11-1-2007

Inventing the Greatest: Constructing Louisville’s Future out of Story and Clay

James A. Throgmorton

University of Iowa

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17077/a6f2-zwvr


Hosted by Iowa Research Online. For more information please contact: lib-ir@uiowa.edu.
Inventing the Greatest:
Crafting Louisville’s Future out of Story and Clay

by

Professor James A. Throgmorton
The University of Iowa

ABSTRACT

In earlier publications I have argued that planning can be thought of as a form of persuasive and constitutive storytelling about the future. In this paper I tell a story about the transformation of Louisville, Kentucky, a city of approximately 700,000 people located in the middle of the United States. The story begins in the early 1950s with a youth named Cassius Marcellus Clay, moves through space and time, weaves together a series of locally-grounded common urban narratives, and ends at a new Center in Louisville named after Muhammad Ali. By weaving these tales together, I seek to demonstrate how narrative might be used to generate a more capacious approach to planning, but also to indicate how the physical design of the city-region has to be changed to make space for diverse common urban narratives. I end by suggesting that such an approach might help increase the sustainability of Louisville and other city-regions.
Come closer. I want to tell you a story.¹ It is a story about transformation, Muhammad Ali’s, Louisville’s, and (indirectly through me) planning theory’s.² Much of it will seem deeply familiar, as if you have heard it (or read about it) all your lives.³ Some of you may even feel the story in your bones, as if your whole life has been shaped by it in important ways. But, unless you come from Louisville, Kentucky, or are a planning theorist, parts of it will seem completely unfamiliar. For this story contains particularities that can be found only in those terrains. Parts of it might even catch you by surprise. The story begins with a youth named Cassius Marcellus Clay, moves through space and time, and ends at a new Center named after Muhammad Ali.

Fifty-five years ago, when Cassius Clay (see Figure 1) and I were growing up in Louisville, it was the country’s 30th largest city. Roughly 369,000 people lived in the city itself, and another 260,000 lived in the rest of the seven county region. Approximately 16 percent of the industrialized city’s residents were, like the young Clay, African-American, but virtually all of the remaining region’s residents were white, like me.

[FIGURE 1 GOES ABOUT HERE.]

The city and its surrounding region have changed dramatically over the intervening years, as have Ali and I. Cassius Clay transformed himself into Muhammad Ali (“The Greatest”) and became a hero to millions of people around the world, myself included.⁴ After going through a traumatic bout of deindustrialization, Louisville has become a “transnational” city-region and the nation’s 16th largest city. As for me, well I have become a professor of planning at the University of Iowa.

While living 500 miles away from “the Big L,” I still visit it at least twice a year.
And I think about it in terms of what I’ve learned about planning as I’ve moved through life. The more I have studied and practiced planning within city-regions, the more I have come to see the importance of stories and storytelling. In brief, stories and cities construct one another.

What might that mean? People tell a diverse array of “common urban narratives” (Finnegan, 1998), which become locally-grounded. To varying degrees, each of these locally-grounded stories influences the physical transformation of places over time. Reciprocally, the resulting physical design influences the stories that can be told, and to whom they can be told. Consequently, to make any city-region more sustainable, the people of that place need to begin telling a persuasive story that makes narrative and physical space for diverse locally-grounded common urban narratives.5

What might such a story look like for Louisville? What kinds of “common urban narratives” would it have to make space for? And what might that mean for physical design in the city-region? Ultimately, only Louisvillians (and others who have a stake in the city) can answer these questions. For now I simply want to highlight some possibilities and to make one strong claim: By making physical space for the African-Americans’ story to be told, the new Muhammad Ali Center could act as a powerful “trope” in a persuasive story about making Louisville a more sustainable place.

A Web of Stories in the “Gateway to the South”

As a child I was entranced by discoveries of Indian arrowheads and stories of Daniel Boone. While I did not know it at the time, I was learning what might be called the founders’ tale. In the U.S., as symbolically portrayed in John Gast’s painting,
“American Progress” (see Figure 2), this tale typically links to the grand national
narrative about Manifest Destiny and the westward course of empire. It begins when a
few white European immigrants first settled the wilderness, seeking to escape their
troubled European past and make the world anew. [FIGURE 2 GOES ABOUT HERE.]

Founders’ tales typically recount the effort to establish and grow a shining new
city on the hill. Look around any U. S. city, especially its older parts, and you will see the
founders’ story embedded in the names of streets, parks, hills, and schools. For example,
if you stand at the north center of Louisville’s Riverfront Plaza and look south along Fifth
Street, you will find yourself peering through a symbolic “Gateway to the South” (see
Figure 3). Just to your right, you would see Felix de Weldon’s statue of General George
Rogers Clark, who founded Louisville in 1778 at the Falls of the Ohio and conquered the
Northwest Territory during the Revolutionary War.6 [FIGURE 3 GOES ABOUT HERE.]

But I can also recall playing the game of Confederates against Yankees and
learning to sing “Dixie” (with a Southern accent of course). Unconsciously, I was
learning the locally-grounded version of the founders’ narrative, one that reflected the
city elite’s attachment to the “Lost Cause” of the Confederacy and their effort to create a
most “southern” city after the Civil War (Ellis 1997, p. 17).

Many who tell the founders’ tale think of their place as home. They feel emotional
attachments to the story they tell and the houses in which they live, to the familiar
surroundings of their neighborhoods, and—with decreasing intimacy—to their cities,
their regions, and perhaps even larger areas. Guided by this sense of caring attachment,
they try to maintain the quality of their homes, the historic character of their
neighborhoods, and the vitality of their social communities. But feeling attached to the
familiar physical surroundings and story of their place, the tellers of this story often feel tremendously uncomfortable when strangers arrive. Their familiar place and story can suddenly feel unfamiliar and threatened.  

My parents used to visit friends who lived in Louisville’s west end, on Northwestern Parkway. But, like thousands of other white people, those friends moved out of the west end in the mid-1950s. In retrospect it is easy to see their move as part of another story that has circulated widely in American cities over the past fifty years or more. Let’s call it the city as nightmare.  

According to this story, once poor people—especially non-white poor people—start moving into a neighborhood, existing residents begin fearing that their property values and quality of life will decline. Becoming increasingly fearful as they see neighbors move, they too flee. As neighbours flee, the population and physical condition of the neighbourhood decline. The nightmare narrative circulates more widely. For the people who tell this story, the city comes to be seen as a place that seethes with drug-related criminal activity, experiences riots, suffers diminished employment, faces a shrinking tax base, loses the white middle class, and is full of abandoned and torched buildings.  

Muhammad Ali spent his childhood in the west end, which by that time had become predominantly black and largely low-income. At the same time I was playing in my parents’ yard on the white middle-class southeast side of Louisville, just south of Bowman Field. As a child I attended elementary school at St. Agnes on Newburg Road, roughly two miles west of my home. As far as I can recall, no black children attended St. Agnes when I was there. No, that’s not quite right. (Who can fully trust the details of
I recall a single black boy who attended second grade for a few days or maybe weeks. But then he disappeared. Recalling this boy’s disappearance makes me think of Jim Brown, who was a bartender at my parents’ country club. As a teenager, I loved talking with Jim Brown, for he seemed to provide me with a window to an unfamiliar world. But one day in the early-1960s, not long after Cassius Clay TKO’d Sonny Liston to win the heavyweight championship of the world and announced that he had joined the Nation of Islam and changed his name to Muhammad Ali, Jim disappeared from the club. When I asked what happened to him, I was told that he had gotten too uppity.

What confused me at the time, no longer seems inexplicable. Jim Brown’s disappearance can be understood as part of another story that has circulated widely in American cities. Let’s call it *the city of oppression (but also hope)*. According to one version of this common urban narrative, when black workers migrated northwards between World Wars I and II, fleeing oppression and seeking opportunity, they were met by white rioters and racially-restrictive zoning ordinances and covenants (Sugrue 1996). Confined to ghettos and alienated by decades of racially insensitive policies, blacks exploded during the 1960s decade of civil rebellion. And now many African-Americans find themselves striving heroically to preserve and improve their neighborhoods in a racially divided and oppressive metropolis. Thus the city of despair and oppression can also become a site of hope, empowerment and action.

Of course, Louisville has its own locally-grounded version of this tale. A border city in a former slave state, this “Gateway to the South” has (unlike larger cities of the Northeast or Midwest) always had a relatively large population of African-Americans.
Moreover, unlike cities of the deeper South, its dominant white population never denied blacks the right to vote after the Civil War. Consequently, racism took a unique form in Louisville: in historian George C. Wright’s (1985) words, it became a site of “polite racism” where blacks had to adjust to “living behind a veil” and to willingly accepting “their place” in a complicated dance of race relations. Within the boundaries of this dance floor, black Louisvillians’ efforts to find better housing and jobs were met by white rioters and racially-restrictive zoning ordinances and covenants. So too various federal projects confined them within existing ghettos or displaced them from land that local leaders wanted for other uses. But through court action, rallies and demonstrations, economic boycotts, nonviolent direct action, political activity, public education, and other social mobilization efforts, African-Americans and their white allies were able to transform the dance and make the veil more porous over time.

In the late 1950s and early ‘60s I attended St. Xavier High School, initially at its location downtown and then at its new campus on the south side of the city. By this time the city had grown to 391,000 people and was the 31st largest city in the country. Not quite 18 percent of the city’s residents were black. But, reflecting the effects of interstate highway construction, white flight, and other factors, the region’s population was both growing and dispersing: 397,000 people now lived in the other parts of the region.

White middle-class people were moving to the suburbs partly to circumvent the Supreme Court’s 1954 Brown v. Topeka decision ordering desegregation of public schools. Many were also enrolling their children in parochial schools for the same reason.

Mention of school desegregation turns my memory back to March, 1958, when I was an eighth-grader planning to attend St. X. One night that March, in Male High
School’s gym just south of downtown, I watched an all-white St. X beat an all-black Central High team in a thrilling triple-overtime basketball game and thereby win the regional championship. (I like to think that Ali, who was a student at Central High then, was also present in the gym that night.) I sat on the first floor on the northeast side of the court and joined St. X’s cheerleaders as they chanted, “Two, four, six, eight, who do we appreciate? Bobby, Bobby, Bobby.” But I also watched and heard Central High’s fans, who were on the second floor at the south end of the building, move to a completely different beat: “Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, get that ball, get that ball.” The teams played just as differently. St. X ran set plays, while Central hurried up and down the court. It was like watching Snooky Lanson sing along with Chuck Berry, or, to be more place specific, like watching Louisville’s white singing cowboy of the Fifties (Randy Atcher) playing some cool jazz at Joe’s Palm Room, a black nightclub in the west end.

Maybe memory is playing tricks on me, but I recall feeling that my world had changed fundamentally, and for the better. Perhaps I unconsciously recognized that even if the fans and schools were segregated, the sounds were integrated; hearing the two chants together might have symbolized for me what integration could mean.

In the late-Sixties Ali became “The Greatest,” a heavyweight champion who had an amazing ability to dance his way out of trouble while hitting with power. But he turned his world upside down by refusing induction into the Army and later speaking out against the war in Vietnam. For that brave action, he lost his heavyweight crown. While Ali was dancing in the ring, then losing his crown, I was studying history at the University of Notre Dame and then becoming a U. S. Army officer in Germany. When I returned home in 1970, my world had also been turned upside down. Moreover, my
hometown had changed too: the city’s population had fallen to 362,000 people, while the rest of the region had increased to 543,000. Almost 24 percent of the city’s residents were black, while the remainder of the region was almost entirely white.

Shortly after returning home, I began working for the city-county Air Pollution Control District, hoping to help solve the “urban crisis” by cleaning up the environment. My job took me to parts of the city and county I had never seen before. I can recall visiting air monitoring sites on top of fire stations in the west end, tracking industrial plumes into the nearby “Rubbertown” industrial complex, and helping to monitor toxic fumes near the Lee’s Lane Landfill on its southern edge.

No doubt many fascinating tales can be told about Rubbertown, but I do not yet know them. I do know this. During WW II the U.S. military needed large amounts of synthetic rubber, and it decided to build a new butadiene and synthetic rubber manufacturing center next to the river just south of the city’s west end. At its wartime peak in 1944, nearly 4,000 people were employed at National Carbide, B. F. Goodrich, and DuPont. As the years passed, Union Carbide, National Synthetic Rubber, Rohm and Haas, and other corporations opened plants in the complex. Now there are great concerns about cancer and other adverse health effects potentially associated with Rubbertown, especially with regard to 1,3-butadiene, acrylonitrile, and chloroprene, which are used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.11

In retrospect I can see that by tracking industrial plumes into Rubbertown I was playing my role in the environmentalists’ story, which might be called the city of boiling frogs. In this familiar limits-to-growth tale, the people of a city are like the frog that has been tossed into a pot of temperate water. The frog never notices that the water is
gradually heating up, eventually to the boiling point and to the frog’s death. Like the boiling frog, the people of a city gradually over-consume resources and pollute their environment until the city becomes uninhabitable. According to this environmentalist reconstruction of the Founders’ tale, human progress (that is, cities and all that they entail) is rapidly destroying or taming wild nature. But the more closely I looked at this particular pond, the more I understood that not all parts of the pond were heating at a uniform rate. Though I did not have access to the term at the time, for it had not yet been invented, I was beginning to think in terms of environmental justice.

While helping to improve Louisville’s air quality, I also started becoming a scholar of urban planning. As a Masters student at the University of Louisville (and later at Kansas University and UCLA), I learned the modernist planners’ tale about how expert planners can solve the problems of the industrial city. While this tale typically takes many twists and turns, it has a clear beginning and end, a clear setting (the territorially-bounded place), a clear plot (destiny fulfilled), a set of characters (especially citizens and self-interested businessmen and politicians), and an evident hero (the expert planner). Each succeeding plan becomes part of a larger story in which planning, as Leonie Sandercock (1998, p. 35) puts it, slays “the dragons of greed and irrationality” and, if not always triumphing, is “always noble, on the side of angels.”

I left Louisville in 1976, not long after Ali had won his “Thrilla in Manilla” over Joltin’ Joe Frazier. Like many others, I left in pursuit of opportunities not available at home. At that moment the city’s population was continuing to fall: by 1980, shortly after Ali had lost and then regained his heavyweight crown for the last time, it had shrunk to 298,000, dropping Louisville to 49th on the nation’s list of large cities. By that year, more
than twice as many people (655,000) lived in surrounding parts of the region, and 28 percent of the city’s people were black. The city’s downtown was dying, the white middle class was still fleeing for the suburbs, and conflict over mandatory busing was traumatizing the city and county. Perhaps more important, the city’s industrial economy was collapsing, just as it was in Birmingham (England), Dortmund (Germany), Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), and hundreds of other places. This process of deindustrialization revealed the extent to which the entire city-region had been built on an economic base that could no longer be sustained. Like a retreating glacier depositing drift, deindustrialization also left “brownfields” in its wake.

The deindustrialization of Louisville can be interpreted in light of a fourth story, which might be called the city of ghosts. This offers a narrative of neighborhoods being eviscerated by deindustrialization, of small towns drying up and blowing away, of farmland disappearing from the urban fringe, of other neighborhoods being destroyed by urban renewal and interstate highway construction.

In these cities of ghosts, changes superimpose upon the visible surface an unseen layer of usage, memory, and significance. Oldtimers recall how lively and hopeful their older towns, neighborhoods, or countryside used to be, and they seek to preserve what remains from any further demographic, economic, and environmental change. In Louisville’s beautiful east side Cherokee district, for example, a neighborhood in which I used to live (see Thomas 2003).

Or sometimes people try to create new neighborhoods that purport to recreate the moral values, safety, innocence, and sense of community allegedly found at some idyllic moment in the past. On the Main Streets of small town America, for example. But this


desire to return to the small town forgets just how stifling such places can be, as it was for Jimmie Stewart early in Frank Capra’s film, *It’s a Wonderful Life*. It forgets how young people fled them for New York and other big cities seeking entertainment, opportunity and excitement.¹⁷

These nostalgic stories are often complicated by the fact that the towns and neighborhoods have already changed. This points to yet another important story. When migrants cross borders in pursuit of economic opportunity, present day Latinos from Central America for example, they bring with them memories of those other places and the pathways leading away from them. This, I’m sure most of you recognize, is the classic *immigrants’ tale*, only now with a new post-colonial twist.¹⁸

Can newcomers and oldtimers plan together? Howie Baum (1997) tells an illuminating story about the people of Southeast Baltimore and their effort to develop a neighborhood plan. According to Baum, those neighbors believed quite strongly that all community members should have an opportunity to help envision the neighborhood's future. But in practice they were not able to adhere to that principle. Renters, poor people, and blacks who had moved into the neighborhood over the previous twenty years either did not participate or else were not thought of as part of the community. Instead, white professional middle-class people who thought of themselves as "goodhearted homeowners" dominated the process. In Baum’s view, the result was a conflict between the long-time residents’ "community of memory" and the actual, diverse residents' potential "community of hope." Consequently, the neighbors were not able to think seriously about their present and anticipated problems.

From Louisville I moved in the late-1970s first to Kansas City and then to Los
Angeles. In both places, I worked for environmental consulting firms that were helping the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency implement the Clean Air Act. But I was also beginning to see many flaws in the modernist planners’ story. At UCLA I learned that there were diverse theories about how to plan well and that planning was inescapably political. Building on that insight, I studied the political and technical complexities of promoting alternative energy sources. In the mid-1980s I lived those complexities first hand at Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago as I sought to assess how national energy policy and programs were affecting minority populations (Throgmorton 1989).

During this period Louisville was changing in ways that I, a person who visited the city but once a year and whose mind was focused on other matters, could not see clearly. The city’s population declined by 93,000 people from 1970 to 1990 while the rest of the region’s population increased by 136,000. The economy was slowly becoming more service-oriented. And the percentage of city residents who were black increased slightly to almost 30 percent.

Having lived the complexity of planning, I moved to the University of Iowa in 1986. Making my own modest contribution to “the communicative turn” in planning, I began writing about how planners face the very difficult challenge of persuading technical experts, elected officials, and the lay public to accept their advice. Out of this came a book about how Chicago’s electric power future was being constructed through persuasive storytelling, argumentation, and negotiation (Throgmorton 1996).

It was good scholarly work, but did it have any practical implications? In the mid-1990s I tried to find out by serving as an elected member of my hometown’s city council. This led me to conclude that, to build a sustainable city, people who differ from one
another need to acknowledge, care for, and attend to one another’s deepest inner fears, angers, joys and hopes; they need to learn how to nurture a “sustainable economy of spirit” (Throgmorton 2000).

My work as a city councilor can easily be seen as part of yet another urban narrative that gained increasing resonance throughout the 1990s. Let’s call it the dream of the sustainable city. By using such tropes as environmental indicators and ecological footprints, by promoting more compact physical design, and so on, this story imagines that places can thrive economically while also becoming more ecologically healthy and socially just.

Inspired by this dream and finished with my work as a city councilor, I undertook a quest to find a truly sustainable city. In 1998, just two years after Muhammad Ali lit the torch at the Olympics in Atlanta, a group of students and I visited several cities in Europe. We found that each city had produced high quality physical designs that contributed to a healthier natural environment. We also found that the best of them thrived economically and distributed the benefits more fairly. Who could not feel inspired and full of hope after such a trip?

A year later I explored Germany with a group of Fulbright scholars, seeking to learn how that country was promoting a more sustainable economy by using alternative sources of energy. This lengthy trip complicated my understanding of sustainability. While visiting Weimar and many other German cities, I learned that the meaning of any structure, place or action depends on the story of which it is a part.  

Berlin’s Marlene-Dietrich-Platz (see Figure 4), which I explored in the early 2000s, provides a good example. Prior to World War II, Berlin was a compact and
walkable place, full of vibrant public spaces like its famous Potsdamerplatz. And it is this walkable pre-war city that city building director Hans Stimmann sought to recreate in the early 1990s. “We must bring this city back so that when we look in the mirror,” he said, “we will know that it is our face” (Howell-Ardila, 1998, p. 82). [FIGURE 4 GOES ABOUT HERE.]

But who is the “we” Stimmann refers to? It was in these very public spaces that Nazis terrorized Jews. So Berlin taught me that, when conceived too narrowly, physical design can enable the “poetic narratives” of ethnically homogenous native-born residents to design “poetic cities” which reproduce a singular, essentialist notion of platial identity. It also revealed that, when not supported by richly democratic processes, the public spaces of these “poetic cities” can become sites of gruesome oppression and control.

This quest for the sustainable city also enabled me to see first hand how extensively cities have been changing over the past twenty-five years. As amply documented by Michael P. Smith (2001) and Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin (2001), an array of trends and processes have been producing “global” or “transnational” city-regions that are so complicated as to defy coherent explanation in public discourse. Consequently, they have been radically transforming the context for local action, in Louisville and elsewhere (Albrecht and Mandelbaum, 2005).

In this transformed context, one narrative typically dominates city building in most cities around the world. We might call it the story of Sex and the Creative City. This narrative presumes that, in the context of an increasingly competitive globalized economy, the central challenge is to design dynamic, diverse, and culturally rich cities that will attract new high technology businesses and smart, creative, knowledge-based
workers who have lots of disposable income.\textsuperscript{23,24}

Although this story has many tellers, members of locally-rooted “growth machines” (or pro-growth regimes) tell it with the greatest gusto.\textsuperscript{25} In Louisville, the “growth machine” is guided by Greater Louisville, Inc. (GLI). Formed by combining the Louisville Area Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Louisville Economic Development Partnership in 1997, and with the City/County Office for Economic Development in 1998, GLI has been trying to develop a “vision” for Louisville’s future through strategic economic planning.

As part of GLI’s effort to forge a vision for the city’s future, it assembled a group of 40 community leaders to consider what needed to be done, and it hired M. Ross Boyle, an economic development consultant, to advise them. Describing Louisville as “a nice average place to live and work” and as “a good example of the kind of place that makes American great,” Boyle urged the community leaders to strive for much faster, higher-quality economic growth in order to “make the Louisville area special, not average.” Inspired by Boyle’s advice, the committee produced a Visioning Report in 1997 that included seven major strategies designed to transform Louisville into “an economic hot spot” (Greater Louisville 2002, pp. 2-3).

Growth machine efforts have borne fruit in many cities, Louisville included. Over the past decade or more, the Louisville city-region has increasingly become a national center for logistics and distribution services and for biomedical research and health care.\textsuperscript{26} The city-region’s air and water have become noticeably less polluted. Innovative forms of neighborhood development have been initiated at the Park DuValle HOPE VI site in the nearly all-black west end and at the New Urbanist “Norton Commons” site in
the nearly all-white east end. The downtown has been spruced up, a new Waterfront Park has been developed, efforts to celebrate the city-region’s sense of place have been accelerated, and the governments of the city and county have been merged.27

Consequently, almost 694,000 people currently live in this transnational city, the 16th largest in the U. S., whereas another 332,000 live in the other six counties of the region.28 On the whole, the city feels like a more hopeful and exciting place, and some say that race and racism no longer matter.29 And now the new Muhammad Ali Center will act as a magnet for tourists, drawing even more visitors to the Big L. Just to its east, gazing toward the Center, stands Ed Hamilton’s 2003 statue of York (see Figure 5), the slave who played an important role in the Lewis and Clark Expedition a quarter-century after Louisville’s founding. [FIGURE 5 GOES ABOUT HERE.]

The Muhammad Ali Center as a Trope in Louisville’s Story

Foundational myths, fears and nightmares, injustice and oppression, boiling frogs, destinies fulfilled, ghosts and grief, innocence and nostalgia, hope and effort, creativity and excitement, the dream of sustainability, and now fear of terrorism: this is the stuff out of which contemporary city-regions are being constructed.30 All of these stories are circulating in common culture and shaping how people think city-regions should be built.

But the meanings of these stories cannot be found by looking at them in isolation. Rather, these stories weave together, both challenging and informing one another. Consequently, the meaning of any one story depends on who hears it and on the context in which it is heard.31 In other words, it is not merely the individual stories that count, but story telling and the complex social networks, physical settings, and institutional
processes in which those stories are told.

Said differently, the “we” a story constructs depends on how the story is spatialized, and how a story is spatialized depends on who is involved in constructing it.

In this context, the new Ali Center has an important role to play, both in terms of shaping collective understandings of the past and envisioning possibilities for the future. The possibilities for our interpretations of the past became clear to me as I slowly walked through the Center shortly after it opened in mid-November, 2005. While much of the Center predictably focused on Ali and his famous bouts, the upper floor also revealed that “the Greatest” had emerged at a moment when race relations were being transformed, and that his own life had a major effect on that transformation. At one point I walked into a room that had been configured to look like a lunch counter. As soon as I entered, a recorded voice said something like, “Hey, what are you doing here? You know we don’t allow your kind in here.” I froze. A few seconds later the voice said something like, “Move it!” I felt a twinge of fear and rejection. But of course I am not African-American, and I have no embodied memory of what it must have felt like to be so rejected. Just a minute or two later, an African-American woman entered with three young children. Two of them leaped onto the soda fountains stools and immediately heard the recorded voice say, “Hey, what are you doing here?” “What’s that about, momma?” one of the young boys asked. She replied, “A long time ago . . .,” and she proceeded to narrate her story about how people like her had been treated in Louisville 50 years ago. The experience moved me deeply, but much more important, I think it affected the children deeply. It inspired them, maybe, to become “the greatest” they could be.

Just as the Center can transform understandings of the past, so too it could, with a
few well-considered interventions, challenge visitors to imagine how Louisville’s city-region can be made even better. Visitors could learn that Louisville’s predominantly black west end remains much more troubled than the rest of the city-region. They could learn that market-led industrialization undermined Louisville’s long-term prospects by leaving acres of contaminated “brownfields” and public health problems of inadequately-documented severity, problems which seem to concentrate disproportionately in the west end. They could celebrate the thousands of industrial workers—black and white—who made their livelihoods at the plants in Rubbertown and elsewhere.

They could discover how existing transportation plans and development of city-region’s exurban periphery are undermining the ability of lower-income residents—both black and white—to access new jobs and are making the region ever more dependent on risky imported oil. They could discover that new migrants, especially Latinos, have been disrupting the old black/white divide. They could explore the possibility that, by ignoring adverse effects on other parts of the world, the city-region’s planning is undermining the long-term viability of development at both the local and the global scale.

They could examine the extent to which African-Americans are influencing the content of planning throughout the city-region, and they could discuss the extent to which planned developments—including the new Ali Center— make space for them.

With these associations in mind, the people of Louisville could feel inspired to imagine a persuasive story about their city-region’s future, a story that makes space for African-Americans both physically and narrationally, a story that enables blacks and whites to peel back the unseen layers of history and memory and to transform the walls that remain in their heads and under their feet.
Black and white Louisvillians could be inspired to treat their shared past as a house which lodges memories, fears, and aspirations, but also fosters creativity and imagination. Most important, they could feel inspired to ask: Who are we? What does it mean to be a Louisvillian? Whose story, what culture, what sense of community, and what collective identity does our contemporary planning help sustain? How do we want to live with one another? What should our plans sustain?

My hope is that, just as Cassius Clay was able to transform himself into Muhammad Ali, the people of “the Big L” will be able to set forth on a transformational journey that embodies respect for their shared life and humanity. My hope is that the diverse storytellers of the Louisville city-region will be able to collaboratively invent and live an energizing myth that makes space for diverse locally-grounded common urban narratives—especially the story of how African-Americans transformed the dance of race relations in the Big L. By signaling that the people of Louisville intend to go this way rather than that, the new Ali Center can help Louisvillians construct a persuasive story about how to make the city-region a more sustainable place long into the future, truly a “Greater Louisville,” a worthy home for “the Greatest.”

Postcript

Hope alone is not enough.

In a recent paper about “phronetic planning research,” Flyvbjerg (2002) argues that power can be exercised so as to control how problems are defined and what counts as important knowledge. Surely he is right. As I have suggested elsewhere (Throgmorton 2003), one important way power can be exercised is narrational: the act of constructing
the narrative is inherently a purposeful, hence political, act, and narratives unavoidably shape their readers’ attention. Moreover, as Leonie Sandercock (2005) has recently emphasized, powerful agents can control which stories are most likely to be told (and heard) within actually-existing institutional processes. Storytellers must necessarily speak in a context of power relations, and in that context some audiences count more than others. In this postscript, I will build on Flyvbjerg’s and Sandercock’s critical insights about the relationships between storytelling, power and institutional structures.

I have argued that diverse stories are circulating in common culture and are shaping how people think city-regions should be built. Within each city-region, a web of locally-grounded common urban narratives forms something like a cultural landscape upon which governmental jurisdictions and institutional structures are superimposed; this web provides the deep substrata of sustainable democratic planning. But it is also important to recognize that jurisdictions and structures (along with the physical development patterns they engender) in turn shape the content of the stories and affect the ability of particular storytellers to encounter one another.

As legal scholar Gerald Frug (1999) and others have emphasized, the current structure of governance in the United States constructs city-regions as aggregations of autonomous, territorially-bounded local governments. In this institutional context, citizens of territorially-bounded governments elect representatives who are supposed to carry out the will of the majority (of eligible voters who express their will at the ballot box) and who appoint expert planners to construct and carry out plans that are consistent with that will. Planners do the research, elected representatives make the decisions. Everyday talk tends to take this structure for granted.
This distribution of governmental jurisdictions within regions does not simply emerge naturally through some kind of neutral, a-political process. As I have indicated in this paper, fear of particular kinds of strangers and trust in the truth of one’s own story leads people (who have the requisite resources and inclination) to intentionally segregate land uses in space, build “gated communities,” and create subdivisions and municipalities that are explicitly designed to exclude “unwanted neighbors” by race and/or class. In other words, U. S. city-regions have been subdivided in a way that enables some people to live out their stories while avoiding encounters with unfamiliar strangers (and their stories).

If we let this structure and conventional thinking confine our creativity, it is very hard to see how professional planners will ever be authorized to make space for diverse stories, and hence to imagine, articulate, pursue, and actualize a persuasive vision of just and sustainable city-regions.

Conventional talk notwithstanding, a variety of trends and developments have been complicating and disrupting this taken-for-granted structure. Largely because of these trends, its key elements—especially the territorially-bounded city, the citizen, and the expert planner—are being supplanted or transformed by other conceptions. In this transformed context, “the city” no longer means only the territory located within a municipality’s official boundaries. In addition to being transformed into the city-regions of large sprawling metropolitan areas, it is becoming the global city, a node in Manuel Castells’ (1996) “space of flows” or Michael P. Smith (2001) “transnational urbanism.” Furthermore, economic globalization, ecological flows, and migration patterns have placed stakeholders on a parallel footing with citizens and have created a need to resolve
conflicts in ways that differ from majority-based representative democracy. And advocacy research and planning by diverse stakeholders has made it impossible for planners to occupy the role of “the expert.” Consequently, planners have had to practice not just technical skills but also the ability to facilitate collaborative work; that is, to engage in “deliberative democracy.”

In the transformed context of “the network society” (Albrecht and Mandelbaum 2005), the crucial challenge is to create new institutional structures and processes that will make space for diverse stories to be told (and heard) at the city-regional scale and thereby help move city-regions toward sustainability.38 How this can best be done will surely vary from place to place; however, my general sense is that some group or coalition of groups must successfully advocate the value of sustainability and collaborative planning processes that sharpen debate between conflicting interests. Once this new institutional structure and process is in place, diverse storytellers would be able to collaboratively invent a story that is persuasive enough to mobilize a political constituency, which in turn would be powerful enough to change things on the ground within existing city-regions.

I do not want to sound hopelessly naïve. This is a profoundly difficult task, primarily because collaborative planning processes can exclude or constrain certain storytellers in many ways, including: (1) determining which sets of stakeholders will or will not be represented in those processes, (2) influencing which storytellers will be allowed to speak and be taken seriously, and (3) defining the spatial boundaries of the institutional processes, which in turn limits who the stakeholders might be and which topics might be on the table.39
Hope is not enough. But it is a place to start.
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1 Detailed justification for using a storytelling approach and references to other relevant sources can be found in Throgmorton (1996) and Throgmorton (2003). The latter explicitly lays out the framework that I have sought to follow in this article.

2 As the author of this story, I have two primary purposes in mind: first, I want to help make Louisville a more sustainable place by providing narrative and physical space for African-Americans, both in Louisville and in the ever evolving story about that city-region’s planning and development; and second, I want to demonstrate how narrative might be used to generate a more capacious approach to planning. By emphasizing the city-region, I am also responding to Susan Fainstein’s (2005) call for better integration of planning theory with urban theory.

3 Barbara Eckstein (2003) points out the importance of audience in storytelling. With audience in mind, a critical reader of this paper might ask such questions as: Who is the “you” my opening paragraph addresses? What kind of reader does it conscript? What kind of community does it seek to create, both among its readers and between the readers and the author? These are the kinds of questions about the interaction of communication and community that Seymour Mandelbaum has long asked, most notably in his 2000 book, Open Moral Communities. At the end of his chapter about “Stories,” Mandelbaum observes that “the processes of telling and managing stories create and destroy moral communities” (p. 94). As the author of this paper, I am trying to address not just my fellow planning theorists and a diverse array of professional planners, but also the real flesh-and-blood people of the Louisville city-region, including African-Americans who live predominantly in the west end and whites who live in the exurban periphery. In the spirit of Mandelbaum’s work, one might ask whether the story I recount here facilitates, or threatens to disrupt, a sense of community among those diverse readers.

4 Sociologist Charles Lemert (2003) characterizes Muhammad Ali as a “trickster,” one of the most common figures in the folklore of “premodern” societies. The trickster is, he says, “a boundary crosser…always there, at the gates of the city and the gates of life, making sure there is commerce. He also attends the internal boundaries by which groups articulate their social life….Trickster is the mythic embodiment of ambiguity and ambivalence, doubleness and duplicity, contradiction and paradox” (p. 38). Trickster is a “culture transformer” who “transforms himself in order to remake the worlds at hand” (p. 41). In Lemert’s view, Ali was “self-consciously a character in a story of his own invention” (p. 140), and Ali the trickster “queered” the world by working against the received cultural system when the political and economic powers were still so entrenched as to limit the hope of fundamental social change (p. 81). For insight into how Ali transformed himself from Cassius Clay into “The Greatest,” see Lemert (2003), Remnick (1998), Dennis and Aytea (2003), and Muhammad Ali Center (2005).

5 The literature about sustainability is voluminous. For overviews of the concept and its applicability to city-regions, see Campbell (1996), Portney (2003), and Throgmorton (2003b).

6 The meaning of a statue, event, or action depends on the story, or stories, of which it is a part. Consequently, there is more than one way to interpret this gateway. Houston A. Baker, Jr., a scholar of
African and African-American Studies who also grew up in the west end of Louisville in the 1950s, writes, “‘Gateway’ meant, of course, very different things to very differently situated people. For my older brother and me, it meant we could get out of ‘the South’ and greet freedom simply by crossing the Ohio River” (2001, p. 16). Moreover, “We paragraped ourselves with bravado into Jim-Dandy-to-the-Rescue dapperness of spirit to carry us through white Louisville’s mean downtown streets unimpeded by youthful visions of snaggle-tooth, slow-drawling Blue Men [a fanged and ferocious mythical figure who stalked young black boys in Louisville] biting off our heads” (p. 5).

Notice the way in which this locally-grounded founders’ tale explicitly excludes African-Americans (and the original Native Americans) from the community of tellers and listeners. How would the founders’ story have to change in order to make space for them?

Unlike Birmingham, Alabama, for example. See Connerly (2005).

This allusion to polite racism is consistent with Kevin Gotham’s (2002) study of race and development in the Kansas City region. Rejecting the notion that there are timeless and universal standards for race and racism, Gotham argues, “Racial groups are socially and politically constructed and exist as the outcome of diverse historical practices . . . that are continually subject to challenge over definition and meaning” (p. 13).

This polite racism manifested itself spatially as well as socially. In 1914, Louisville’s elected officials adopted an ordinance prohibiting blacks from moving into predominantly white neighborhoods and whites from moving into black ones. But the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) contested the ordinance, and on November 5, 1917 the U. S. Supreme Court overturned it in Buchan v. Warley on the grounds that it violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution. Soon blacks began migrating further westward. West end whites responded to this continued westward movement by drawing a sharp line at Thirty-fifth Street, primarily by forming neighborhood organizations, drafting a model restrictive covenant, and conducting harassing violence against any blacks who moved in (Wright 1985). As a result, few blacks were able to live west of Thirty-fifth Street until after 1950. Moreover, the name of the street changed from Walnut to Vermont at Thirty-second Street so that whites could distinguish their residences from blacks (Hudson 2004). This effort continued after WWII, although by this time efforts focused on the newly suburbanizing areas outside of Louisville’s formal city limits. For detailed narratives about how certain people tried to block the movement of African-Americans into an all-white suburban neighborhood just outside the southwest edge of Louisville in the mid-1950s, see Braden (1999) and Throgmorton (2004).

The most recent investigations rose out of concerns raised by West Louisvillians—led by the Rev. Louis Coleman and the Justice Resource Center’s Rubbertown Emergency Action program—that the air was making them sick (see Lewis, et al. 2003; Bruggers 2003a and 2003b). In a report produced for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in 1998, Danielle M. Langmann and others concluded, “the Rubbertown industrial area poses an indeterminate public health hazard” (p. 1). Despite the facts that Rubbertown began operations more than 60 years ago, that the Federal Clean Air Act was adopted more than 30 years ago, and that Rubbertown has long been recognized as the most polluted part of the Louisville city-region, Langmann et al. found that “current air data are not available for this area [West Louisville]” (p. 2) and that “insufficient data are available to fully evaluate any causal links [between Rubbertown and adverse health effects]” (p. 4). For a skilled presentation of the past and current status of toxic emissions in Rubbertown, and the health effects potentially associated with them, see Hurst (2002).

Expressed in somewhat more complex terms, one might say that chemical and other contaminants are being injected into the natural environmental system at one point in space in time but are returning through extremely complex natural environmental flows and cycles to harm humans (and other non-human species) at other points or times. Furthermore, “tenticular radiations” and complicated technosystems (e.g., petroleum supply systems) link city-regions to remote places. Consequently, city-regions such as Louisville’s impose “ecological footprints” on remote places and people. (For a discussion of these concepts, see Throgmorton 2003b).

One might say that the official story of planning in Louisville begins in 1891 with Frederick Law Olmsted’s plan for parks and parkways (Kramer 1980 and 1988). A second key moment in the story involves Harland Bartholomew’s preparation of a comprehensive plan in 1929-31 (Bartholomew 1929, City of Louisville 1933), followed by construction of public housing projects in the late-1930s and the 1940s, and Bartholomew’s revision of the comprehensive plan in 1957 (Bartholomew 1957). Urban renewal and interstate highway construction formed important parts of his 1957 plan. Bartholomew’s
practical, scientific vision was entirely physical, but to accomplish his purposes, he thought he only had to persuade the small set of businessmen that mattered to him. Consistent with Louisville’s “polite racism,” his plans completely ignored other audiences, including the city’s African-Americans (see Throgmorton, 2004a and 2005a). Many other Louisville-specific manifestations of modernist planning, both past and present, are documented in Throgmorton (2004b).

In 1971 the federal government ordered Louisville to desegregate its elementary schools, and in its 1975 Newburg Area Council Inc. et al. v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky, ruling the U. S. Supreme Court affirmed a lower court order requiring racial balance in the elementary schools. Racial balance could be accomplished only through countywide busing and the consolidation of the county’s 180 schools under one new district encompassing 130,000 students. The consolidation and busing proved to be enormously controversial. When schools opened in 1975, more than 50 percent of students were absent, and on the second day a riot broke out in Shively and Pleasure Ridge Park, two relatively small cities just outside the southwest edge of Louisville. The riot lasted all weekend and resulted in over 600 arrests and 200 injuries, with the white rioters breaking school windows, vandalizing buses, and attacking police and state troopers. The school district kept its schools open and continued busing with police protection (Kleber 2001, p. 148-149).

At its peak in 1973, just one year before Ali regained his heavyweight title from George Foreman in Zaire, 137,000 workers (about 27 percent of all workers) in the Louisville area were employed by manufacturing firms. Twenty-six years later the share had declined to 18 percent.

For a brilliant evocation of how memory and city-building interact, especially through the concept huzun (Turkish for melancholy) see Orhan Pamuk’s (2005) tragic romance about Istanbul, Turkey.

In Louisville, the New Urbanist approach is best exemplified by Norton Commons (2005), which was designed by Duany Zyberk and Company and is located in the nearly all white and upper middle-class northeast corner of Jefferson County.

By the early 2000s, the number of Latino residents in Jefferson County had risen to at least 13,000 people, and perhaps many more. According to Nord (2003), the Louisville area had become a hotbed for immigrants from Central and South America in search of a better life.

I obtained my initial understanding of planning theory from two courses I took with John Friedmann at UCLA in 1979 and 1980, when he was drafting Planning in the Public Domain (1987). While very influenced by Friedmann, I was also struck by how extensively he had edited conventional physical planning out of his version of planning theory. Consequently, when I first began teaching planning theory in 1986, I consciously tried to reconnect the two.

In contributing to this turn, I was especially influenced by John Forester, Judy Innes, Charles Hoch, Leonie Sandercock, Howie Baum, Seymour Mandelbaum, Stan Stein and Tom Harper, and Patsy Healey. My debt to them is immense.

With a population 62,000, and with a large array of well-preserved or beautifully-restored old buildings, Weimar offers a beguiling and eminently walkable city. When one wanders through its streets, one finds a remarkably dense repository of German culture and history. Proclaimed European Capital of Culture for 1999, Weimar has been the home of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Johann Sebastian Bach, Franz Liszt, Friedrich Schiller, Duchess Anna Amalia, and Richard Strauss. It was the birthplace of the Bauhaus Movement in modernist architecture and the place in which Friedrich Nietzsche died. It is the city in which the Weimar Constitution was adopted in 1919 and the place where the Nazis first gained power in 1933. Just six or so miles northwest of Weimar stands Buchenwald, a Nazi concentration camp in which roughly 33,000 people were killed. Standing between the prisoner’s kitchen and the laundry at Buchenwald was an old oak tree that was known as “Goethe’s Oak” because Goethe supposedly sat beneath that tree in the company of his educated and enlightened friends. Is Weimar Goethe’s enlightened city, Hitler’s chamber of horrors, or some complex combination of the two (and more)? Who should decide? The content of a story depends on its purpose, and the meaning of the story depends on its context.

For a fascinating set of articles about efforts to transform Birmingham, England, into a “creative city,” especially with regard to the role of Raymond Mason’s sculpture Forward in figurally representing that transformation, see Kennedy (2004).

Richard Florida (2002) has been particularly successful in selling this story to receptive audiences. For an insightful discussion of the ways in which this narrative entails the marketing and branding of city-regions,
see Jensen (2005). And yet this effort to emphasize the economic potential of local cultural attributes often has ironic consequences: driven by the desire to attract investment, cities tend to become more and more like one another. Consequently, it often seems that efforts to enhance the quality of specific city-regions are overwhelmed by the “Las Vegasization of the world.” Or maybe “Los Angelesization” is a more apt “superlative.” For a discussion of what is at stake in the difference, see Brenner (2003).

24 And to attract tourists, lots of them. This, of course, opens up yet another narrative line: the tourists’ gaze. For a fascinating interpretation of the difference between the their gaze and the perspective of oldtimers who grieve over the loss of a valued past, see Pamuk (2005).

25 According to Logan and Molotch (1996), place-based elites (property investors, land developers, real estate financiers, and others) stand to “make great fortunes out of place” (p. 293). For them, the city is a marketable commodity and a “growth machine.”

26 In the early 1980s, just a few years after Muhammad Ali lost his crown to Leonard Spinks, United Parcel Service chose Louisville as its international hub, and by 2000 it was employing 16,000 people and had become the largest private employer in the metropolitan area. Insurance and health care services have also prospered. Humana, a health services firm, employed around 4,500 people as of 1998. The beverage and food service industries grew as well, with Louisville becoming the headquarters of such firms as Brown-Forman, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and Papa John’s Pizza. The Kentucky Fair and Exposition Center on the south side of the city became a major player in the “hospitality” industry. And a new 2,000-acre industrial park (Riverport) has been established on the far southwestern side of the county.

27 For detail about the growth machine’s efforts in the Louisville city-region, see Greater Louisville (2002), Brookings Institution (2002), and Throgmorton (2004b).

28 Approximately 21 percent of the region’s people live across the Ohio River in four counties of the State of Indiana (Brookings Institution 2002).

29 These changes and claims notwithstanding, many of the city-region’s residents still expect Louisville’s African-Americans to know “their place.” In part, “their place” is spatial: the west end. In 2000, almost 19 percent of the merged city’s residents were black, whereas only 3.5 percent of the surrounding counties’ were. As sociologist Charles Lemert writes, “What strikes one so about Louisville today, is that in 2001, some 40 years after he [Ali] made the city world famous,…Louisville today is as segregated as any border city can be so long after the rules changed. The West is black. The East is white” (2003, p. 7). (See also Cummings and Price, 1997.) But in part “their place” is also narrational: being on the margins of planning’s continually evolving “official story” (see Sandercock 1998).

30 In response to the events of September 11, 2001, President Bush and his associates have tried to promulgate a new narrative that constructs the world in terms of a conflict between “Our Nation” and “terrorists of global reach,” between “freedom-loving people” and “terrorists.” By dividing the world into polar opposites, this new narrative excludes or marginalizes alternative narratives. Moreover, to the degree that this narrative successfully dominates public discourse and action, it will provide the primary context for planning in U. S. city-regions, just as the Cold War narrative provided the primary context for Bartholomew’s planning in the mid-1950s. Consequently U. S. planners would find themselves expected to act as agents of the American Empire, enacting the Empire’s story at the frontier between civilization and Barbaria, wherever that frontier might be. See Throgmorton (2004a) and (2005b) and Graham (2005).

31 I am not suggesting that sophisticated technical analysis is not required. And I am not saying that any one of the stories is truer than the others. They are all told for a purpose, whether true or not, and each story excludes much that is important. But I am suggesting that to treat sustainability as only a matter of getting the facts right is to condemn it to political irrelevance, and to treat other people’s stories as a bundle of lies is to deny the interpretive complexity of the world in which we live.

32 In 2000, 80,970 people lived in West Louisville’s neighborhoods. Of that total, 77.1 percent were black. The unemployment rate was 9.5 percent, as compared to 3.5 percent for the rest of the Louisville region. Whereas the median household income was $19,031 for West Louisville, it was $40,886 for the rest of the region. An estimated 42.3 percent of West Louisville’s population lived below the official poverty line, as compared to 14.3 percent for the rest of the region. (See Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and the City of Louisville, 2001)

33 Intending to reduce miles driven and travel times in the Louisville city-region, the States of Indiana and Kentucky are planning to reconstruct the major intersection of three interstate highways just east of downtown. This “two bridges” project will also add a new one-way bridge just east of the existing downtown (I-65) bridge and require construction of another bridge farther upstream. This second bridge
will enable interstate truck traffic to bypass the downtown, while also opening up large amounts of land in southern Indiana to new residential and commercial development. This project, which is projected to cost $1.4 billion and take ten years to complete, forms an important part of the city-region’s overall Regional Mobility Plan for the urbanized area. While sophisticated technical analysis is clearly necessary for regional transportation planning, this very technical and highly bureaucratized effort to plan the transformation of the region’s transportation system translated the African-Americans’ story into political interests and technical terms such as origin/destination, modal choice, and vehicle trips per day. Because their voice is so weak relative to that of economic development interests and middle class exurbanites, Louisville’s African-American population finds itself not well served by the city-region’s transportation planning process. For details, see the Ohio River Bridges Project (2004) and Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (1999). For insight into the views of those who oppose the downtown bridge, see 8664.org (2006).

34 I want to thank several Louisvillians who graciously met with a group of students and me on a field trip in October, 2002. Thanks go especially to former mayor David L. Armstrong, William Summers IV and Eileen Pickett of Greater Louisville Inc., Charles Cash of the Louisville Development Authority, Clark Bledsoe (former chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission), Dr. Tom Owen (associate archivist at the University of Louisville), David Tomes of Triad Development Co., and Susan Rademacher of the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy. I also want to acknowledge my debt to students who conducted research projects focused on Louisville as part of graduate-level courses I taught in 2002 and 2003. Thanks also go to participants in the “City Futures” international conference on globalism and urban change conducted in Chicago in July 2004; to participants in the International Urban Planning and Environmental Association Symposium conducted in Louisville, Kentucky, in September 2004; to participants at the special Seymour Mandelbaum symposium conducted at the 45th annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning in Portland, Oregon, on October 21-24, 2004; to Cary Stemle, editor of the leading alternative newspaper in Louisville: LEO; and to Ole Jensen, Bent Flyvbjerg, and other participants in a “Narratives of Power” thematic workshop conducted at Aalborg University, Denmark on March 27-29, 2006.

35 Note how this conventional approach assumes that “the problem” can be clearly specified and neatly compartmentalized into a well-bounded functional area.

36 This is well-documented in the literature. For two good analyses of it, see Lofland (1998) and Frug (1999).

37 A specific example comes from Kentucky, where a resident, Paul E. Sloane Sr. (2001), condemns the Governor of the state for restricting Sloane’s freedom by trying to impose a “Smart Growth” policy upon people like him: “If the American people haven’t seen how far the Democratic Party has turned to the left politically,” Sloane writes, “this smart-growth policy should be a sure sign. This policy, if implemented in Kentucky, will eventually tell me that I can’t live in the suburbs on one to five acres on a golf course, but have to live where the state government has assigned in its smart-growth policy.…We don’t need this Governor telling landowners in Kentucky to whom they must sell their properties, or be penalized. President Ronald Reagan defeated communism, and we don’t want it creeping back in this country through these Democratic liberals.” One might think of Mr. Sloane’s condemnation as being part of a related story: Big Government and Planning Are the Problem.

38 The November 2005 issue of Planning Theory contains a series of articles about the “institutional turn” in planning and the social sciences. As Patsy Healey (2005, p. 304) puts it, this turn emphasizes that “any planning effort is situated in a particular institutional context, evolved through a particular history and geography, which creates specific ‘affordances’…through which new histories and geographies are in continual construction.”

39 For discussion of factors that influence the extent to which stakeholders can exert negotiating power, see Innes (2004).