

Making Territory in Urban America:

New Urbanism and Kentlands

Bengt Andersen – Universitetet i Oslo

Introduction

I am going to discuss the construction of territoriality in the so-called post-modern USA with some additional references to São Paulo, Brazil.¹ Specifically, I want to look into how some Americans try to make a place for themselves in an urban and suburban environment (cf. Lang 1997:6).

Even if people live in a more or less globalized world where the inhabitants can be described as “inter-cultural hybrids” and even though not all of us feel a strong belonging to our place of residence,² I will argue that the Kentlands material and other studies support the notion that the struggle for territory is not yet over. This does not imply, however, that people everywhere are physically fighting over land but that many of us make our own domains or rather define our own places (cf. Andersen & Sommerfelt 2000a and 2000b). And this is not to say that “spatialization” only concerns residential localities or that it only pertains to the private realm. For Setha M. Low the term *spatialize* means “...to locate, both physically and conceptually, social relations and social practice in social space” (Low 1999 [1996]: 111), and she effectively shows how different groups or categories of people in Costa Rica territorialize plazas, that is, *public spaces* (Low 2000).³

When applying the term *territoriality*, I am using it in a somewhat ambiguous way to refer to “...cultural mechanisms to define or defend territory [but also] to observed behaviour indicating a preference for remaining within a given territory” (Barnard & Spencer 1998 [1996]: 625). Territory can be understood as nothing more than a specific geographical locality. Its more or less defined boundaries can be physical and/or symbolical (cf. Cohen 1998 [1985]).

New Urbanism and one of its Suburban Developments

Kentlands

It is important to stress from the outset of this chapter that the United States of today is largely

...a society of metropolitan areas. These areas consist of central cities surrounded by suburban zones that now include not only sprawling residential suburbs and older small towns, but a growing number of full-scale suburban cities as well (Kleinberg 1995:xiii).⁴

I have done my own fieldwork in a residential development called Kentlands. As of November 2000, the number of residents is somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000. Kentlands is a subdivision located in the city of Gaithersburg, in Montgomery county, Maryland. Gaithersburg is situated about 18 miles northwest of Washington DC. Most of the residents do not confine themselves to Kentlands. They work, do their shopping, visit the theaters etc. in the greater DC metropolitan area.

The largely white population of Kentlands all belong to the middle- or the upper middleclass. This is not just a researcher's reading of Kentlands. Kentlands residents interpret the area the same way; that is, they see their region as divided into class-based portions (of course seldom using such terms). Bethesda, an unincorporated area south in the county, is clearly seen as even more affluent than Kentlands, and the Orchards, a neighboring subdivision to Kentlands, is seen as a lower-income neighborhood. Compared to most of the adjacent neighborhoods, the property values in Kentlands are much higher (cf. Eppli & Tu 1999).

When looking at income level and education attainment the average for Kentlanders are in both cases substantial higher than the local (city), regional and national numbers. And if we look into the "racial" aspect, we find that Kentlands is different, and maybe even deviant, in this respect too. Kentlands is really very homogenous when speaking about both class and race. Joon Kim's study of 1998 found that "...90.1 percent of the residents are White/Caucasian" (Kim 1999:2).⁵ (In addition to Kim's study, Mlaker's study (199?) offers additional quantitative data).⁶

When considering the aforementioned demographics, Kentlands is not Gaithersburg "writ small" (Geertz 1993 [1973]: 21) nor a simple reflection of the even greater society.

Another thing I want to stress is that many of the major differences between Kentlands and surrounding subdivisions are not only economical or ethnic, they are esthetic. Kentlands is not a typical subdivision – it is the first

residential community developed according to the principles of *New Urbanism*. What this means in practice is that Kentlands also *look*, and for some Kentlanders, *feel*, different. The Kentlands' "ethos", as Bateson or Geertz perhaps would say it, is unique when compared to the surrounding subdivisions due to diametrically opposed design principles.⁷

New Urbanism

In the 1970's with "[t]he advent of the postmodernism..." some architects and planners laid down the foundation for an American movement which today is nominally known as *New Urbanism* (Crawford 1999:56).⁸ This movement consists of people who are dissatisfied with where urban America is headed. What they are concerned with is that USA is more suburban than urban – and they see that as a serious problem.⁹

The New Urbanists aver that American cities and its suburbs are no longer real urban places, that is, the physical design of these places has led to the destruction of social bonds between urbanites, or rather, between suburbanites. In short, the physical deterioration of the places has resulted in a loss of *local* social communities. Instead of close-knitted neighborhoods in American cities and towns, Americans are now isolated and alienated individuals living in ugly spaces that are not *real* places. Many of today's social ills are, according to the New Urbanists, the direct result of post-war suburban development.

Peter Katz asserts that suburbia "...fragmented our society – separating us from friends and relatives and breaking down the bonds of community that has served our nation so well in earlier times" (Katz 1994:ix). Individuals are now "isolated together" in "pseudo-communities" (Debord 1997 [1967] : 122).¹⁰

The New Urbanists claim that the residential patterns are society's physical foundation. But as society itself, they are getting more and more fragmented. Patterns of development and local zoning laws segregate age groups, income groups, ethnic groups and different family types. Some consequences are that people and activities are isolated in ugly and polluted "car-scaled communities" rather than gathered together in heterogeneous and "human-scaled communities".

People are not just isolated within the suburbs from the rest of the society. Each and every family or household is isolated in their private residence from their neighbors. This is caused by the very physical design of these suburbs. A suburb's infrastructure is in reality restraining the social life of its own inhabitants. In suburbia you are not supposed to walk around, you are supposed to drive. You need your car wherever you go and for whatever you need. The outdoors is therefore designed for the car, not for the

pedestrian. One of the axiomatic truths held by the new urbanists is that for a community to develop, people must meet each other spontaneously in their own neighborhood time after time. By hindering people from walking around in the neighborhood, one also makes it more difficult for people to meet each other and thereby from forming relationships. The result being that the seeds needed for an authentic community will not be planted. When people choose suburbia as a way of living they also separate themselves from family and friends whom they used to live with in a so-called true community. One has not been able to replace those relationships. In today's America the "bonds of the community" have simply just disappeared.

The New Urbanists do not want Americans to get rid of their cars. They do, however, criticize suburbia for making Americans so car-dependent. The commute, which is so prominent in a typical suburban environment as walking to work is impossible and public transportation a rarity, contribute to worsen people's quality of life. Americans are now living what Lewis Mumford once called "encapsulated lives".

An adult will therefore spend her day something like this: She will wake up in the morning in her house, walk from the kitchen directly into the garage when ready to go to work. Maybe she will bring the kids to preschool, kindergarten and/or school on her way, too. Then she will spend most of the daytime busy at work, in the late afternoon or evening she will stop by the grocery store, then drive home carrying the groceries from the car in the garage into the kitchen (the garage door opens electronically from the car). After that it can be time to drive the kids to some organized activities or picking them up somewhere. If one can afford it, a nanny, babysitter or an au pair can help with some of these tasks. One should not forget making and eating dinner and helping kids with homework. We should not overlook watching TV before going to sleep.¹¹ A majority of the individual's time is spent "encapsulated" within her private car or house – she is never really talking to people in her community.¹²

Americans are therefore *not* interacting with their neighbors – an interaction that is, as I have pointed out, crucial for establishing a true community. There is no way of getting around without driving. In post-war America the public realm is neglected at the expense of the private realm.

From the Etic Point of View

The suburbanization of America is a centrifugal process where the middle-class and their institutions move out of the central cities and into suburbia. Only the poor are left behind in the central cities.¹³ Many people may work downtown but they drive home to suburbia when the workday is over. And what they come home to are homogenous residential subdivisions where

the neighbors next door are strangers. According to Peter Katz, the results are a "...creeping deterioration of once proud neighborhoods, an increasing alienation of large segments of society and a constant rising crime rate..." (Katz 1994:ix).

The anthropologist Karen Michaelson once said, "...Americans have always dealt with the alienation of the greater society by creating smaller communities based upon difference" (quoted in Hakken 1999:103). Americans, as well as others, seek people that are like themselves in some manner and then define themselves as a social community in opposition to those who are seen as different. Michaelson goes on and says:

Shared ethnic identity, the Crips and the Bloods, the mega-churches, are ways of defining a like-minded community and a sense of group identity lacking in the sheer physical proximity of neighborhood and town (ibid.).

Kentlands on the other hand, can be seen as a place where suburbanites try to establish a community that is localized—we can here rightly talk about a process of spatialization. It is, or strives to be, a like-minded community where the residents have a sense of group identity lacking in the modern suburb. Many of the Kentlanders that are active in the local community are very preoccupied with making their neighbors conform to the norms of the community. You must have the right kind of picket fence at the right place, you cannot have plastic flamingos in your front yard, and Christmas-lights decorating your house should not be multicolored. If everybody would do as they pleased, the end result would be chaos or anarchy. Just look to the typical suburbs, they even have trailers parked in their front yard!¹⁴

The Past in the Present

Above I described the New Urbanists' diagnosis of urban America. The cure they prescribe is as follows: Americans need to look to the past to find healthy solutions for the individual and the greater society in the present.¹⁵

To cure the social ills of today's America, Urban America must be cured, and the remedy is New Urbanism: Getting the old ideas and thereby true communities back to life. Communities need to be constructed the right way; that is to say, there must be no cul-de-sacs or dead ends; instead streets must be narrow and laid in a grid-system, there must be no cookie-cutter houses but many different ones. Each neighborhood must also have several housing types so as to accommodate different age- and income groups. Pedestrians must be as welcomed as the drivers and their cars. There should also be plenty of public spaces that people can enjoy.

We used to have good communities, the New Urbanists claim, and we can get them again by just following these design principles. If we do this we can get rid of people's frustration and give them back *a sense of place*, which is lost in today's developmental haze and in a society that is too car-crazed.

The Importance of Territoriality and the Construction of Community

What the New Urbanists want to do then is to *rebuild* what they conceive as real places that people care about. That is, we need to resurrect the authentic American community. Kentlands is a manifestation of these ideas. According to Andres Duany, one of the most prominent New Urbanists, Kentlands is the best example of what New Urbanism is all about: Creating localized local communities in a nation with a highly mobile middle class, that is, constructing real urban towns. What the New Urbanists want is for people to be territorialized. If human beings do not belong to a true local community, that is, a social fellowship in specific physical locale, they will not live good lives – it's as simple as that. The suburban sprawl or the evolution of the modern metropolis, has resulted in "...a profound sense of frustration and placelessness" (Calthorpe 1994:xii). Where people reside, work, go to school, etc. is not confined to a small, clearly defined community. They spend their waking hours all over a larger region, for example the Washington, DC metropolitan area. People are therefore unable to create the necessary neighborhood community. They do not spend enough time in their neighborhood, and the time they *do* spend there is not spent outside socializing with neighbors but inside their house or in their car driving through the neighborhood on their way to somewhere else.

The average American moves every six years. This might make it difficult to establish local social relationships inasmuch as you or your neighbors will soon be moving out of the neighborhood. The New Urbanists say that one of the reasons people have to leave their subdivision is that these developments do not offer several housing types to satisfy the varying demands as the constituency of the household changes. When two become three or four, more room is needed. So you move out of a community with apartments, to one with large detached single-family homes. In Kentlands, many different housing types are represented so as to slow down or even put an end to the fact that people keep moving out of their community. And they have in some respects succeeded in this. People in Kentlands often move within the community, thus making it easier, at least from the emic point of view, to "build a social community" based upon common territory.

Some social scientists may be correct when they say that locality is less

and less important, that in order to understand people, we cannot focus predominantly on tribes, villages, neighborhoods or other imagined territorial communities. Relationships are *not* spatially limited. Unbounded networks are the order of the day – people constantly create new, non-local groups. But based on my own study I think it is premature, at least, to do away with the term and idea of “community” and the idea of common territory giving rise to a social fellowship. I am here thinking of what James Clifford once said:

It is now widely understood (...) that the old localizing strategies – by bounded community, by organic culture, by region, by center and periphery – may obscure as much as they reveal. Separate places become effectively a single community through the continuous circulation of people, money, goods and information (Clifford quoted in Mintz 1998:118).

People do move, and so have all of the Kentlanders. But the people I met – at least some of them, want, and have succeeded in creating “community”, a place that is home, that is theirs, that they belong to, that they live in, that they *enjoy* living in, and that they identify with. These people identify themselves as Kentlanders – a major part of their self-identity is related to Kentlands as a community – some even have the Kentlands’ flag hanging proudly in front of their house.

They live in Kentlands, a place they see as *one community*, both in the social sense and as a specific territory. As long as “community” is important for the people we study, and especially when studying people who have constructed an ideology where “community” is *the* key-concept, how can we then disregard it? Is it not at least good to think with? The boundaries are symbolic as Anthony Cohen and many others have pointed out, but they are no less important to study for that matter (cf. Cohen 1998). For many Kentlanders the material or physical boundaries are congruent with the symbolic ones.

Kentlands people do speak of several communities inside Kentlands and they do belong to non-localized communities. At the same time, they see Kentlands as *one* community when the surrounding neighborhoods come into question, or when “outsiders” threatens their idea of what Kentlands should be. It is similar to what Evans-Pritchard termed *segmentary organization or segmentary opposition*. They might belong to specific factions in Kentlands but they can come together, or see themselves, as *one group* if the situation calls for it. I will just mention one example. People in Kentlands who are active in Kentlands politics can be divided into factions in the day to day running of the Community Association. The factions are so separated

that some people feel a hostility when meeting their neighbors; “This is the worse place I’ve ever lived” the wife of one of the candidates said when talking about how many of her neighbors belonging to other factions treated her. But all of the residents stood together when they faced the threat of Wal-Mart opening up a big box-store in Kentlands – “the whole community fought”, one Kentlander said. “Why can’t we be like that all the time?” he asked me.

In LA and São Paulo too: How Architecture and Urban Planning Can Help People Establish Territories

If Kentlands was the only example of urban or suburban territorialization process, it could be seen as an anomaly. But it is not. Kentlands is part of a much larger trend, not just in the USA but also internationally. New Urbanism is “catching on” in countries outside of the States too. The architects who designed Kentlands have just returned from a trip to Mostar, Bosnia where they have designed a neighborhood that was destroyed in the war.¹⁶ In the US one can also see other examples of what may be called a revitalization of the importance of territoriality. Or to be more specific: the importance of having one’s own territory where the “others” are kept out.

Revitalization may not be the right word unless you agree with those I choose to call the “intra-textualist postmodernists” within anthropology (cf. Barnard 2000:169f; Rabinow 1986:242f; and Kuper 1999:210ff.). Spatial segregation has always been there – it is doubtful if it ever left the scene. It has a long and continual history in American (and other) cities and towns – just remember Middletown (Lynd & Lynd 19?? [1929]; 19?? [1937]¹⁷ and Caplow et al. 1982). It is also a fact that people all over the world often live where they do because of the category they are seen as belonging to – be it social, ethnic, economical or other such criteria that determine how you are being categorized. Conversely, they may be classified according to where they reside.

Many American cities or regions continue to be divided along race or class lines just as Tom Wolfe depicts Atlanta, Georgia in his novel *A Man in Full* (Wolfe 1998). In DC, Blaine Harden writes as Ulf Hannerz did thirty years before her, the whites dominate the suburbs and African Americans dominate the inner city (Harden 1995).

In 1997, Blakely and Snyder informed us that an estimated 8 million Americans live in gated communities (Blakely & Snyder 1997). These communities are closed-off places or territories where only residents and pre-approved visitors are welcomed. Gated communities used to be for the super-rich. Today even the middle-class is taking refuge in communities controlled by private security forces, high walls and gates. And as every-

one who has read Mike Davis, visited Los Angeles or many other American cities will know, the struggle for territoriality in the larger cities is intensifying.

Davis has written about the fortification of an entire city and the militarization of public space. In Los Angeles, certain categories of people, namely African-Americans and Hispanics, are physically and financially inhibited from leaving their communities and especially from entering the middle- and upper class neighborhoods (Davis 1990 and 1997 [1990]). LA is a *field* in Pierre Bourdieu's sense of the term. It "...is a social arena within which struggles or manoeuvres take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them" (Jenkins 1999 [1992]: 84). When the minorities or the poor, that is, *the Other*, do "get out", of course only momentarily, the city's buildings and physical structures are designed so as to prevent any wrongdoings as defined or understood by the governing classes. In addition you have private security forces and a more and more militarized or technology fixated police force illustrated by the SWAT-teams that constantly monitor people's actions, interactions and movements.

In LA they are using architecture to protect the social boundaries.¹⁸ It has gone so far that many urban residents in the USA live in what can perfectly well be termed "fortress cities" where security and safety have first priority. As mentioned earlier many cities are divided into "gated communities" or "fortified cells" of prosperity and "places of fear", like the ghettos and barrios. The middle- and the upper classes demand social and spatial isolation, Davis writes, and they can choose where to live whereas the poor are trapped in the ghetto. As long as affluent people mark or maybe, make their territory, they also ascribe territory to the Other, that is, elsewhere.

In LA it is even difficult for pedestrians to walk from Broadway and Spring Street to the new Bunker Hill. Broadway is where the immigrants shop and take a walk and Bunker Hill is the new financial center where the middle and upper classes can walk "safely". The urban space is now ethnically and economically homogenous. The diversity LA had in the 1940's is gone. Segregation is a reality. It is also so in Gaithersburg, the city Kentlands belongs to. Even though we cannot equate LA and Gaithersburg when speaking of explicit and intentional segregation, the *de facto* result is much the same: different places for "different" people. The Other do not share your space. Even if sidewalks and other facilities in Kentlands are open to "outsiders", not many minorities and no poor street nomads can be observed there. A Kentlander defined the segregation that prevails in the community upon seeing people with different skin-color coming to Kentlands on Halloween to go trick or treating, "You can see who doesn't belong here".

Davis alleges that the militarization he is describing has led to the disap-

pearance of every real democratic urban space. As William Whyte writes about New York City, more and more space is now owned by private interests who do not want the public, at least some segments of the public, to use or occupy these urban spaces. The city space and its furniture are designed so as to hinder people from being there (Whyte 1988). On some of the sidewalks in Manhattan there are signs that mark off private property. The civic authorities do not spend money on public spaces anymore. The same is true for suburbia. Subdivisions are often meant for the residents and not for others. Maybe this is natural since most of them are purely residential areas, but Kentlands can also be seen as exclusive although there are places where everybody is free to take a walk and so on. But just as large parts of many cities are private or semi-public, you will find in Kentlands signs informing you that you need to be a resident, or rather, a member of the citizens association, to use the park and playground outside of the clubhouse.

The street furniture, or the possibility to sit or lay down, tells you a great deal on how welcome as a pedestrian you really are. Walking around as a non-resident in a typical suburb can make you feel “matter out of place” and there are no places to sit – just like the poor areas of LA. While Kentlands has a lot of park benches, just like the rich LA, you know where you do not belong – signs tell you, if the residents do not.

But Kentlands is walkable and people do take advantage of that. This is not the case for all suburbs. When I walked around in other suburbs in Gaithersburg, there is no denying that it felt awkward. People would ask me what I was doing, I was almost the only person walking, and I often had a hard time figuring out how to “get out”. These suburbs are constructed in such ways that it is difficult to orient yourself in them if you do not belong. Every house and street is the same and cul-de-sacs are omnipresent.

The subdivision phenomenon is creating a divided city, rather than a compact and integrated city. Every subdivision has its own name, it is physically delimited, and you better get there by car since they are small “islands” connected to each other through a massive road system.

Davis claims that what he observes in LA is a national trend. Large cities all over the US apply a formula that combines sprawl, social homogeneity and a feeling of security. But we find it in other countries too.

Teresa Caldeira said that “[i]n the last few decades, the proliferation of fortified enclaves has created a new model of spatial segregation and transformed the quality of public life in many cities around the world” (Caldeira 1999:83). She is studying São Paulo, Brazil. We can also witness the same phenomenon appearing here in Scandinavia, for example, Aker Brygge in Oslo.

But I will remain focused on the Americas. The fortified enclaves in São

Paulo have the following characteristics: “...high walls and fences, armed guards and technologies of surveillance...” (ibid.). Such defenses indicate that some people are being kept out and others are being locked in – because of a fear of the “Others”. The effect is spatial segregation. Caldeira says that this spatial segregation, or may I say, *territorialization*, has

...transformed the quality of public life in [these] cities (...). Fortified enclaves are privatized, enclosed, and monitored spaces for residence, consumption, leisure, and work. The fear of violence is one of their main justifications. They appeal to those who are abandoning the traditional public sphere of the streets to the poor, the ‘marginal’ and the homeless. In cities fragmented by fortified enclaves, it is difficult to maintain the principles of openness and free circulation that have been among the most significant organizing values of modern cities (ibid.).

Territory is indeed important. Perhaps the establishment of local communities is an epiphenomenon – that common locality is not people’s main concern but an unintended by-product of the strategies the middle and upper classes choose to get away from the “Others”. What is of particular interest, however, is that the *result* is a process of territorialization. In Kentlands, common territory is one of the basic values – at least ideally. A real community cannot exist without common locality. It should be added though, that I am becoming more and more convinced after examining my empirical material that property value is, even if not more, then certainly not any less, important than “community” (the importance of property value is explicitly acknowledged in chapter 1 of The Kentlands Citizens Assembly Members Handbook).¹⁹ True community, what ever that may be, is nice, but not at the expense of the value of my house. Tom, a Kentlander, illustrated this when I asked him:

When you talk to neighbors and friends, do you ever discuss the lack of ethnic heterogeneity, and do you think people would like it if Kentlands was more ethnically diverse?

Oh yeah, Tom said, I think *my* friends would like there to be more mixture. I don’t know how typical or representative they are. The original store that was planned for Kentlands, that was promised, was a Nordstrom, which is an expensive department store. And when that was changed to a KMart there was a public meeting when all the people who had contracts came and protested that we were gonna have a KMart instead of a Nordstrom. They said things like; “I go to KMart, I know what kind of people that go

to KMart you don't want those kind of people in your neighborhood!"

But! The point is; I think there is probably a minority that's very interested in economic integration and a majority would rather have the highest possible property values which they think they would get by not having apartments mixed in with the houses and not having too many poor people. Not having that much of an economic and that much of a racial mix.

Concluding Remarks

The process of de facto spatial segregation that exists in Kentlands, may be a direct consequence of social inequality, as it is in Los Angeles and São Paulo. People want to live in a safe environment and they do not want their community to be too socially or economically stratified since this will, as they see it, only decrease their property value. But again, the *result*, the making of Kentlands and the social processes taking place within it, is the creation of a place seen as distinct and separated. Of uttermost importance to many in Kentlands is the fact that they live there and not anywhere else. Kentlands is the place to be – “this is the first place we feel at home”.

When speaking of Kentlands then, the prevalence of place becomes obvious. A lot of Kentlanders really care about their community – just like Setha Low observed that people care for places they hold dear (Low 2000). For some Kentlands is constantly on their mind, for others it is more a question of context. As Mike Davis, Caldeira, many others, and myself have noticed, (sub)urbanites demarcate their space. It might be a process of social spatialization in Low's sense of the term, but it sure is a process of social territorialization. Kentlands consists of five neighborhoods, “...each bound together by ‘the feeling of pride and unity and a sense of the ‘territoriality’ of its inhabitants” (Gupta describing Calcutta, quoted in Archer 2000:50n2). But the social networks in Kentlands are of course not restricted to the neighborhoods or to Kentlands itself, and there is no evidence to support the proposition that everybody in Kentlands is bounded together. This does not, however, invalidate the statement that several individuals in Kentlands are bound together and that they on certain occasions see themselves as one. They will fight for their domain. It is dubious if some people would be so preoccupied with Kentlands affairs if they had no attachment to Kentlands or if they did not have Kentlands on their mind. Any statement arguing that people are placeless, that urban people are not localized, or that “postmodern” people are deterritorialized, needs to be modified.

In the sprawling American socio-material field one can clearly see, as the

Norwegian sociologist Dag Østerberg might have put it, the imprint of the differences and oppositions between the classes. American space is divided into class-based portions. Its subdivisions and cities are segregated. But not just there, cities all over the world have been, and are made up of spheres belonging to different classes or social defined categories of people.²⁰

So then: people may travel and visit other places and have non-localized communities, but when they go home, many of them go back to “their place” – a place that is not for everyone, a place that is sealed off, in short, a territory.²¹

Notes

¹This article is a slightly edited version of a paper presented at the “People on the Move and the Territoriality of Nations” seminar held in Oslo November 24-25, 2000. I thank the organizers for giving me the opportunity to present this paper and all the participants for valuable comments. I would also like to thank all the people that has read earlier versions of it and given me valuable comments. These include Øivind Fuglerud and Jonas Lea. I would especially like to express my gratitude to Nina Hellerud, Line Opjordsmoen, Erin Sobkowski and Sondre Sommerfelt who all contributed to the improvement of the text. I am of course solely responsible for the final content presented herein. A last thing that I need to note is that this text is written while my analysis of the empirical material is still in a preliminary phase. This means that there can be discrepancies as regards the statements I make in this text and the conclusions I will draw in the “final” thesis.

²E.g. Appadurai 1998 [1996]; Barnard & Spencer 1998 [1996]: 599; Clifford 1997; Eriksen & Hemer (eds.) 1999; Hannerz 1998 [1996].

³William Whyte’s study of public places in New York offers some interesting parallels from USA and as Low does, he shows how some categories such as street vendors are not always welcome (Whyte 1988).

⁴For further information on the metropolitan USA and the strong centrifugal trends the US has witnessed, cf. e.g. Fishman 1987; Hall 1998 [1996] and 1996 [1992]; Garreau 1992; Gottdiener 1977; Palen 1981 [1975] and 1995; Rabinowitz & Beimborn, 1991; Sies & Silver 1996; Soja 2000; Tabb & Sawers 1984; Teaford 1979 and 1986. See also my forthcoming thesis that will discuss the postwar urban development with a particular emphasis on the new urbanism, a movement that describes itself as reaction to the kind of planning described and analyzed in the above-mentioned books.

⁵There might be some problems here. Many social scientists have pointed out that some categories, like minorities, for different reasons are more hesitant to participate in surveys etc. But after having lived in Kentlands the impression I have, as well as the impressions Kentlanders themselves have, all point to the same “fact”: Kentlands is mostly populated by affluent Caucasians people, also relatively speaking. This in contrast to one of the core ideas behind Kentlands: making a community with a diverse population.

⁶The actual date Glenn Mlaker carried out his research has been impossible to determine exactly. But it was probably just before Joon Kim’s study which he started in April 1999. Since both Mlaker and Kim had recently collected demographic and other quantitative data, it was not necessary to do so for me and I could thus concentrate more on a qualitative study of (the) “community” the main topic of my thesis.

⁷This is not to say that I share this emic view.

⁸The following is based on interviews and conversations with new urbanists, but also Kentlands’ own newspaper, *The Town Crier*; in addition to *The Town Paper*; *New Urban News*, a lot of documents, articles (cf. e.g. ULI 1999) and material (including videotapes) collected in the field, different web sites (e.g. dpz.com; kentlandsusa.com; kentlands.org), and books (e.g. Duany et al. 2000; Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company 1999; Katz 1994; Krieger 1991; Kunstler 1998 [1996] and 1993; Langdon 1994).

⁹But see Calthorpe 1994 (p.xi).

¹⁰I am not “accusing” Debord for being a new urbanist, but parts of his critique of modern society has some parallels with new urbanism’s critical assessments of urban USA.

¹¹As James Gleick notes, “everything” in the modern world seems to accelerate and Americans use less and less time on each task. The few exceptions are commuting (which is not only getting longer but also relatively slower) and watching TV (Gleick 1999).

¹²This example, which is constructed on the basis of the New Urbanist literature and my own experiences in the “field” can be found in almost identical form in Østerberg 1998 (p.37). The reader should be aware of the interesting fact that I had not read Østerberg prior to constructing this illustration. The reader can therefore ask herself the following: Is it fair to conclude that since the observations of the New Urbanists of USA

in general, Østerberg of Oslo and my own of Kentlands and Gaithersburg seem to be congruent, it must be something to this description of “sprawl”?

¹³I will not list the endless non-urbanist authors who have written about the “white flight”. But I will point out that even though he studied a ghetto community in DC, Ulf Hannerz’ study also mentions the fact that the “whites” have moved out to the suburbs even if they are still working, getting entertained and educated in this very city (Hannerz 1969).

¹⁴This is not to say that there are no conflicts in Kentlands, because there are. But this is not the place to discuss that fact.

¹⁵This text would be too extensive should I analyze the new urbanists’ preoccupation with the past. I did that to some degree in a pre-fieldwork essay. See also Harvey 2000.

¹⁶If Herbert Muschamp, an architecture critic for the New York Times, is to be believed, “The Congress for the New Urbanism is the most important phenomenon to emerge in American architecture in the post-Cold War era” (quoted in Bohl 1998). If one is going to talk numerically, it can be mentioned that an article in Time (August 16, 1999) referred to the new urbanist journal New Urban News and said that investments in neo-traditional neighborhoods “...has nearly doubled, from \$1.2 billion in 1997 to \$2.1 billion last year” (Padgett 1999). And according to New Urban News in its October/November 2000 issue, more than 300 new urbanist projects 15 acres or larger are being planned, under construction, or already built in 36 states (von Platen 2000:1 and 5). A report made by New Urban News lists almost thirty projects in Canada and other projects in Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Scotland and Turkey (Halloran 2000). And *New Urban News* writes in their January/February 2001 issue that “...about 20 new urbanist communities are under constructions or in advanced stages of planning across Australia and New Zealand” (p. 14). These two countries have experienced much of the same metropolitan development as the US has (ibid.).

¹⁷The year of publication for the Harcourt Brace Jovanovich editions is not printed in the books.

¹⁸See also Ellin 1997.

¹⁹kentlandsusa.com/CommunityInfo/Documents/Handbook/chapter_i.htm. See also Ross 1999.

²⁰It is interesting to note that much of what I have said about the US more generally and Kentlands especially confluence with David Harvey’s *Spaces of Hope* (2000).

²¹I would like to add one final comment. Above I referred to the “state of being encapsulated” as characteristic for suburbanites. But Kentlands is a suburb, and people spend their time driving, if not exactly the same, then not much less that people in other suburbs. They drive to work (mostly outside Kentlands), to the store or the mall, to the (movie) theater and so on. Having said this, I must also add that several Kentlanders also use the public spaces in Kentlands when they have the time.

Bibliography

- Andersen, Bengt & Sondre Sommerfelt 2000a:** “Absolutt Stedløs” in *Morgenbladet* August 18th.
- Andersen, Bengt & Sondre Sommerfelt 2000b:** “Er vi stedløse?” in *Localmotives* 3.0 (an internetonly magazine), http://www.localmotives.com/hoved/print/ervistedsloese_P.html
- Appadurai, Arjun 1998 [1996]:** *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Archer, John 2000:** “Paras, Palaces, Pathogens: framework for the growth of Calcutta, 1800-1850” in *City & Society*. Vol. XII. No. 1.
- Barnard, Alan 2000:** *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnard, Alan & Jonathan Spencer (eds.) 1998 [1996]:** *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Blakely, Edward J. & Mary Gail Snyder 1997:** *Fortress America – Gated Communities in the United States*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge.
- Bohl, Charles C. 1998:** “New Urban News: Covering Traditional Town Planning and Development”. A review of the new urbanist newsletter New Urban News in *Urban Land*. February, p.96.
- Caldeira, Teresa P. R. 1999:** “Fortified Enclaves: The New Urban Segregation” in Setha M. Low (ed.): *Theorizing the City: The New Urban Anthropology Reader*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Calthorpe, Peter 1994:** “The Region” in Peter Katz: *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Caplow, Theodore and Howard M. Bahr, et al:** *Middletown Families: Fifty Years of Change and Continuity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clifford, James 1997:** *Routes: Travels and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, Anthony P. 1998 [1985]:** *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.
- Crawford, Margaret 1999:** “The ‘new’ company town” in *Perspecta: Settlement Patterns, The Yale Architectural Journal*, no. 30. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

- Davis, Mike 1997 [1990]:** “Festningen Los Angeles: Militariseringen av byens rom” in Jonny Aspen & John Pløger (eds.): *På sporet av byen: Lesninger av senmoderne byliv*. Oslo: Spartacus Forlag.
- Davis, Mike 1990:** *The City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. London: Verso.
- Debord, Guy 1997 [1967]:** *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.
- Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company 1999:** *The Lexicon of the New Urbanism*. A hard copy.
- Duany, Andres, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk and Jeff Speck 2000:** *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream*. New York: North Point Press.
- Ellin, Nan (ed.) 1997:** *Architecture of Fear*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Eppli, Mark J. & Charles C. Tu 1999:** *Valuing the New Urbanism: The Impact of the New Urbanism on Prices of Single-Family Homes*. Washington DC: Urban Land Institute.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland & Oscar Hemer (eds.) 1999:** *Ambivalens og fundamentalisme: Seks essays om kulturens globalisering*. Oslo: Spartacus Forlag.
- Fishman, Robert 1987:** *Bourgeois Utopia: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Garreau, Joel. 1992:** *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Geertz, Clifford 1993 [1973]:** “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture” in his *The Interpretations of Cultures: Selected Essays*. London: Fontana Press.
- Gleick, James 1999:** *Faster: The Acceleration of Just About Everything*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gottdiener, Mark 1977:** *Planned Sprawl: Private and Public Interests in Suburbia*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Hakken, David 1999:** *CyborgCyberspace? An Ethnographer Looks to the Future*. New York: Routledge.

- Hall, Peter 1998 [1996]:** *Cities of Tomorrow*. Updated Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hall, Peter 1996 [1992]:** *Urban & Regional Planning*. Third Edition. London: Routledge.
- Halloran, Sean, 2000:** “The New Urbanism in Canada and abroad” in *New Urbanism and Traditional Neighborhood Development: Comprehensive Report and Best Practices Guide*. Ithaca: New Urban News.
- Hannerz, Ulf 1998 [1996]:** *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.
- Hannerz, Ulf 1969:** *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Harden, Blaine 1995:** “A City in Transition” in Washington Post, 06/18/95.
- Harvey, David 2000:** *Spaces of Hope*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jenkins, Richard 1999 [1992]:** *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge.
- Katz, Peter 1994:** *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- kentlandsusa.com/CommunityInfo/Documents/Handbook/chapter_i.htm (Webpage)
- Kim, Joon 1999:** *The Kentlands Study: The Report of the Preliminary Findings (part I)*, (Unpublished).
- Kleinberg, Benjamin 1995:** *Urban America in Transformation: Perspectives on Urban Policy and Development*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Krieger, Alex (ed.) 1991:** Duany, Andres & Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk: *Towns and Town-Making Principles*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications.
- Kunstler, James Howard 1998 [1996]:** *Home From Nowhere: Remaking Our Everyday World for the 21st Century*. New York: Touchstone.
- Kunstler, James Howard 1993:** *The Geography of Nowhere: The Rise and Decline of America’s Man-Made Landscape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kuper, Adam 1999:** *Culture: The Anthropologists’ Account*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Lang, Peter 1997:** “The Occulted Suburb” in Lang, Peter and Tam Miller (eds.): *Suburban Discipline*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Langdon, Philip 1994:** *A Better Place to Live, Reshaping the American Suburb*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Low, Setha M. 2000:** *On the Plaza: The Politics of Public Space and Culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Low, Setha M. 1999 [1996]:** “Spatializing Culture: The Social Production and Social Construction of Public Space in Costa Rica” in Setha M. Low (ed.): *Theorizing the City: The New Urban Anthropology Reader*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Lynd, Robert S. & Helen Merrell Lynd 19?? [1929]:** *Middletown. A Study In Modern American Culture*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Lynd, Robert S. & Helen Merrell Lynd 19?? [1937]:** *Middletown in Transition. A Study in Cultural Conflicts*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Mintz, Sidney W. 1998:** “The Localization of Anthropological Practice. From area studies to transnationalism” in *Critique of Anthropology* Vol. 18(2).
- Mlaker, Glenn 199?:** *Kentlands Community Survey: An Independent Study of the Kentlands Community*. Unpublished survey for the City of Gaithersburg.
- “New urbanists in Australia and New Zealand plan first congress”, in *New Urban News*, Vol. 6, n. 1, January/February 2001.
- Padgett, Tim, 1999:** “Saving Suburbia” in *Time Magazine* (www.time.com). August 16, VOL. 154, NO. 7.
- Palen, J. John 1995:** *The Suburbs*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Palen, J. John 1981 [1975]:** *The Urban World*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Rabinow, Paul 1986:** “Representations Are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology” in James Clifford & George E. Marcus (eds.): *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Rabinowitz, Harvey, & Edward Beimborn 1991:** *The New Suburb: Final Report, July 1991*. Prepared by the Center for Urban Transportation Studies and School of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for the University Research and Training Program, Office of Technical Assistance and Safety, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Washington D.C.
- Ross, Andrew 1999:** *The celebration chronicles: life, liberty and the pursuit of property values in Disney's New Town*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Sies, Mary Corbin and Christopher Silver 1996:** Introduction: "The History of Planning History" in Sies, Mary Corbin & Christopher Silver (eds.): *Planning the American Twentieth-Century American City*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Soja, Edward W. 2000:** *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Tabb, William K. & Larry Sawers (eds.) 1984:** *Marxism and the Metropolis: New Perspectives in Urban Political Economy*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Teaford, Jon C. 1979:** *City and Suburb: The Political Fragmentation of Metropolitan America, 1850-1970*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Teaford, Jon C. 1986:** *The Twentieth-Century American City: Problem, Promise, and Reality*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- ULI 1999:** *New Urbanism/Neotraditional Planning: Selected References*. InfoPacket no. 338. Washington DC: Urban Land Institute Information Service InfoPacket Series.
- von Platen, Philip, 2000:** "Growth in new urbanist projects continues at sustainable pace" in *New Urban News*. Volume 5. Number 6.
- Whyte, William 1988:** *Rediscovering the Center*. New York: Doubleday.
- Wolfe, Tom 1998:** *A man in full: a novel*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Østerberg, Dag 1998:** *Arkitektur og sosiologi i Oslo: en sosio-materiell fortolkning*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.