Is It Preservation?" Historic Preservation (October): 42-7.

Abrahams, Roger. 1970. Deep Down in the Jungle: Negro Narrative Folklore from the Streets of Philadelphia. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1990. "The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power Through Bedouin Women." American Ethnologist 17(1): 41-55.

Addams, Jane. 1910. Twenty Years at Hull-House. New York: Penguin Books.

Allen, Barbara. 1990. "Regional Studies in American Folklore Scholarship." In Sense of Place: American Regional Cultures, eds. Barbara Allen and Thomas J. Schlereth, pp. 1-13. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Allen, J. Linn. 1988. "Maxwell Street a Market for Land: Historic District is Targeted for Development." Chicago Tribune, 27 November, sec. 16, pp. 1+.

___. 1998a. "Busy State Street is Bustling with New Possibilities." Chicago Tribune, 3 February, pp. 1, 12.

___. 1998b. "New 'Tallest' Building May Be in Loop." Chicago Tribune, 9 June, pp. 1+.

Altman, Irwin and Setha M. Low. 1992. Place Attachment. New York: Plenum Press.

Appelbaum, Stanley. 1980. The Chicago World's Fair of 1893: A Photographic Record. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

___. 1984. Rabelais and His World. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Baldwin, Paul and Yussef Nimmer. 1999. The Struggle for Maxwell Street. Now Media, UK. Audiotape.

Balkin, Steve. 1997a. Letter to author. 9 May.

___. 1997b. E-mail to author. 16 July.

___. 1998. "Rhetoric vs. Reality on Maxwell Street." Streetwise, 14 April, p.13.

___. 1999. E-mail to author. 22 September.

___, and Brian Mier. 2000. "Maxwell Street: One of America's Largest Third Places." Forthcoming.

Baltazar, Pat and Sarah Randag. 1994. "A Bad Day in the Park: Police Maintain No Homeless Zones in City Parks." StreetWise, 16 September, pp. 5+.

Berger, Philip. 1997. "Street Smart." Chicago (February): 47-8.

Berkow, Ira. 1977. Maxwell Street: Survival in a Bazaar. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Bey, Lee. 1997. "Maxwell Street in Stone, Song." Chicago Sun-Times, 27 October, p. 16.

___. 1998a. "Daley Shows a Flair for Urban Design." Chicago Sun-Times, 5 April, p. 36.

___. 1998b. "Maxwell Street Character May Survive." Chicago Sun-Times, 1 June, p. 14.

The Blues Brothers. 1980. Dir. John Landis. MCA Discovision. Film.

Bodnar, John. 1985. The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

___. 1992. Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Botkin, Benjamin. 1956. New York City Folklore. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology. Trans. Matthew Adamson. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Boyer, M. Christine. 1992. "Cities for Sale: Merchandising History at South Street Seaport." In Variations on a Theme Park, ed. Michael Sorkin, pp. 181-204. New York: Hill and Wang.

Boylan, Anthony Burke. 1998. "Residents Ask: What Have You Done, Joe DiMaggio?" Chicago Tribune, 13 November, Metro sec., p. 9.

Breen, Ann and Dick Rigby. 1994. Waterfronts: Cities Reclaim Their Edge. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Bukowski, Douglas. 1996. Navy Pier: A Chicago Landmark. Chicago: Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority.

Bunuel, Diego. 1998. "North Ave. Beach Plan Unveiled." Chicago Tribune, 3 February, p. 2.

Burnham, Daniel Hudson. 1993. Plan of Chicago/Daniel H. Burnham, Edward H. Bennett. Ed. Charles Moore. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Buscemi, Connie. 1997. Telephone interview with author. 16 July.

Camper, John. 1990. "40-Year Plan to Expand UIC Campus Announced." Chicago Tribune, 10 May, p. 4.

Chase, John. 1998. "Maxwell Street Feels the Blues." Chicago Tribune, 2 December, Metro Chicago sec., p.1.

Chiem, Phat X. 1999. "Greening of Expressways Moves Toward Fast Lane." Chicago Tribune, 10 June, pp. 1, 6.

Chudacoff, Howard P. and Judith E. Smith. 1975. The Evolution of American Urban Society. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Coffey, Raymond R. 1993. "UIC Expansion Plan: Does It Make Sense?" Chicago Sun-Times, 16 July, p. 3.

Cohen, Abner. 1993. Masquerade Politics: Explorations in the Structure of Urban Cultural Movements. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, Laurie and Andrew Martin. 1999. "Theater Plan Not Living Up To Billing." Chicago Tribune, 15 January, pp. 1+.

Concepcion, Ralph. 1997. Personal interview with author. Chicago, Illinois, 11 November.

Corfman, Thomas. 1999. "Reviving a Historic Neighborhood: A New Course." Crain's Chicago Business, 4 October, pp. 1+.

Cronon, William. 1991. Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Cutler, Irving. 1996. The Jews of Chicago: From Shtetl to Suburb. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Dargan, Amanda and Steve Zeitlin. 1990. City Play. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Delaney, Stanton. 1998. "Is UIC Doing Enough to Save Maxwell Street?" Chicago Sun-Times, 3 May, p. 28.

Diamonstein, Barbaralee. 1978. Buildings Reborn: New Uses, Old Places. New York: Harper & Row.

___. 1986. Remaking America: New Uses, Old Places. New York: Crown.

Dorson, Richard. 1952. Bloodstoppers and Bearwalkers: Folk Traditions of the Upper Peninsula. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

___. 1959. American Folklore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. .

___. 1964. Buying the Wind: Regional Folklore in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

___. 1981. Land of the Millrats. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

___. 1983. Handbook of American Folklore. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dorst, John. 1989. The Written Suburb: An American Site, An Ethnographic Dilemma. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Douglas, Mary. 1966. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo. New York: Routledge.

Eastwood, Carolyn. 1991. Chicago's Jewish Street Peddlers: Toehold on the Bottom Rung. Chicago: Chicago Jewish Historical Society.

___. 1995. "The Demise of an Urban Market: Does It Matter? Who Cares?" Paper presented at Central States Anthropological Meeting, March, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Edwards, David Honeyboy. 1997. The World Don't Owe Me Nothing: The Life and Times of Delta Bluesman Honeyboy Edwards. Chicago: Chicago Review Press.

Ennis, Philip H. 1992. The Seventh Stream: The Emergence of Rock-n-Roll in American Popular Music. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Fjellman, Stephen. 1992. Vinyl Leaves: Walt Disney World and America. Boulder: Westview Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1978. The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1: An Introduction. New York: Random House.

___. 1986. "Disciplinary Power and Subjection." In Power, ed. Steven Lukes, pp. 229-42. New York: New York University Press.

Frieden, Bernard J. and Lynne B. Sagalyn. 1989. Downtown, Inc.: How America Rebuilds Cities. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. 1986. "Power and Organization." In Power, ed. Steven Lukes, pp. 211-28. New York: New York University Press.

Gans, Herbert J. 1982. The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans. New York: The Free Press.

Garvin, Alexander. 1996. The American City: What Works, What Doesn't. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gottdiener, Mark. 1997. The Theming of America: Dreams, Visions, and Commercial Spaces. Boulder: Westview Press.

Granger, Bill. 1982. "Maxwell Street: Still Crazy After All These Years." Chicago Tribune Magazine, 7 February, sec. 9, pp. 11-18.

Gratz, Roberta Brandes. 1994. The Living City: How America's Cities are Being Revitalized by Thinking Small in a Big Way. Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press.

Groth, Paul and Todd W. Bressi. 1997. Understanding Ordinary Landscapes. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Grove, Lori. 1998. "Historic Maxwell Street Tour." Brochure.

Halpert, Herbert. 1947. "American Regional Folklore." Journal of American Folklore 60 (238): 355-66.

Hanney, Suzanne. 1999. "Maxwell Street Merchants Promise Suit." StreetWise, 14-27 September, pp. 1-10.

Hay, Fred J. 1992. "'Blues What I Am': Blues Consciousness and Social Protest." In America's Musical Pulse: Popular Music in Twentieth-Century Society, ed. Kenneth J. Bindas. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Hayden, Dolores. 1997. "Urban Landscape History: The Sense of Place and the Politics of Space." In Understanding Ordinary Landscapes, eds. Paul Groth and Todd W. Bresi, pp.111-33. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hiss, Tony. 1990. The Experience of Place. New York: Vintage Books.

Hoak, Amy. 1998. "Last Days of Maxwell Street." Chicago Flame, 1 December, pp. 1, 7.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1983. The Invention of Tradition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, Gil. 1997. "That Great Street." Chicago Jewish News, 3 October, pp. 24-30.

Hufford, Mary. 1994. Conserving Culture: A New Discourse on Heritage. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Jackson, Papa Charlie. 1991. Papa Charlie Jackson, Complete Recorded Works in Chronological Order. Vienna, Austria: Document Records. Sound recording.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Vintage Books.

Jones, LeRoi. 1963. Blues People: The Negro Experience in White America and the Music that Developed from It. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.

Jones, Patrice M. and Gary Washburn. 1999a. "UIC Offers to Save Face of Maxwell St." Chicago Tribune, 1 September, News sec., p.1.

___. 1999b. "Daley Puts His Seal on Maxwell Street Plan." Chicago Tribune, 2 September, Metro Chicago sec., p.1.

Jones, Suzi. 1976. "Regionalization: A Rhetorical Strategy." Journal of the Folklore Institute 13(1): 105-20.

Joravsky, Ben. 1994. "Market Value." The Neighborhood Works (April/May): 21-2.

Kamin, Blair. 1997a. "In a City Blessed with Diversity, Generic Fountains Pose Problems." Chicago Tribune, 17 July, Tempo sec., p. 1.

___. 1997b. "North Halsted Plan Sends Messages, but Are They the Right Ones?" Chicago Tribune, 22 August, pp. 1, 8.

___. 1997c. "Boul Mich Project: It's Not Too Late to Make It Right." Chicago Tribune, 10 December, Tempo sec., p. 1.

___. 1998a. "A Bright Idea: Plan to Illuminate Downtown Buildings Reflects Well on the Mayor." Chicago Tribune, 18 January, p. 7.

___. 1998b. "Daley Draws on Architects." Chicago Tribune, 27 March, sec. 5, pp. 1,5.

___. 1998c. "A Park for the People." Chicago Tribune, 5 April, pp. 1,7.

___. 1998d. "Building the City Beautiful." Chicago Tribune, 15 April, Tempo sec., p. 1.

___. 1998e. "Big Canvas, Little Plans." Chicago Tribune, 5 November, pp. 1, 6.

___. 1999a. "New Bridge over Chicago River Troubles Political Waters." Chicago Tribune, 18 February, Tempo sec., p.1.

___. 1999b. "Master Plan: Burnham Drawings that Shaped Chicago Still Wield Breathtaking Power." Chicago Tribune, 28 February, Arts and Entertainment sec., p. 6.

___. 1999c. "Faking History: Disney's Make-Believe Architecture Is Just What Michigan Avenue Doesn't Need." Chicago Tribune, 5 August, pp. 1, 11.

___. 1999d. "Mockery on Maxwell Street." Chicago Tribune, 15 October, Tempo sec., p. 1.

Kass, John. 1997. "In Daleyland, Hotel Next in Line for Antiseptic Ride." Chicago Tribune, 21 July, Metro Chicago sec., p. 1.

___. 1998. "Chicago Cleaning Street of Peddlers, and It's Not Pretty." Chicago Tribune, 7 July, News sec., p. 3.

Keegan, Anne. 1994. "The Big Squeeze." Chicago Tribune, 26 September, p. 11.

Keil, Charles. 1966. Urban Blues. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kendall, Peter. 1998. "It'll Be Nip an Tuck for Great Stone Face of Michigan Avenue." Chicago Tribune, 7 July, pp. 1, 10.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1983a. "Studying Immigrant and Ethnic Folklore." In Handbook of American Folklore, ed. Richard M. Dorson, pp. 39-47. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

___. 1983b. "The Future of Folklore Studies in America: The Urban Frontier." Folklore Forum 16(2): 175-234.

___. 1995. "Times Square: A Pedestrian Perspective." In Fields of Folklore: Essays in Honor of Kenneth S. Goldstein, ed. Roger D. Abrahams, pp. 169-83. Bloomington, IN: Trickster Press.

Kogan, Bernard R. 1976. "Chicago's Pier." Chicago History: The Magazine of the Chicago Historical Society V(1): 28-38.

Kogan, Rick. 1998. "Morning on Maxwell." Chicago Tribune Magazine, 1 November, p. 10.

Kugelmass, Jack. 1986. The Miracle of Intervale Avenue: The Story of a Jewish Congregation in the South Bronx. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kunstler, James Howard. 1993. The Geography of Nowhere: The Rise and Decline of America's Man-made Landscape. New York: Touchstone.

Lawrence, Curtis. 1999a. "City Dealing to Preserve Maxwell St." Chicago Sun-Times, 12 March, p. 6.

___. 1999b. "Will UIC's Ideas Sell?" Chicago Sun-Times, 27 June, p. 4A.

___. 1999c. "Foes Decry UIC Plan." Chicago Sun-Times, 1 September, p. 8.

LeFebvre, Henri. 1991. The Production of Space. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.

Longworth, R.C. 1993a. "Maxwell St. in the Middle." Chicago Tribune, 21 November, sec. 7, pp. 1-6.

___. 1993b. "City Attempts to Calm Neighbors Fighting Maxwell Market Move." Chicago Tribune, 29 November, p. 2.

___. 1994a. "Canal St. to Get Half of Maxwell Market." Chicago Tribune, 11 February, Chicagoland sec., p. 1.

___. 1994b. "Time Running Out for Urban Bazaar on Maxwell Street." Chicago Tribune, 27 March, pp. 1-2.

___. 1994c. "Maxwell Street Teardown Begins." Chicago Tribune, 16 August, Chicagoland sec., p. 3.

Luh, Shu Shin. 2000. "Group Seeks Boycott of UIC Plan: Maxwell Street Coalition Wants Historic Status." Chicago Sun-Times, 7 July, p. 16.

Lukes, Steven. 1986. Power. New York: New York University Press.

Lutton, Linda. 1998. "Will Development Bury the Barrio?" Chicago Reader, 24 April, pp. 1+.

Lyderson, Kari. 1999. "Eloteros Versus the City." StreetWise, 14-27 September, pp. 1-23.

MacCannell, Dean. 1976. The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class. New York: Schocken.

"The Maxwell Street Blues Beat Goes On, and On." 1999. UIC Today, 25 March, pp. 1+.

Madhani, Aamer. 1999. "Judge Oks Cleanup of Maxwell St. Building." Chicago Tribune, 19 September, Metro Chicago sec., p. 3.

Mander, Jerry. 1990. "The Walling of Awareness." In The Dolphin Reader, ed. Douglas Hunt, pp. 309-19. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Marmer, Dan. 1998a. E-mail to author. 8 April.

___. 1998b. E-mail to author. 31 May.

Martel, Elise Noelle. 1996. "From Market to Market: The Reinstitutionalization and Legitimation of Chicago's Maxwell Street Market." M.A. thesis, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Martin, Andrew. 1998a. "City Teardown Policy Has Gone Too Far, Critics Say." Chicago Tribune, 1 March, pp. 1-2.

___. 1998b. "City Rolls Out a Plan to Give Life to River." Chicago Tribune, 17 April, pp. 1, 17.

Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. 1999. The Last Days of Maxwell Street. Video footage.

Mayer, Harold M. and Richard C. Wade. 1969. Chicago: Growth of a Metropolis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McAloon, Lois. 1998. "Maxwell Street Blues." Chicago Sun-Times, 15 May, Homefront sec., p. 1.

McCarron, John. 1998. "Neighborhood Brawl: The Dispute over What's Left of Maxwell Street." Chicago Tribune, 6 April, p. 18.

___. 1999. "Maxwell Town? Mayor Daley's 11th-Hour Bid to Save a Bit of History." Chicago Tribune, 15 March, Commentary, p. 19.

Menchaca, Job. 1997. Personal interview with author. Chicago, Illinois, 8 May.

Mendell, David. 1999. "Skinned Buildings." Chicago Tribune, 3 October, Metro Chicago sec., p. 1.

Mielecki, Jeanine N. 1998. "UIC, Preservationists, City Agree to Save Some Maxwell St. Buildings." Near West Gazette, 2 July, pp. 1+.

Mier, Brian. 1998a. "Maxwell Street Blues." New City, 4 June, pp. B3-4.

___. 1998b. "New Market Survey." Paper presented to Conference on Chicago Research and Public Policy, 19 October, Chicago, Illinois.

Mier, Robert. 1994. "Scrap Daley's Maxwell St. Plan and Just Start Over." Crain's Chicago Business, 21 February, p. 13.

Miller, Donald. 1996. City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago and the Making of America. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Miller, Ross. 1996. Here's the Deal: The Buying and Selling of a Great American City. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Miller, Stuart and Angela Voulangas. 1999. A Tenement Story: The History of 97 Orchard Street and the Lower East Side Tenement Museum. New York: The Lower East Side Tenement Museum.

Mitra, Steve. 1992. "UIC Fence Has Ominous Look to Maxwell Street's Regulars." Chicago Tribune, 13 January, sec. 2, p. 3.

Moberg, David. 1999. "How Does Richie Rate? Opening Up the Mayor's Report Card." Chicago Reader, 19 February, pp. 1-31.

Morales, Alfonso. 1993. "Making Money at the Market: The Social and Economic Logic of Informal Markets." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University. Ann Arbor: UMI. 9327261.

Mumford, Lewis. 1938. The Culture of Cities. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company.

___. 1961. The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects. San Diego: Harcourt Brace and Company.

Nagel, Emerson Howell. 1999. "A Funky Twist on Recycling: Warehouse Turns Trash into Treasures." Chicago Sun-Times, 28 February, p. 11.

Nelson, Angela. 1998. "TIF Application for Maxwell Street Area Has Residents Displeased." UIC Flame, 25 August, p. 1+.

"New Maxwell Street Market." City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development. Chicago, Illinois. Proposal.

The New Maxwell Street Market Handbook. City of Chicago Department of Consumer Services. Chicago, Illinois.

Newell, William Wells. 1883. Games and Songs of American Children. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Newman, M.W. 1999. "Glaring Mistakes." Chicago Tribune, 13 May, sec. 5, pp. 1,6.

Nighthawk, Robert. 1979. Interview with Peter Guralnick. Live on Maxwell Street – 1964. Compact disc jacket.

Norkunas, Martha K. 1990. "Tourism, History, and Ethnicity: The Politics of Public Culture in Monterey, California." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

___. 1993. The Politics of Public Memory: Tourism, History, and Ethnicity in Monterey, California. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Okrie, Tom. 1998. Personal interview with author. Chicago, Illinois, 16 January.

Oldenburg, Ray. 1989. The Great Good Place. New York: Marlowe and Company.

Oliver, Paul. 1984. "On Maxwell Street: Chicago's South Side." In Blues Off the Record, by Oliver. New York: Hippocrene Books, Inc.

Orsi, Robert Anthony. 1985. The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1950. New Haven: Yale University Press.

---. 1992. "The Religious Boundaries of an Inbetween People: Street Feste and the Problem of the Dark-Skinned Other in Italian Harlem, 1920-1990." American Quarterly 44 (3): 313-47.

---. 1999. Gods of the City. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Papajohn, George. 1999. "Challenge for a New Century." Chicago Tribune, 7 February, pp. 1, 15.

Paredes, Americo. 1958. With His Pistol in His Hand: A Border Ballad and Its Hero. Austin: University of Texas Press.

___, and Ellen Stekert. 1970. "The Urban Experience and Folk Tradition." Journal of American Folklore 83(328).

Patner, Andrew. 1995. Letter from Maxwell Street. <http://www.openair.org/maxwell/ppatner.html>.

Pernot, Laurent. 1998. "South Campus Plans 'Knit UIC, Chicago.'" UIC News, 15 April, pp. 1+.

Peterson, David. 1997. "The Top Censored Stories in Chicago: Mayor Daley's Preference for the Rich." Chicago Ink, October, pp. 6+.

Pollack, Neal. 1997. "The Pushcart War." Chicago Reader, 9 May, sec. 1, pp. 1+.

___. 1998a. "Disinfecting the City." Chicago Ink, January, p. 8.

___. 1998b. "Wrecking Ball Blues." Chicago Reader, 10 April, pp. 12- 15.

___. 1998c. "Forgotten Blues." Chicago Reader, 25 September, pp. 12-14.

___. 1998d. "Honor Thy Father." Chicago Reader, 18 December, sec. 1, p. 8.

___. 1999. "Pushed Off the Platform." Chicago Reader. 14 May, pp. 1-29.

Porteous, J. Douglas. 1971. Design With People: The Quality of the Urban Environment. Victoria, Australia: J.D. Porteous.

Randolph, Vance. 1943. Tall Tales from the Ozarks. Girard, KS: Little Blue Books.

Reich, Howard. 1994. "Musicians Also Singing the Maxwell Street Blues." Chicago Tribune, 13 April, pp. C1-3.

___. 1999. "Vanishing Acts?" Chicago Tribune, 20 June, pp. 1-9.

Richards, Cindy and Diane Struzzi. 1999. "Lower Wacker to Shut Its Gates on Homeless." Chicago Tribune, 29 January, p. 1.

Richards, Jonathan. 1994. Facadism. London: Routledge.

Robinson, Jimmie Lee. 1998. Maxwell Street Blues. Amina Records. Compact Disc.

Rosen, George. 1998. "The Siting of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle: A Struggle of the 1950s and 1960s." In A Wild Kind of Boldness: The Chicago History Reader, ed. Rosemary K. Adams, pp. 422-34. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Rowe, Mike. 1975. Chicago Blues: The City and the Music. New York: De Capo Press.

Rydell, Robert W. 1984. All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

___. 1993. World of Fairs. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ryden, Kent C. 1993. Mapping the Invisible Landscape: Folklore, Writing, and the Sense of Place. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Sandburg, Carl. 1990 (1916). "Chicago." In Poetry, ed. Jill P. Baumgaertner, pp. 560-1. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Santino, Jack. 1999. "Public Protest and Popular Style: Resistance from the Right in Northern Ireland and South Boston." American Anthropologist 101(3): 515-28.

Saunders, Matthew. 1986. "Facadism." Ancient Monuments Society. Transactions 30: 227-40.

Sharp, Cecil. 1932. English Folksongs from the Southern Appalachians. London: Oxford University Press.

Sharp, Steven. 1993. "The Maxwell Street Market: No More Fun in the Street?" Living Blues 111: 33-9.

Sloan, Paul. 1993. "Maxwell Street Market Getting Squeezed Out." Chicago Tribune, 21 May, pp. 1,12.

Sorkin, Michael. 1992. Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space. New York: Hill and Wang.

Spencer, LeAnn and Andy Davis. 1999. "South Side Landmark Heads for Extinction." Chicago Tribune, 28 May, Metro Chicago sec., p. 1.

Spielman, Fran. 1994. "Businesses Not Buying City's Maxwell St. Plan." Chicago Sun-Times, 15 February, p. C6.

___. 1994. "Council OKs Moving Maxwell St. Market." Chicago Sun-Times, 14 April, p. 5.

Steinberg, Neil. 1994. "City, UIC Battle Vendors Over Relocation Plan." Chicago Sun-Times, 10 April, p. 23.

Strausberg, Chinta. 1994. "City Council Votes to Sell Maxwell St." Chicago Daily Defender, 14 April, p. 1.

Stoeltje, Beverly. 1993. "Power and the Ritual Genres: American Rodeo." Western Folklore 52 (April): 135-56.

Suttles, Gerald D. 1968. The Social Order of the Slum: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swain, Thomas M. 1975. "A Day on Maxwell Street." Living Blues 22: 12-14.

Thomas, Henrietta. 1998. Interview with Venice Johnson. Maxwell Street: A Connecting Place. 12 October. <http://www.openair.org/maxwell/phenrt.html>.

Thompson, Michael. 1979. Rubbish Theory: The Creation and Destruction of Value. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. 1977. Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

"UIC's Unconvincing Case for Expansion." 1993. Chicago Sun-Times, 8 August, Commentary, p. 35.

Wallace, Mike. 1996. Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Walter, E.V. 1988. Placeways: A Theory of the Human Environment. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Warshaver, Gerald. 1983. "Urban Folklore." In Handbook of American Folklore, ed. Richard M. Dorson, pp. 162-71. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Washburn, Gary. 1998a. "Daley's Light Plan Hopes to Bring Bit of Paris to Loop." Chicago Tribune, 9 January, pp. 1-2.

___. 1998b. "Daley Sees Beauty Wherever He Looks." Chicago Tribune, 15 May, Metro Chicago sec., p. 3.

___. 1998c. "Daley Turns a Grabowski into Beauty." Chicago Tribune, 6 October, News sec., p. 1.

___. 1999. "City Street Artists May Face Moving Performance." Chicago Tribune, 10 June, Metro Chicago sec., p. 2.

___. 2000. "Daley Will Propose New Gang Loitering Law." Chicago Tribune, 7 January, Metro Chicago sec., p. 1.

---, and Andrew Martin. 1997. "Daley Springs to Defense of City's TIFs." Chicago Tribune, 5 November, Metro Chicago sec., p. 1.

Whiteis, David. 1994. "The Last Sunday: A Farewell to Maxwell Street." Chicago Reader, 2 September, pp. 8+.

Wille, Lois. 1972. Forever Open, Clear, and Free: The Struggle for Chicago's Lakefront. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Willenson, Marni. 1999. E-mail to Maxwell Street Historic Preservation Coalition. 4 May.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Elizabeth. 1991. The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wirth, Louis. 1928. The Ghetto. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

___. 1951. "The Limitations of Regionalism." In Regionalism in America, ed. Merrill Jensen. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Zashin, Elliott. 1998. "Maxwell Street's History." Paper presented to Conference on Chicago Research and Public Policy. Chicago, Illinois, 19 October.

Zotti, Ed. 1993. "Can Maxwell Street Be Saved from Itself?" Chicago Enterprise (July/August): 28-9.

Zukin, Sharon. 1991. Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World. Berkeley: University of California Press.

___. 1995. The Cultures of Cities. Oxford: Blackwell.

VITA
Janelle L. Walker

Education

2000 Ph.D., Folklore, Folklore Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
1990 M.A., English Literature, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
1987 B.S., Advertising, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL

Academic Honors and Services

1999 Honorable Mention, Carter Manny Award, Graham Foundation
1997 Richard M. Dorson Dissertation Research Grant, Folklore Institute
1996 High Pass, Ph.D. Exams, Folklore Institute, Indiana University
1995 Reuss Prize for Students of Folklore and History
1994-96 Managing Editor, Folklore Forum
1994-95 Undergraduate Development Committee, Folklore Institute
1993-95 Tuition Scholarship, Indiana University
1993-94 President, Folklore Student Association, Indiana University
1992-94 Bibliographer, Modern Language Association
1992-93 Performance Award, Folklore Institute, Indiana University
1989-90 Fiction Editor, Chicago Review, University of Chicago

Teaching Experience

Instructor, Division of Extended Studies, Indiana University, 1995-96
Associate Instructor, Folklore Institute, Indiana University, 1993-95
Lecturer, English Department, Loyola University, Chicago, IL 1991-92
Instructor, English Department, North Park College, Chicago, IL, 1990-92
Instructor, The American School, Chicago, IL 1990-92
Instructor, English Department, East-West University, Chicago, IL 1990-91
Tutor, Literacy Volunteers of Chicago, 1987-89

Publications and Presentations

1999 "When Vernacular Places Become Expert Spaces: Maxwell Street, Chicago, and the Loss of Community," Good Places by Design lecture series, Bloomington, IN

1998 "'The Maxwell Street Teardown Blues': An Exploration of Tourism and Place in Chicago," Hoosier Folklore Society, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN

1998 "Maxwell Street's Touristic Future: Potentials and Risks," Conference on Chicago Research and Public Policy, Loyola University, Chicago, IL

1998 "The Market's Places: The Fight to Preserve Historical and Cultural Memory at Chicago's Maxwell Street," American Folklore Society, Portland, OR

1996 "History and Progress for Sale: Chicago's Navy Pier as Festival Marketplace," American Folklore Society, Pittsburgh, PA

1995 "A Perspective on the Use of Personal Texts in Folklore," Folklore Historian 12: 29-38.

1994 "Moving Maxwell Street: People and Power Relations in an Urban Marketplace," American Folklore Society, Milwaukee, WI

1993 "The Semi-Personal Narrative: A Look at Dyadic Storytelling," American Folklore Society, Eugene, OR

1990 "Opium as 'Other': Its Representation of Societal Attitudes in Three Works of Detective Fiction," Master's Thesis, University of Chicago