

## Conclusion and Epilogue

### Redeveloping Regent Park: From a Place of Hope to the Necessity of Renewed Struggle

People give Regent Park an awesome bad rap. It's not like we're living on the west side of LA. I mean look at this place. Does this place really look dangerous to you?

Matthew Brown, 16 years old, Regent Park tenant, 2000<sup>1</sup>

Condemned by academics as too large and badly designed, by governments and the media as a haven of single mothers, welfare families and deviants, by police and law and order advocates as a magnet for crime and drug problems, and by many popular commentators as the site of potentially explosive “racial” problems, Regent Park (RP) has come full circle in the public mind from the “ordered community” of the 1950s. Media commentary in the first years of the twenty-first century regurgitates the same inaccurate, sensational and destructive images of the project. In June 2002, a reporter characteristically referred to the housing development as a “poster child for poverty.”<sup>2</sup> An acknowledged anomaly of six drug-related murders in the project in 2001 makes RP a “homicide hotbed”<sup>3</sup> according to the *Globe and Mail's* crime reporter. The *Toronto Star's* Joseph Hall is somewhat more circumspect and acknowledges the power of “perception” in shaping ideas, yet still reinforces the stereotype: “Arguably the city's most notorious neighbourhood — a perceived breeding ground for crime, neglect and generational poverty — the shambling downtown housing complex has become synonymous in Toronto with social decay and failed urban planning.”<sup>4</sup>

This process of place-based image construction has always been tied to particular state and reform agendas revolving around programmes of urban economic, social and moral

redevelopment. The powerful images of slums and pathological slum dwellers that circulated in the media, academia and the state were crucial in building the case for urban redevelopment in the 1940s and 1950s; from the 1960s through the 2000s, these same depictions have been instrumental in the thoroughgoing typecasting of RP and its residents as dangerous “underclasses,” fuelling appeals for heavy policing, redevelopment of the built environment, social mixing of poor residents with more affluent families and even demolition of the project altogether.

Yet this dissertation has argued that the social construction of RP as a nefarious problem project has not been an exclusively ideological process that rests solely on the discursive level of representations. Marginalization has resulted from a powerful blend of very tangible and intense social and economic segregation, a declining welfare state and coercive internal housing policies, the lack of adequate jobs and educational opportunities, as well as the ruinous consequences of place-based labelling. This potent combination of ideological and material oppression, firmly reflected by, rooted in and moulded by spatial relations, has worked together to powerfully limit the life chances and social and economic rights of tenants in Canada’s largest and most notorious public housing project.

If this territorial regulation formed a powerful constraining context in which tenant lives were lived, RP could also be what David Harvey has called a “space of hope.”<sup>5</sup> While some RP’ers internalized the stigmatizing attitudes of external observers and reacted to marginalization with an anti-social behaviour that harmed social solidarity, others worked

to improve the image of the project, developed self-help initiatives to lift themselves out of acute material misery and worked to encourage a sense of community in the “Park.” To be sure, many tenants with sufficient resources did leave for better surroundings, free from the extensive stigmatization of public housing. Many, though, attempted to carve out a decent life amidst the problems of project life. From the outset of the project in the 1940s, regulatory intrusions by the state housing officialdom were not just meekly accepted by tenants; they were countered, subverted or assimilated in class-specific and place-particular ways. RP’ers developed networks of self-help and community bonds, often against daunting economic odds. By their own stories, many built decent lives and raised successful families by drawing on these relations of solidarity and explicitly contrasted the warmth and commonality of Regent with other neighbourhoods. For a short but significant period, moreover, a cadre of tenant activists succeeded in galvanizing tenants to fight for concrete demands to improve their lives and defy the brutalizing stereotypes of their homes and conduct. These struggles were limited by strategic weaknesses and tactical errors, above all the inability to generalize struggles and build wider political solidarity, but they demonstrated to all that the so-called “lowest of the low” could carve out autonomous political spaces, mobilize significant numbers, inspire others in similar situations, and launch partially successful campaigns against formidable state adversaries. In this way, they began the process of becoming active citizens rather than just passive consumers of state largesse.



**Figure 7.1 – Woman Cooking. Annual “Bloc-o-rama” festivals in the 1980s and 1990s included the sharing of multicultural foods made by the diverse tenant body.**

Source: Photograph by David Zapparoli, silver print, 1990.



**Figure 7.2 - St. David's Square Wading Pool. One of the fruits of tenant activism for improved recreational facilities in the project.**

**Source: Photograph by David Zapparoli, silver print, 1990.**

Many of the socio-economic and ideological developments that shaped public housing in the last decades of the twentieth century – neoliberal economic policies, the continuing crisis situation of affordable housing, welfare state retrenchment, intrusive law enforcement, racism and resistance – have continued unabated in the first years of the new millennium. The blatant lack of decent rental units in Toronto has sustained a 67,000 plus family waiting list for public housing as of January 2003.<sup>6</sup> Public housing construction starts have been effectively halted for years and funding for social housing in

general has been considerably reduced. Low-income families have been largely abandoned to the vagaries of a cutthroat market.<sup>7</sup> General redistributive policies at the national and provincial levels that all citizens rely on – health care, education and welfare policies – have been savagely cut by federal, provincial and municipal governments tied to a punitive neoliberalism that blames the victims for the economic crisis. It is obscene that at the same time as over a million Canadian families were living in officially “unacceptable” dwellings according to Canada Mortgage and Housing (CMHC), this same “public” body raked in profits of \$565 million in 2001, every cent of which was used to pay down the deficit.<sup>8</sup>

Already severely disadvantaged, public housing tenants have faced the brunt of this economic assault on workers and the poor. And, as 1996 census figures<sup>9</sup> divulge, RP tenants are among the poorest of the poor in Canada. For individuals and families, the average income for RP residents and families is approximately half that of other Toronto, Ontario and Canadian residents. A clear majority of families are officially classified as low-income by the census, including nearly 5,000 children. Education and employment figures show similar, shockingly low levels of economic attainment. Lone-parent families, facing formidable challenges to make a livelihood, are also significantly over represented in the project. In the last 15 years, the project has also become home to an increasingly diverse population with immigrants making up more than half the resident population. Furthermore, visible minorities now account for more than seven in ten residents. Such intense poverty, lack of educational resources and the special language

and cultural barriers, as well as racism, that affect immigrants and visible minorities, of course, adversely shapes the life chances of both parents and children.

It is in this context of bitter despair that we need to place the widely publicized rise in violence and drugs in RP in the 1990s and 2000s. As the state increasingly cut funding and programs, material deprivation intensified, and a related increase in hard drug dealing has plagued the project. Drug dealers, many of whom live outside the project,<sup>10</sup> have sunk roots in the project, providing much-needed monetary and social benefits to young people with no futures. According to community members, “they start by giving them a loonie for getting something for them at the store. They are given more for running other errands, and soon kids get a sense of their own value as well as money in their pockets. Then the dealers – very few of whom live in the area – ask the kids to store drugs and guns in their homes.” “It means that some parents are afraid of their own kids,” says one tenant.”<sup>11</sup> Drug-related violence, while often overblown and nowhere near the scale of American ghettos, claimed the lives of six young black men from the project in 2001.<sup>12</sup> Despite the long-standing propensity of the Toronto media to sensationalize and blow crime figures out of proportion, particularly in regard to public housing, it is apparent that the problems of violence and drugs have increased to worrying proportions for many tenants.

The disreputable representation of RP in popular discourse has, if anything, intensified as a result of the rising problems of drugs and aggressive, often violent, behaviour among a minority in the project. The image of criminality in Regent, increasingly

racialized in the 1980s and 1990s, was nevertheless always more powerful than the reality. Social geographers have demonstrated the significance of racialized representations, which link race, crime and neighbourhood. They have argued persuasively that racialized depictions of minority groups and criminality are enhanced when linked with certain identifiable places.<sup>13</sup> In a *Toronto Life* article, Don Gillmor writes sympathetically of black residents, but nevertheless sees RP as representative of “poverty, crime and a radical experiment in multiculturalism – roughly 10,000 people sharing thirty-five home languages, a Babel defined by ten square blocks...”<sup>14</sup> The diverse nature of the project’s population has been designated a “problem” itself and associated with disorder and marginalization. Law-and-order driven depictions of criminality in the project have also been increasingly associated with blacks. Several academic and government studies have noted that “racial profiling” and harassment of young black men in areas such as RP have been pervasive.<sup>15</sup> A study by *The Toronto Star* of cocaine possession arrests from 1996-2002 showed that those charged with possessing cocaine by 51 Division officers were treated more harshly than anywhere else in the city – a glaring case in point of unfair “racialized” policing also evident in the US case.<sup>16</sup> An extensive 2002 survey of over 1,200 young people in four “high risk” areas, including RP, disclosed that police abuse was a close second to drug dealing in major worries that “negatively affect a person's sense of personal safety.”<sup>17</sup> As numerous studies of police culture have commented, many police officers perceive certain parts of the “public” to be their enemy, especially those populations labelled as problematic and dangerous – the poor, communities of colour and ethnic minorities.<sup>18</sup> RP resident Yvonne Beasley, mother of Sydney Hemmings, who was murdered in the

project on 5 July 2001 asked police: “My question to you is, how exactly do the youth of Regent Park trust the police in the neighbourhood, when all it is to them is niggers killing niggers?”<sup>19</sup>

The lack of a definitive, representative and united political organization in RP in the 1980s and 1990s, in a context of drug-related violence and even further social and economic marginalization, has led to two main political attitudes in the community on the question of security and other project problems: one group of tenants has persistently lobbied for a firmer police presence based on a mix of “hard-nosed zero tolerance” and “community policing” with extensive foot patrols. Throughout the 1990s, various attempts were made by a group of Regent Park activists for “community policing” – an approach backed up by a highly regarded 1996 consultant’s report.<sup>20</sup> Shifts in police personnel and general intransigence on the part of law enforcement officials and local politicians nixed this program after a few tentative outreaches. Another group, mostly young and black people, and their supporters, decry police racism and brutality and argue that no progress will be made without across-the-board attitudinal changes among police officers and increased educational and employment opportunities for residents.<sup>21</sup> They argue that frustration with the police had reached an explosive boiling point by the mid-1990s. It came as little surprise that soon after welfare was savagely chopped by 21.6 per cent by the Ontario Conservative government in 1995, pent-up frustration with police brutality and desperation with living conditions led to a “riot” against police in RP involving several hundred residents and one hundred police officers.<sup>22</sup>

Socio-economic marginalization, tensions between police and tenants and general security concerns continue to dominate the political activities of tenants in Regent even though a new plan to “redevelop” – both architecturally, by substantially renovating the built environment of RPN, and socially, by including a number of private market units – has once again put the “Park” at the top of the headlines at the end of 2002. In the 1990s, there were two stillborn renovation projects that proposed architectural redevelopment of one small section of the project, which would allow tenants to buy their own units. Lack of interest on the part of the city and the inability to garner adequate funding halted these projects in their tracks. In the second half of 2002, the Toronto Community Housing Corporation, the renamed housing authority responsible for public housing in the city, put together a new bid for total redevelopment of the project. Drafted by a team of design consultants after extensive consultation with tenants, it proposes, “a mixed-income community that would reconnect Regent Park to the city.”<sup>23</sup> The proposal calls for the demolition of the existing buildings, creating through streets in the project and introducing regular street blocks and addresses. Low-rise and “stacked” townhouses, mid- and high-rise apartments, and space for commercial establishments constitute the projected building forms. Most importantly, however, a new “mixed-income community” is anticipated. The old public housing units will be replaced and 2,400 new private-market rental units, condominiums and townhouses will be built and sold or rented at market prices. Public and private units will be combined as much as possible on streets and in buildings to create an integrated, socially-mixed community.

Concern over structural deterioration of the buildings, especially in RPN, which is now over fifty years old, has been a mainstay of recent criticism, but housing form and site design have long been the target of academic and popular criticism. Critics focus on the blandness of the buildings, the negative effects of high-rises on family life, the isolation of the development from the rest of Cabbagetown, and the absence of private space within the project. Much of this criticism takes as its starting point Jane Jacobs' 1961 book, *Life and Death of Great American Cities*, which argues that urban design elements themselves can enable healthy and safe social interaction by providing spaces that encourage natural meetings and other friendly interactions. She believed that modernist planning, especially public housing projects, had destroyed this "natural" urban fabric.<sup>24</sup> Cultural critic Robert Fulford also writes that the state "created an enclave with its own style and rules" that pegged residents as "second-class citizens."<sup>25</sup> *Toronto Star* reporter, Christian Cotroneo, describes RP as sprawling "in all its Soviet sameness, flanked by anonymous apartment blocks."<sup>26</sup> Former Toronto mayor and long-time urban activist, John Sewell, makes similar arguments as Fulford, but explicitly draws on the "defensible space" theories of Oscar Newman and Alice Coleman to argue that modernist design features themselves such as the lack of privately definable space, the high numbers of dwellings that use a single entrance, high rise buildings in general and the absence of "defensible space" have themselves caused anti-social behaviour, encouraged deviancy and undermined community.<sup>27</sup> The only solution to RP's problems, these authors conclude, is wholesale redevelopment of the built environment to create safe and orderly communities.

Such arguments, echoed in the new RP redevelopment proposal, tread dangerously close to the same “environmental determinism” of post-war planners and the state. Physical form does influence human life and behaviour, but it cannot be treated as an independent phenomenon or factor as this dissertation has argued. As Edward Soja writes, “these physicalist methodologies are fixed too exclusively on the formal properties of materialized spatial configurations, giving too little attention to the complex social forces that exist behind their appearance... When looking at social phenomena, therefore, physical space matters a great deal, but the spatiality of social life extends far beyond physical forms and directly measurable surface appearances.”<sup>28</sup> Take the anti-modernist arguments on the unsuitability of high-rise apartment buildings for children in public housing made by almost all commentators on RP. Few of these critics acknowledge that “apartment living” is a cultural preference shaped by particular urban aesthetic and historical traditions. It is not intrinsically “good” or “bad.” New York City’s public housing, for example, is rarely criticized for its extensive reliance on high-rises since apartment living is common among all classes in the city. Ultra-modernist apartment buildings and condominiums for the rich, moreover, including typical structures by Le Corbusier in Marseilles and Mies van der Rohe’s lake shore apartments in Chicago, are never discussed in the same terms as projects such as RPS.<sup>29</sup> Residents in the former buildings do not have to worry about adequate recreation, community and day care facilities. Environmental determinist arguments not only deflect attention away from the wider socio-economic problems of poor project dwellers, they discourage, as Tony Manzi and Keith Jacobs argue, “new possibilities and alternative visions” to deal with the crisis of affordable housing.<sup>30</sup>

It also stretches belief to argue, as John Sewell does, that the problems of crime in public housing can be solved by mere changes to the built environment. Design changes making it less easy to hide or escape from the police, or integrate living with public spaces, may enhance some tenants' sense of well being, but it does nothing to deal with the root problems of economic misery, which fuel the drug trade and other security concerns. As Soja again puts it eloquently:

Such studies are particularly subject to another pitfall, a territorial fallacy whereby the space analyzed is made into an island unto itself, disconnected from the wider urban milieu, so what appears as a successful reduction of crime in one area may merely be its displacement to another area. Equally troublesome, the discovery of a statistical link between design and crime rates, or other such close correlations between physical form and behaviour, is often exploded into ever broadening concepts of design determinism and all-encompassing superficial spatial theories of the city, overlooking the possibility that the discovered linkage or correlation is itself the product of other social and spatial forces operating to shape urban life. Here again, surface appearances and configurations become highly deceptive, especially perhaps when they prove superficially useful.

Soja's last sentence is perceptive: "defensible space" arguments seek superficial short cuts to deeper structural and governmental inadequacies and are therefore applauded by state officials unwilling to adequately invest in jobs and education. David Harvey makes a similar point in arguing that such general design approaches falsely contend, "that the shaping of spatial order can be the foundation for a new moral and aesthetic order,"<sup>31</sup> bringing us back to the authoritarian utopianism of 1950s urban renewal.

The RP redevelopment scheme is centrally bound up with questions of reforming "underclass" populations through "community building." Community in the discourse of housing reform "presumes that sharing a physical space produces a common culture; however when there are only very poor people living together, a culture of poverty is

produced.”<sup>32</sup> Physical redesign and the social “mixing” of poor project dwellers and professional middle classes who want to live in the city centre are intended to reform the “deviant” cultures of the poor, generating new and positive attitudes towards work, harmonious social relations and crime- and drug-free neighbourhoods. The real emphasis here is on changing tenants themselves and not government social and economic policies that have generated problems in the project.

The evidence of improvement from such redevelopment experiments in the United States and Britain is decidedly mixed. Some mixed-income housing projects and housing voucher schemes allowing tenants to use government subsidies in private-market neighbourhoods have produced improved living conditions,<sup>33</sup> but at a cost, Harald Bauder argues, of cultural assimilation: “the reason for improvement is not that movers become better families or individuals, but that they assimilate to a dominant set of cultural norms and values, and therefore experience less cultural discrimination in the school system, labour market and other institutions.”<sup>34</sup> The one Canadian study, conducted on a small, experimental scale in Toronto, has shown that there were no perceived benefits in the labour market at all.<sup>35</sup> In any case, the redevelopment proposal is decidedly not a solution to the overwhelming problem of housing affordability in Toronto. This proposal will actually slightly lower the number of public housing units in Regent. It does nothing to tackle the long waiting list for public housing in the city. It does nothing to change the state-sponsored deterioration of living standards that has harmed both Regent residents and the poor in general. It does nothing to improve the educational and employment infrastructure in the area that has contributed to Regent’s status as the poorest

neighbourhood in Canada. What it does, Janet L. Smith succinctly argues, is “clean up” public housing “by sweeping out the poor” and justify funding cuts without addressing systemic problems.”<sup>36</sup>

The fact that tenants themselves were centrally involved in the decision-making process for the redevelopment proposal is the most important and welcome development. Tenants still face a formidable challenge and some hard political dilemmas. If there is a lesson in the history of Regent Park, it is that tenants will have to fight tooth and nail for everything they want and build allies in the larger community. The state that gives can also take away – as we have seen first hand in the wholesale assault on social programs in the last decade from governments across the board. Tenants will have to maintain pressure on the Toronto Community Housing Corporation to keep it honest and make links with other groups in society, other public housing tenants, social movements and the trade unions, to build the type of movement strong enough to win against a reluctant state.

The very history of Regent also demands that there be an honest recognition of the severe limitations of the redevelopment program. Tenants maintain that redevelopment will bring stability, order and aesthetic benefits, “This development is long overdue,” Brenda Degourse believes. “Our buildings are falling apart dreadfully. It's time for them to go.” Sixteen-year-old Keder Ahmed concludes, “I think for once they are actually going to do something. We need to change Regent Park into a place people want to live. A place where people say, `Yeah, that's my neighbourhood. I like it there.”<sup>37</sup> Certainly, RP needs substantial renovations due to the aging buildings and infrastructure. Improving design

may be worthwhile, but it does not provide jobs or adequate funding for local schools. Nor does it tackle police brutality against black youth. These are the key reasons for socio-economic marginalization and it is this lack of power in society that leads to the often exaggerated, but nevertheless real anti-social and harmful behaviour that is wrapped up with drugs and violence in RP. Redevelopment may promise a sense of stability and social order in a time of rapid socio-economic change, as Tony Manzi and Keith Jacobs contend. Yet it also “serves to legitimize the ideological shift presenting the problems of housing as attributable to individuals rather than a failure of government.”<sup>38</sup>

The new proposal may improve the “look” of the area but will an architectural face lift and the middle-class neighbours next door really make a difference in poor people’s lives? I have shown that an overarching cultural bias against public housing, insidious external representations that label residents themselves as the problem, and a discriminatory social and economic structure that inhibits life chances are responsible for RP’s problems. Redevelopment seems to be a convenient mask to deflect attention away from the cruel lack of government funding that goes towards affordable housing. Toronto needs more high-quality, well-built public housing to deal with the huge numbers who lack a decent place to live, just as maintaining RP as a place of hope requires a struggle for better opportunities to participate in and succeed in the economy and build a decent life.

## Notes to the Conclusion and Epilogue

<sup>1</sup> Cited in *A Way Out*, dir. Christene Brown (Toronto: Syncopated Productions, 2001).

<sup>2</sup> Kerry Gillespie, "Don't forget the city's poor, summit urged," *Toronto Star*, Online Edition, 21 June 2002, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com) (22 February 2003).

<sup>3</sup> Colin Freeze, "Despite recent shootings, city remains one of the safest in Canada, U.S., police say," *Globe and Mail*, 31 December 2002, A12.

<sup>4</sup> Joseph Hall, "A noble experiment that went awry," *Toronto Star*, 20 December 2002, online edition, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com) (2 March 2003).

<sup>5</sup> *Spaces of Hope* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000).

<sup>6</sup> Toronto Social Housing Connections, "Monthly Report," January 2003. City of Toronto Website, [http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/toronto\\_housing/connections.htm#stats](http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/toronto_housing/connections.htm#stats) (1 March 2003).

<sup>7</sup> On the general situation note Robert A. Murdie and Carlos Teixeira, *Towards a Comfortable Neighbourhood and Appropriate Housing: Immigrant Experiences in Toronto*, CERIS Working Paper No. 10, 1999, 1-75 and Michael Shapcott, "Made in Ontario Housing Crisis," Technical Paper No.12, (Toronto: Ontario Alternative Budget, 2001.) On government housing policies, see Tom Carter, "Current Practices for Procuring Affordable Housing: The Canadian Context," *Housing Policy Debate*, 8 (1997), 593-632.

<sup>8</sup> Carol Goar, "A way to create homes and hope," *Toronto Star*, 17 September 2002, online edition, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com) (2 March 2003).

<sup>9</sup> I rely in this section on the concise summary of 1996 census figures by Pathways to Education, a support group for RP students organized by the Regent Park Community Health Centre.

<http://www.regentparkchc.org/cspnew/SomeCharacteristics.htm> (1 March 2003).

<sup>10</sup> Don Gillmor, "The punishment station," *Toronto Life*, January 1996, 49.

<sup>11</sup> John Sewell, "Tragedy in Regent Park," *Eye Magazine*, 17 May 2001, 9.

<sup>12</sup> "Making Peace, Ending the Violence," Town Hall Discussion, CBC Toronto <http://www.toronto.cbc.ca/features/peace/discussion.jsp>, 3 June 2002 (1 Sept. 2002).

<sup>13</sup> See Mark Edward Pfeifer, "Community, Adaptation and the Vietnamese in Toronto," Ph.D., University of Toronto, 1999, chap.10; Peter Jackson, "Policing difference: 'race' and crime in Metropolitan Toronto," in P. Jackson & J. Penrose, eds., *Constructions of Race, Place and Nation* (London: UCL Press, 1993), 181-200 and "Constructions of Criminality: Police Community Relations in Toronto." *Antipode*, 26 (1994), 216-235.

<sup>14</sup> Gillmor, "The punishment station," 51.

<sup>15</sup> Stephen Lewis, *Consultative Report on Race Relations* (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, 1992); M.Gittens, D.P. Cole, and G. Ioannou, *Report of the Commission on Systemic Racism in the Ontario Criminal Justice System: a community summary* (Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1995); Frances Henry, *The Carribean Diaspora in Toronto: Learning to Live with Racism*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994) and *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society* (Toronto: Harcourt Brace Canada, 1995); Frances Henry and Carol Tator, *Racist Discourse in Canada's Print Media* (Toronto: Race Relations Foundation, 2000), 123-160.

<sup>16</sup> "Treatment differs by division," *Toronto Star*, 19 October 2002, Online Edition, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com), (15 January 2003). On how crack cocaine, used and sold more often by poor blacks, draws a disproportionately harsher criminal sentence see Neil Websdale, *Policing the Poor: From Slave Plantation to Public Housing* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001), 47-49.

<sup>17</sup> Graeme Smith, "Police see teens as threat," *Globe and Mail*, 16 January 2003, A16; Vanessa Lu, "Youthful fears include police treatment," 16 January 2003, *Toronto Star*, Online edition, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com) (2 March 2003).

<sup>18</sup> For a synopsis of the literature and analysis of policing in public housing, see Websdale, *Policing the Poor*, chap.6.

<sup>19</sup> Cited in "From Making Peace, Ending the Violence," Town Hall Discussion, CBC Toronto, 3 June 2002.

<sup>20</sup> Jim Ward Associates, *The Report on a Study to Identify and Address Police-Community Issues in Regent Park* (Toronto: Jim Ward Associates, 1996), 3. For resident attempts to increase security, see National Film Board (NFB) of Canada documentary, *Return to Regent Park*, dir. Bay Weyman (NFB: Montreal 1994).

- 
- <sup>21</sup> NFB, *Return to Regent Park*; Enzo Di Matteo, "Residents say neighbourhood needs foot patrols, not cops in cruisers," *NOW Magazine*, Online Edition 20 (Aug 2-8, 2001); Gillmor, "The Punishment Station."
- <sup>22</sup> Gillmor, 51-52.
- <sup>23</sup> Kerry Gillespie, "New face for Regent Park," *Toronto Star*, 17 December 2002, online edition, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com) (2 March 2003).
- <sup>24</sup> Jane Jacobs, *Life and Death of Great American Cities* (New York: Bantam Books, 1964), Introduction.
- <sup>25</sup> Robert Fulford, "The making of a neighbourhood," *Toronto Life*, March 1995, 27-28.
- <sup>26</sup> Christian Cotroneo, "Dynamic duo delivers Christmas," *Toronto Star*, 16 December 2002, Online edition, [www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com) (2 March 2003).
- <sup>27</sup> John Sewell, *Houses and Homes: Housing for Canadians* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1994), 149-151. On "defensible space" see Oscar Newman's comprehensive "Defensible Space" website, [www.defensiblespace.com](http://www.defensiblespace.com) (2 March 2003); for Alice Coleman see *Utopia on Trial: Vision and Reality in Planned Housing* (London: Hilary Shipman, 1985). These arguments are also echoed in the rise of "New Urbanism" – a school of architectural thought based on creating "community" through the use of traditional design elements to create "small-town America" in the city. For a devastating critique, see Peter Marcuse, "The New Urbanism: Dangers So Far," DISP Online (2000) online edition, [www.orl.arch.ethz.ch/disp/pdf/140\\_1.pdf](http://www.orl.arch.ethz.ch/disp/pdf/140_1.pdf) (2 March 2003).
- <sup>28</sup> Edward Soja, "Different Spaces: Interpreting the spatial organization of societies," in J. Peponis, J. Wineman and S. Bafna, eds., *Proceedings of the Third International Space Syntax Symposium*, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Proceedings, [undertow.arch.gatech.edu/homepages/3sss/papers\\_pdf/s1\\_Soja.pdf](http://undertow.arch.gatech.edu/homepages/3sss/papers_pdf/s1_Soja.pdf) (2 March 2003).
- <sup>29</sup> Raman Pattabi G. and Richard Coyne, "The Production of Architectural Criticism," *Architectural Theory Review*, Journal of the Department of Architecture, Planning and Allied Arts, The University of Sydney, 5, no. 1 (2000), 83-103.
- <sup>30</sup> Keith Jacobs and Tony Manzi, "Urban Renewal and the Culture of Conservatism: changing perceptions of the tower block and implications for contemporary renewal initiatives," *Critical Social Policy*, 18, no.2 (1998), 170. They note the pertinent story of tower block residents in Liverpool who struggled to maintain their blocks, arguing cogently that the real problem was stigmatization and job discrimination not the housing type itself.
- <sup>31</sup> David Harvey, "The New Urbanism and the Communitarian Trap," Paper prepared for the conference, Exploring New Urbanism, Harvard Design School Unpublished Paper March 1997 cited in Peter Marcuse, "The New Urbanism: Dangers So Far."
- <sup>32</sup> Janet L. Smith, "Cleaning Up Public Housing By Sweeping Out the Poor," *Habitat International*, 23 (March 1998), 50.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Harald Bauder, "Neighbourhood Effects and Cultural Exclusion," *Urban Studies* 39, no.1 (2002), 89.
- <sup>35</sup> Philip Oreopolous, "Do Neighbourhoods Influence Long-term Labour Market Success? A Comparison of Adults Who Grew Up in Different Public Housing Projects," Statistics Canada Research Paper, Family and Labour Studies Division, October 2002.
- <sup>36</sup> Janet Smith, "Cleaning Up Public Housing by Sweeping Out the Poor."
- <sup>37</sup> Kerry Gillespie, "New face for Regent Park."
- <sup>38</sup> Manzi and Jacobs, "Urban Renewal and the Culture of Conservatism," 167-168.