

ABSTRACT

Resilience as Organicist Metaphor in OneNYC: The Plan for a Strong and Just City

Trevor M. Reddick, M.A.

Mentor: Sam Perry, Ph.D.

This thesis analyzes the discursive and material effects of resilience as organicist metaphor in One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City (OneNYC). The resilience metaphor's form and function is inherently conservative, constraining the vision of an ecologically just NYC within broader discourses of growth-dependent urban planning, the reversal of white flight, and intensification of environmental racism. By figuring social equity as a product of economic and environmental resilience strategies, the rhetorical form of de Blasio's speech and OneNYC plan centralizes neoliberal market logic of development as a natural, organic mode of perceiving and engaging the city. Despite intentions of planners and the de Blasio administration, the naturalization of such market logics materially functions to displace responsibility for disaster relief onto affected communities. At the same time, it incentivizes speculative investing that makes green washing and displacement of New York City's most vulnerable communities inevitable.

Resilience as Organicist Metaphor in OneNYC: The Plan for a Strong and Just City

by

Trevor M. Reddick, B.A.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Communication

David W. Schlueter, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts

Approved by the Thesis Committee

Samuel Perry, Ph.D., Chairperson

Scott Varda, Ph.D.

Charles McDaniel, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
May 2017

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2017 by Trevor M. Reddick

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgments..... | vi |
| Dedication..... | vii |
| Chapter One | 1 |
| Naturalizing Injustice: Resilience in de Blasio’s <i>One New York</i> | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Literature Review..... | 3 |
| 100 Resilient Cities and the Rise of the Urban Organicist Metaphor..... | 10 |
| Social and Cultural Resilience in the Modern Ecological City | 19 |
| Significance and Thesis Structure..... | 22 |
| Chapter Two..... | 37 |
| Earth Day Spiritual- de Blasio’s One New York Announcement Speech..... | 37 |
| The Bronx Burns No More- Re-Making Space Uptown | 37 |
| From a Tale of Two Cities to a Strong and Just Society | 41 |
| Civic Religion: The Promised Land of Economic and Environmental Resilience... | 49 |
| The Role of Voice in Reception of de Blasio’s Announcement Speech | 58 |
| Chapter Three..... | 70 |
| Urban Resilience in the Age of the Global City | 70 |
| The Long Road to Resilience- Origins in “Organized Complexity” | 70 |
| Jane Jacobs and the Origins of “Organized Complexity” | 74 |
| Grassroots Movements and the Aesthetics of “Organized Complexity” | 77 |
| Grassroots Movements and the Practicality of “Organized Complexity” | 79 |
| From the Local to the Global- “Organized Complexity” Institutionalized..... | 82 |
| Congress of the New Urbanism- Institutionalizing Sustainable Development | 87 |
| From Sustainable Development to Resilience | 90 |
| Urban Branding- Organized Complexity in the Tech Ecosystem | 104 |
| The Lie of Techquity - Uneven Development in the Tech Ecosystem..... | 106 |
| Mapping the Non-Resilient City- Technology and the Politics of Scale..... | 110 |
| Unintended Consequences- Resilience Betrayed and Final Thoughts | 114 |
| Chapter Four | 133 |
| “One New York” Deferred: Covenant Renewal in the <i>OneNYC Progress Report</i> | 133 |
| The Covenant is Broken- Criticism and New Rhetorical Strategies..... | 133 |
| The de Blasio Jeremiad..... | 138 |
| Failure to Launch: Progress Report as Covenant Renewal..... | 142 |
| Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative | 145 |
| Bronx-Queens Connector and the Innovation Economy | 150 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Neoliberalism and Urban Branding- A Recipe for Expulsions | 154 |
| Chapter Five..... | 166 |
| Conclusion | 166 |
| Summary and Findings | 166 |
| Implications..... | 170 |
| Limitations and Future Research | 174 |
| Final Thoughts | 175 |
| Bibliography | 178 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you so much to my advisor Dr. Perry for being so understanding, forgiving, and helpful throughout this process. Appreciate it beyond words.

A heartfelt thank you to the rest of my committee. Dr. Varda and Dr. McDaniel, for your insight and support.

Endless appreciation for Dr. Gerber, Kristiana, Kanan, Amrut, Andrew, Alden, Greg, Payton, Samwise, Sarah, Simon, and the entire Baylor University Debate Team for being such good confidantes, colleagues, and friends.

Would never have gotten here if not for JL Schatz, Guy Risko, Jen Sweeney, Armands Revelins, and bill shanahan. Your intellectual guidance stays with me always.

Thank you Binghamton debate: Jazzy Jeff, Mark, Pete, Jon, Raul, Jordan, Lenny, Jason, TJ, Phil, Maneo, Dhruv, Annabelle, Brandon, Brittney, Major Sturms.

Thank you Mom! You are my rock. Thank you Dylan, for being there with me in the best of times, and the worst. Thank you Dad, Grandpa, Aunt Liz, Aunt Lisa, Aunt Jill, Uncle Bob, Uncle Greg, Jonathan, Nick, Kaitlyn, and Michael. I love you all so much, and hope I make you proud.

Thank you Nene and Pop-Pop for raising me to be a good man. As long as I work to be as good as you thought I was, I know I will be ok.

Thank you Syed, Sachin, Gabe, Lazz, Connor, Matt, and Adam. Teamwork makes the dream work.

DEDICATION

To my mom's parents, I wish you could see me now

CHAPTER ONE

Naturalizing Injustice: Resilience in de Blasio's *One New York*

Introduction

Now, we said at the beginning of the administration – literally the first day – the idea was to create one city – one city that rises together. The antidote to the tale of two cities is to work always towards greater unity and fairness. And we have to do that in a lot of ways. What was unacceptable, I felt, was to see the growing divisions just fester. And again, so many people who have fought for economic justice have also fought for environmental justice, because these challenges go hand in hand. So many people in the city have for so long recognized that inequality takes many forms. And the way forward is to create a vision for one city, where there's opportunity for all, fairness for all, sustainability for all. That's what animated the work that led to One New York.¹

So began Mayor Bill de Blasio of New York City's announcement of his administration's *One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City (OneNYC)* to the people of Hunts Point, NY on a cloudy temperate Earth Day last year. Invoking the still resonant memory of 2012's Hurricane Sandy and the disproportionate effects natural disasters have on low-income, high-minority population communities, de Blasio couched *OneNYC* as a reaffirmation of his administrations' commitment to Mayor Mike Bloomberg's *PlaNYC* platform for environmental sustainability with an added plank to address the "crisis of our times," economic inequality.² Flanked by advisors, local politicians, and representatives of international corporations and non-profits, Mayor de Blasio proposed to the people of the Bronx his blueprint for environmentally sustainable growth of all NYC sectors, tied together through an emphasis on increasing the resilience of economies, communities, and the spaces they inhabit.

The pursuit of urban planning strategies that can address issues of ecological, economic and social catastrophe has compelled contemporary urban planners and architects to adopt organicist metaphors to explain the cities form and function. Joseph McLaughlin writing on the rhetoric of Urban Jungle and Late-Victorian London quotes Jonathan Raban's observation that "one indication of the intense difficulty we experience when we try to perceive the city is the way in which it irritates us into metaphor."³ Irritated to find a metaphor "that has the capacity to incorporate and accommodate the inherent conflictual conditions between ecology and urbanism,"⁴ planners, academics, and politicians have constructed an Ecological Urbanist sensibility. This Ecological Urbanist approach treats cities as organic ecosystems, whose susceptibility to natural and human-induced shocks is a function of its diversity, redundancy and control of potential feedback loops.⁵ This approach has enabled policymakers and academics to craft incredibly powerful and effective strategies for dealing with land-use and energy imbalances.⁶ However, attention must be paid to the value-system and intellectual heritage that inheres in any particular organicist metaphor to understand the cultural, social, and political impacts of the policies they inform.

The intent of this thesis is to analyze and critique the discursive and material effects of resilience as organicist metaphor in Mayor Bill de Blasio's *One New York: The Plan for A Strong and Just City (OneNYC)*. This first chapter traces the naturalistic metaphor of resilience, from its origin in engineering and ecosystems to its application in urban planning and policy. The metaphor's form and function is inherently conservative, constraining the vision of an ecologically just NYC within broader discourses of growth-dependent urban planning, the reversal of white flight, and intensification of

environmental racism. By figuring social equity as a product of economic and environmental resilience strategies, the rhetorical form of de Blasio's speech and *OneNYC* plan centralizes neoliberal market logic of development as a natural, organic mode of perceiving and engaging the city. Despite the valiant and best intentions of planners and the de Blasio administration, the naturalization of such market logics materially functions to displace responsibility for disaster relief onto affected communities. At the same time, it incentivizes speculative investing that makes greenwashing and displacement of New York City's most vulnerable black and brown communities inevitable. To understand how this happens we must first understand the rhetorical functions of metaphor as terministic screens in policy.

Literature Review

Kenneth Burke in *Language as Symbolic Action* forwards his dramatic approach to the structure of language as symbolic action, in contrast to the scientific approach that sees language as naming or definition.⁷ Exemplified by people's ability to have multiple interpretations of a singular photograph, Burke argues that even when terminology reflects reality it must always be a mere selection of reality, and hence a deflection of it as well.⁸ Burke uses the phrase terministic screens to describe this function. The terministic screen is a master image or conceptual metaphor that directs attention to one particular field of intelligibility; one way of interpreting the concepts they describe.⁹ Any observations derived from use of such a conceptual metaphor "are but implications of that particular terminology in terms of which the observations are made."¹⁰ Burke extends this to the domain of science because any scientific analysis relies on a particular perspective or field of terms from which observable phenomena are

recorded and interpreted. Burke's dramatist perspective is helpful for the critic to unpack the "necessarily suasive nature of even the most unemotional scientific nomenclatures."¹¹ Scientific terms that name and define the world impart a particular set of values by which people collectively understand their relationships with lived environment. Hence such terms create "consubstantiality" between peoples, acting as shared sets of meaning "even when their interests are not joined."¹²

Robert L. Ivie extends Burke's analysis through critique of the figurative and literalized metaphors of the Cold War deployed in public address and policies. Ivie explains that political motives derive from the shift of figurative metaphor to literalized metaphor. When perception of metaphor shifts from 'x is *like* y' to 'x is y', as in the case of Soviets and savages becoming virtual identities, the general political perspective is formed around it. When the conceptual metaphor of a discourse extends into a generalized perspective, it will pre-determine any potential "program of action"¹³ for responding to a particular political exigency. "We are in the presence of literalized metaphor," Ivie explains, "when we act upon the figurative as if it were real, not recognizing that two domains of meaning have been merged into one despite their differences."¹⁴ The phrases literal and figurative here do not mean real and imaginary. Rather, Ivie draws from Paul Cantor and his work on Friedrich Nietzsche, describing a metaphor's literal nature as a function of its use, its "frequency and rarity."¹⁵ Hence, "what is regarded as literal at one moment may become figurative at another, and vice versa."¹⁶ There is no natural hierarchy of meaning in language. Yet, the choice of conceptual metaphor constrains how people interpret fact or fiction, in ways that can have devastating political consequences.

The rhetorical scholar, Ivie reminds us, does not stand outside of this process. Rather, they are an invested participant within the process of literalizing or de-literalizing competing conceptual metaphors in the texts they analyze. In doing such, they are “well advised to treat literalized metaphors as pragmatic fictions, exposing those that are no longer practical in the nuclear age and searching for others that may prove more functional as symbolic equipment for living.”¹⁷ In an age of increasing urban populations faced with economic and environmental crisis, it is imperative for urban planners, academics, and activists to interrogate how cities are understood. The resilience paradigm as critiqued here has a historical and institutional value-structure that enables, and in many ways necessitates, a series of speculative and unjust practices. In Chapter Five, I will briefly offer the metabolic paradigm¹⁸ as a more effective and just means by which to apprehend the form and function of a city’s communities and institutions.

Edward Schiappa in *Defining Reality: Definitions and the Politics of Meaning* parallels Burke and Ivie by arguing that the process of defining words should be understood as an *ought* question, rather than a simple *is* question.¹⁹ Definitions, he argues, are both prescriptive (restrict how language should be used), and theory-bound (what counts as an observation statement can only make sense from within a cluster of particular beliefs about an aspect of the world).²⁰ Definitions do not merely index some object or entity that is in the world, but rather reflect “rhetorically induced social knowledge” that constitute “a shared understanding among people about themselves, the objects of their world, and how they ought to use language.”²¹ Hence, it is critical to subject political definitions of even lived environment to scrutiny. Relationships with lived environments are intimately connected with the language used to describe those

environments, as the contest over who and what defines the “natural” attest to.²²

Organicist metaphors are persuasive because they have an internal justification for their dominance in the hierarchy of meaning. Because of “the belief that the order of Nature is unquestionable and good because it has its origin in a higher power”, metaphors that map natural concepts onto built environments intuitively hold sway over mechanistic terminology.²³

In his chapter on the controversy surrounding President George H.W. Bush’s Administration and its definition of wetlands, Schiappa argues that all definitions, even scientific, serve particular interests and are hence political.²⁴ A definition’s shared acceptance is not a function of its fidelity to what it describes, but rather a function of power and persuasion.²⁵ The Bush campaign promise to achieve “no net loss” of wetlands was interpreted by the nation as a concession to conservation movements’ values as guided by a 1989 definition of wetlands from the *Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands*.²⁶ However, pressure from corporate entities inspired the administration to attempt a balance of interests in 1991 by restricting its definition of wetlands to open up approximately 30 million acres of federally protected land for development. Schiappa points to debate over the true nature of wetlands as an important aspect of the controversy, but sees it as an inevitably circular and self-referential one.²⁷ Rather, by interpreting the controversy as one over political interests and values rhetorical critics can deconstruct how and why particular definitions are persuasive and dominate the hierarchy of meaning. Because Bush’s proposed redefinition distanced his administration from the values of his campaign promise, it created a definitional rupture that failed to garner political and social support.²⁸

Schiappa's rhetorical criticism of the controversy surrounding Federal wetlands definition is situated within the field of study called environmental communication. Since its inception with the publication of Christine Oravec's 1981 study of the "sublime" in John Muir's appeals to preserve Yosemite Valley, scholars of environmental communication have created many different ways of understanding and interpreting the "relationships between our talk and our experiences of our natural surroundings."²⁹ Environmental communication studies have recently come to the fore, becoming a prominent scholarly field of inquiry in its own right.

In his introduction to *Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere*, Robert J. Cox identifies the seven broad areas of study that constitute the field of environmental communication. They are environmental rhetoric and discourse, media and environmental journalism, public participation in environmental decision-making, social marketing and advocacy campaigns, environmental collaboration and conflict resolution, risk communication, and representations of nature in popular culture and green marketing.³⁰ In establishing the domain of study in environmental communication, Cox identifies citizens and community groups, environmental groups, scientists, corporations and business lobbyists, anti-environmentalist groups, media and environmental journalism, and public officials and regulators as those whose competing voices and interests constitute conflict over lived environment.³¹ Cox provides environmental communication scholars with a domain of integral factors to analyze in their studies. By properly understanding the participants and forms of appeal in the environmental controversy, scholars can more accurately apprehend and attend to the multitude of voices at play.

Jennifer Peeples and Stephen Depoe expand our understanding of voice in the study of environmental controversy in their introduction to *Voice and Environmental Communication* by establishing the five primary roles of voice. The five roles are as shaper of identity, as textual construction which establishes and constrains point of view, as instigator and opposition to modes of social organization, as currency or blockade to forms of political process and environmental decisionmaking, and as mediated means of communication from non-human nature to humans.³² All of these forms except non-human voice will be addressed in the thesis. However, I first turn to the intent of this thesis as its own voice in the contest over defining relationships to lived environment in urban policymaking. I align my study with Cox's invitation to think of the field as a crisis discipline, where scholars' intentions must be to intervene on "failures of human response and communication" regarding environmental destruction.³³ My project takes equally seriously Senecah and Netzley's argument that environmental communication scholars should "act as an identifiable source of theoretical and applied knowledge to public policy decision makers, communities, businesses, educators, and citizen groups."³⁴ I contend that rhetorical criticism of environmental policy frames and terminology can be such an important source for two reasons. First, it enables concerned citizens to deconstruct the persuasive nature of dominant frames. Recognition of whose voice and values are privileged in a particular policy frame is critical to evaluating its fidelity to intentions, and efficacy as conservation practice. Second, rhetorical criticism enables citizens to construct alternate frames attendant to contrasting voices currently disregarded in the process of constructing and implementing environmental policy

A useful paradigm for understanding the way the resilience appeal functions in the OneNYC Plan is through the concept of greenwashing. Greenwashing is defined as “the act of misleading consumers regarding the environmental practices of a company or the environmental benefits of a product or service.”³⁵ Through means of “confusion, fronting, and posturing,”³⁶ corporate entities hide deviance, deflect attributions of fault, obscure the nature of a problem, and reattribute blame all to ensure an entity's reputation or appearance of leadership position.³⁷ Rhetorical scholars in recent years have analyzed the form and function of greenwashing by a variety of entities including Conservative Environmental Think Tanks,³⁸ the US Coal Industry,³⁹ Oil and Gas Industries,⁴⁰ Universities⁴¹ and many others. Scholars have also studied the effectiveness and greenwashing effects of proposed solutions such as Sustainability Ratings,⁴² Mass Media Oversight,⁴³ and NGO Review.⁴⁴

The greenwashing paradigm is helpful to explain how value-laden definitions construct persuasive power and affect outcomes in environmental policymaking. Peoples study of Wise Use advocacy groups analyzed their “aggressive mimicry” of “environment” and “conservation” rhetoric to explain how a loose coalition of “natural resource industries, outdoor recreation groups, and land-owners” portray themselves as a legitimate environmental movement.⁴⁵ Corporate representative’s values are perceived as conservation while persuasively framing contemporary environmentalist positions as irrationally anti-humanist. Bricker explains the rhetorical strategies of naming and definition that anti-environmentalist groups use to coopt conservation movements rhetorical power.⁴⁶ By taking names that seemingly aligned groups with conservation values (ex/ The American Petroleum Institute’s rebranding as Energy Citizens) and by

defining themselves as “mainstream and driven by scientific consensus” these “faux-grassroots” conservative movements breed “perceptions of inconsistency, skepticism, and contrarianism” that effectively reduce and counter the rhetorical force of pushes for regulation of corporate environmental exploitation.⁴⁷ Echoing Burke, Bricker emphasizes that the appropriation of a subordinate group’s voice by a dominant one makes it harder to parse their distinctive value sets, even when interests do not align.

While many have used the greenwashing paradigm, critics like DeLuca warn that such paradigms risk overgeneralizing and being ahistorical regarding the corporate roots of environmentalism and the beneficial roles corporations can continue to play in environmentalist causes.⁴⁸ Specifically referencing the role that train companies and tourism played in establishing the preservationist frame that sustain environmentalist movements, DeLuca argues that environmentalists and scholars must avoid a counterproductive impulse for purity by being attentive to the ways corporate influence can work for good.⁴⁹ It will suffice here to say that this thesis heeds DeLuca’s criticisms by pointing to the influence of specific corporate entities, explaining how their politically motivated definitions crowd out values of the very people they supposedly represent. In chapter Five, I defend a different organicist frame for thinking the city that understands the role that corporations must play in urban planning and development. However, my alternate frame divests from a purely growth-oriented paradigm that make the worst outcomes for communities and environmental destruction inevitable.

100 Resilient Cities and the Rise of the Urban Organicist Metaphor

In the context of this study, I argue that Mayor Bill de Blasio’s *OneNYC* announcement speech and plan deploy the terministic screen of resilience as the field of

intelligibility by which citizens, policymakers, and planners come to understand themselves, their communities, and their city. The organicist metaphor of city resilience in the *OneNYC* Plan is a value-laden term with discursive roots in a long history stretching from Urban Sociology to 100 Resilient Cities' corporatized planning discourse. Its form and function constrains voice so that the plan's construction and enactment is interpreted by policymakers and citizens as effective, yet proves ultimately antithetical to ecological conservation and equity. Invested scholars, concerned citizens, affected community members, planners, and policymakers, if truly dedicated to the values of environmental conservation and ecologically sustainable lifestyles, must construct alternative means of understanding the ecology of the urban.

The *OneNYC* platform appropriates the voice of environmental movements and conservationists to project a paradigm whose focus on responding to the concerns of minority communities actually secures the means of their dispossession. Of particular importance is the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities (100RC) paradigm of city resilience played in naming and defining the *OneNYC* Plan. 100RC is an international network of resources and expertise funded by the Rockefeller Foundation that materially and intellectually supports city planners and legislators to design planning strategies to help individuals, communities, institutions, businesses and systems "withstand, respond to, and adapt more readily to shocks and stresses to bounce back stronger after tough times, and live better in good times."⁵⁰

The 100RC analyzes the resilience of urban systems through its *City Resilience Index (CRI)* developed in conjunction with Engineering Firm Arup. The *CRI* is based on Four Dimensions (Health & Wellbeing, Economy & Society, Infrastructure &

Environment, Leadership & Strategy), Twelve Drivers (Meets Basic Needs, Supports Livelihood and Employment, Ensures Public Health Services, Promotes Cohesive and Engaged Communities, Ensures Social Stability Security and Justice, Fosters Economic Prosperity, Enhances and Provides Protective Natural & Man - Made Assets, Ensures Continuity of Critical Services, Provides Reliable Communication and Mobility, Promotes Leadership and Effective Management, Empowers a Broad Range of Stakeholders, Fosters Long-Term and Integrated Planning) and Seven Qualities (Reflectiveness, Resourcefulness, Robustness, Redundancy, Flexibility, Inclusiveness, Integration) of a resilient system.⁵¹ The *CRI* combines social and ecological notions of resilience, a move that reflects the urban ecological sensibilities of its architects.⁵² In their report on the development of the City Resilience Index, the Rockefeller Foundation and Arup begin their narrative with Jane Jacobs' 1958 urban planning keystone *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* written with funding by a Rockefeller Foundation grant. As a response to her contemporary crisis of urban decay, Jacobs' pinged orthodox urbanism like that of Robert Moses' as the cause. Orthodox urbanism in its realist approach tends to treat any problems of the city as distinct, independent variables that should be interpreted and responded to as such. However, Jacobs' believed that accounting for urbanity's problems "involve dealing with a *sizable number of factors which are interrelated into an organic whole* (Author's Emphasis)."⁵³ Contrary to orthodox perspectives like that of Robert Moses which obscure the interconnected nature of variables in city planning, she believed cities are places of "organized complexity."

While the Rockefeller Foundation traces this notion of the organic whole to Jacobs' work in the late 50's, the conceptualization of urban as ecological is actually a far

older concept. Some of the earliest roots of treating cities as an organic unity are in Aristotle's notion of the synoptic or whole-view of the city.⁵⁴ To Aristotle, the unique character of Greek urbanity was the ability of a citizen to "behold his whole city as readily as he might take in the form and character of a single person."⁵⁵ Drawing from Aristotle's early notion of the organic whole, Lewis Mumford agreed with Jacobs' diagnosis in his National Book Award winning study *The City in History*, arguing that the relentless acceleration of strictly technical understandings of human organization are detrimental to urban planning and flourishing. The purely technical destructive practices that came to fall under the banner of urban renewal exemplified by the urban renewal of Moses and others was, to Mumford, an "urban cancer."⁵⁶ However, despite agreement on the disease, they disagreed on the cure. Mumford derided Jacobs' focus on the street level and her desire for "cities to grow naturally,"⁵⁷ decrying it as a "home remedy."⁵⁸ Donald M. Miller, Mumford's biographer summed up the disagreement as "a question of order versus disorder, of disciplined, or well-planned urban development versus a more haphazard, hit-or-miss approach."⁵⁹ However, despite Mumford and Jacobs' disagreement on the solution, Mumford fundamentally agreed that the future of urban culture "rests on the development of a more organic world picture, which shall do justice to all the dimensions of living organisms and human personalities."⁶⁰

To understand the development of this unique form of the organic city paradigm in urban planning and policy mainstreams, it is imperative to turn to the works of 20th century Scottish biologist and architect Paul Geddes. In *Cities in Evolution* Geddes grappled with the problem of massive urban influx by incorporating biological evolutionary concepts into city analysis. In describing how urban planners should think

the city, Geddes' argued that the city's "healthy life is completeness of relation of organism, function, and environment, and all at their best."⁶¹ Geddes' work and its notion of city as living organism were foundational to the birth of the Chicago School.⁶² By combining ecological theory and case studies of Chicago's development in the 1920's and 1930's, the Chicago School pioneered contemporary urban sociology.⁶³ Their most prominent publication *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment* popularized the Concentric Zone Theory. The theory used Darwinian notions of competition between social groups and natural evolution, explaining Chicago's spatial organization of neighborhoods as a "product of nature."⁶⁴ This paradigm did not define the city as *like* a natural ecosystem, but *as* organic entities. Literalizing the metaphor, the Chicago School used life science paradigms to explain the very impetus and functions of urban social and institutional organizations.

For the Chicago School, competition explains and predetermines the spatial layout and expansion of the city.⁶⁵ In contest for scarce resources like land, people restrict themselves to natural areas, or niches, where shared social characteristics arise from similar ecological pressures.⁶⁶ A succession accompanies this growth; more wealthy people stave off potential invasion from the impoverished by relocating to the external rungs of the city, producing five concentric zones of wealth and social dispersion.⁶⁷ The authors of *The City* described these five zones as a Central Business District Zone at center, a Transition Zone, a Zone of Workingmen's Homes, a Residential Zone, and a Commuter Zone on the outside.⁶⁸ Because the city's forms of human organization are subject to the observed laws of the life sciences, author Ernest Burgess claimed that a student of urban community or community organizer would learn more about "natural

organization of the community from Warming's *Oecology of Plants* or from Adams's *Guide to the Study of Animal Ecology* than from any other source.”⁶⁹

In the context of urban sociology, planning, and policymaking, the Chicago School’s publications “pioneered the use of ecological theory and terms to describe the structure and function of cities.”⁷⁰ One can see the influence of the Chicago School in the urban planning mainstream through the sector theory of rent areas proposed by Homer Hoyt in his 1939 report *The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities*. Acting as Principal Housing Economist of the Federal Housing Administration, Hoyt’s report reviewed and modified the Concentric Zone Theory. If city planners and policymakers seek to establish the most effective concentration of retail and business groupings within the city, Hoyt argued, they would need more complexity when describing neighborhood groupings than simple zonation.⁷¹

Specifically taking issue with the Chicago School’s thesis that a zone of higher rent surrounds the entirety of the city at the farthest rung from the CBD, Hoyt uses block-by-block data of 142 American cities to design a more nuanced analytic lens.⁷² Using the ecological metaphors of succession and filtering, Hoyt describes immigration into cities as a vacancy chain.⁷³ When new better properties are crafted at the periphery of centrally located high rent sectors within which higher earners coalesce. Newcomers then inhabit the old properties that still reside within the high rent sector, but it now simultaneously extends out to the periphery of the city itself. Even when taking into account the effects of future transportation on patterns of growth, Hoyt concludes that despite increasing complexity, policymakers and planners must “continue to make it imperative that our main shopping, financial, and business centers be located in the inner portion of the urban

organism.”⁷⁴ Hoyt’s paradigm of urban ecology was central to the urban renewal framework that would define planning practice until the late 60’s. Even those scholars and planners that commented on or wholly rejected Hoyt’s conclusions expanded and modified rather than abandoned ecological metaphors.

Influenced by Hoyt’s notions of filtering neighborhoods, urban planning scholars Edgar Malone Hoover Jr. and Raymond Vernon proposed a “life-cycle notions of neighborhood change,” describing the growth and decline of a neighborhood as a five-stage process following a trajectory of Initial Urbanization, Transition, Downgrading, Thinning, and Renewal.⁷⁵ Anthony Downs would later echo Hoover & Vernon in his own description of the neighborhood continuum, explaining the five stages as Stable and Viable, Minor Decline, Clear Decline, Heavily Deteriorated, and Unhealthy and Nonviable.⁷⁶ These life-cycle analyses of neighborhoods became definitive for risk-rating systems and underwriting practices of the Home Owner’s Loan Corporation (HOLC) and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). These organizations life-cycle analysis “accommodated the biased practices of the real estate and financial industries.”⁷⁷ Hoyt, while acting as director of economic studies for the Regional Plan Association of New York, centralized blight and outmigration of whites as the greatest urban problems.⁷⁸ Simultaneously, the siting of primarily black communities as end of life-cycle neighborhoods meant the FHA denied them any funding until the late 70s, significantly affecting the wealth distribution of modern cities.⁷⁹ Robert Moses and other planners adopted these life-style cycles in their own planning practices, designing the face of contemporary urbanity.

Despite widespread popularity, The Chicago School's use of ecological metaphor and its resultant paradigms have been under heavy scrutiny for decades in the urban planning and sociology literature. Grove and Burch Jr. classify the criticisms of the Chicago School in three different categories. The first category is critique of biological determinism, arguing that social structures and individual action cannot be defined by biology. In fact, culture and social environment are both unique to, and sufficient to describe human organization and action.⁸⁰ Second was reductionism of cause. Specifically, the notion that competition is the sole or overarching determinant of social organization and action.⁸¹ Competition defining human success and naturally produced social differentiation is the foundation of Social Darwinism, whose prominence in the 1800's and 1900's was an important factor in the justification of racism, and other forms of social discrimination and violence.⁸² Third was critique of scale. Primarily, the idea that individual action can be explained by macro-level statistical⁸³ and conceptual⁸⁴ analysis was flawed in both process and product.

Jacobs would extend these analytic critiques in her own rejection of the urban renewal paradigm. Decrying it as a self-fulfilling prophecy, Jacobs argued that when you define a neighborhood as declining it will inevitably decline.⁸⁵ To foster vitality in the ways planners conceive of neighborhoods, Jacobs proposed a reconceptualization of revitalization through four principles that cities should aim for. First, she encouraged fostering lively and interesting streets. Second, she encouraged making the fabric of streets as continuous a network throughout a district of potential subcity size and power. Third, she encouraged using parks and squares and public buildings as part of this street fabric; not to island off different uses or subdistricts but to intensify and knit together the

fabric's complexity and multiple use. Fourth, she emphasized the functional identity of areas large enough to work as districts.⁸⁶ Jacobs conceded that “[d]ull, inert cities... do contain the seeds of their own destruction and little else.”⁸⁷ However, by fostering the “organized complexity” of cities, planners would foster “lively, diverse, intense cities [that] contain the seeds of their own regeneration, with energy enough to carry over for problems and needs outside themselves.”⁸⁸ Similar to earlier critics, Jacobs does not abandon, but rather centralizes the organicist metaphor of urban life. Intending to undermine the conservative nature of previous interpretations she hoped to reinvigorate the organism with vitality rather than restriction.

Jacobs' work marked a paradigmatic shift in how planning development and policymaking were formulated. Dominant interpretations of planning and policymaking turned from the life-cycle paradigm toward “organized complexity.” Rather than characterizing a neighborhoods vitality in terms of an inevitable cycle, this new paradigm viewed social life of through metrics to foster and expand a neighborhoods innovative potential. Jacobs attempted to argue for the importance of recognizing the authentic character of urban buildings and spaces to detract from those who wanted to destroy them in the name of urban renewal. Yet, Zukin argues, she simultaneously “failed to look at how people use capital and culture to view, and to shape, the urban spaces they inhabit.”⁸⁹ This happened because Jacobs did not seem to understand that authenticity of urban spaces “is itself a social product.”⁹⁰ Mueller, calling upon Zukin's criticisms, couches Jacobs' work as an active “avoiding of class realities,” and as the “softer side to the war” on impoverished minority communities. Jacobs is the “Patron Saint” of a new “liberal project of city governance,” Mueller proposes. This “liberal project” turns

Jacobs' ideological commitments into an accomplice to NYC Mayor Rudy Giuliani's "broken windows" policing strategy.⁹¹ As Zukin argued, "What Jacobs valued — small blocks, cobblestone streets, mixed-uses, local character — have become the gentrifiers' ideal. This is not the struggling city of working class and ethnic groups, but an idealised image that plays to middle-class tastes."⁹² While Giuliani empowered a targeted crackdown on petty crimes in impoverished areas to kick people out, Jacobs' fetishization of authentic urban space makes cleared space ripe for gentrification.⁹³ Jacobs' emphasis on the "organized complexity" of urban environs made modern cities so amenable to the conceptual frame of resilience itself. By figuring Jacobs' as the instigating ideology of resilience thinking in 100RC and hence *OneNYC*, I argue that the plan participates and extends this "liberal governance" project to the detriment of the City's vulnerable residents.

Social and Cultural Resilience in the Modern Ecological City

While there are hundreds of contemporary uses of resilience, the concept itself arose in the field of ecology in the 1970s. Resilience as originally described by Holling is the measure of a system and its internal relationships to persist through change.⁹⁴ Despite disagreement on the true definition of what constitutes resilience, and what objects should be definable in terms of resilience, resilience's explanatory power has historically been as an outcome, a state, a property, or a process.⁹⁵

In the context of cities, ecological metaphors have helped explain their organization since the Chicago School's Concentric Zone Theory in the 1920s.⁹⁶ Yet, the introduction of resilience as a metric for studying the urban environment did not happen until the mid to late 1990s, when scientists began to integrate analytic paradigms to

understand the interplay of human communities and environmental systems.⁹⁷ Holling and associates adopted such an integrated paradigm, coining the term “social-ecological systems”.⁹⁸ They gave contours to this conceptual frame by offering up four qualities of a resilient system (Latitude, Resistance, Precariousness, Panarchy),⁹⁹ and by delineating a distinction between engineering resilience (stability near an equilibrium) and ecological resilience (measure of magnitudes of disturbance before a system changes states).¹⁰⁰ By bringing together social economic and environmental factors, “[r]esilience theory provides a framework for understanding social and demographic changes within an urban system while acknowledging the influence of the ecological system on social structures and functions.”¹⁰¹ However, Bures and Kanapaux warn that “[f]or resilience to be useful for studying urban systems, it must move beyond metaphor to something that is measurable.”¹⁰² Despite being a scientific claim, the relevance is important in the rhetorical construction of resilience. For resilience to become a dominant means of thinking the city, it had to transform from a means of describing what a city is like to what a city is. Hence, as Ivie and Schiappa make clear, the pursuit of literalizing the metaphor of resilience is not merely to give it scientific legitimacy but to establish its dominant space in the hierarchy of meaning.

Taking up the demand to produce metrics for analyzing city resilience, the Rockefeller Foundation’s 100RC partnered with engineering firm Arup to create the *CRI*. Integrating social and ecological resilience, the *CRI* explicitly references Jacobs’ influence on their thinking of cities as “complex systems that are constantly adapting to changing circumstances.”¹⁰³ To test and develop their resilience metrics, 100RC designated twenty-four research cities, or “living laboratories,” whose institutions and

resources were analyzed. As a product of this test phase, *OneNYC*'s adoption of these resilience metrics reflect in the name itself. The phrasing of "One New York" is not merely symbolic regarding de Blasio's "Tale of Two Cities" narrative; it also reflects the "organic complexity" and "whole-of-city" thinking adopted from 100RC.¹⁰⁴ In the text of the plan itself, the administration centralizes "the approach of the 100RC initiative, recognizing the need to address acute shocks and chronic stresses in securing the city's growth."¹⁰⁵ Similarly, the text of *OneNYC* explains the importance of adopting the paradigm because it "demonstrates leadership in resiliency and takes advantage of the resources and opportunities it presents."¹⁰⁶ In its strategic naming the plan reflects Jacobs' "bottom-up" emphasis and projects a constitutive vision that I will explore in Chapter Two. The name *OneNYC* acts as a point of identification¹⁰⁷ through which the disparate stakeholders in city planning and development imagine shared interests and collaborative policymaking strategies. However, as Schiappa and Burke emphasize, even "natural" or "scientific" definitions are subject to politics, as they arise out of institutional debate, and rely on particular intentions. Levine et al. warn that in the context of resilience, "hidden value judgements" can sustain unequal power imbalances and injustice rather than rectify them.¹⁰⁸ They write that

The paradigm encourages value-free analysis by focusing on outcomes and symptoms of resilience, avoiding looking at the power relations that are at the root of much vulnerability. The quest for objectivity remains an illusion, though, because exploitation too can be resilient, so any 'scientific' analysis still had to judge which is resilience-to-be-supported and which is resilience-to-be-fought.¹⁰⁹

In defining the aspirations of the plan, the emphasis on global leadership and the central role of cumulative growth function as ideological screens to criticism of the means and motives by which growth actualizes. Haffner explains in the context of large-scale urban

greening projects that even projects rightfully “intended to serve existing residents” can produce resultant “exodus [that] in turn transforms the sociological contours of the area and, by extension, the spatial segregation of the entire city.”¹¹⁰ While increasing segregation is obviously not the intent of such plans and not of *OneNYC*’s either, projects “nevertheless reflect a rather narrow-minded vision of what it means to bring nature into the city.”¹¹¹ Despite the perception that “One New York” would produce a unified and mutually beneficial New York for all residents, this thesis traces definitional ruptures in resilience as terministic screen. Tracing the conceptual development as response to political and social exigencies manifested by actualized policies and clarification of the role played by corporate entities, I hope to clarify the contours of this specific political project of resilience, and the effects it has on the makeup of a modern city.

Significance and Thesis Structure

While it may seem restrictive and counter-intuitive to study only one instance of city resilience policy, I argue that there is perhaps no more important contemporary American resilience policy to analyze than *OneNYC*. First, the notions of resilience that frame *OneNYC* are part of a global political project undertaken by the Rockefeller Foundation’s 100RC. As representative of an international movement, *OneNYC* serves as both test case and model for global city resilience methodology. It is critical then that invested stakeholders such as myself speak to and refine the rhetorical construction and material implications of this proposal. Second, *OneNYC* contains one of the most ambitious citywide poverty reduction plans in American history. As inequality continues to plague not only NYC, but also cities nationwide and across the globe, it is imperative to understand how the framing of policies will affect their outcomes. As government

intervention on economic crisis continues to lessen, it is a responsibility to comprehend and encourage responsible, effective economic policy. Third, is that as the role of the EPA and federal regulations on environmental sustainability are in question,¹¹² it increasingly falls to cities to make large declarations and lead in environmental, social, and institutional resilience.¹¹³ The successes or failures of *OneNYC* will serve as a beacon for policies implemented across the country and the globe. Hence, it is of the utmost importance for scholars, urban planners, and policymakers to take seriously the broader implications that adopting similar policies in their cities will have, and to push for these policies to be as successful and effective as possible.

The next chapter will undertake a rhetorical critique of de Blasio's Announcement Speech on Earth Day 2015 at The Point. The Mayor's announcement of the plan on the holiday dedicated to environmental protection to the primarily Latinx peoples of Hunts Point enacts a rhetorical construction of space, employing code-switching and appeal to the unique character of the community to produce identification with and through resilience strategies. The speech in form and content undertakes a spatial and experiential development that acts as constitutive narrative, calling the local community and New Yorkers as a whole to civic duty. I also analyze the structure of the speech as secular jeremiad, where de Blasio's "Tale of Two Cities" reflects the Book of Isaiah's narrative of Zion and Babylon. By taking the role of prophet and priest, de Blasio offers the community and New Yorkers writ-large a covenant with God, the opportunity for salvation through pursuit of environmental, economic, and social resilience policy.

The third chapter extends Bricker and Schiappa's works on "strategic naming" and "definitional argument" to argue for resilience as a political project. The resilience

paradigm in *OneNYC* is greenwashing, a value-laden perspective on urban design constrained by institutional histories and hierarchies that legitimates exploitative practices. I will show this by identifying three instructive historical developments and institutional shifts of the “organized complexity” frame *OneNYC*’s resilience paradigm relies on. The first shift is from Jane Jacobs’ understanding of “organized complexity” to its taking up by grassroots architectural movements in the 60s, 70s, and 80s. The second shift is from the grassroots movements to the New Urbanism movement and the Congress of the New Urbanism in the 80s, 90s, and 2000s. Lastly, I study the shift from the New Urbanists to 100 Resilient Cities and *OneNYC* in the 2010s. While each social and institutional arrangement discussed explicitly draws on the frame of “organized complexity”, each uses strategic naming and definitional argument to mask shifts in values, and ideology. I then turn to a case study of *OneNYC*’s “tech ecosystem” proposal to exemplify my findings. I analyze two distinct functions. First is that resilience functions through a politics of scale that restricts analysis to the internal complexity of the city organism. This frame distracts from analyzing the planetary impacts of technological development and financial capital within the city. The result is that global planetary offsets from waste, energy-use, and economic instability that actually make the city and world more unstable are hidden from view. Second, the plan emphasizes the impact on economic resilience by arguing for increased role for impoverished people within high-growth, high-value industries. Extending the rhetorical criticism of organicist metaphors to the “tech ecosystem,” I argue that the operative assumptions within such interpretations of “techquity”¹¹⁴ are bankrupt. The success of transnational firms and industries do not easily equate to the competitiveness and economic uplift of the city and

its current inhabitants. In fact, I argue that the resultant naturalizing of market logics and speculative valuations of underserved, peripheral neighborhoods of New York City inevitably dispossess the very people they intend to serve.

The fourth chapter extends the critical lenses developed in Chapters Two and Three, arguing that de Blasio uses the *OneNYC 2016 Progress Report* to chart a new rhetorical strategy, modifying his vision of “One New York” to take the form of Puritan rhetoric of covenant renewal. In the *Progress Report* de Blasio foregoes the prophetic, abandoning the “Tale of Two Cities” portion of the narrative that framed both his announcement of *OneNYC*, and the *OneNYC* text itself. Calling upon youth to embrace the resilience of New Yorkers past, and upon all New Yorkers to participate within community-driven resilience projects. Mayor de Blasio’s rhetoric of covenant renewal compels the citizenry to internalize the struggle for resilience as civic duty. The result of de Blasio’s updated vision of “One New York” is a community and individual resilience paradigm that strategically appeals to white youth, but does so in a way that endangers the fundamental intents of *OneNYC* to bolster rather than endanger the City’s most vulnerable communities. I analyze two project proposals within the *Progress Report* to substantiate this claim. First, I use Bricker’s framing of strategic naming and definition as argument to look at the Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative proposal and the rhetorical shift from “collaborative planning” in *OneNYC* to “community planning” in the *Progress Report*. The rhetoric of social resilience acts as a screen from which inequitable effects remain indecipherable. In effect, communities plan themselves right out of their own neighborhoods. Second, I analyze the proposal for the Brooklyn-Queens Connector (BQX), a sixteen-mile long streetcar line stretching from Astoria, Queens to

Sunset Park, Brooklyn. Mayor de Blasio's pivot to "innovation clusters" participates within, and normalizes broader discourses of the "smart city,"¹¹⁵ and urban branding¹¹⁶ of New York as "the global capital for innovation."¹¹⁷ These discourses are particularly attractive to a burgeoning "creative class" of white entrepreneurial youth seeking rebranded space, speculative real estate development, and accessibility to high-tech industries.¹¹⁸ Subject to increasing economic and social pressures, predominately black and brown neighborhoods surrounding the line experience "bright flight,"¹¹⁹ an influx of white youth with "cultural capital to appreciate the aesthetics of heritage and the financial capital to buy into it."¹²⁰ In form and function, de Blasio's rhetorical choices in the *Progress Report* lay the ideological and political groundwork for gentrification.

The final chapter concludes by offering the rhetorical frame of metabolic analysis as alternative to resilience. Urban Political Ecologists propose a new politics of scale and apprehension of political, economic, social, and environmental systems that can mobilize urban policymaking that recognizes and contends with the tension between growth-dependent planning and any true notion of environmental and social sustainability.

Notes

¹ Bill de Blasio, “Transcript: Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City,” The Official Website of the City of New York, April 22, 2015, <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/259-15/transcript-mayor-de-blasio-releases-one-new-york-plan-strong-just-city>.

² Ibid.

³ Joseph McLaughlin, *Writing the Urban Jungle: Reading Empire in London from Doyle to Eliot* (University of Virginia Press, 2000).

⁴ Mohsen Mostafavi, “Why Ecological Urbanism? Why Now?,” *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring/Summer 2010, <http://www.harvarddesignmagazine.org/issues/32/why-ecological-urbanism-why-now>.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Steward T. A. Pickett et al., “Evolution and Future of Urban Ecological Science: Ecology In, Of, and for the City,” *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability* 2, no. 7 (July 1, 2016): n/a-n/a, doi:10.1002/ehs2.1229.

⁷ Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (University of California Press, 1966), 42–43.

⁸ Ibid., 45.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., 46.

¹¹ Ibid., 45.

¹² Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (University of California Press, 1969), 20.

¹³ Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History* (University of California Press, 1984), 92.

¹⁴ Martin J. Medhurst et al., *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology* (MSU Press, 1997), 73.

¹⁵ Paul Cantor, “Friedrich Nietzsche: The Use and Abuse of Metaphor,” *Metaphor: Problems and Perspectives*, 1982, 71.

¹⁶ David S. Miall, *Metaphor, Problems and Perspectives* (Harvester Press, 1982), 72, 74.

¹⁷ Medhurst et al., *Cold War Rhetoric*, 73.

¹⁸ Nikolas C. Heynen, Maria Kaika, and Erik Swyngedouw, *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political Ecology and the Politics of Urban Metabolism*, vol. 3 (Taylor & Francis, 2006),
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=M5D2gt0fB5IC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=swyngedouw+heyne&ots=6lm8ud5VsH&sig=cTu4ry8Niz68siLQTgNSrNI8Xeo>.

¹⁹ Edward Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning, Rhetorical Philosophy and Theory* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003), 1, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=104400&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 49–69.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

²² *Ibid.*, 70.

²³ Harvard Law Review, “Organic and Mechanical Metaphors in Late Eighteenth-Century American Political Thought,” *Harvard Law Review* 110, no. 8 (1997): 1839, doi:10.2307/1342046.

²⁴ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 88.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 77.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 85–86.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 85.

²⁹ Celeste Michelle Condit and Stephen Depoe, “Environmental Communication: Environmental Studies in Mass Communication,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 14, no. 4 (1997): 368.

³⁰ Robert Cox, *Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere* (SAGE, 2010), 16–19.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 26–32.

³² Jennifer Peeples and Stephen Depoe, *Voice and Environmental Communication* (Springer, 2014), 3–11,
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Ue5CBAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&q=Voice+and+Environmental+Communication&ots=_nrlzMB1Pi&sig=bxMnUvcZMqanvAE-CwDwbWkCmks.

³³ Robert Cox, “Nature’s ‘crisis Disciplines’: Does Environmental Communication Have an Ethical Duty?,” *Environmental Communication* 1, no. 1 (2007): 10.

³⁴ Susan Senecah and Michael Netzley, “What Is the Case for an SCA Environmental Communication Commission?,” in *Legislative Council of the Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA. Retrieved August*, vol. 3, 1996, n.p.

³⁵ TerraChoice, “The Seven Sins of Greenwashing,” Summary Report, Environmental Claims in Consumer Markets (North America: TerraChoice, April 2009), 1, <http://sinsofgreenwashing.com/index3c24.pdf>.

³⁶ William S. Laufer, “Social Accountability and Corporate Greenwashing,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 43, no. 3 (2003): 256.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 255.

³⁸ Brett Jacob Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument,” *Western Journal of Communication* 78, no. 5 (2014): 636–52, doi:10.1080/10570314.2013.835065; Peter J. Jacques, Riley E. Dunlap, and Mark Freeman, “The Organisation of Denial: Conservative Think Tanks and Environmental Scepticism,” *Environmental Politics* 17, no. 3 (June 1, 2008): 349–85, doi:10.1080/09644010802055576.

³⁹ Peter K. Bsumek et al., “Corporate Ventriloquism: Corporate Advocacy, the Coal Industry, and the Appropriation of Voice,” in *Voice and Environmental Communication* (Springer, 2014), 21–43, http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137433749_2; Jen Schneider et al., “Under Pressure,” in *Under Pressure* (Springer, 2016), 1–24, http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/978-1-137-53315-9_1.

⁴⁰ Eric Lipton and Clifford Krauss, “Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign,” *The New York Times* 13 (2012), http://www.climateaccess.org/sites/default/files/Lipton%20%26%20Krauss_Fossil%20Fuel%20Industry%20Ads%20Dominate%20TV%20Campaign.pdf; Barbara M. Miller and Julie Lellis, “Audience Response to Values-Based Marketplace Advocacy by the Fossil Fuel Industries,” *Environmental Communication* 10, no. 2 (2016): 249–268; Chad Wickman, “Rhetorical Framing in Corporate Press Releases: The Case of British Petroleum and the Gulf Oil Spill,” *Environmental Communication* 8, no. 1 (2014): 3–20.

⁴¹ Julia D. Fox, “Leasing the Ivory Tower at a Social Justice University Freeport McMoRan, Loyola University New Orleans, and Corporate Greenwashing,” *Organization & Environment* 10, no. 3 (1997): 259–277; Stuart Kirsch, *Mining Capitalism: The Relationship between Corporations and Their Critics* (Univ of California Press, 2014),

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=uMubAwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&ots=Psgc_Uifj_&sig=4mVfc_Gh61AwSJVd9vsnwq22ug.

⁴² Béatrice Parguel, Florence Benoît-Moreau, and Fabrice Larceneux, “How Sustainability Ratings Might Deter ‘greenwashing’: A Closer Look at Ethical Corporate Communication,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 102, no. 1 (2011): 15–28.

⁴³ Carmen Daniela Maier, “Communicating Business Greening and Greenwashing in Global Media: A Multimodal Discourse Analysis of CNN’s Greenwashing Video,” *International Communication Gazette* 73, no. 1–2 (2011): 165–177.

⁴⁴ Linnea I. Laestadius et al., “‘We Don’t Tell People What to Do’: An Examination of the Factors Influencing NGO Decisions to Campaign for Reduced Meat Consumption in Light of Climate Change,” *Global Environmental Change* 29 (November 2014): 32–40, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.08.001.

⁴⁵ Jennifer A. Peeples, “Aggressive Mimicry: The Rhetoric of Wise Use and the Environmental Movement,” in *The Environmental Communication Yearbook, Volume 2*, ed. Susan L. Senecah, 2012, 184, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jennifer_Peeples/publication/249873731_Chapter_One_Aggressive_Mimicry_The_Rhetoric_of_Wise_Use_and_the_Environmental_Movement/links/5744c06508ae9f741b4081aa.pdf?origin=publication_detail.

⁴⁶ Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument.”

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 637–41.

⁴⁸ Kevin Michael DeLuca, “Trains in the Wilderness: The Corporate Roots of Environmentalism,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4, no. 4 (2001): 633–652; Kevin Michael DeLuca, “A Wilderness Environmentalism Manifesto: Contesting the Infinite Self-Absorption of Humans,” *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement*, 2007, 27; Kevin Michael DeLuca, “Salvaging Wilderness from the Tomb of History: A Response to The National Parks: America’s Best Idea,” *Environmental Communication* 4, no. 4 (2010): 484–493.

⁴⁹ DeLuca, “Trains in the Wilderness,” 648–49.

⁵⁰ Arup and 100 Resilient Cities, “City Resilience Framework” (The Rockefeller Foundation, November 2015), 4, http://www.100resilientcities.org/page/-/100rc/Blue%20City%20Resilience%20Framework%20Full%20Context%20v1_5.pdf.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 3–5.

⁵² Jo da Silva, “City Resilience Index” (Rockefeller Foundation, Arup, 2013).

⁵³ Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (Vintage Books, 1961), 432.

⁵⁴ Lewis Mumford, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1961), 186.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Lewis Mumford, “Mother Jacobs’ Home Remedies,” *The New Yorker*, December 1, 1962.

⁵⁷ Donald L. Miller, *Lewis Mumford, a Life* (Grove Press, 2002), 475.

⁵⁸ Mumford, “Mother Jacobs’ Home Remedies.”

⁵⁹ Miller, *Lewis Mumford, a Life*, 475.

⁶⁰ Mumford, *The City in History*, 567.

⁶¹ Patrick Geddes, *Cities in Evolution : An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics* (London, UK: Williams & Norgate, 1915), 392, <https://archive.org/stream/citiesinevolutio00gedduoft#page/12/mode/2up>.

⁶² Nancy B. Grimm et al., “Integrated Approaches to Long-Term Studies of Urban Ecological Systems Urban Ecological Systems Present Multiple Challenges to Ecologists—pervasive Human Impact and Extreme Heterogeneity of Cities, and the Need to Integrate Social and Ecological Approaches, Concepts, and Theory,” *BioScience* 50, no. 7 (2000): 571–584.

⁶³ William G. Flanagan, *Contemporary Urban Sociology* (CUP Archive, 1993), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=eIo6AAAAIAAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR6&dq=Contemporary+Urban+Sociology&ots=xHhJuXWS7R&sig=TNWTYXJgDzEBPwoA-gmbsD1eVBE>.

⁶⁴ Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick Duncan McKenzie, *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1925), 1.

⁶⁵ Nina Brown, “Park, Robert, and Ernest Burgess: Urban Ecology Studies, 1925,” *Center for Spatially Integrated Social Science*, November 14, 2002, <https://web.archive.org/web/20021114154941/http://www.csiss.org/classics/content/26>.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*, 145.

⁷⁰ Mark J. McDonnell, “The History of Urban Ecology,” in *Urban Ecology: Patterns, Processes, and Applications*, ed. Jari Niemelä and Jürgen H. Breuste (Oxford University Press, 2011), 8.

⁷¹ Homer Hoyt, *The Structure and Growth of Residential Areas in American Cities* (Washington D.C.: Federal Housing Administration, 1939), <https://archive.org/stream/structuregrowtho00unitrich#page/n3/mode/2up>.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 104.

⁷⁵ Dave H. Kaplan and Steven Holloway, *Urban Geography* (Wiley Global Education, 2014), 227.

⁷⁶ Anthony Downs, *Neighborhoods and Urban Development* (Brookings Institution Press, 1981), 63–64.

⁷⁷ John T. Metzger, “Planned Abandonment: The Neighborhood Life-Cycle Theory and National Urban Policy,” 2000, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10511482.2000.9521359>.

⁷⁸ Homer Hoyt, “Economy of Northeastern United States and Effect on Mortgage Investments,” in *Twelve Lectures Comprising the New York University Conference on Urban Mortgage Lending, Held in New York City in June, 1945, in Cooperation with the Mortgage Bankers Association of America*, xi, 306 p. (New York city, Albany: Fallon Law Book Company; M. Bender & Company, Incorporated, 1945), [//catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/010442174](http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/010442174).

⁷⁹ Calvin Bradford, “Financing Home Ownership The Federal Role In Neighborhood Decline,” *Urban Affairs Review* 14, no. 3 (1979): 313–335; Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (Oxford University Press, 1985), https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=XDQC1w1LIFMC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=Crabgrass+Frontier:+The+Suburbanization+of+the+United+States&ots=MDzzAYiq7l&sig=zKUrj_iDM-rUnZUxbS6LGwMLstc.

⁸⁰ M. A. Alihan, *Social Ecology: A Critical Analysis* (Columbia University Press, 1938); Warner E. Gettys, “Human Ecology and Social Theory,” *Social Forces* 18, no. 4 (May 1, 1940): 469–76, doi:10.2307/2570623; A B Hollingshead, “A Re-Examination of Ecological Theory.,” *Sociology and Social Research* 31 (January 1, 1946): 194.

⁸¹ Alihan, *Social Ecology*; Hollingshead, “A Re-Examination of Ecological Theory.”

⁸² William R. Burch, *Daydreams and Nightmares: A Sociological Essay on the American Environment* (Harper & Row, 1971); ROGER D. MASTERS, *The Nature of Politics* (Yale University Press, 1989), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1dxg7qh>.

⁸³ W. S. Robinson, "Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals," *American Sociological Review* 15, no. 3 (1950): 351–57, doi:10.2307/2087176.

⁸⁴ Burch, *Daydreams and Nightmares*; W. Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947); Walter Firey, "Sentiment and Symbolism as Ecological Variables," *American Sociological Review* 10 (April 1945): 140–48; MASTERS, *The Nature of Politics*.

⁸⁵ Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*; Robert E. Lang, "Did Neighborhood Life-Cycle Theory Cause Urban Decline?," 2000, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10511482.2000.9521358>.

⁸⁶ Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 129.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 448.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ Sharon Zukin, *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places* (Oxford University Press, 2009), 17.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ Gavin Mueller, "Liberalism and Gentrification," *Jacobin*, September 26, 2014, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/09/liberalism-and-gentrification/>.

⁹² Sharon Zukin, "Jane Jacobs (1916-2006)," *Architectural Review*, October 26, 2011, <https://www.architectural-review.com/rethink/reputations/-jane-jacobs-1916-2006/8621634.article>.

⁹³ Mueller, "Liberalism and Gentrification."

⁹⁴ "Resilience determines the persistence of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes of state variables, driving variables, and parameters, and still persist." C. S. Holling, "Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems," *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4 (1973): 1–23.

⁹⁵ Magali Reghezza-Zitt et al., "What Resilience Is Not: Uses and Abuses," *Cybergeography: European Journal of Geography*, 2012, <http://cybergeography.revues.org/25554>.

⁹⁶ Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*.

⁹⁷ James P. Collins et al., “A New Urban Ecology Modeling Human Communities as Integral Parts of Ecosystems Poses Special Problems for the Development and Testing of Ecological Theory,” *American Scientist* 88, no. 5 (2000): 416–425; Grimm et al., “Integrated Approaches to Long-Term Studies of Urban Ecological Systems Urban Ecological Systems Present Multiple Challenges to Ecologists—pervasive Human Impact and Extreme Heterogeneity of Cities, and the Need to Integrate Social and Ecological Approaches, Concepts, and Theory”; G. E. Likens et al., *Humans as Components of Ecosystems: The Ecology of Subtle Human Effects and Populated Areas* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Z4MHCAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR6&dq=Humans++as+++components+++of+++ecosystems.&ots=2ugt1YGt6S&sig=kaiBB3SEPN34bRDogWQm2T4Ml58>; Pickett et al., “Evolution and Future of Urban Ecological Science”; Jianguo Wu, “Urban Ecology and Sustainability: The State-of-the-Science and Future Directions,” *Landscape and Urban Planning* 125 (2014): 209–221.

⁹⁸ Brian Walker et al., “Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social–ecological Systems,” *Ecology and Society* 9, no. 2 (2004), <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5/inline.html>.

⁹⁹ “1. Latitude: the maximum amount a system can be changed before losing its ability to recover (before crossing a threshold which, if breached, makes recovery difficult or impossible). 2. Resistance: the ease or difficulty of changing the system; how “resistant” it is to being changed. 3. Precariousness: how close the current state of the system is to a limit or “threshold.” 4. Panarchy: because of cross-scale interactions, the resilience of a system at a particular focal scale will depend on the influences from states and dynamics at scales above and below. For example, external oppressive politics, invasions, market shifts, or global climate change can trigger local surprises and regime shifts.” See: *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ Crawford Stanley Holling, “Engineering Resilience versus Ecological Resilience,” *Engineering within Ecological Constraints* 31, no. 1996 (1996): 33.

¹⁰¹ Regina Bures and William Kanapaux, “Historical Regimes and Social Indicators of Resilience in an Urban System: The Case of Charleston, South Carolina,” *Ecology and Society* 16, no. 4 (November 17, 2011), doi:10.5751/ES-04293-160416.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁰³ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 5.

¹⁰⁴ Blythe McLennan, Martin Mulligan, and Tarnya Kruger, “Has the 100 Resilient Cities Challenge Benefited Melbourne?,” *The Conversation*, June 1, 2016, <http://theconversation.com/has-the-100-resilient-cities-challenge-benefited-melbourne-60307>.

¹⁰⁵ “One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City” (New York, NY: Office of the Mayor- NY Government, April 20, 2015), 13, <http://www.nyc.gov/html/onenyc/downloads/pdf/publications/OneNYC.pdf>.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 20.

¹⁰⁸ Simon Levine et al., *The Relevance Of 'resilience'?* (ODI, 2012), 2, <http://www.alnap.org/resource/10970.aspx>.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Jeanne Haffner, "The Dangers of Eco-Gentrification: What's the Best Way to Make a City Greener?," *The Guardian*, May 6, 2015, sec. Cities, <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/may/06/dangers-ecogentrification-best-way-make-city-greener>.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Deborah Seligsohn, "Will Clean Air and Water Survive EPA's Scott Pruitt?," February 16, 2017, <https://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/9612-Will-clean-air-and-water-survive-EPA-s-Scott-Pruitt->.

¹¹³ Noah Toly, "Cities Play Key Role in Climate Action," *100 Resilient Cities*, March 25, 2016, <http://www.100resilientcities.org/blog/entry/>.

¹¹⁴ Jason Shueh, "Seeking 'Techquity': Preparing for Industry While Preserving Diversity," *Government Technology*, August 2016, <http://www.govtech.com/civic/Seeking-Techquity-Preparing-Industry-While-Preserving-Diversity.html>.

¹¹⁵ Alberto Vanolo, "Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy," *Urban Studies*, 2013, 0042098013494427.

¹¹⁶ Alberto Vanolo, "The Image of the Creative City: Some Reflections on Urban Branding in Turin," *Cities* 25, no. 6 (2008): 370–382.

¹¹⁷ The City of New York Mayor Bill de Blasio, "OneNYC 2016 Progress Report," OneNYC (New York, NY: Office of the Mayor- NY Government, April 20, 2016), 19, <http://www1.nyc.gov/html/onenyc/downloads/pdf/publications/OneNYC-2016-Progress-Report.pdf>.

¹¹⁸ Richard Florida, "The Rise of the Creative Class, and How It Is Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life," *New York*, 2002, [https://www.creativeclass.com/rfcgdb/articles/Class_Distinctions_for_Global_Economy_\(RiseReview\).pdf](https://www.creativeclass.com/rfcgdb/articles/Class_Distinctions_for_Global_Economy_(RiseReview).pdf).

¹¹⁹ Hope Yen, "Suburbs Losing Young Whites To Cities, Brookings Institution Finds," *Huffington Post*, July 9, 2010, sec. Business, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/09/suburbs-losing-young-whit_n_569226.html.

¹²⁰ Zukin, *Naked City*, 87.

CHAPTER TWO

Earth Day Spiritual- de Blasio's One New York Announcement Speech

The Bronx Burns No More- Re-Making Space Uptown

On Earth Day 2015, Mayor Bill de Blasio made a rare appearance in the Hunts Point neighborhood of the South Bronx. The mayor took stage at The Point, a Community Development Corporation serving the South Bronx. Flanked by government officials and local community members, he announced the city administration's sweeping plan to address climate change and inequality. For those familiar with local politics, the choice of day for this event was far from random. In 2007, on Earth Day, Mayor Mike Bloomberg announced his own visionary strategy to address climate change, PlaNYC. Compared to Bloomberg's event hosted at the American Museum of Natural History in Manhattan, however, de Blasio's choice of venue seemed far more reserved.

The South Bronx, a primarily black and Latino community, was a key constituency for de Blasio's successful mayoral campaign.¹ During the campaign, de Blasio proclaimed to be harbinger of a new left populist movement and made one of his central platforms the resolution of New Yorkers growing economic inequity.² Lamenting past administration's privileging of elite New Yorkers over the needs of the many, de Blasio argued that New York had become an unfortunate "Tale of Two Cities," a narrative prevalent throughout his public addresses.³ The sentiment resonated with the people of the South Bronx because despite the city's economic gains under Rudy Giuliani

and Mike Bloomberg, they persistently experienced high poverty rates and a broad sense of institutional neglect.⁴

The South Bronx was originally a Jewish and Irish neighborhood in the 1940s.⁵ However, Robert Moses' urban revitalization policies of the 50s and 60s caused a significant shift in demographic and economic makeup.⁶ With strict rent controls and construction of the Cross Bronx Expressway came mass displacement, collapsing property rates, and high levels of vacancy.⁷ While the South Bronx had been two-thirds white in 1950, by 1960 the population was two-thirds black and Puerto Rican.⁸

Exacerbated by property owner abandonment, waves of white flight, and endemic redlining, the economic state of the South Bronx in the 1970s represented a veritable crisis.⁹ Bureaucratic decisions restricting resources and emergency services to the failing South Bronx precipitated a wave of fires that led to the infamous phrase "the Bronx is burning."¹⁰ Highly publicized visits by President Jimmy Carter and President Ronald Reagan only exacerbated this image of urban blight.¹¹ By 1980, over 40% of all buildings in the South Bronx were lost to vacancy, or arson.¹²

The South Bronx's legacy of racial and economic disparity plagues their community today. It is the poorest borough in the city, with nearly thirty percent of its residents at or below the poverty line.¹³ The unemployment rate is nearly seventy percent higher than NYC as a whole. Hunts Point's highest median income rate is lower than the Bronx's overall lowest median rate.¹⁴ In a statewide ranking of health and education, the Bronx came in dead last. In Hunts Point, the infant mortality rate is over twice that of Manhattan. Similarly, Hunts Point life expectancy is nearly eight years lower than that of people living in Battery Park.¹⁵ One particularly troubling trend to local residents is the

high rate of childhood asthma. The problem, locals believe, stems from a preponderance of trucking routes linked to the Hunts Point Food Distribution Center and local waste transfer stations.¹⁶ A feeling of government neglect pervades the area, as residents continue to experience the confluence of racial, health, environmental, and economic disparities.¹⁷

While things seemed bleak, the area saw a significant turnaround in the 1980s and 90s. That change was due to a concomitant rise in owner-occupied buildings, and the growing influence of community development groups.¹⁸ The Point, founded by residents of the Hunts Point neighborhood in 1993, is one such group. As billions of dollars began funneling into the area for revitalization, determined residents organized and backed ambitious projects. Of particular note is the work of Majora Carter. While acting as Assistant Director of The Point, Carter successfully raised millions of dollars in local and federal funding to break ground on the Hunts Point Riverside Park.¹⁹ That park has become the cornerstone of the Bronx River Greenway project, a 23-mile long multi-use path that will comprise 633 acres of parkland upon completion.²⁰

The Point has been one of the most visible collectivities working in the Bronx to combat historical injustices. Their incessant demands for action on behalf of the area's residents have led to impactful public-private partnerships, garnered significant media attention, and received accolades from public officials like Mayor Bloomberg, and Congressman José E. Serrano.²¹ The decision to host the OneNYC announcement at The Point, then, makes perfect sense for an administration whose expressed priority is the economic uplift of New York's most vulnerable.

In fact, de Blasio's speech that day, in which he committed to the uplift of 800,000 people, is among the most important speeches ever given on municipal economic policy. This is because de Blasio takes the idea of a "strong and just society," and turns it from an unrealized ideal to a civic commitment. Mayor de Blasio, in his speech at The Point, displays the political, environmental, social, and economic implications of "the Tale of Two Cities" as a confession of municipal sin. He offers the people of New York restitution through empowerment, and proffers the provision of economic and environmental buttresses as penance.

The chapters proceeds in two parts. First, de Blasio's speech progresses narratively from a "Tale of Two Cities" to a "Strong and Just Society." The internal organization of the speech follows a spatial and experiential development, which parallels both the outside world and the political and social experiences of the local community. Second, the speech takes the form of a priestly address. Situating environmental and economic injustice as civic sin, de Blasio offers redemption to a dream deferred via individual and community empowerment. Yet this functions through an interesting inversion. It is not the plan that will make these people resilient. Rather, the community's own resilience establishes the trajectory for saving the city and the world.

In the last chapter, I introduced Jennifer Peeples and Stephen Depoe's five primary roles of voice. In discussing my two arguments, I will draw on voice as a shaper of identity, and as instigator to modes of social organization. In discussing reception of his speech, I will extend those analytic lenses to explain the cultural, ideological, and economic blinders that instigated black and Latino critics.

From a Tale of Two Cities to a Strong and Just Society

Peeples and Depoe explain that “[t]he expression of and the constitution of a life story are intertwined and inseparable throughout the process of giving voice.”²² Mayor de Blasio’s speech follows a narrative progression of spatial development that traces where voices of local New Yorkers are developed and travel. He begins at “The Point,” moving to the “strong and resilient neighborhood” (Hunts Point), then to “One New York” (the holistic vision of NYC), then “Albany” (New York State Government), then to “the rest of the nation” (America), then to “the rest of the globe” (the planet Earth). The speech also follows an experiential development, from New York as a “tale of two cities” (the experiential space of oppression), to “One New York” (a cohesive community), arriving at “a very different place” (the imagined world of the oppressed), and “a fairer and brighter future” (the destination NYC and the world are headed toward). Mayor de Blasio’s speech traces the spatial and experiential journey of community advocates and their voices, from origins to potential futures. Resilience functions as an anchoring device in that development. It acts both as the experiential status that inspires community to voice, and is the guiding principle that carries their voice beyond the community and into the world.

Mayor de Blasio begins his speech by thanking The Point and its staff for “what [they] do,” their “great work” “fighting” to “mobilize people.”²³ Their goal, de Blasio indicates, is to “strengthen” and “better [the] neighborhood.”²⁴ The mayor explains that he chose The Point as the place to announce OneNYC because their work

Epitomize[s] the efforts to create a fairer city, a better city for all residents, for all neighborhood members – a city that really addresses both our environmental challenges and our economic challenges and realizes that we have to do those both at the same time.²⁵

Moving to the broader neighborhood as “strong and resilient,” Mayor de Blasio emphasizes it as a “neighborhood [that] often got less than its fair share.”²⁶ Stopping to ruminate on how “residents for a long time have been on the short end of the stick of our economic reality,” de Blasio laments the area’s “[m]edian income – less than \$26,000. \$26,000 – try living on \$26,000 or less – family of four in New York City.”²⁷ He situates the neighborhood’s economic and environmental challenges as evidence of “the growing divisions” within the city overall.²⁸ He articulates that “[s]o many people in the city have for so long recognized that inequality takes many forms,” and that inequalities in Hunts Point are evidence of the different experiences of New York that make it a “tale of two cities.”²⁹ By beginning with Hunts Point as a physical and experiential place defined by crisis and resilience, de Blasio identifies crisis as the precondition for resilience. Despite being a place where the people “feel they don’t have an economic future,”³⁰ the people of Hunts Point continue to fight for representation and their survival. Despite their resilience, however, fellow New Yorkers have remained incognizant to their plight. The “Tale of Two Cities” is not just a question of who has power, but whose voice matters in public policy. By giving recognition to these voices, de Blasio legitimates the neighborhood’s perspective for its role in public policy. While their voices construct Hunts Point as a physical location of vulnerability, they also constitute an experiential location of resilience.

Extending from the local to the city as a whole, de Blasio makes clear that the “antidote to the tale of two cities is to work always towards greater unity and fairness.”³¹ For the people of NYC to experience unity and fairness, “[w]e can’t have people be strong in one way, and weak in another, and be a successful community. Here...they’re

addressing the whole community, the whole family. That concept pervades OneNYC.”³² The mayor’s invocation of “we” here is what Griswold calls a “protreptic ‘we’” because it attempts to change how the audience views itself, their relationships, and to compel them to action.³³ The invocation of a “we” is not just the move to shift toward a collective experience of place, but also for the voice of the City to become a magnifier of the resilient identity reflected in Hunts Point. The mayor’s “vision for one city” emulates the resilient communal ties of Hunts Point, equating the value of vulnerable and wealthy voice in their importance for communal “strength” and “justice.”³⁴ The mayor’s speech invokes a collective “we” to project a community of shared intention, worth, and importance. To become resilient, New Yorkers must become cognizant of the voice of the oppressed, and make sure that the whole city thrives. Hence, de Blasio’s vision makes the call to uplift 800,000 people out of poverty essential to the very resilience and coherence of New Yorkers’ identity as a community.

Giving more context to how resilience plays into the collective identity and experience of place, Michael Berkowitz, President of 100 Resilient Cities, spoke at the event. Referencing terrorism, Superstorm Sandy, and infrastructure failures, he explains that to build resilience against such threats, “a city must not only consider sustainability and disaster response, but also take into account social and economic issues, and really consider them together.”³⁵ This is crucial, he argues, because “[e]very major disaster demonstrates that cities that have more cohesive communities...respond and recover better and faster.”³⁶ Berkowitz’s invocation of crisis and community is a narrative of New Yorkers collective experience and future that serves a constitutive function.³⁷ First, it calls upon citizens to consider not only their own experience, but to understand the

experiences of vulnerable New Yorkers as a crucial aspect of their own resilience. This is critically important to building community because as Peeples and Depoe explain, “[t]he social aspect of voice allows for the construction of commonality and community; upon hearing the stories of others, people find similarity with their own lives.”³⁸ Berkowitz’s invocation of resilience metrics and empirical evidence compels New Yorkers to believe in their community’s existence as an extra-rhetorical entity.³⁹ Berkowitz’s call for New Yorkers to sacrifice individual concerns in exchange for the community’s needs reflects a collective subject indicative of Charland’s first ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric.⁴⁰

Second, Berkowitz figures city resilience as a psychological state, rather than simply a physical state. By invoking the specters of terrorism and Sandy, Berkowitz does not merely bring New Yorkers into a collective historical experience; he also calls them to reflect on those resilient New Yorkers who died in those events. Berkowitz calls upon contemporary New Yorkers to work together buffering themselves and the community, to embody the very spirit of New York resilience of those who were lost, and to work together to not allow those events to have the same effect on their community. The invocation of a collective, suffering entity that has “consubstantiality”⁴¹ with the dead is the second ideological function of constitutive rhetoric.⁴²

Lastly, Berkowitz situates the New York narrative in terms of impending crisis that New Yorkers can overcome if they act cohesively, if they understand resilience not simply as an internal state, but as a function of a complex unity. This narrative charts a temporal sequence from the historical experiences of crisis to the future survival of New Yorkers through dedication to making their community cohesive. Berkowitz’s narrative

thusly provides the illusion of freedom that completes the ideological functions of constitutive rhetoric.⁴³ With the narrative completed, Berkowitz's rhetorical maneuver compels New Yorkers to overcome their individualistic orientation, and take up the complex metrics of city resilience to better the overall community.

While the community's cohesion is critically important, de Blasio argues that New Yorkers cannot construct a resilient system all alone. Rather, they must be able to call upon the entire web of political mechanisms and resources available. Despite not having direct control over state-level decision-making, the mayor explains that if New Yorkers can rally behind the vision for "One New York" then "a lot of things can change in places like Albany."⁴⁴ Hence, in the fight against economic inequity, "we will go to Albany, and we'll bring the people of New York City with us, to change the minimum wage so it can actually reach the needs of the people."⁴⁵ The "protreptic 'we'" that de Blasio invokes here is not the collective citizenry of New York, but rather references his administration. As a representative of New York City, de Blasio intends to carry the collective voice of "the people" with him to the State government.

To have influence in environmental decision-making processes, Senecah argues, communities must have a speaker with access, standing, and influence in the venue of choice.⁴⁶ When engaging larger government institutions such as state, or national representatives, local groups like The Point have some access, but lack significant standing and influence. However, de Blasio, as mayor of NYC, offers himself as conduit for the demands of such groups. As mayor of a world powerhouse, de Blasio meets all three requirements when dealing with state, and even national representatives. It is hence possible to interpret de Blasio's statement that he will bring New Yorkers to Albany in

two ways. First, that he will use his access, standing, and influence in the state government to cede the floor to New Yorkers, who will share their experiences and voice directly with representatives. Second, even if unable to, or unwilling to bring New Yorkers to Albany physically, he intends to use his voice as conduit, to speak on behalf of the vision and needs of his constituents.

Moving from the state to the national level, de Blasio emphasizes the important role of having New York set standards for cities across the nation. He explains that “historically, [New York City mayor’s] are supposed to be spokespeople for the needs of cities around the country.”⁴⁷ The mayor speaks to shifting trends in popular opinion across the country on economic issues, referencing demonstrations for a fifteen-dollar minimum wage that occurred in two hundred different cities simultaneously.⁴⁸ Yet, despite that trend, in the domains of municipal economic, environmental, and social policy, de Blasio declares *OneNYC* “the most ambitious plan in the nation by any city for addressing poverty,” lamenting that it falls to New York City to “show what it looks like” and “lead the way for the rest of the nation.”⁴⁹ Mayor de Blasio figures *OneNYC* as a self-evident demonstration of the value of attuning municipal governance to the voice of their people. This is an act of *apodeixis*, Aristotle’s term for describing a “logically valid, scientific demonstration.”⁵⁰ Referencing a trend where “the local level is leading national policy in so many instances around the globe,” de Blasio extends his theme of municipal leaders as mouthpiece of “the people.”⁵¹ Rhetorically, de Blasio situates *OneNYC* as a response to the voice of the people, and that he is a mouthpiece for his constituents. Hence, de Blasio figures that acting on behalf of New Yorkers collective voice is a self-

evident example of the benefit and trend toward more participatory governance nationwide.

In the last spatial shift, de Blasio situates his One New York concept within a globalist frame. The theme of being a “global leader ,” and the central role that New York plays in an increasingly “globalized world” and “globalized economy ,” are prevalent throughout this section.⁵² The mayor rhetorically frames the city’s status as global leader on economic and environmental policy as a question of collective success, and global survival. If unable to deliver on economic parity, New York City’s international success will falter in a “more complicated” and increasingly “competitive” globalized economy.⁵³ If unable to “lead the way...for the globe” on environmental sustainability goals, climate change risks becoming an “existential threat to this city and this earth.”⁵⁴ Hence, it is not merely important for the city itself to be resilient, but rather its role as leader on such initiatives is critical to the very resilience of the international sphere. As the mayor’s address ends, he returns to the theme of “leading your leaders.” He calls upon the people of New York to make sure OneNYC initiatives succeed. If we “challenge ourselves to do things differently ,” he states, then the people will “lead this city to a fairer and brighter future” and will “set a pace for much greater changes far beyond our borders.”⁵⁵ The mayor invokes a “protreptic ‘our’” whose possessive nature emphasizes civic duty. If New York citizens can attune themselves to higher-level spatial and temporal scales, they will be able to lead their leaders toward collaboration with state, national, and international actors. Berkowitz refers to *OneNYC* as a “new benchmark,” putting it, and NYC, at “the cutting edge of urban planning worldwide.”⁵⁶ As a global beacon for urban planning, the oppressed of New York can gain access, standing, and influence in the international arena

by channeling their concerns into the mayor and other local representatives. By organizing around strategic vision, the people can empower themselves through participatory planning.

The mayor closes the speech with a small passage read in Spanish. Translated, he says the following

The new plan for sustainable development, OneNYC, will focus for the first time on reducing poverty. We can both reduce inequality and construct a very strong and sustainable city. We want to take eight hundred thousand New Yorkers out of poverty in the next decade. We will use every resource we have to construct a New York that is very strong and fair to the residents of all neighborhoods.⁵⁷

The mayor's choice to conclude his speech with a passage in Spanish has two distinct rhetorical functions. First, it completes the spatial and temporal development of the speech by bringing it full circle, from the local, to the global, and back again. Starting with the "resilience" of The Point, the speech takes audience members all the way to the abstract level of global economy. In such an immigrant heavy community, there is going to be a general familiarity with global economic exchange. Speaking Spanish brings focus to local's role in sustaining the global impact of NYC. This rhetorical move builds a conceptual bridge between locals and Spanish-speaking countries, what Burke would term a point of identification.⁵⁸ Despite the global implications of *OneNYC*, speaking Spanish allows de Blasio to collapse the distance and the "Tale of Two Cities" by reinvigorating strength and justice within the audience and community addressed in the room. Temporally, the promise to raise people out of poverty in a decade, and the dedication "to construct[ing] a New York that is very strong and fair" locate the past as a site of injustice, and the status quo as a time of promise.⁵⁹ By projecting audience member's language and voice into an experiential time of the future, Spanish-speaking

empowers change through a shared vision of communal uplift. Temporally, it completes the narrative that empowers the community to act.

Second, by reaffirming the commitments of the plan in the native language of the audience-members, de Blasio manages to balance what Warner would call the impersonal and personal aspects of addressing an audience.⁶⁰ As Warner explains, addressing an audience must constantly negotiate the fact that speech is deeply personal, often dealing with compelling, contemporary issues. However, the fact that the audience were mere strangers before being addressed means identification is especially difficult to establish and negotiate.⁶¹ Especially considering the endemic distrust of government officials by the people of Hunts Point, de Blasio's attempt to address the audience in their most familiar language emphasizes the personal nature of his engagement with the public, an attempt to overcome distrust through sincerity.⁶² Simultaneously, de Blasio uses this code-switch to emphasize that the voice of the people are heard, and that their leader can and will speak for them, with their own voice. It allows the audience to change identity, to see themselves not as opposed, but aligned with de Blasio and his vision for New York.⁶³ By speaking not just with their voice, but also in their native language, de Blasio encourages participatory democratic practice through perception of sincerity and personal attachment to the resolution of communal problems. By ending where he began, de Blasio completes the narrative trajectory and the constitution of a "protreptic 'we'" with the audience.

Civic Religion: The Promised Land of Economic and Environmental Resilience

Mayor de Blasio's speech at The Point takes the form of covenantal rhetoric,⁶⁴ intermingling religion and civic duty in what Dorsey has termed a "civil religious

construct.”⁶⁵ I read de Blasio’s “Tale of Two Cities” rhetoric as a Biblical reference to the Book of Isaiah’s story of Zion and Babylon,⁶⁶ representing the two divergent paths New York City and its citizens are taking, and can take. In the Book of Isaiah, Babylon represents different wasteful and sinful ways of living in cities. While Babylon is blessed and bountiful like Zion, the idolatry of Babylon’s citizens is their undoing. Their wasteful nature and unwillingness to turn from their economic wonders to attend to their fellow suffering citizens leads God to punish them. In judgement for the Babylonian’s insolence, God declares that “[t]he earth shall be utterly laid waste and utterly despoiled,”⁶⁷ and will make it so that “[d]esolation is left in the city, the gates are battered into ruins.”⁶⁸ Mirroring this narrative, de Blasio takes up the roles of prophet and priest⁶⁹ by framing his speech as a secular jeremiad.⁷⁰

Figuring economic inequity and wastefulness of sacred environment as sin, de Blasio prophetically declares New Yorkers deviation from their inaugural promise of being a “strong and just society.”⁷¹ By erring from the path of Gods will, New York City risks not only moral and social degradation, but also the destruction of earth and the end of human existence. To avert this dangerous course of history, the people of New York must change their ways. Taking on the priestly role, he offers up the “resilient community” of Hunts Point as exemplar of salvation and as the “chosen” people. It is only through renewed commitment of social and political energy toward environmental and economic resilience that New York’s citizens can reach the Promised Land.

While Mayor de Blasio does not personally observe any religion, he has made it clear that appealing to the religious elements of New Yorkers lives is crucial to achieving equity in the city. “If you are going to understand the community and the city ,” he

claimed in an interview with the *New York Times*, “you have to understand how deeply faithful people are, and how central it is to people in their lives.”⁷² To ensure success of social programs and other public policy goals, de Blasio emphasizes in the same interview that he is willing “to be creative, in a very appropriate way, to get that done.”⁷³ I argue that his rhetorical strategy in the OneNYC announcement speech reflects such a creative appropriation, using Biblical narrative to incentivize the people of Hunts Point and beyond to support its initiatives.

Mayor de Blasio begins the speech with his campaign promise, his “vision for one city, where there’s opportunity for all, fairness for all, sustainability for all.”⁷⁴ The mayor begins where the story will end, the same way the Book of Isaiah starts with a vision of God’s judgement and redemption of Zion. Contemporary New York, de Blasio explains, is a place where “[s]o many people in the city have for so long recognized that inequality takes many forms,” yet he claims to “see growing divisions just fester.”⁷⁵ The rhetoric of “vision” and “seeing” are part of a large system of Biblical metaphors regarding knowledge and ignorance. In response to the sinful nature of the citizens of Zion, Isaiah denounces those who “deal perversely and do not see the majesty of the LORD.”⁷⁶ Their ignorance is a strain on social values, legitimating a cruel state of affairs where they choose, willingly or not, “to not defend the orphan, and the widow’s cause does not come before them.”⁷⁷ However, ignorance also makes them unaware of righteous indignation, in this instance to the economic and environmental consequences of living a non-resilient lifestyle. To come to sight is to recognize reality, and God’s will, so “as out of their gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind shall see.”⁷⁸ The mayor’s “vision” then,

functions as a bringing to sight for those ignorant to the disastrous consequences of a wasteful, excessive lifestyle.

Describing the “vision” of OneNYC as the fulfillment of “all that New York City was meant to be ,” de Blasio’s invocation reflects an inaugural promise betrayed, and sets the trajectory of history addressed in the speech. When God judges Zion, he laments in Isaiah 1:22, “How the faithful city has become a whore! She that was full of justice, righteousness lodged in her— but now murderers.”⁷⁹ The mayor’s use of “so long” in describing the city’s inequality situates the contemporary moment as an unequal state of affairs. The mayor explicitly identifies his own wasteful use of disposable water bottles as “sin,” explaining that the economic, environmental, and social wastefulness of New Yorkers lifestyle is “outrageous and is outdated, and we’re not going to be party to it.”⁸⁰ The mayor’s invocation of a “protreptic ‘we’” enacts a secular jeremiad by identifying sin within the citizenry, and within the people of New York’s sinful lifestyles.⁸¹ The mayor’s epideictic rhetoric attempts to take economic inequality and environmental devastation out of the banal, to situate them as antithetical to the timeless values embodied in his “vision” of a “strong and just city,”⁸² and hence as antithetical to God’s will itself.

Bemoaning that New York has become a “Tale of Two Cities ,” de Blasio calls income inequality the “crisis of our times.”⁸³ He warns that the problem is going “fundamentally unaddressed,” and that it is “threatening the very cohesion and stability of our society. In this city, and in this whole country.”⁸⁴ The mayor positions economic and environmental resilience as questions of social survival. However, the integration of both issues into one course of action is key. Resolving one cause without the other, he

argues, will produce a “gilded city” only for the rich, or a wasteful city that risks environmental devastation.⁸⁵ Mayor de Blasio completes the jeremiad by indicting New Yorkers for their sinful lifestyles, establishing a conceptual field of values that define civic duty and the will of God from which they have deviated.

In de Blasio’s rhetorical formulation, the citizens of NYC have the option to work toward the gilded/environmentally destructive city, or to work toward the “strong and just” city. Due to greed or ignorance, de Blasio argues that the citizens of New York have lost sight of their inaugural values. Invoking the “protreptic ‘we’” of New York citizenry, de Blasio warns that “if we’re going to be all that New York City was meant to be” it will require a radical change in lifestyle.⁸⁶ If the citizens of NYC continue to elevate material goods over God, they are the Biblical “fools”⁸⁷ and “villains”⁸⁸ that will merely extend contemporary and historical idolatry into the future, with disastrous consequences. This rhetorical maneuver by de Blasio initiates what Burke refers to as the first of two “great movements” in the cycle of “original sin” and “redemption.”⁸⁹ The internalization of pollution, or guilt, is a social process enabled through the citizen’s inability to live up to civic values and moral ideals. Mayor de Blasio’s prophetic rhetoric attempts to bring this social pollution to the forefront to enable the “second movement” of purification and redemption through priestly rhetorical form.

It is at this point in the speech that Mayor de Blasio shifts from a prophetic diagnosis of New Yorkers erring, to the priestly annunciation of salvation available in the chosen people-- those at The Point. Fairbanks argues that the civic priest’s role is to give voice to the “values around which society is organized, and articulating goals derived from those values that can carry society’s members ‘above the conflicts that tear a society

apart, and ... in the pursuit of objectives worthy of their best interests.”⁹⁰ Acting as mayoral priest, de Blasio attempts to create a point of identification between communities through shared dedication to resilient life embodied in the values of justice and equity for all. Dorsey explains that speakers deploying priestly rhetoric provide an audience the means to revere those values, and hence provide an opportunity for redemption of individual and society.⁹¹ This moment of redemption is a ritualized socialization process that attempts to endow the audience with a different “perspective” and produce a “dramatic change in identity.”⁹² Offering the economic, environmental, and social resilience policies of *OneNYC* as the means to achieve those values, de Blasio attempts to form the population into a political and social bloc that will mobilize in favor of those policies fulfillment.

At the beginning of his priestly proclamation, de Blasio announces a suite of economic policies intent on taking the city’s 800,000 impoverished citizens and “rising them up”⁹³ out of poverty. The metaphor of “rising” is part of the larger Biblical metaphoric system of light and darkness, with “rising up” symbolizing both the ascendance of the impoverished to economic parity, and the rising up of the forsaken into God’s light.⁹⁴ This transformation is not physical but experiential. Bringing the impoverished out of the world of “injustice” and bringing them into the world of “justice” occurs by embracing resilient subjectivity. Detailing his administration’s programs as means to accomplish this benchmark, de Blasio proposes, “[t]he antidote to the tale of two cities is to work always towards greater unity and fairness.”⁹⁵ By embracing the dedication to unity and justice, the citizenry of New York embrace God, and become the vehicle for God’s “redeeming work” on Earth.⁹⁶

To confess the community's crimes, and to repent through work for economic and environmental equity makes possible what Isaiah declares is a world where "[a] fool will no longer be called noble, nor a villain said to be honorable."⁹⁷ By offering *OneNYC* as the path toward "greater unity and fairness," de Blasio elevates economic and environmental resilience policy from the realm of civic duty to a spiritual calling and moral imperative. Initiating the rhetorical maneuver necessary as the mayoral priest, de Blasio establishes the path by which citizens can be reborn through civic virtue.

The mayor turns his focus to the people of Hunts Point, fore fronting their community's challenges with violence, chronic disease, and infant mortality. He does so to emphasize the harsh life people experience at "the short end of the stick of our economic reality."⁹⁸ Yet, de Blasio figures, it is precisely because of their experience of oppression that they are empowered to create resilient political organizations, and formulate a coherent communal voice. Playing upon the Biblical paradox of finding strength in weakness is the central act of rhetorical invention within de Blasio's priestly address. In the Book of Isaiah, Isaiah describes a man seemingly abandoned by God, rife with infirmity and trouble. However, it is revealed that he had "borne our infirmities," and that [o]ut of his anguish he shall see light; he shall find satisfaction through his knowledge. The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities."⁹⁹ Resilience as a construct in *OneNYC* is dependent upon this very Biblical paradox. The very metrics by which 100RC measures resilience depends upon the system experiencing a multitude of crises so that metrics can be tested and legitimated.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, the people of Hunts Point have endured the worst impacts of

economic and environmental forces, but it is in their anguish that they become stronger together, and more righteous in cause and fury.

Burke explains this particularly cruel aspect of Christian redemption as “purification”¹⁰¹ via “mortification.”¹⁰² Resilience, like Christian ascetic ideology, demands an “extreme form of self control”¹⁰³ established through the infliction of mental and physical anguish to regain worthiness. In de Blasio’s rhetorical formulation, it is the internalization of suffering and the resilience of a subject’s psychological state¹⁰⁴ that is emblematic of the path to Godliness. God, at the rebirth of Zion declares the impoverished as his “chosen” people. The Lord declares, “I have put my words in your mouth, and hidden you in the shadow of my hand”¹⁰⁵. Mayor de Blasio gestures toward The Point’s “whole community” orientation, their emphasis on constructing resilient family structures, neighborhoods, and organizations as the ethos that “pervades OneNYC.”¹⁰⁶ Hence, just like God’s elevation of the impoverished as the “chosen” people, it is the lessons that the people of Hunts Point offer regarding social, political, and environmental resilience that “shall make many righteous.” Mayor de Blasio’s annunciation of Hunts Point’s population as the model for what resilience should look like to New Yorkers as a whole signals that the people of Hunts Point speak with the voice of God.

The mayor completes his speech by exploring the choice between complacency and action for the people of NYC. He warns that people could in one way look at the significant environmental and economic crises and conclude that society has “fallen into an intractable rut, there is no way forward.”¹⁰⁷ However, in New York City, de Blasio emphasizes, “we don’t buy into complacency.”¹⁰⁸ Extending the metaphor of light and

knowledge, the complacent are those inattentive or unaware of God's will. In Isaiah, the “complacent daughters”¹⁰⁹ are those whose lack of faith leads God to wreak their harvests. The symbolism of de Blasio's invocation of complacency is clear in the context of enlightening the population to the dangers of excess and existential risk for climate change. In contrast, those attentive to God's word and acting on the Lord's behalf are the people of Zion whose work can make a world where the “wilderness becomes a fruitful field, and the fruitful field is deemed a forest”¹¹⁰. The same goes for New Yorkers. They redeem themselves, but only through the pursuit of economic and environmental resilience.

Reading from famed environmentalist Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, de Blasio warns “[t]he road we have long been traveling is deceptively easy – a smooth superhighway on which we progress with great speed. But at its end lies disaster.”¹¹¹ The rhetoric of “paths” and “highways” are metaphors for the trajectory of a life-journey, be they closer or farther from God and his will. The mayor makes a case that it is not the voice of a politician, but rather the voice of the chosen people, and hence the voice of God, which will allow government and citizens alike to “change our course.” By “leading their leaders” to the Promised Land, the people of New York can change and fulfill government's role as voice of the people.

In prophecy, God declares that the “ransomed of the Lord shall return” to a rebirthed Zion, where “[a] highway shall be there, and it shall be called the Holy Way; the unclean shall not travel on it, but it shall be for God's people; no traveler, not even fools, shall go astray”¹¹². The highway to destruction is smooth because of its ease; it requires nothing but complacency to retain the morally bankrupt consumptive practices

that drive the status quo. Yet, the struggle of taking the “road less traveled,” as de Blasio puts it, is exactly what is the tough decision necessary to “make smooth the path of the righteous.”¹¹³ This highway leads to the Promised Land of economic and environmental resilience, instead of disaster. It will produce the “urban ideal,” a rebirth of New York’s inaugural promise, just as Zion is a “return to Eden” with its environmental bounty.¹¹⁴ However, the path to God cannot form through complacency. Rather, it will come from trampling, smoothed by “the feet of the poor, the steps of the needy.”¹¹⁵ This is the fulfillment of the priestly role, as the path toward fulfillment of civic virtues is established and paved for the “protreptic ‘we’”¹¹⁶ of New Yorkers.¹¹⁷ The secular jeremiad is complete, with the civic body called into existence, scorned for its turn from God’s will, and the elevation of civic virtue empowering the community’s voice and action for resilience policies.¹¹⁸ Lastly, this rhetorical maneuver fulfills the requirements of Burke’s “great movement” of redemption,¹¹⁹ offering a momentary release of guilt through the achievement of a new state, here symbolized by resilient subjectivity. By internalizing the psychological fortitude necessary to subsist in a world of impending crisis,¹²⁰ strength and justice is secured by New Yorkers, and their deliverance to the Promised Land secured.

The Role of Voice in Reception of de Blasio’s Announcement Speech

The rhetorical choices de Blasio made in his OneNYC announcement speech were effective in achieving the goals of mobilizing the Point, and the local community toward engagement with the initiatives. “It is refreshing and inspiring to hear the language of environmental justice,” said Omar Freilla, founder of Greenworker Cooperatives. As a member of the Hunts Point community invested in decreasing waste

and increasing coastal resiliency, he concluded, “[t]hey’re definitely taking a different approach, having equity as a central theme.” Maria Torres, co-founder and president of The Point echoed that sentiment, saying that the presentation “nailed it” in terms of providing a response to what local advocates had been pushing for years ¹²¹. Speaking to the existing work happening in the community, and establishing the community’s role in the production and expansion of public policy spurred them into agreement with the mayor’s assessment and initiatives.

The mayor effectively used his rhetorical strategies to inculcate a “protreptic ‘we’,” a resilient New Yorker whose life-world inculcates values that produce an active civic agent. While critics have questioned the accuracy and divisiveness of de Blasio’s “A Tale of Two Cities” narrative, ¹²² the integration of South Bronx related issues within that narrative frame spoke directly to these community’s experiences of oppression. “I was extremely excited and honored,” Kellie Terry, then-executive director of the Point said after the event. “The mayor’s ‘Tale of Two Cities’ spoke directly to our work, so to have the opportunity to host The mayor and watch the marriage of equity, sustainability, and the environment come together in an official capacity was a wonderful opportunity.”¹²³ Echoing the voice of local advocates thus effectively overcame distrust of government intentions in attending to communal needs, and even begins to bridge gaps between the local and wider New York community.

While the short-term effectiveness of the rhetorical strategies are evident, its success as a rhetorical strategy necessitated enduring criticism. By asking the communities of NYC to “lead their leaders,” de Blasio not only opened himself up for criticality, but also demanded it. By connecting his rhetorical success to the enactment of

policy initiatives, disconnect between actual success and promises have led to multi-faceted criticisms. While Berkowitz did an effective job of linking the multiple planks of OneNYC to the framework of resilience, de Blasio's explicit separation of resilience from other values such as equity and sustainability throughout the speech created ambiguity on its role as a unifying concept. Said Kellie Terry, "[t]here's a lot of questions we have because there's not a lot of clarity."¹²⁴ By not effectively organizing the values and how they interact throughout the speech, it leaves high-level community advocates confused on *how* they should engage, and the form that the plan's initiatives will truly take. Eddie Bautista, executive director of the NYCEJ questioned, "The opportunities to make the city climate resilient, equitable, and just are there—but how do you balance all of that?"¹²⁵ While the announcement intended merely to prefigure and emphasize the importance of the "vision" as a whole, ambiguity within its structure pulled the audience out of believing in its cohesiveness, and leaves local advocates at a standstill on how to most effectively engage and advocate for their communities.

Simultaneously, a lack of focus on what *kinds* of resiliency that the plan would endeavor to support left The Point and other community members disheartened by resultant policy initiatives. Angela A. Tovar, director of community development for The Point explained, "[w]e were a little disappointed that the city didn't go with coastal resiliency because that is definitely something that needs the investment."¹²⁶ The criticisms are constructive, as one would expect de Blasio desired based on his rhetorical strategies. Bautista declared that that his institution and the broader community "seriously want to engage with the administration on this, because it's in all of our self-interests to get this right." Criticism is not meant to take away from the plan as "there's a lot in the

plan to like,” “but rather [is] offered in the “spirit of wanting [de Blasio’s] plan to succeed.”¹²⁷ Mayor de Blasio’s speech was a rousing success in completing its rhetorical intentions, but the question of how the vision will play out and its true effectiveness for increasing equity, sustainability, and resilience remain contentious.

Notes

¹ Ford Fessenden et al., “How de Blasio Turned Conventional Wisdom on Its Head,” *The New York Times*, September 11, 2013, sec. NY Region, <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/09/11/nyregion/mayoral-primary-vote-analysis.html>.

² Robert Borosage, “New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio: A Powerful Populist Voice,” *Campaign For America’s Future*, October 16, 2014, <https://ourfuture.org/20141016/new-york-city-mayor-bill-de-blasio-a-powerful-populist-voice>; Thomas B. Edsall, “Bill de Blasio and the New Urban Populism - The New York Times,” *The New York Times*, October 22, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/23/opinion/edsall-bill-de-blasio-and-the-new-urban-populism.html>; Tom Hayden, “Bill de Blasio: Harbinger of a New Populist Left in America,” *The Guardian*, November 6, 2013, sec. Opinion, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/nov/06/bill-de-blasio-new-populist-left>.

³ David Ludwig, “New York’s Unfinished Tale of Two Cities,” *The Atlantic*, January 1, 2015, <https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2015/01/bill-de-blasio-one-year-later/383658/>.

⁴ “Officials and Community Members React to Mayor de Blasio’s OneNYC Initiative,” *The Official Website of the City of New York*, April 22, 2016, <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/388-16/officials-community-members-react-mayor-de-blasio-s-onenyc-initiative>.

⁵ “History of the Bronx - Yes The Bronx,” accessed February 11, 2017, <http://www.yesthebronx.org/about/history-of-the-bronx/>.

⁶ Amy Plitt, “A Brief History of the Bronx: From First Settlers to Modern Megaprojects - Curbed NY,” *Curbed New York*, April 11, 2016, <http://ny.curbed.com/2016/4/11/11404772/bronx-new-york-history-timeline>.

⁷ Robert A. Caro, *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York* (Random House, 2015), 893–94.

⁸ Denton Tarver, “The New Bronx- A Quick History of the Iconic Borough,” *The Cooperator*, April 2007, <https://cooperator.com/article/the-new-bronx>.

⁹ Winnie Hu, “The Bronx Struggles to Escape Its Image as the ‘Burning’ Borough,” *The New York Times*, June 2, 2013, sec. N.Y. / Region, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/03/nyregion/the-bronx-struggles-to-shed-burning-borough-image.html>.

¹⁰ Jody Avirgan, “Why The Bronx Really Burned,” *FiveThirtyEight*, October 29, 2015, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/why-the-bronx-really-burned/>.

¹¹ Jonathan Mahler, “Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bronx Is Burning,” *The New York Times*, April 24, 2005, <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/24/books/chapters/ladies-and-gentlemen-the-bronx-is-burning.html>.

¹² Joe Flood, “Why the Bronx Burned | New York Post,” *New York Post*, May 16, 2010, <http://nypost.com/2010/05/16/why-the-bronx-burned/>.

¹³ Flavia Krause-Jackson and Henry Goldman, “Bronx Burns No More as NYC’s Poorest Borough Comes Back: Cities,” *Bloomberg*, March 6, 2015, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-03-06/bronx-burns-no-more-as-nyc-s-poorest-borough-comes-back-cities>.

¹⁴ City-Data, “Poverty Rates in Bronx,” *City-Data.com*, accessed February 11, 2017, <http://www.city-data.com/poverty/poverty-Bronx-New-York.html>.

¹⁵ County Health Rankings & Roadmaps, “Bronx County,” *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps*, 2016, <http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/app>.

¹⁶ Rae Zimmerman, “South Bronx Environmental Studies- Public Health and Environmental Policy Analysis” (New York University, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service: Institute for Civil Infrastructure Systems, September 2002), <http://www.icisnyu.org/admin/files/PhaseIWagner930.pdf>.

¹⁷ Marnee Meyer, “Wheeze- Environmental Racism in New York,” *Zine, Make Zine*, (Fall 1999), <http://www.makezine.enoughenough.org/wheeze.html>.

¹⁸ Terry Wynn, “South Bronx Rises out of the Ashes,” *NBC News*, January 17, 2005, <http://www.nbcnews.com/id/6807914/#1>.

¹⁹ Jay Farbstein et al., “2009 Rudy Bruner Award: Silver Medal Winner- Hunts Point Riverside Park” (Bruner Foundation, 2009), <http://www.rudybruneraward.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/05-Hunts-Point-Riverside-Park-1.pdf>.

²⁰ Charlene Giannetti, “Majora Carter-Greening the Bronx,” *Woman Around Town*, February 22, 2009, <http://www.womanaroundtown.com/sections/woman-around-town/woman-around-town-majora-carter-greening-the-bronx>.

²¹ John Freeman Gill, “A Slow Renaissance for a Struggling Neighborhood - Living In/Hunts Point-Longwood, the Bronx,” *The New York Times*, November 12, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/14/realestate/14Living.html>.

²² Peoples and Depoe, *Voice and Environmental Communication*, 3.

²³ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Charles L. Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 7.

³⁴ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

³⁵ NYC Mayor’s Office, *Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City*, 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SL1D42BWQaM>.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Maurice Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Quebecois,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, no. 2 (1987): 133–150.

³⁸ Peeples and Depoe, *Voice and Environmental Communication*, 6.

³⁹ Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric,” 138.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 139.

⁴¹ Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 21.

⁴² Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric,” 140.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Susan L. Senecah, “The Trinity of Voice: The Role of Practical Theory in Planning and Evaluating the Effectiveness of Environmental Participatory Processes,” *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decision Making*, 2004, 13–33.

- ⁴⁷ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Omer Aristotle and George A. Kennedy, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (Oxford University Press, 2006), 33.
- ⁵¹ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ⁵⁶ NYC Mayor’s Office, *Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York*.
- ⁵⁷ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.
- ⁵⁸ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, vol. 111 (Univ of California Press, 1969), 20,
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=y44o7549eC8C&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=a+rhetoric+of+motives&ots=Jj0YSPHrcf&sig=pWqjZFIMTdnshgOqQPcgWFAVXc0>.
- ⁵⁹ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.
- ⁶⁰ Michael Warner, “Publics and Counterpublics,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 4 (November 2002): 57–58.
- ⁶¹ Warner, “Publics and Counterpublics.”
- ⁶² Joe Hirsch, “Mayor Unveils New Plan at The Point,” *The Hunts Point Express*, April 22, 2015, <http://brie.hunter.cuny.edu/hpe/2015/04/22/mayor-unveils-sustainability-plan-at-the-point/>.
- ⁶³ Juan Castillo Cocom, “Vulnerable Identities: Maya Yucatec Identities in a Postmodern World,” 2000, <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/2080/>.
- ⁶⁴ Denise M. Bostdorff, “George W. Bush’s Post-September 11 Rhetoric of Covenant Renewal: Upholding the Faith of the Greatest Generation,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89, no. 4 (2003): 293–319.
- ⁶⁵ Leroy G. Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion,” in *Green Talk in the White House: The Rhetorical Presidency Encounters Ecology*, ed. Tarla Rai Peterson (College Station, TX: Texas

A&M University Press, 2004), 40,
http://baylor.summon.serialssolutions.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/#!/search/document?ho=t&l=en&q=preaching%20conservation&id=FETCHMERGED-scopus_primary_2553182932.

⁶⁶ Sean McDonough, “A Tale of Two Cities (Revelation 17-22) - Bible Commentary,” *Theology of Work Project*, 2016, <https://www.theologyofwork.org/new-testament/revelation/a-tale-of-two-cities-revelation-17-22/>.

⁶⁷ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. Isaiah 24:3, accessed February 10, 2017, <http://biblia.com/books/nrsv/Is1.1>.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, v. Isaiah 24:12.

⁶⁹ Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion.”

⁷⁰ John M. Murphy, “‘A Time of Shame and Sorrow’: Robert F. Kennedy and the American Jeremiad,” 1990, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00335639009383933>.

⁷¹ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

⁷² Michael M. Grynbau and Sharon Otterman, “Mayor de Blasio Emerges as an Unexpected Champion of Religion,” *The New York Times*, March 18, 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/19/nyregion/mayor-de-blasio-emerges-as-an-unexpected-champion-of-religion.html>.

⁷³ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, Isaiah 26:10.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, v. Isaiah 1:23.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, v. Isaiah 29:18.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 1341.

⁸⁰ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

⁸¹ M. Bostdorff, “George W. Bush’s Post-September 11 Rhetoric of Covenant Renewal”; Murphy, “‘A Time of Shame and Sorrow.’”

⁸² de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

- ⁸³ Ibid.
- ⁸⁴ Ibid.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid.
- ⁸⁷ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. 32:6.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid., v. Isaiah 32:7.
- ⁸⁹ Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose* (University of California Press, 1984), 283.
- ⁹⁰ James David Fairbanks, "The Priestly Functions of the Presidency: A Discussion of the Literature on Civil Religion and Its Implications for the Study of Presidential Leadership," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1981): 224.
- ⁹¹ Dorsey, "Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion," 49.
- ⁹² Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 210.
- ⁹³ de Blasio, "Transcript," April 22, 2015.
- ⁹⁴ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. 60:1.
- ⁹⁵ de Blasio, "Transcript," April 22, 2015.
- ⁹⁶ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. Isaiah 63:4.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid., v. Isaiah 32:5.
- ⁹⁸ de Blasio, "Transcript," April 22, 2015.
- ⁹⁹ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. Isaiah 53:11.
- ¹⁰⁰ da Silva, "City Resilience Index."
- ¹⁰¹ Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 283.
- ¹⁰² Sandra L. French and Sonya C. Brown, "It's All Your Fault: Kenneth Burke, Symbolic Action, and the Assigning of Guilt and Blame to Women," *Southern Communication Journal* 76, no. 1 (2011): 3.
- ¹⁰³ Kenneth Burke, *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology* (University of California Press, 1970), 190.

¹⁰⁴ Julian Reid, “The Disastrous and Politically Debased Subject of Resilience,” *Development Dialogue* 58, no. April (2012): 67–80.

¹⁰⁵ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. 51:16.

¹⁰⁶ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. Isaiah 32:9.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, v. Isaiah 32:15.

¹¹¹ de Blasio, “Transcript,” April 22, 2015.

¹¹² *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. Isaiah 35:8.

¹¹³ “Arise, shine; for your light has come, and the glory of the LORD has risen upon you.” *Ibid.*, v. 26:6.

¹¹⁴ McDonough, “A Tale of Two Cities (Revelation 17-22) - Bible Commentary.”

¹¹⁵ *The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*, v. 26:6.

¹¹⁶ Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment*.

¹¹⁷ Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion.”

¹¹⁸ Murphy, ““A Time of Shame and Sorrow.””

¹¹⁹ Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 283.

¹²⁰ “In this sense, the resilient subject must live a life of continuous struggle to accommodate itself to the world. It is not a subject which can conceive of changing the world, its structure, and conditions of possibility, with a view to securing itself from threats and dangers. Rather, it understands the world as a space of endemic disaster and accepts this as a condition for partaking of that world; it likewise accepts the necessity to change itself in correspondence with the threats and dangers now presupposed as necessary rather than contingent” See: Reid, “The Disastrous and Politically Debased Subject of Resilience,” 362.

¹²¹ Hirsch, “Mayor Unveils New Plan at The Point.”

¹²² Kyle Smith, “There’s One Thing Dividing New Yorkers: Bill de Blasio,” *New York Post*, June 12, 2016, sec. Opinion, <http://nypost.com/2016/06/12/theres-one-thing-dividing-new-yorkers-bill-de-blasio/>.

¹²³ Brentin Mock, “Does the OneNYC Sustainability Plan Really Address Equity?,” *CityLab*, April 13, 2016, <http://www.citylab.com/politics/2016/04/does-the-onenyc-sustainability-plan-really-address-equity/477852/>.

¹²⁴ Cole Rosengren, “Funding against Storms Falls Short, Say Planners,” *The Hunts Point Express*, January 20, 2015, sec. Economy/Environment, <http://brie.hunter.cuny.edu/hpe/2015/01/20/funding-against-storms-falls-short-say-planners/>.

¹²⁵ Mock, “Does the OneNYC Sustainability Plan Really Address Equity?”

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER THREE

Urban Resilience in the Age of the Global City

The Long Road to Resilience- Origins in “Organized Complexity”

In the front matter of *One New York: The Plan for A Strong and Just City*, Mayor Bill de Blasio’s introductory letter describes the plan as “a blueprint of the New York City we want our children to inherit.”¹ Out of a three hundred fifty four-page report offering hundreds of proposals in the areas of urban design, planning, and policy, Mayor de Blasio’s introductory letter is of unique significance because in just one page, he manages to use six distinct conceptions of resilience. First, as an urban policy paradigm in which New York has and maintains “global leadership.”² Second, as a metric for determining and ameliorating deficiencies in government responsiveness.³ Third, as a metric for analyzing and bolstering community adaptation to the effects of climate change.⁴ Fourth, as a characteristic describing the vulnerability of society’s basic physical features, organizational structures, and facilities.⁵ Fifth, as a description of the whole city’s capacity to absorb unexpected stressors and return to a steady state stronger than before.⁶ Lastly, as an individual and communal trait describing the tenacity and triumph of the human spirit in the face of catastrophe.⁷

Each of these concepts are distinct because they are metrics for analyzing different systems. Yet, in spite of their differences, these disparate analytics share ideological origins and conceptual limits. Resilience discourse figures prominently in contemporary deliberations over urban design and policy because it strategically

constitutes neoliberal ideology through a combination of scientific claims regarding human nature, the language of social responsibility, and environmental stewardship.⁸ I argue that resilience is a political project. As such, it adopts a value-laden perspective on urban design constrained by institutional histories and hierarchies.⁹ In a world with hundreds, perhaps even thousands of distinct ways of thinking the concept resilience, it is crucial to understand how political and institutional constraints delimit a paradigm's rhetorical dimensions. At the same time, it is important to understand how those constraints implicate the material effects of proposed resilience policies. This chapter examines the origin, development, and implications of OneNYC's resilience frame within political and institutional structures. My argument develops in two sections.

First, practices of strategic naming and neoliberal redefinition enacted in OneNYC's resilience paradigm constitute a strategy of greenwashing. Rooted in Jane Jacobs' "organized complexity" theory of urban planning and development, the OneNYC plan presents resilience and its projects as "objective", sustainable, and equitable metrics for analyzing and addressing systemic vulnerabilities.¹⁰ Strategically naming the paradigm as an organic metaphor smuggles in a naturalization of neoliberal market logic as a natural way to perceive, analyze, and act within urban environments. The plan's redefinition of "organized complexity" embeds a growth-dependent value structure that privileges corporate entities within a system of unequal power relations, under the guise of objectivity. At the same time, scale of city resilience is restricted to understanding the internal coherence of the system rather than the role it plays in larger ones. Due to this politics of scale,¹¹ supra-city complexities that can trouble the effectiveness of the plan's resilience metrics or even produce planetary offsets are elided. Similarly, this rhetorical

screen renders stakeholders incognizant to the resilience of the global system under this growth-dependent paradigm. These practices serve to legitimate speculative, inequitable, unsustainable, and environmentally destructive development policies under the guise of social and environmental responsibility.

These functions do not merely problematize OneNYC's proposed resilience policies. Rather, they justify a critical deconstruction and reconceptualization of the value-laden system of "organized complexity" out of which this notion of resilience arises. To understand how this came to be, I trace a half-century of institutional and social developments in urban planning and sustainable development that give historical and ideological context to OneNYC's metrics of urban resilience. Extending Bricker and Schiappa's works on "strategic naming" and "definitional argument" in the context of greenwashing, I identify three historical developments and institutional shifts as instructive. The first shift is from Jane Jacobs' understanding of "organized complexity" to its taking up by grassroots architectural movements in the 60s, 70s, and 80s. The second shift is from the grassroots movements to the New Urbanism movement and the Congress of the New Urbanism in the 80s, 90s, and 2000s. Lastly, I study the shift from the New Urbanists to 100 Resilient Cities and *OneNYC* in the 2010s. While each social and institutional arrangement discussed explicitly draws on the frame of "organized complexity", each uses strategic naming and definitional argument to mask shifts in values, and ideology.

I begin with Jane Jacobs' work in the early 60's where she coined the phrase "organized complexity" as contrasting narrative to the Modernist paradigm of design. Opposed to urban revitalization's linear modalities for thinking about urban space, she

proposed a severely restricted development paradigm that fostered livable space and bottom-up planning to maximize the city's "natural" diversity.¹² With fidelity to Jacobs' stated values and intentions, grassroots architectural and design movements of the 60s and 70s gave groundswell to the "natural" development paradigm in a variety of academic and institutional contexts.

Inspired by these grassroots movements and Jacobs' work, the New Urbanism (NU) design movement of the 80s, 90s, and 2000s codified themselves through development of dense, walkable mixed-use neighborhoods. The NU movement explicitly took up and defended the "organized complexity" thesis, but re-interpreted it through an ideological commitment to the tenets of "sustainable development". The "sustainable development" paradigm of the NU movement arose as a response to the oppositional nature of conservationists and corporate capitalists. Attempting a compromise between camps, the NU adopted the language of conservationists to rebrand growth-dependence and de-regulation as environmental stewardship. The result, however, was a betrayal of Jacobs' inaugural promise, and a destructive compromise of the grassroots movement's dedication to sustainable, equitable urbanity.

I conclude this section with an analysis of how the NU movement's paradigmatic vision of "organic complexity" based in "sustainable development" evolved into OneNYC's conceptual frames for resilience. Attentive to the "organized complexity" of urban systems, the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities network (100RC) transformed the NU movement's sustainable development frame into the resilience frame used by OneNYC. The plan effectively greenwashes growth-dependent development by renaming the paradigm using organic metaphor, redefining environmentalism through

growth-dependence, and restricting the field of intelligibility to the city unit, rendering planetary impacts of these policies indecipherable.

Second, I explore the structural incapacities of resilience as terministic screen through a criticism of the OneNYC plan's resilient infrastructure policy. Specifically, I analyze the proposal to expand and harden the "tech ecosystem." This proposal is uniquely interesting because its function is to enhance the resilience of infrastructure, which in turn purportedly bolsters the resilience of communities, governance, environment, and local/global economy.

However, despite proposed benefits, the restriction of complexities accounted for within resilience analysis to citywide systems renders invisible global economic trends and unintended planetary offsets related to energy, waste, and crises of financial capitalism. Simultaneously, the inability for resilience systems to account for power dynamics and localized impacts resulting from global crisis these policies can contribute to a vicious cycle that implicates all four goals of OneNYC's strategic vision on resilience. The result is an incognizant public, and an inability to hold administration or corporate entities responsible for the contributions their speculative resilience projects make to an unsustainable and inequitable global system. The branding of this paradigm as a global standard for sustainable urban policymaking, and its increasing adoption worldwide present a uniquely pernicious paradox in that regard.

Jane Jacobs and the Origins of "Organized Complexity"

In Chapter One, I situated the origins of the Rockefeller Foundation's 100RC and its metrics for analyzing urban resilience within Jane Jacobs' seminal critique of urban revitalization. To reiterate, in the late 1950s the dominant paradigm in urban planning

policy was urban revitalization, emblemized by the projects of Robert Moses. Planners, policymakers, and real estate developers evaluated a neighborhood's vitality in terms of a "natural" cycle of rise and decline. Moses' focus on slum clearance and producing urban freeways like the Cross Bronx Expressway accelerated patterns of investment and disinvestment along race and class lines.¹³ The overarching legacy of the revitalization paradigm has been cycles of gentrification, zoning policies that sapped social cohesion from neighborhoods, and decades of racially motivated housing and land-use laws that created pockets of abject poverty.¹⁴

In 1961, with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, well-known Robert Moses critic Jane Jacobs published her scathing criticism of what she termed the Modernist paradigm. In *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Jacobs argued against the linearity and self-fulfilling nature of life-cycle analysis. Using an organic metaphor herself, Jacobs argued that neighborhoods and cities as a whole are subject to similar pressures and modes of organization as non-human ecosystems. Contrary to the linear life-cycle model, however, balance and success of neighborhoods and cities proper relies on a complex interplay of multiple factors related to environment, economy, and sociality. Each one of these factors individually, and together, contributes to the lived reality of urban populations and neighborhoods. Jacobs dismissed the top-down planning of Moses as a foolish, lifeless endeavor. Contrarily, she advocated street level planning, and intended to cultivate "naturally evolved" neighborhoods through livable space.¹⁵

Toward that end, she proposed four distinct courses of action constituting the "organized complexity" paradigm of urban planning. First, she encouraged fostering lively and interesting streets. Second, she encouraged making the fabric of streets as

continuous a network throughout a district of potential subcity size and power. Third, she encouraged using parks and squares and public buildings as part of this street fabric; not to island off different uses or subdistricts but to intensify and knit together the fabric's complexity and multiple use. Fourth, she emphasized the functional identity of areas large enough to work as districts.¹⁶ The intent of these guiding principles, as Jacobs made clear, was to contest the "domesticity" of urban space, and the inequitable power dynamics of top-down urban planning.¹⁷ By working toward livable neighborhoods and cities, Jacobs' writing established a paradigm from which policymakers could cultivate space that invigorates "social capital."¹⁸ Jacobs' monumental work was reflective of growing disillusionment with suburban sprawl, and raised awareness of a budding crisis in how to construct and maintain social cohesion in the urban environment. Playing on this crisis, Jacobs' definition of the city as "organized complexity" was persuasive for a few reasons.

First, Jacobs successfully framed Moses' political failures as the inevitable result of a reductive, scientifically inaccurate paradigm. Linear cause-effect analysis, she argued, was woefully over simplistic to understand complex ecosystems.¹⁹ Buttressed by a rising tide of scientific literature, especially Weaver's "Science and Complexity" (1948), Jacobs stated succinctly in the conclusion to her book that, "[c]ities happen to be problems in organized complexity, like the life sciences."²⁰ Definitions are not questions of reality, but rather are "claims and tools for meaning", where meaning is "a dynamic social agreement."²¹ The city is a site of community-imposed meaning for its inhabitants. Yet, the concept of the city has "a vague descriptive meaning and a rich emotive meaning" which leaves it "subject to constant redefinition."²² Jacobs does not merely

establish her definition of the city as more scientifically valid. Rather, she uses the scientific basis to explain why Moses' definition of the city offered no more promise, and then established strategic advantages to a complex analysis. Jacobs' thus persuasively began the process of re-shaping community-based meaning of what the city is, or can be.²³

Second, Jacobs' criticisms of elitism in planning, and her successes at blocking Moses' projects empowered her narrative arc as a triumphant NYC everywoman. Situating the city not like a complex ecosystem, but *as* a complex ecosystem actualizes motives and prescribes a course of action for city dwellers.²⁴ By offering alternative pathways, Jacobs' re-definition of the city offers a moment of rhetorical ingenuity, where the result is consubstantiality at the neighborhood and city level.²⁵ While Jacobs' work did not trigger an immediate change in urban governance, her "organized complexity" thesis was prolific in its influence over the next two decades of aesthetic and academic urban design practice.

Grassroots Movements and the Aesthetics of "Organized Complexity"

In the 60s and 70s, a slew of grassroots movements and influential figures extended and modified Jacobs' criticisms, acting as an ideological precursor to the NU movement. Approaching the question of the city from a primarily aesthetic lens, famed architect Robert Venturi's book, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (1966), functioned as a sequel of sorts to Jacobs' work. Agreeing that the Modernists had rejected "the complex and contradictory order that is valid and vital for our architecture as an urbanistic whole", Venturi chose to divest systems analysis to focus on the complexity of built environment aesthetics.²⁶

Situating the aesthetics of buildings as rhetorical acts in and of themselves, Venturi argued that designing and developing complex buildings produces a unique opportunity for those on the street to “focus on different things and relationships in different ways.”²⁷ As an integral part of the place-making process, complex buildings from this era are not art for art’s sake. They instead enact a change in perception of lived environments in form, and function as “twists of context” that let “us see the same things, but in different ways.”²⁸ Venturi’s complex building designs evolve from an “organized complexity” paradigm, but constitute a rhetorical shift in definition that raises new interesting questions; new metrics of analysis for the same object of study were laid out in Venturi’s work. Taking from Jacobs the emphasis on lived experience of place as crucial to bolstering social capital, he simultaneously shifted the paradigm toward emphasis on minor tweaks rather than the radical shifts in architectural design that people like Bernard Rudofsky would take up.

In 1964, writer and architect Bernard Rudofsky presented “Architecture Without Architects” at the Museum of Modern Art. His exhibit and subsequent studies echoed Jacobs’ critique of elitism in planning, offering in stow the paradigm of “vernacular architecture.”²⁹ He argued that to allow for a natural progression in urban life would require local, nontraditional architects planning buildings and neighborhoods that incorporate the local environment. Here “organized complexity” integrates ecological awareness not just into the metrics of analysis, but also into the built environment itself.

Rudofsky echoed Jacobs’ “eye-on-the-street” paradigm of bottom-up design, but integrates the street itself as an equal factor within the makeup of place.³⁰ Equating the role of the street with the buildings, Rudofsky explains that it offers a matrix from within

which community evolves. To create community and benefit from “organized complexity”, people must have the desire and means to actualize the benefits that livable space can offer.³¹ However, by not proposing *how* people should live and integrate themselves within these spaces, Rudofsky does not necessarily evolve the paradigm. Rather, he offers an enthymematic form to architectural design.³² Simply forwarding the aesthetic value of complex interrelatedness provides an extremely flexible ideological ground from within which an alternative definition can evolve, including one without the values shared between Rudofsky and Jacobs.

Grassroots Movements and the Practicality of “Organized Complexity”

Such an alternative definition of “organized complexity” arose in the urban planning mainstream in the early 70s with Léon Krier’s writings on the “reconstruction” of the European city. Krier’s work evolves from a fundamental assumption that there exists “objective laws in architecture, [and] that these laws remained unchanged over time.”³³ Calling for a return to the preindustrial town, he forwards “organized complexity” as a process of engaging with humanity’s “collective intelligence,” here meaning the few thousand years of Western architecture.³⁴ The return to this form, for Krier, is a move toward lived experience of architecture as an aesthetic event. This event intends to bring the “actor-inhabitant” into a deeper connection with the richness of human life and history.³⁵ Krier hence argues that his “top-down” regime is decidedly humanist, and that the “technology” of memory in architecture does not have a moral implication. Instead, it simply functions as a pragmatic knowledge-bank architects can draw from to address contemporary issues.

While the lived aesthetic experience of architecture can be important to galvanize and foster connection with place, it can simultaneously be a site of alienation and exploitation. Krier's projects have historically come under scrutiny for their large scale, and the economic reality that, "his projects require enormous concentrations of capital to develop... and provide no guarantee of ever being home to a true community."³⁶ The inability to produce community is a function of the ideological shift in "organized complexity" from Jacobs' paradigm to Krier's. Jacobs understands complexity as a function of the natural evolution of neighborhoods, advocating for limited intervention design strategies meant to ease the spatial inertia of an already evolving or forming community. On the other side, Krier situates "organized complexity" as the result of constructing and fostering mixed-use neighborhoods, and as the ultimate expression of social and aesthetic experience of community knowledge in architecture. Yet, it is precisely because Krier acts as if "community and space have become synonymous," that his argument fails.³⁷

Contrary to Krier's assertion, aesthetic experience of tradition and architecture can never be divorced from political and ethical implications. In fact, the collusion of corporatism, aesthetics, and tradition is on display in cities where "corporations, [are] by proxy...assum[ing] the duty of care for the civilising role of aesthetics in our societies."³⁸ Of note are so-called "Art for Air" projects in Auckland, where developers get bonus zoning space in return for installing public plazas, and the introduction of Quadruple Bottom Line standards of urban planning, focused on fostering environmental, social, economic, and cultural/aesthetic well-being.³⁹

The rhetorical functions of architecture and cultural history are not, despite Krier's insistence, exclusively about practicality. The debate figuring Rudofsky on one side, and Krier on the other, presents an excellent example of definitional argument. While both take on the "organized complexity" thesis, they do so with radically distinct values which invert, betray, or abandon the original meaning and values of Jacobs' concept. It is important to contextualize corporate driven versus local driven architectural and development impulses as a contestation over who determines tradition, the denial of authentic human experience, and the banalization of aesthetic experience as cultural asset in the functions of global capital. The rhetorical functions of built environment thus intimately connect with the interplay of place-making, selective renderings of cultural tradition, and the increasingly global forces of capital.⁴⁰

These rhetorical shifts in the meaning of "organized complexity" are crucial to understanding the discursive trajectory that *OneNYC* draws from. The legacy of mixed-use neighborhoods, the logic of bolstering social capital in communal spaces, the centrality of open space to increasing "face-to-face" interaction, and the importance of retaining neighborhood character to incentivize the "natural" growth of the community are central to 100 Resilient Cities metrics of city resilience which *OneNYC* builds on. Drawing from this rhetorical and political history in *OneNYC* acts as a "compromise conceptual device,"⁴¹ a Burkean point of identification that attempts to bridge competing communities and conceptions of urban space within one strategic vision. However, I argue that the development of modern neoliberal economy transforms the discursive and material functions of these proposals, allowing them to become means of subjection and domination rather than empowerment. Through incentivizing cycles of disinvestment and

then rapid reinvestment through the production of livable, mixed-use communities, *OneNYC* inadvertently produces the exact opposite of its original intentions.

From the Local to the Global- “Organized Complexity” Institutionalized

During the late 80s, early 90s, the conceptual frame of “organized complexity” in urban environments shifted in institutional and ideological function. The concept’s purview extended beyond the nature of the city’s form and its cultural, social, and economic implications to begin addressing globalism and the environment. The rise of institutions like the Congress of the New Urbanism (CNU) and 100 Resilient Cities (100RC) reflect an institutional and ideological turn from the “pure” conservation and local urbanist movements of the 60s and 70s to the corporatized planning and environmental responsibility paradigm of the 80s, 90s, and 2000s.

What became increasingly central was the role that the city’s systems play in an increasingly interconnected, risky world. This shift resulted from the ideological and institutional rearrangements marking the rise of globalized financial capital. While conservation groups of the 60s and 70s established their goals and values as fundamentally incompatible with corporate goals and values, international political declarations on “sustainable development” attempted to produce an amicable concession. Concomitantly, the shift from manufacturing to global finance capitalism, and the central role cities like New York have taken, forced new metrics and approaches to “organized complexity” to design amenable urban form and function. I will explore these shifts to give the context necessary to understand the rhetorical functions of “sustainable development” and “resilience” as they relate to the “organized complexity” of urbanity.

Global Institutionalization and Ideological Shift to Sustainable Development

The post-war capitalist economy of the late 60s was strong. However, the corporate class felt threatened by a multitude of factors, including the rising global influence of anti-capitalist political movements, trade unions empowerment of the Democratic Party, and a battery of regulatory agencies and initiatives such as consumer protections and the EPA⁴². To secure the balance of power, famed anthropologist and history David Harvey explains, the corporate class waged ideological and political war on the middle class to dispel growing labor power.⁴³ Harvey points to a 1971 US Chamber of Commerce internal memo circulated by soon-to-be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Lewis Powell as the impetus for corporate collaboration on the “political project” of restructuring the national and global economies.⁴⁴ It is this memo, Harvey indicates, that birthed the concept of neoliberalism.⁴⁵

Powell’s memo characterized all oppositional parties as fundamentally anti-American, a power bloc whose intentions were the destruction of the corporate capitalist class.⁴⁶ Calling for the pursuit of uninhibited free enterprise, Powell demanded that corporations actualize their own collective power to design education campaigns, take the government’s regulations to the Supreme Court, and other political programs to maintain their economic interests.⁴⁷ Powell’s memo functioned as an ideological narrative of communal development similar to the narrative structure of constitutive rhetoric as described by Charland.⁴⁸ Characterizing this attack on free enterprise as an attack on “individual freedom itself,” he calls for concerted, “unified action” through the National Chamber of Commerce.⁴⁹ Corporate America was receptive to Powell’s constitutive rhetoric, and it contributed to a mounting group-identification whose collective actions

contributed to a broader economic and ideological shift that collapsed workers' rights, environmental regulations, and shifted manufacturing offshore. A simultaneous shift in the broader conceptual field substantiated their actions, as Powell's call for education campaigns coincided with the founding of a multitude of conservative think tanks such as the Heritage Foundation and Manhattan Institute.⁵⁰ These institutions evidence-based research advocacy for deregulation, union busting, and supply-side economics were incredibly successful at shaping public perceptions in favor of neoliberalism.⁵¹ One of the most important fields for corporate America to intervene on was increased environmental regulations. Seeing groups like the EPA as a threat to not only profit margins but also freedom itself, corporate entities were intent to develop a paradigm of thinking that would resolve their concerns.

This shift in institutional and ideological paradigms reflects in the development of the term "sustainable development." A large number of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) formed in the 1970s as a response to ecological crisis, most prominently the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). The IUCN believe continued incompatibility between conservation and economic growth would be the death knell for environmental progress, and that corporate entities have a central role in stimulating conservation practice.⁵² While NGOs like Greenpeace took a staunchly oppositional position to government cooperation in the 70s, the IUCN chose instead to take a consultative role.⁵³ In 1980, the IUCN, together with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) jointly published the *World Conservation Strategy* (WCN) in an attempt to create long-term international standards that established "alignments between conservation, development

and sustainability.”⁵⁴ This document coined the term “sustainable development”, explaining it as an incentive-based paradigm for conservation programming.⁵⁵

While the WCN coined the phrase, it was the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development’s report *Our Common Future* (from here: Brundtland Report) (1987) that popularized “sustainable development” as a triple bottom line standard of “environmental preservation, economic growth, and social equity.”⁵⁶ Believing “the historical ecological contradictions of capitalism can be resolved through new strategies of accumulation and that these should rightly be the main mode of environmental protection for the planet,” international actors attempted to inspire planners and policymakers at all levels to design institutions that would work with private interests to preserve the environment.⁵⁷

Rhetorical functions aligned with institutional actions to appease corporate entities, and pursue conservation practices simultaneously. The establishment of organizational units within NGOs dedicated to collaborative relationships with private sector entities, and the broad-based use of incentive programs with subsidies for sustainable development programs stimulated global acceptance and adoption of the “sustainable development” paradigms.⁵⁸ The report was a rhetorical failure at achieving its largest intention, as it seemingly effected a sense of global interdependence for only a brief time. Yet, broad-based application of the conceptual frame for urban, national, and international planning and policy in the past 30 years reveal “sustainable development” to be a rousing rhetorical success. That success is a function of the terms strategic naming and definitional capacity.

Prefiguring a turn against governmental regulation of the environment in the 1980s, the use of “sustainable development” by the *WCN* and *Brundtland Report* functioned as “compromise conceptual device.” Functioning as a Burkean point of identification, the use of “sustainable development” as terministic screen intended to overcome divisiveness between conservation groups, corporations, and government entities by providing a perception of shared values between actors.⁵⁹ By taking up the rhetoric of sustainability, these reports represent themselves as amenable to conservationist value-systems whilst backgrounding focus on the broader negative implications of making conservation amenable to corporate influence.⁶⁰

The *Brundtland Report*’s equation of “nature” and capital subsumed protection of nature to market forces in an attempt to incentivize the role of corporate entities in the process, while avoiding alienating government institutions already turning their backs to environmental protection.⁶¹ The acceptance of “sustainable development” as a paradigm appeases conservationists, while requiring the least material change in social, economic, and institutional arrangements. By leveraging a large implication with a path of least resistance, the coalescence of meaning and construction of identification between parties were successful. However, despite the ethos of compromise, larger political goals and values of corporate entities inevitably prove antithetical to the political goals and intentions of conservation groups.⁶² Schiappa explains using the example of Bush’s renegotiation of the wetlands definition that all contest over definitions is political, because they “always serve particular interests” and coerce people to adopt different linguistic and nonlinguistic responses.⁶³ Even definitions “by scientists”⁶⁴ are subject to Burke’s analysis of terministic screens, a particular perspective brought to a set of

observable phenomena.⁶⁵ Just as there are multiple psychoanalytic interpretations for a single dream or multiple metrics by which to determine what is or is not a wetland, the correct definition is never a question of metaphysics, but rather of persuasion and social practice.⁶⁶ Moreover, it is the field of ambiguity constituted by compromise between environmental and ecological values that “sustainable development” as a paradigm is uniquely amenable to greenwashing.⁶⁷ As Bricker explains, greenwashing occurs when corporations take up strategic names such as “Wise Use” and adopt conservationist rhetoric to absolve themselves of controversy, enabling and empowering corporate influence over ecological values.⁶⁸ Similarly, the paradigm of “sustainable development” as developed in these documents adopts conservation rhetoric, but is entirely reliant on corporate influence that primes the environment for exploitation hidden behind a façade of conservationist values.⁶⁹ The paradigm was incredibly successful in this regard. While a significant amount of contestation occurs between conservationists and corporate-backed institutions, the ubiquity of the concept speaks to its broad acceptance, and the legitimization of corporate exploitative practice.⁷⁰ The integration of “sustainability” and its evolution along and into resilience both institutionally and within the four visions of *OneNYC* reflects a “Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus.”⁷¹ *OneNYC* draws intimately from *WCN* and the *Brundtland Report*’s “compromise conceptual device” which projects a vision of sustainability dependent on growth and private partnership.

Congress of the New Urbanism- Institutionalizing Sustainable Development

The chartering of the CNU in 1993 reflected the institutional adoption of Krier’s approach to “organized complexity” in American and global urban design.⁷² With partial funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, the CNU declared themselves a direct response

to the destructive effects of Modernist land-use and urban renewal strategies. Inspired by the work of Jacobs and Krier, the CNU's Charter declared three guiding principles, "urban infill supporting walkable blocks and streets, traditional neighborhood development (TND), and transit-oriented development (TOD)."⁷³ In 2008, the CNU, recognizing the growing importance of addressing environmental crisis directly, supplemented their Charter's guiding principles with the "Canons of Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism." The Canons emphasize reuse of infrastructure, long-term life cycle design that retains flexibility for growth, buying down future economic impacts of climate change, and adaptation as the primary organizing principles for sustainable, resilient urban environments.⁷⁴ It is on these principles that "organized complexity" gained not just cultural recognition, but institutionalization.

The principles espoused in the CNU's Charter and Canons have had a significant influence on municipal, state, and federal housing policy influencing directly the planning of hundreds of cities throughout the world.⁷⁵ Of particular note is the Housing and Urban Development HOPE IV program. Crafted by the CNU, the program operates on the belief that Modernist low-income housing's scale and design function to sap rather than build social capital in impoverished communities.⁷⁶ To resolve this crisis, the program has built over 110,000 sustainable units at 240 sites in cities across the country, replacing debilitated affordable-housing projects with mixed-income and mixed-use properties.⁷⁷ The rhetorical functions of "organized complexity" in these NU-inspired projects speak to the dominance of Krier's definition, and its expanded legitimacy through institutional arrangements and manifestation in policy.

New Urbanism as a paradigm ascribes to the belief that environmental protection, social sustainability, and economic growth are coterminous rather than contradictory impulses. Schiappa explains that definitions will always serve interests, but that the only pertinent question for the public is to understand whose interests.⁷⁸ Despite the claim that Krier's urbanism would serve the social capital and development of the community, its complicity in larger political projects of neoliberalism necessitated outcomes contradictory to intents. Similarly, the paradigm and institutional platform of New Urbanism itself participates within those broader political projects.⁷⁹ Its rhetorical framing as a socially and environmentally sustainable way of living operates as "compromise conceptual device" betrayed by the pragmatic and political results contradictory to its intents.⁸⁰ New Urbanism's capitulation to growth-dependence marks "natural" aspects of the environment as selling points rather than as living aspects critical to social sustainability.⁸¹ In studies of their builds, there is a noted failure to protect "natural amenities" over the long term⁸², and a strictly utilitarian approach to natural resources that simply "underwrites the pro-growth stance of the movement."⁸³ Simultaneously, the assumption that increased settlement density decreases environmental impact is fundamentally incorrect, due to an increased number of non-porous surfaces⁸⁴, and increased vulnerability to hazards in floodplain areas.⁸⁵

Despite the best intentions of planners and architects, the fact that "livable", "walkable" communities are inherently more likely to produce environmental offsets, and can even leave residents more vulnerable to environmental impacts speaks to a structural and ideological deficiency in the paradigms analytic capacity. Constituting a definitional rupture,⁸⁶ it is perhaps more accurate to describe New Urbanism's purported dedication

to the cause of sustainability as green marketing than green living.⁸⁷ Yet despite these realities, New Urbanism remains a significant vein of urban planning and development. As Reid explains succinctly in regards to neoliberalism and sustainable development, “Its powers of persuasion and discursive prosperity depend on its own capacity to adapt to the hazards of critique.”⁸⁸ We can understand this adaptive nature by analyzing the rhetorical functions of strategic naming and definitional argument.

Rhetorically, the strategic naming of the movement as “New Urbanism” situates it as an attack on Modernist development and design, which provides anti-Modernist activists, conservationists, and planners a perception of alliance in values and motives.⁸⁹ At the level of definition, “organized complexity” in the New Urbanist frame symbolizes the triple bottom line of corporate enrichment aligned with communal/cultural flourishing, and environmental stewardship. By defining the movement’s pursuit of “organized complexity” as a function of “sustainable development”, pursuit of wealth disconnects from any negative connotations. Playing upon neoliberal ideals of growth and independence, community members and policymakers alike are convinced that the pursuit of corporate profit is not only beneficial for securing the functional and adaptive nature of the community’s cultural, social and environmental systems, it is necessary.⁹⁰

From Sustainable Development to Resilience

While talk of “sustainable development” remains germane in discussions regarding the urban environment, the past decade has seen a growing trend away from the term toward the paradigm of resilience. In a 2012 New York Times Op-ed, Andrew Zollner argued that world leaders are increasingly recognizing sustainability’s promise of world balance restored as myth.⁹¹ Where sustainability aims to put the world back into

balance,” Zolli writes, “resilience looks for ways to manage in an imbalanced world.”⁹² Hence, “resilience thinking” as a new paradigm prioritizes strategizing how to prepare communities, institutions, built environments, and even people’s psychological capacities, to deal with escalating waves of human and non-human caused disasters in an increasingly complex world.⁹³ Inculcation of resilient subjectivity is the mechanism that *OneNYC* relies upon. To encourage New Yorkers to support the plan’s policies, they must accept the constitutive lifeworld as defined by the historical and institutional development of the “Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus.” Before addressing the contemporary approach to urban resilience as found in *OneNYC*, I undertake a quick analysis of the historical development of resilience as a concept. This will provide necessary background to understand the contours of resilience as strategic naming and multi-scalar adaptive capacity as definitional argument in regards to the 100 Resilient Cities and *OneNYC*’s conceptions of the city as “organized complexity.”

Briefly reiterating the work done in Chapter One, resilience as a concept is born out of the engineering and ecology literature, originally described by Holling as the measure of the ability of a system and its internal relationships to persist through change.⁹⁴ Since that time, the literature on resilience has exploded. Its expansive field now covers an incredible array of applications to a variety of systems, and sub-systems. Despite disagreement on the true definition of what constitutes resilience, and what objects should be definable in terms of resilience, resilience’s explanatory power has historically been as an outcome, a state, a property, or a process.⁹⁵

In the context of cities, ecological metaphors have helped explain their organization since the Chicago School’s Concentric Zone Theory in the 1920s.⁹⁶ Yet, the

introduction of resilience as a metric for studying the urban environment did not happen until the mid to late 1990s, when scientists began to integrate analytic paradigms to understand the interplay of human communities and environmental systems.⁹⁷ Holling and associates adopted such an integrated paradigm, coining the term “social-ecological systems”.⁹⁸ They gave contours to this conceptual frame by offering up four qualities of a resilient system (Latitude, Resistance, Precariousness, Panarchy),⁹⁹ and by delineating a distinction between engineering resilience (stability near an equilibrium) and ecological resilience (measure of magnitudes of disturbance before a system changes states).¹⁰⁰

Despite the progress made in terms of social-ecological resilience, in 2012 the ambiguity or overwrought rigidity of resilience frames were still of limited utility in addressing the “organic complexity” of the urban environment.¹⁰¹ Academics and institutional agents alike warned that without a clarification on its metrics, the “conceptual clarity and practical relevance of the concept of resilience are critically in danger.”¹⁰² While many actors worldwide are working to produce programmatic, effective resilience metrics, the Rockefeller Foundation’s 100RC network has attracted the most visibility and groundswell through their vast breadth of projects. In the Rockefeller Foundation white paper titled *Building Climate Change Resilience in Cities: The Private Sector’s Role* (2014), they forward that “[c]ities are extremely complex ecosystems.”¹⁰³ To the Rockefeller Foundation, resilience defines “the capacity of individuals, communities, institutions, businesses, and systems within a city to survive, adapt, and grow no matter what kinds of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience.”¹⁰⁴ Yet, due to the tendency for policymakers to think in terms of discrete

sectors, a structural inability to “[think] about cities holistically as systems” remains one of the largest obstacles to city resilience.¹⁰⁵

Institutionalizing Resilience- 100 Resilient Cities and the City Resilience Index

To facilitate “resilience thinking” that can address an increasingly complex world, and with recognition that cities are increasingly important transnational actors in climate action, the Rockefeller Foundation designed the 100RC network.¹⁰⁶ 100RC has one primary directive, which is to hold and maintain a competition selecting one hundred of the most impactful cities in the world. To qualify, selected cities must be willing to act as “living laboratories” for testing, development, and modification of these metrics.

OneNYC is one such project.¹⁰⁷ In these cities, the network supports city governance by helping elect a Chief Resilience Officer, provides expertise developing a Resilience Strategy, and offers a platform that integrates knowledge and resource exchange with other cities, private, and philanthropic entities.¹⁰⁸ Offering a model for global leadership in urban resilience policy, 100RC sets a standard for “collaborative resilience planning” incorporating private, public, and community actors in a concerted effort to prepare for both abrupt and chronic stressors.¹⁰⁹

The actual metrics by which 100RC evaluates the resilience of a city and its systems were crafted in Strategic Partnership with engineering firm Arup, codified in their City Resilience Index (CRI). Their qualitative and quantitative analysis indicates that a resilient city attends to four dimensions (Health and well-being, Economy and society, Infrastructure and environment, Leadership and strategy), twelve goals that all cities should strive toward, and fifty-two indicators of “critical factors” and qualities, determined through “empirical research.”¹¹⁰ Former Managing Director of the

Rockefeller Foundation Dr. Nancy Kete frames the Index's dimensions, goals, and indicators as a "baseline" for determining "what matters most" in city resilience, and as a "tool" that "enable[s] all of us interested in city resilience to convene around a common understanding of that idea."¹¹¹ As Schiappa makes clear, there is no such thing as "neutral" criteria for interpreting the world, merely a set of "value-laden political factors" from which observations are developed.¹¹² Depending on the tool of analysis applied in any given situation what is "objectively real" and hence available for discussion is restricted. However, as Schiappa reminds us "what is or is not part of our shared reality is a profoundly political act."¹¹³ The City Resilience Index's criteria for analyzing city resilience and its functions as a tool for establishing a "common understanding"¹¹⁴ of the "complexity of city systems"¹¹⁵ is not value-neutral. I argue instead that it is both an extension and strategic manipulation of the "sustainable development" thesis of "organized complexity" which counterintuitively smuggles in individualistic neoliberal ideology under the guise of objectivity.

The strategic name of this paradigm reflects a return to the science-based, naturalistic metaphor that establishes its purview as an organic one. The conceptual frame of resilience is increasing applied and adopted because its very name allows it to be "perceived as apolitical and grounded in sound ecological sciences."¹¹⁶ The paradigm of resilience, no matter its definitional content, draws from the very inherent nature of systems themselves, and is hence increasingly persuasive.¹¹⁷ As well, the name resilience itself plays a critical role in "shaping and broadening" definitional argument's capacity.¹¹⁸ The name resilience itself "presupposes the disastrousness of the world," constraining the form and function of any definition.¹¹⁹ The shift from "sustainable

development” to resilience establishes a frame of persistence opposed to change, of a world defined by fundamental insecurity opposed to re-balancing.¹²⁰

The name of the institution, 100 Resilient Cities, similarly functions as argument. The question is not whether 100 Resilient Cities truly intend to produce that many resilient cities. Rather, what is of importance is that the institution’s name calls upon cities to understand themselves in terms of resilience. Specifically, while cities may be diverse in geographical size, population density, national location, or racial and economic makeup, resilience is a paradigm that is global in scale and applicability.¹²¹ Resilience as rhetorical framing delimits the political exigency of city stakeholders, constraining the field from which courses of action can derive.¹²²

While the 100RC paradigm of resilience and its redefinition of the city’s “organized complexity” has a variety of impacts, I identify two broad implications that help give context to the ways it contributes to a conceptual greenwashing function. First the plan’s re-definition of “organized complexity” embeds a growth-dependent, neoliberal value structure privileging corporate entities within a system of unequal power relations, all under the guise of objectivity. The 100RC paradigm of resilience is intimately rooted in ecological resilience as described by Holling. 100RC contextualizes resilience not in terms of the return to a particular point of equilibrium, but rather defines it as a balancing act “based on the shifting relationship between scales, and between autonomy on the one hand and connectivity on the other.”¹²³ It is important to situate this distinction not just in terms of the socio-ecological resilience literature, but also within the institutional and conceptual succession of the 100RC network and resilience over the CNU and “sustainable development.”

Following the broader trend away from sustainability described by Zolli, 100RC's definition presumes that there is no equilibrium to return to, as cities are "complex systems that are constantly adapting to changing circumstances."¹²⁴ The denigration of sustainability as a paradigm is not simply implicit either. While describing the seven qualities of a resilient city, the CRI report forwards that these qualities "provide a more complete measure of resilience than conventional sustainability indicators such as energy efficiency."¹²⁵ Such claims work to re-characterize the very nature of the city, enacting a succession of organic metaphors through argument at the level of descriptive applicability and values.

Declaring the indicators of "sustainable development" structurally insufficient for cities to "assess their trajectory towards a more resilient future," persuades stakeholders to believe that sustainability is not only inaccurate, but also predicated on values potentially incompatible with the contemporary city.¹²⁶ The 100RC network is conceptually linked with the most accurate and effective metrics to interpret and anticipate the natural eccentricities of the urban environment. In "sustainable development," the presumption is that disaster is the result of a system gone wrong, something staved off as much as possible. On the contrary, 100RC posits that resilience anticipates disaster as an inevitable facet of life, but also figures it as productive. Because resilience is an abstract concept, they argue, it "can only be truly measured following a real-life shock or period of stress."¹²⁷ By weathering a multitude of severe events, cities will gain enough measurements of their system's resilience to "compare performance between jurisdictions" and "track progress over time" on their "trajectories towards resilience."¹²⁸ For 100RC to hone and expand on their quantitative baselines for

evaluating resilience, they must normalize disaster as opportunity for growth, use the post-disaster time to track a system's development by analyzing its coherence, and change in state.

The shift in “organized complexity” from sustainability to resilience naturalizes disaster as the necessary precondition for political and economic growth.¹²⁹ What is “politically most at stake” in the 100RC city resilience paradigm is that it interpellates subjects “permanently called upon to bear the disaster—a subject for whom bearing the disaster is a required practice without which he or she cannot grow and prosper in the world.”¹³⁰ As Charland echoing Burke explains, the ideological function of constitutive rhetoric is that it provides a textual narrative within which the subject identifies, radically altering the material lifeworld and domain of motives the subject enacts.¹³¹ Just as in the call for corporate America to unify under a single motive in defense of individual freedom, definitional argument functions here as constitutive rhetoric. The resilient subject is hailed within a narrative of history that contextualizes their exposure to damage and crisis as a function of a system's, and their own persistence.¹³² The failure to become resilient does not merely challenge their possibility to thrive in a neoliberal economy; it constitutes the very precondition for existential risk from impending disaster. Hence, the resilient subject cannot avoid disaster. Rather, experience of “disaster is conceptualized in positive terms as constitutive of the possibility for the development of neoliberal systems of governance.”¹³³ By narrating disaster as both an intrinsic natural occurrence, and as a positive opportunity for growth, the paradigm calls into being a new mode of individual, social, political, and institutional being in citizens of cities across the globe.

For Charland, traditional interpretations of persuasion are insufficient to describe the rhetorical situation, as both speaker and audience enter into the rhetorical situation as pre-constituted subjects. Rhetorical invention is not a matter of changing the audience's view on any particular issue, but rather about modifying the audience's subjective affiliation and structures of thinking. Charland concludes that rhetors enact this modification through explicit appeal to the constitutive narrative of a community. Cities and their citizens had internalized the "sustainable development" narrative, where the community's goal was to come into balance with the environment while simultaneously achieving significant economic gains. 100RC does away with this narrative, declaring it bereft of value and explanatory power. Contrarily, 100RC calls for the city stakeholder to situate themselves within a narrative trajectory of the resilient city and civilian.

This trajectory begins with internalization of resilience as a framework providing "deeper understanding of the systems", progressing to awareness of the city's and civilian's "baseline", moving to the experience of multiple disasters and recoveries by which a city and individual track their "progress over time", finishing in an imagined state of adaptation where individual and city are defined by "resilience". Stakeholders in the city, hailed by this form of the "organized complexity" paradigm, are willing to transform particular manifestations of psychological, communal, social, political, and economic life to make themselves amenable to a variety of shocks. This is the first ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric, calling the city's subjects into a collectivity by narrating their communal arrangements within and as a whole city.¹³⁴ In Charland's formulation, the narrative brings the world into a particular order that in effect subverts the individual's interests to those of the collectivity.¹³⁵

Yet, while the 100RC and their CRI call for a variety of institutional, economic, and environmental modifications to make city systems flexible and amenable to change, what is strictly determined in advance is the value-structure undergirding individual, city, and global life. To put this more simply, the rhetorical functions of resilience in the 100RC paradigm is to mold subjects constantly amenable and flexible to pressures of the modern city. Resilience aims at modification of the subject, and the tweaking of local systems to increase livability in a world that increasingly makes life unlivable. What remains beyond questioning or change are the fundamental values the individual must inculcate to do so, and the values of growth-dependence that undergird cities and the global system of financial capital.

This is the third ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric, what Charland terms the illusion of freedom.¹³⁶ The narrative of the resilient city offers city stakeholders an explicitly liberating opportunity. In a world defined by disaster, the narrative goes, working together as a community toward a resilient city allows the community, city, and world to persist and prosper. Hailed subjects believe themselves free to act as they would like to achieve this nominal sense of freedom, but are inevitably constrained by the narrative's status as a "logic of meaningful totality."¹³⁷ Subjects are compelled to follow through and maintain the narratives consistency, effectively positioning them to pursue economic, political, and social actions in line with neoliberal ideology.¹³⁸

Of importance here is that the subject positioned by resilience does not fulfill their narrative through political empowerment. In fact, the narrative of resilience relies on the "deliberate disabling of the political habits, tendencies, and capacities of peoples and replacing them with adaptive ones."¹³⁹ Subjects of the resilience narrative are constrained

to enacting a change in their own mindset; the way they internalize and grapple with the variety of crises that come to define late-capitalism.¹⁴⁰ While 100RC and resultant policies like OneNYC speak about the importance of adopting collaborative governance between citizens and municipal administrators, that impetus occurs within a decisive shift of burden from state to citizen.¹⁴¹

The functional role of governance in “resilience thought” is as facilitator of environment in which communities develop a resilient psychosocial infrastructure.¹⁴² Because of assumptions that the poor are unaware of how to effectively construct strong institutions, temper their actions in post-disaster scenarios, or inculcate sustainable social practices, bolstering resilience requires, “flexible and open institutions and multi-level governance systems.”¹⁴³ 100RC explicitly emphasizes that if communities are “appropriately supported” by city government and “well connected” to one another, it will facilitate the “bottom-up” development of a “strong identity and culture.” That is important because when communities “face unforeseen circumstances together,” with a strong bottom-up structure they will do so “without civil unrest or violence.”¹⁴⁴ Governments functioning under “resilience thinking” facilitate community psychological resilience to turn feelings of helplessness in post-disaster environments into a perceptual “window of opportunity” for communal growth.¹⁴⁵ City governments functionally absolve themselves of responsibility by putting the onus on the community to alter their outlook on crisis, and to become self-sufficient in post-disaster scenarios.

Resilience is about people’s willingness and ability to persist through contemporary crises. Yet, the 100RC themselves warn that a “conceptual limitation” of their resilience paradigms is that often it functions “without any ability to necessarily

account for the power dynamics that are inherent in the way cities function and cope with disruptions.”¹⁴⁶ 100RC proscribes disasters not simply as inevitabilities, but also as necessary points of growth so “communities are able to undergo novel processes of developmental change in order to reconstitute themselves as neoliberal societies.”¹⁴⁷ At risk in this “conceptual limitation” of resilience is the extension of contemporary power imbalances into the resilient future under the guise of meaningful growth for individuals, communities, and society writ large.

For example, the *OneNYC* plan describes a “workforce development” initiative where all resilience projects will prioritize job opportunities for residents of disaster-affected areas, and low-income residents.¹⁴⁸ To ensure its effectiveness, the municipal government will develop a centralized data-collection tool to oversee local hiring practices.¹⁴⁹ This plan presents workforce development as an anti-poverty initiative that will “ensure residents impacted by disasters are able to participate in the recovery.”¹⁵⁰ The reality is that short-term hiring programs like this rarely address “structural” inequalities in city labor markets.¹⁵¹ Simultaneously, it reflects the neoliberal nature of the project, as workforce development responsibility shifts from government to private entities.¹⁵² In fact, examples like New Orleans show how market-driven workforce programs emphasis on development actually undermine local initiatives toward community organization,¹⁵³ while reinforcing the “taken-for-granted” authority of corporate entities drawn to these areas for high profit post-disaster contracts and a local subsidized labor force.¹⁵⁴ The dangers of these projects reflect how growth-dependence undergirding the paradigm of resilience can structurally overwhelm intentions. By

defining the contours of the actionable world, it acts as fundamental constraint on which political and ethical objections to domination can occur.

Second, 100RC's practices of strategic naming and definitional argument with resilience and "organized complexity" render stakeholders incognizant to planetary instability and offsets exacerbated by profit-driven resilience policies. Dr. Kete contextualizes the role of globalization within the 100RC's definition of a city's "organized complexity" through her introduction to the CRI report. Situating 100RC and its resilience frame within the fifty-year development of "the values and ideas put forward by Jacobs," she argues that the CRI represents a negotiation of those values within the "context of dynamic urban growth and globalisation."¹⁵⁵ Dr. Kete's move to construct the city's "organized complexity" in terms of a "global-urban interface" reflects and refracts the financial reality that "[c]ities now find themselves competing economically with each other across national borders in a way that would have been inconceivable in the 1970s."¹⁵⁶ The "global" is conceived in this formulation of "organized complexity" as either a source of city stressors or potential investments for growth. The paradigm of city resilience cannot concern itself with changing the larger conceptual fields that structure global systems. Instead, subjects can merely attune themselves to its demands as effectively as possible. Together, these factors determine the value-laden structure from which 100RC's resilience metrics are drawn.

This value-laden structure reflects in the mesh of descriptions regarding interplay between resilience and the "global" offered in the CRI. The CRI report depicts the relevance of the "global" for urban form in terms of the need for resilience paradigms to account for "global pressures that play out at a city scale."¹⁵⁷ Rhetorically situating the

city as an entity reliant on global economic growth constrains the scale of analysis, so that metrics of city resilience measure the adaptive capacity of a city to global economic with minimal risk for citywide system collapse. Throughout the rest of the CRI report, resilience is figured as a globally popular idea¹⁵⁸, resilience variables as site for global deliberation by city stakeholders¹⁵⁹, the metrics as globally applicable¹⁶⁰, the index as tool used by partner cities around the globe in agenda-setting meetings¹⁶¹, and the globe as site of economy that resilient cities integrate with.¹⁶² The urban resilience frame relies on an assumption that its metrics are reflexive, and hence amenable to interpretation of a constantly changing, and complex system.¹⁶³ However, while 100RC's city resilience paradigm is attentive to city and sub-city systems, its neoliberal, growth-dependent value structure restrict the metrics descriptive capacity to a unidirectional relationship between the "global" and the city.

The greenwashing function of this framing cannot be overstated. Analyzing the inter-scalar nature of resilience policy impacts reveals a whole slew of complexities challenging not only the reflexive character of its metrics, but also the veracity of claims that 100RC's metrics will produce resilience at all.¹⁶⁴ Yet, the strategic naming functions of resilience and the definitional arguments of 100RC's "organized complexity" constrain these analytic capacities through a downscaling of regulatory scale with a concomitant upscaling of economic integration. The result is an offshoring of responsibility to communities, and an absolution of city administrators, international non-governmental organizations, and corporate entities for the unjust, unsustainable, and inequitable implications of speculative resilience projects at a local and global scale.¹⁶⁵ 100RC's rhetorical hail to make the city's communities and people resilient produces a subject

whose internalization of neoliberal ideology renders them incognizant to the potentially unethical impacts that this paradigm simultaneously necessitates and normalizes. The following section analyzes the OneNYC plan to expand and harden the city's "tech ecosystem" as an explicit example of these greenwashing functions of 100RC's resilience paradigm.

Urban Branding- Organized Complexity in the Tech Ecosystem

OneNYC's four pillars of growth, equity, resilience, and sustainability find a particularly salient point of coalescence in its proposals for New York's "tech ecosystem." OneNYC forefronts the "tech ecosystem" as one of New York City's "fastest growing and highest paying sectors" representing 291,000 jobs and \$30 billion in wages annually.¹⁶⁶ The centrality of "digital technology" and the "exponential growth of data," the plan forwards, are "transforming every aspect of the economy, communications, politics, and individual and family life."¹⁶⁷ Capitalizing on broader changes, the city administration "acknowledges the importance of technology and data to each of our visions," and describes expansion of the tech industry as a "critical part" of the city's strategic approach to "tackling inequality, expanding our economy, and creating good jobs for all New Yorkers."¹⁶⁸ Despite these stated intentions, the rhetorical frame of the "tech ecosystem" naturalizes a growth-dependent, corporatized value-system, risking unanticipated consequences that will have exactly the opposite of its intended effects.

The metaphor of the tech ecosystem serves a value-crafting function. It naturalizes growth and the role of informational technologies within both contemporary society, and the city's very structure.¹⁶⁹ The metaphor participates within a broader

metaphor of the city as “organized complexity,” a sub-system fundamental to sustained growth and balance of the city’s complexities. The narrative of OneNYC fixes the tech ecosystem’s growth as natural progression in the linear trajectory toward complete immersion and integration of the city. It functions as a rhetorical frame subsuming any alternative conception of New York’s future, legitimating in advance the technology-centric vision of a unified city’s inevitable succession through digital immersion.¹⁷⁰

The plan’s acknowledgement of the global trends in technology and the central role it will play in achieving resilience policies reiterate the same reduction of scale found in the plan overall. The plan situates NYC’s tech ecosystem as a site for international investment and as the city’s attempt to adapt and “respond to these [global] changes.” The scale of analysis is rhetorically constrained from analyzing the tech ecosystem in terms of global output and its role international systems to one as stimulus and central driver for the city’s growth. The integration of New York with international telecommunications networks and finances will have significant implications, but they remain structurally indescribable.

The metaphor also serves a strategic function, as a “branding of place.”¹⁷¹ The plan attempts a strategic shifting of interpretation, from the popular understanding of New York as a financial hub to a tech hub. This is an important strategic function because corporations are subject to “agglomeration economies.”¹⁷² Despite the increasing integration of place through telecommunications, corporations choose to centralize top-level management and control functions in one place. Cities tend to segregate by industry, as a concentration of human capital from a variety of industry corporations is good for competition.¹⁷³ To establish New York as “the city of choice for tech firms,”

then, it is imperative that they brand New York as a “growing, thriving city” for technological innovation.¹⁷⁴

The Lie of Techquity - Uneven Development in the Tech Ecosystem

Under the header “A Growing, Thriving City,” the plan proposes two broad-scale intentions to actualize a more effective, functioning tech ecosystem. These intentions are to significantly expand allocation of space for tech startups and infrastructure, and facilitate a prepared workforce through education and training programs.¹⁷⁵ Serving as an advertisement of sorts, this section describes the city’s administration dedication to “supporting this sector,” and the “crucial” role it plays in the city’s approach to resolving economic inequities. The so-called “key” to resolving inequality, economic growth, and creating jobs for all New Yorkers is “ensuring employers have the workers they need to innovate and grow.”¹⁷⁶ Echoing the neoliberal value structure of NYC writ large, the plan’s solution to inequity lies not in government services or programs, but will be a market-driven function of expanding data and technology industries.

The plan emphasizes increased infrastructure for the city’s budding tech ecosystem through proposals to increase high-speed broadband access for businesses, increase “flexible, affordable commercial space” for the innovation economy, and an “advanced manufacturing network” including R&D facilities, workspaces for startups, and fabrication labs.¹⁷⁷ As Sassen notes in her analysis of the “global city”, information industries need a vast physical infrastructure containing “strategic nodes with hyper-concentration of facilities” to support their innovative projects and structure.¹⁷⁸ Simultaneously, the growth of “nodes” comes with an expansion of industry hotspots throughout cities away from the Central Business District. This is evident in New York

through the explosive growth of tech industries in previously underserved communities in Brooklyn.¹⁷⁹ The plan's emphasis on the interconnected nature of the city through the metaphor of the ecosystem materializes in a concentration of new centralized business districts throughout the city. *OneNYC*'s constitutive narrative situates these developments as necessary to the overcoming of contemporary economic inequality. As communities who have experienced generations of disenfranchisement, the expansion of job opportunities is not simply an occurrence; it is the fulfillment of a promise and a natural outgrowth a strong and just city's "organic complexity." Within the constitutive resilience narrative, community embracement of developmental nodes and technological development is the very means by which the vulnerable conceive of their freedom from injustice.

Yet, increased infrastructure resolves around an assumption of "techquity," that the increased infrastructure will encourage an equal distribution of economic benefit.¹⁸⁰ That dispersal into underserved communities actually encourages new concentrations of financial investment and land-use strategies that result in waves of gentrification like in Oakland.¹⁸¹ New York City's pursuit of the moniker of "a growing, thriving city" for tech innovation is the attempt to overcome the Bay Area's current domination. Yet the focus on growth overwhelms the dedication to equity. Just as Zukin analyzed Jacobs' failure to see that the authenticity of neighborhoods was an economic factor,¹⁸² *OneNYC*'s vision of "organized complexity" fails to address how increased "nodes" of tech in underserved communities combine with a rebranding of space to expand the functions of gentrification.¹⁸³ The operationalized definition of "organized complexity" does not line up with intentions embodied within the local community's constitutive narrative. This

constitutive narrative hailed subjects within a narrative that promised the actualization of their freedom through increased economic opportunity, “organized complexity” as a “compromise conceptual device” serves to incentivize and legitimize corporate exploitation rather than the needs of the community.

The city similarly to infrastructure situates the growth of access to data and information not only in terms of the need to encourage institutional investors, but also for its implications for a just and equitable city. Describing a growing gap between the “technology haves and have-nots,” the city proposes a variety of programs intent to narrow the “digital divide.” By offering free wireless, investing in innovative ways to provide high-speed internet to homes and businesses, and by decreasing costs and time to make it easier for small businesses to help solve “complex urban policy challenges,” the city proposes it can “ensure all New Yorkers can participate fully.”¹⁸⁴ The central thesis of this claim is that a more connected city is an equal one, and that it can even overcome older spatial inequalities and hierarchies through digital access.¹⁸⁵ Yet, both the growth-dependent paradigm that undergirds this value-laden claim and the market-driven assumptions behind the proposals are detrimental to their intentions.

Of primary concern is the privatization of access to information. The OneNYC plan intends to overcome the “digital divide” primarily through incentivizing private industries to expand availability of lines of communication to previously underserved communities. This is part of what Mosco terms the “pay-per-revolution.”¹⁸⁶ This neoliberal shift from generalized, publicly regulated services to de-regulated privatized control ensures individualized pricing schemes that determine degrees of access to information.¹⁸⁷ In other words, OneNYC repeats the mistakes of the plans that preceded

an previous theories of urban development that conflated resilience paradigms with gentrification and economic development that benefitted those who already had economic agency. Simultaneously, left free to develop the contours of the platforms offered through OneNYC programs, corporations will have the profit motive to provide inferior services to precarious populations.¹⁸⁸ Not only more unbalanced and slower, the very platforms may be “configured largely for the passive consumption of corporate entertainment and services.”¹⁸⁹ An equal physical distribution of internet access, then, does not automatically equate to equal access to information or economic opportunity.

Of increasing concern as well is a trend of substitution that arises with the growth of technological access. This process occurs when services offered through telematics means replace physical locations for services such as banking, food shopping, and even public libraries.¹⁹⁰ Significant profit motives lie in “creaming” the markets, closing down physical operations in low-income areas to focus on monetizing the services that high-income communities use.¹⁹¹ Empirically, a lack of physical locations combined with higher instances of limited mobility leaves community members more and more dependent on the “good will” of others.¹⁹² As services move online, there is decreased equality in access for those who cannot read or afford a computer, and a loss of economic opportunities due to closing businesses in the community.¹⁹³ It may be legitimate to worry that those increasingly locked out of the “network marketplaces” may see not only the “digital divide”, but also the economic divide exacerbated by these policies.¹⁹⁴ Despite the claims made by de Blasio in his announcement speech at The Point to empower communities and to make their economies resilient, the operationalized nature of “organized complexity” inevitably detracts from proposed intentions.

Mapping the Non-Resilient City- Technology and the Politics of Scale

The OneNYC plan proposes that to increase resilience and sustainability will require “digital strategies.”¹⁹⁵ These strategies include the empowerment of “digital tools” connecting residents to government services and each other, mobile applications to help brownfield cleanup, modern lighting and sensors, and creating platforms to aggregate community-based organizations and agencies in local communities across the city. The result, they offer, will be the bolstering of neighborhood resiliency, social cohesion, a more effective government, a “serious dent” in GHG emissions, and increased ability to withstand disruptive events.¹⁹⁶

These technologies, while intended to increase cohesion and sustainability, may in actuality serve to undo it. I will isolate four main objections. A salient concern here is the decreased amount of “face-to-face” engagements that were so critical to Jacobs’ original conception of the “organized complexity” of a neighborhood. To Jacobs, not merely a people’s physical proximity to one another makes them a community. Rather, social cohesion relies on the existence of communal space and place in which the community can share experiences, collect community knowledge, and instill the physical location with collective history and meaning.¹⁹⁷ Due to the rise of digital technologies, that role for community is becoming increasingly obsolete. Rarely is it about instilling space and place with meaning, now the “collective memory” of humanity is available at one’s fingertips.¹⁹⁸ The OneNYC plan posits, “connectivity worldwide fosters interaction and collaboration between distant populations on a scale never seen before.”¹⁹⁹ It is perhaps exactly that globalized nature that means “digital tools” can actually decrease the “social

cohesion” of neighborhoods. With the rise of global interconnectivity, it seems the cohesion of local communities collapses.²⁰⁰

Second, the proposed comprehensive interactive platform to monitor, map, and aggregate activities of community-based organizations and government agencies in OneNYC function as “performance technologies” whose intent is to standardize and more easily govern communities.²⁰¹ While that is not an inherently bad thing, the metrics are the 100RC resilience metrics, complicit in growth-dependence that incentivizes neoliberal ideology. In function, then, the mapping of neighborhood and government projects acts as a means of “disciplining” political and social actions to reflect the preferred, ideal actions under this style of governance.²⁰² The rhetorical framing of mapping as means to “bolster neighborhood resilience and social cohesion” serves as an absolution of government complicity in isolating growth-dependent values as the metrics for describing a “resilient” or “non-resilient” community. By putting the onus back on the community, while simultaneously using those metrics as a signal to transnational capitalist industries that these areas are profitable sites for investment, the maps serve to legitimate and incentivize speculative accumulation of capital that may prove detrimental to the community’s resilience and cohesion after all.²⁰³ This maneuver reveals a potential definitional rupture in the concept of resilience as its material effects trouble its scientific basis and denotative consistency. Mounting criticism of these impacts by affected communities post-plan reflect a growing concern that de Blasio has “effectively abandoned his identification”²⁰⁴ with the people of NYC.²⁰⁵ The cohesion of de Blasio’s constitutive vision for “One New York” remains reliant on shaky grounds.

Third, even if access to technology equalizes, the uses of collected information regarding communities will not occur in an equitable manner. Jane Jacobs warned of the dangers of a Total Information Awareness program, which evolved into the NSA's PRISM program.²⁰⁶ Bodell, writing on the contemporary integration of technology and the lived environments of NYC, explains that even the sensors in traffic lights are dangerous in a world with automated cars.²⁰⁷ The identification of an increasingly integrated network identifying the everyday actions of a community, measuring them by a particular set of growth-dependent standards reeks of a profit-driven scheme to mine the public for data.²⁰⁸ In a particularly salient moment, Bodell brings today's moment in line with Jacobs' to argue that the power imbalances within surveillance and flows of information contribute to a decidedly inequitable state of affairs. As he says

Indeed, if we are to consider that sensors are the networked "eyes on the street" of the Internet of Things, it is clear from a study of the sensors already embedded in the urban environment that the digital modulation of the city's many complex systems is not a bottom-up process, but rather an extension of the vertical hierarchy, with government institutions at the top controlling the flow of both information and people.²⁰⁹

The tech ecosystem disastrously combines personalized marketing, increased surveillance of social groups, and platforms manufactured to accede to corporate intent. This confluence manifests in segmented markets, an expanded "digital divide" across newer race and class lines, while determining the flows of information and technologies according to an exclusively profit-driven paradigm.²¹⁰ Simultaneously, the risks of surveillance being used to forward the policing strategies and overt crackdown on social and cultural expressions considered to be detrimental to the cohesion of the society will contribute exponentially to breaking down any authentic cohesion in these communities.²¹¹ The result of technological integration, it seems, will be a concomitant

breakdown in the coherence and integration of communities on their own terms. The multiple fronts upon which de Blasio's constitutive vision for "One New York" are challenged by its very precepts gives context to mounting criticism,²¹² and his change in rhetorical strategy I trace in Chapter Four.

Fourth, the plan's claims to increase sustainability through decreased energy usage and mobile applications for brownfield redevelopment are the most prominent example of how the politics of scale distracts from inequitable impacts. The socio-environmental dynamics of expanding the tech ecosystem do not remain within the city, but expand through an intensive infrastructure producing massive amounts of energy and waste that decimate lived environments.²¹³ The very means to produce the minerals that go into constructing the technological infrastructure that runs this world requires would not exist "without a vast immolation and involution of the Earth's mineral cavities."²¹⁴ With almost no effective e-waste reprocessing cycle in operation, the vast majority of used mechanic materials ship to West Africa, where the pollutants poison the ground mere miles from where the original minerals source.²¹⁵ Outside of cities lay towns encumbered with environmental and economic catastrophe, the products of technological Not-In-My-Backyard initiatives that have offset the greatest costs of technological innovation to the poorest.²¹⁶ In fact, the very "energy-information network" that powers and supports the data cloud is so inefficient and productive of greenhouse gasses in parts of the world, that to scale them up risks the irreversible exhaustion of resources and destruction of the planet.²¹⁷ Due to the centrality of urban centers to the informational economy, the energy-use implications of a massive up-scale in technological

infrastructure in NY would far out pace proposed reductions in energy use that resulted from light sensors.²¹⁸

It seems evident, considering the global scale and importance of technological development in the city, that “urban infrastructural networks and the metabolic flows they perform have reached an unprecedented density and breadth.”²¹⁹ Despite the internal resilience that such systems can build up, the fundamental crisis is that the resilience of the global system is now in question. Yet, despite the dire nature of this state of affairs, the true costs of expanding New York’s technological infrastructure remain “veiled by an entrenched neoliberal rationale.”²²⁰ As Bratton so insightfully puts it,

Our ecological emergency is an exceptional state of things largely built out of unaccounted-for transactional externalities, neither legal nor illegal per se, but that nevertheless cannot be expunged from the physical world that a sovereign state tries to see, name, and count.²²¹

Rhetorically constrained from view, the politics of scale and growth oriented values and metrics that define the city’s “organic complexity” demand a re-evaluation of the domain and applicability of its analysis. If there is hope for equity in extending the contemporary organization of urban living, or resilience of the city to be truly possible, then OneNYC’s metrics cannot rely on a re-instantiation of the very of a tale of two cities it seeks to undo, just because the other city remains beyond the city limits.²²²

Unintended Consequences- Resilience Betrayed and Final Thoughts

The last point of contention regarding the tech ecosystem proposal is that the plan proposes technological integration will significantly contribute to the reduction of economic disenfranchisement.²²³ This will occur, they propose, through increased access to computers and technological training in public schools. While the plan emphasizes the role that lower income peoples will play in the actual central workings of these corporate

structures, the reality is that those jobs will remain limited, while most will be in the service industries that underwrite and support those industries.²²⁴ The process of centralizing economic power in these corporate structures was a primary move toward cementing economic injustice in the 70s and 80s.²²⁵ Due to the high levels of specialization required to work in industries like banking, telecommunications, and energy, class mobility is far easier to control.²²⁶ Expanding the amount of in-house services and the “corporate service network” provide a steady base of employment with minimal training, and minimal mobility.²²⁷ To accentuate that trend, executive wages have grown exponentially, while wages in the expanding service sectors continue to flounder.²²⁸ With a concomitant decline in business regulation on work, the tech industry has notoriously turned to “just-in-time” workers, whose low-hour requirements, consultant status, and abuse of immigrant rights have allowed maximum profit with minimum responsibility.²²⁹

Class mobility then, is a myth of the strategic vision of OneNYC. Rhetorically, the promise of economic uplift functions to invert responsibility. The promise of a “good job” the plan makes is not, in fact, the promise of a stable, long-term, or insured job. The question of success averts from government and private sector motives, directed to the individuals drive, and failure to capitalize on opportunity in the increasing opportunities of the “network markets.”²³⁰ Similarly, the critique of “corporate branding” seems equally applicable here. Attaching the labels of resilience and equity to “Tech Talent Pipeline” workforce training programs and projects functions to define tech industries not by their profit-driven investment in speculative projects and environmentally destructive infrastructure, but by their socially conscious values.²³¹

Using the example of the tech ecosystem, I have elucidated some of the material manifestations of “organized complexity” and resilience as figured by 100RC and OneNYC. The city, as Jacobs forwarded sixty years ago, is indeed alive, and indeed lives as an “organized complexity.” However, the rhetorical constraints that have evolved within the institutional contours of 100RC and the manifestation of that specific notion of resilience found in OneNYC do not do justice to the complexity of urban life. It is dangerous to argue that corporations have no place to play in the pursuit of environmental, economic, and social resilience. However, it is equally dangerous to allow the pursuit of those goals be directed by a value-system that seems to care little for what those values mean to the people they supposedly serve and respond to. Planners, policymakers, and stakeholders in urban development should not abandon organic metaphor. They provide an intricate and important frame from which to derive ethics and pragmatic political practice. Instead, there must be a reconceptualization of the interpretive value system around urban life. In Chapter Five, I look to the Urban Political Ecologists unpacking of urban metabolism to explain a more complex and adaptive frame from which to chart the future of New York City, and beyond.

Notes

¹ “OneNYC,” 3.

² “With the launch of *One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City*, we build on New York City’s *global leadership* when it comes to growth, sustainability, and *resiliency*—and embrace equity as central to that work (emphasis added).” Ibid.

³ “*OneNYC sets out what we need to do to make our city stronger, our people better prepared for jobs in the 21st century economy, our government more responsive, and our communities able to withstand the existential threat posed by climate change* (emphasis added).” Ibid.

⁴ “*OneNYC sets out what we need to do to make our city stronger, our people better prepared for jobs in the 21st century economy, our government more responsive, and our communities able to withstand the existential threat posed by climate change* (emphasis added).” Ibid.

⁵ “*The actions we take now will ensure we have a dynamic, inclusive economy, a healthier environment, more affordable housing, and more reliable and resilient infrastructure* (emphasis added).” Ibid.

⁶ “*With this work, we will be prepared for the shocks and stresses ahead, and have the ability to bounce back stronger* (emphasis added).” Ibid.

⁷ “We will meet the challenges we face today and in the future—as New Yorkers have always done—and inspire other cities around the world to do the same (emphasis added).” Ibid.

⁸ Reid, “The Disastrous and Politically Debased Subject of Resilience,” 72. “‘Ecological ignorance’ began to be conceptualised as a threat, not just to the resilience of the biosphere, but to humanity (Folkes 2002: 438). Resilience was reconceived not simply as a property of the biosphere, in need of protection from the economic development of humanity, but a property within human populations which now needed promoting through the increase of their ‘economic options.’ As remarkably, the biosphere itself began to be conceived not as an extra-economic domain, vulnerable to the economic practices of human populations, but as an economy of ‘services’ which ‘humanity receives’ (Folkes et al. 2002: 437).”

⁹ For more on resilience as political project, see: Angga Dwiartama, “Resilience Thinking, Fluidity and the Agency of a Quasi-Actant,” *Dialogues in Human Geography* 6, no. 1 (2016): 28–31; Georg Frerks, Jeroen Warner, and Bart Weijts, “The Politics of Vulnerability and Resilience,” *Ambiente & Sociedade* 14, no. 2 (2011): 105–122.

¹⁰ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 23.

¹¹ Erik Swyngedouw and Nikolas C. Heynen, “Urban Political Ecology, Justice and the Politics of Scale,” *Antipode* 35, no. 5 (2003): 898–918.

¹² Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 101.

¹³ Jody Avirgan, “Why The Bronx Really Burned | FiveThirtyEight,” *FiveThirtyEight*, October 29, 2015, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/why-the-bronx-really-burned/>.

¹⁴ Tarver, “The New Bronx- A Quick History of the Iconic Borough.”

¹⁵ Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 132.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 129.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 225.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 138.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 271.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 433.

²¹ Kenneth T. Broda-Bahm, “Finding Protection in Definitions: The Quest for Environmental Security,” *Argumentation and Advocacy; River Falls* 35, no. 4 (Spring 1999): 162.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ “The Politics of Meaning: Power and Explanation in the Construction of Social Reality: Peter C. Sederberg: 9780816508600: Amazon.com: Books,” 119, accessed February 15, 2017, <https://www.amazon.com/Politics-Meaning-Explanation-Construction-Reality/dp/0816508607>.

²⁴ Medhurst et al., *Cold War Rhetoric*, 72.

²⁵ Ernesto Grassi and John Michael Krois, *Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition* (SIU Press, 2000), 16, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=1P7yDPPaFS8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=ernesto+grassi+rhetoric+ingenium&ots=zF18x-6lT-&sig=81mNlAFQ2H8SxW_NgtKxGmBj460.

²⁶ Peter L. Laurence, “Contradictions and Complexities: Jane Jacobs’s and Robert Venturi’s Complexity Theories,” *Journal of Architectural Education (1984-)* 59, no. 3 (2006): 49.

²⁷ Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, vol. 1 (The Museum of modern art, 1977), 130, <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=dyPusXZQ6YIC&oi=fnd&pg=PA6&dq>

=venturi+complexity+and+contradiction&ots=88NLXNBoRr&sig=YKkf-Et7wX8Ak7o94Eoh4m_6RKs.

²⁸ Ibid., 1:144.

²⁹ Bernard Rudofsky, *Architecture without Architects: A Short Introduction to Non-Pedigreed Architecture* (UNM Press, 1964), 5, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=F_khGKj2sKwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq=bernard+rudofsky+architecture+without+architects&ots=tDT4jQY41Q&sig=qcaiPZDSv_y92P8lFYjFjjWZcdE.

³⁰ "...for the street is not an area but a volume. It cannot exist in the vacuum; it is inseparable from its environment. In other words, it is no better than the company of houses it keeps. The street is the matrix: urban chamber, fertile soil, and breeding ground. Its viability depends as much on the right kind of architecture as on the right kind of humanity." See: Agustina Martire, "STREETSPACE: The Quote of the Week. Bernard Rudofsky," *STREETSPACE*, January 5, 2015, <http://streetpacearchitecture.blogspot.com/2015/01/the-quote-of-week-bernard-rudofsky.html>.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Robert Hariman and Ralph Cintron, *Culture, Catastrophe, and Rhetoric: The Texture of Political Action* (Berghahn Books, 2015), 7.

³³ Mathieu Helie, "Leon Krier's Lesson in Architecture | Emergent Urbanism," Blog, *Emergent Urbanism*, (December 29, 2009), <http://emergenturbanism.com/2009/12/29/leon-kriers-lesson-in-architecture/>.

³⁴ Lucien Steil et al., "New Science, New Urbanism, New Architecture?," *Katarxis 3* (September 2004), <http://www.katarxis3.com/Introduction.htm>.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Helie, "Leon Krier's Lesson in Architecture | Emergent Urbanism."

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Nanette Monin and Janet Sayers, "Art Rules? Brokering the Aesthetics of City Places and Spaces 1," *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 9, no. 02 (2006): 125.

³⁹ Ibid., 122–24.

⁴⁰ "It offers fresh perspectives on the deployment of history and memory by various powerful forces intent on remaking the city to 'make sense of, and make excuses for, the present' (p. 173). In a related vein, it explores how global capital tends to abstract selectively from tradition in its relentless commodification of greater areas of everyday

life and culture (including the spaces of everyday life in the city - the streets, squares, plazas, shopping malls, etc. - and the representations of urban life in movies, tourist brochures, real-estate advertisement, etc.). There is fruitful territory here for further research in this nexus between modernity and tradition, globalisation and locality, culture and economy.” See: Michael Punch, “The Politics of Memory: The Socio-Cultural Contradictions of Globalisation and Urban Regeneration in Dublin.,” 2006, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00750770609555880>.

⁴¹ Kenneth Iain MacDonald, “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity: Private Sector ‘engagement’ and the Restructuring of Biodiversity Conservation,” *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (2010): 517.

⁴² Max Haiven, *Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power: Capitalism, Creativity and the Commons* (Zed Books, 2014), 245; Alexis C. Madrigal, “Gallery: Why Nixon Created the EPA - The Atlantic,” *The Atlantic*, December 2, 2010, <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2010/12/gallery-why-nixon-created-the-epa/67351/>.

⁴³ David Harvey, “Neoliberalism Is a Political Project,” *Jacobin*, July 23, 2016, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/07/david-harvey-neoliberalism-capitalism-labor-crisis-resistance/>.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ “The Powell Memo (Also Known as the Powell Manifesto),” *Reclaim Democracy!*, April 3, 2004, http://reclaimdemocracy.org/powell_memo_lewis/.

⁴⁷ Harvey, “Neoliberalism Is a Political Project.”

⁴⁸ Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric.”

⁴⁹ “The Powell Memo (Also Known as the Powell Manifesto).”

⁵⁰ Harvey, “Neoliberalism Is a Political Project.”

⁵¹ Ibid.; Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument.”

⁵² “Business and Biodiversity Programme Annual Report 2005” (Switzerland: The World Conservation Union IUCN, March 5, 2008), <https://www.iucn.org/es/node/1132>.

⁵³ MacDonald, “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity,” 514.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 517.

⁵⁵ “World Conservation Strategy” (IUCN, UNEP, WWF, 1980), 18, 39, <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/wcs-004.pdf>.

⁵⁶ Isabelle Anguelovski and Joan Martínez Alier, “The ‘Environmentalism of the Poor’ revisited: Territory and Place in Disconnected Glocal Struggles,” *Ecological Economics* 102 (2014): 168.

⁵⁷ MacDonald, “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity,” 519; Kate Ervine, “The Greying of Green Governance: Power Politics and the Global Environment Facility,” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 18, no. 4 (2007): 125–142.

⁵⁸ MacDonald, “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity,” 519–20.

⁵⁹ Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 20.

⁶⁰ Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument,” 638.

⁶¹ MacDonald, “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity,” 518.

⁶² Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument.”

⁶³ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 69.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁶⁵ Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 20.

⁶⁶ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 70.

⁶⁷ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*; Anguelovski and Alier, “The ‘Environmentalism of the Poor’ revisited.”

⁶⁸ Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument.”

⁶⁹ Donald Ludwig, Ray Hilborn, and Carl Walters, “Uncertainty, Resource Exploitation, and Conservation: Lessons from History,” *Ecological Applications*, 1993, 548–549.

⁷⁰ MacDonald, “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity,” 513–14.

⁷¹ Julian Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” *International Political Sociology* 7, no. 4 (December 1, 2013): 353–67, doi:10.1111/ips.12028.

⁷² New Urbanist Movement co-founder Andres Duany is a disciple of Krier. In interview with *The American Enterprise*, he clearly explains the direct role that Krier had on influencing his principles, and the vision of the Congress of New Urbanism

“TAE: Could you describe your conversion from a fairly conventional modern architect and urban designer to something not very conventional?”

Duany: Well, that took place in about 1980. We were having great success as young architects building high-rises in Miami Beach, including the famous one with the big hole in it that was shown on *Miami Vice*. Then one day I went to a lecture by a fellow called Leon Krier, the man who designed the English model town of Poundbury for the Prince of Wales. Krier gave a powerful talk about traditional urbanism, and after a couple of weeks of real agony and crisis I realized I couldn’t go on designing these fashionable tall buildings, which were fascinating visually, but didn’t produce any healthy urban effect. They wouldn’t affect society in a positive way.

The prospect of instead creating traditional communities where our plans could actually make someone’s daily life better really excited me. Krier introduced me to the idea of looking at people first, and to the power of physical design to change the social life of a community. And so, in a year or so my wife and I left the firm and went off to do something very different.”

For More, see: Andres Duany, Neo-Traditionalist Architect Andres Duany Explains How to Build Better Communities, November 2002, http://syracusesthenandnow.org/SettlementPlan/Duany_Interview.htm.

⁷³ CNU, “The Charter of the New Urbanism,” Text, *CNU*, (1996), <https://www.cnu.org/who-we-are/charter-new-urbanism>.

⁷⁴ “Canons of Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism: A Companion to the Charter of the New Urbanism” (Congress of the New Urbanism, 2008), 2, https://www.cnu.org/sites/default/files/Canons_0.pdf.

⁷⁵ The Town Paper, “Links to TND and New Urban Neighborhoods,” accessed February 16, 2017, <http://www.tndtownpaper.com/neighborhoods.htm>.

⁷⁶ CNU, “HUD HOPE VI,” Text, *CNU*, (July 14, 2015), <https://www.cnu.org/our-projects/hud-hope-vi>.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 88.

⁷⁹ Neil Smith, “New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy,” *Antipode* 34, no. 3 (2002): 427–450.

⁸⁰ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 88.

⁸¹ Ivonne Audirac, Anne H. Shermeyen, and Marc T. Smith, “Ideal Urban Form and Visions of the Good Life Florida’s Growth Management Dilemma,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 56, no. 4 (1990): 470–482.

⁸² Karen E. Till, “New Urbanism and Nature: Green Marketing and the Neotraditional Community,” *Urban Geography* 22, no. 3 (2001): 220–248; Jeffrey Zimmerman, “The ‘nature’ of Urbanism on the New Urbanist Frontier: Sustainable Development, or Defense of the Suburban Dream?,” *Urban Geography* 22, no. 3 (2001): 249–267.

⁸³ Dan Trudeau, “New Urbanism as Sustainable Development?,” *Geography Compass* 7, no. 6 (2013): 435–448.

⁸⁴ Philip R. Berke et al., “Greening Development to Protect Watersheds: Does New Urbanism Make a Difference?,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69, no. 4 (2003): 397–413.

⁸⁵ Philip R. Berke, Yan Song, and Mark Stevens, “Integrating Hazard Mitigation into New Urban and Conventional Developments,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 2009, <http://jpe.sagepub.com/content/early/2009/04/24/0739456X09331550.short>.

⁸⁶ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 89.

⁸⁷ Timothy Beatley, *Green Urbanism: Learning from European Cities* (Island Press, 2012), https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=dLMuQxpjCgsC&oi=fnd&pg=PR2&dq=Green+urbanism:+learning+from+European+cities.+&ots=rOTU4jMLMt&sig=YjfO__ssnQThoKDke50AKjniEY4.

⁸⁸ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 355.

⁸⁹ Mark Duffield, *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples* (Polity, 2007), 66–70, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=P__CWicYcN0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR4&dq=Development,+Security+and+Unending+War:+Governing+the+World+of+Peoples&ots=NACs0gVh1M&sig=XxiiZoaR9b-Kg81vo8MftTQuqJo.

⁹⁰ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 354.

⁹¹ Andrew Zolli, “Forget Sustainability. It’s About Resilience.,” *The New York Times*, November 2, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/03/opinion/forget-sustainability-its-about-resilience.html>.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Brian Harrison Walker and David Andrew Salt, *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World* (Island Press, 2006).

⁹⁴ “Resilience determines the persistence of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes of state variables, driving variables, and parameters, and still persist.” Holling, “Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems.”

⁹⁵ Reghezza-Zitt et al., “What Resilience Is Not.”

⁹⁶ Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*.

⁹⁷ Collins et al., “A New Urban Ecology Modeling Human Communities as Integral Parts of Ecosystems Poses Special Problems for the Development and Testing of Ecological Theory”; Grimm et al., “Integrated Approaches to Long-Term Studies of Urban Ecological Systems Urban Ecological Systems Present Multiple Challenges to Ecologists—pervasive Human Impact and Extreme Heterogeneity of Cities, and the Need to Integrate Social and Ecological Approaches, Concepts, and Theory”; Likens et al., *Humans as Components of Ecosystems*; Pickett et al., “Evolution and Future of Urban Ecological Science”; Wu, “Urban Ecology and Sustainability.”

⁹⁸ Walker et al., “Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social–ecological Systems.”

⁹⁹ 1. Latitude: the maximum amount a system can be changed before losing its ability to recover (before crossing a threshold which, if breached, makes recovery difficult or impossible).

2. Resistance: the ease or difficulty of changing the system; how “resistant” it is to being changed.

3. Precariousness: how close the current state of the system is to a limit or “threshold.”

4. Panarchy: because of cross-scale interactions, the resilience of a system at a particular focal scale will depend on the influences from states and dynamics at scales above and below. For example, external oppressive politics, invasions, market shifts, or global climate change can trigger local surprises and regime shifts.

See: Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Holling, “Engineering Resilience versus Ecological Resilience,” 33.

¹⁰¹ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 5.

¹⁰² Fridolin Brand and Kurt Jax, “Focusing the Meaning(s) of Resilience: Resilience as a Descriptive Concept and a Boundary Object,” *Ecology and Society* 12, no. 1 (June 5, 2007), doi:10.5751/ES-02029-120123.

¹⁰³ The Rockefeller Foundation, “Building Climate Change Resilience in Cities: The Private Sector’s Role” (New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 2014), <https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20141218195822/c17e6a74-b3b6-427a-9864-8e4225b6b695-urban.pdf>.

¹⁰⁴ 100 Resilient Cities, “City Resilience,” *100 Resilient Cities*, accessed February 17, 2017, <http://www.100resilientcities.org/resilience>.

¹⁰⁵ The Rockefeller Foundation, “Building Climate Change Resilience in Cities: The Private Sector’s Role,” 4.

¹⁰⁶ Toly, “Cities Play Key Role in Climate Action.”

¹⁰⁷ da Silva, “City Resilience Index.”

¹⁰⁸ “100 Resilient Cities | Arup | A Global Firm of Consulting Engineers, Designers, Planners and Project Managers,” accessed February 17, 2017, http://www.arup.com/projects/100_resilient_cities.

¹⁰⁹ The Rockefeller Foundation, “Building Climate Change Resilience in Cities: The Private Sector’s Role,” 7.

¹¹⁰ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 3.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹¹² Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 70.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 1.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹¹⁶ Brian Mayer, “A Framework for Improving Resilience: Adaptation in Urban Contexts,” in *Resilience, Environmental Justice and the City*, ed. Beth Schaefer Caniglia, Manuel Vallee, and Beatrice Frank (Routledge, 2016), 37, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=P2muDQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT14&dq=Resilience,+Environmental+Justice+and+the+City&ots=8E7Zt9XLP2&sig=m5QE DvpDQFR_S2eImT5_wlI6_Vo.

¹¹⁷ Harvard Law Review, “Organic and Mechanical Metaphors in Late Eighteenth-Century American Political Thought,” 1839.

¹¹⁸ Bricker, “Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument,” 638.

¹¹⁹ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 355.

¹²⁰ Zolli, “Forget Sustainability. It’s About Resilience.”

¹²¹ “We also wanted it to be both relevant and accessible to cities globally irrespective of their size, capacity or location, since a common basis of measurement creates opportunity for peer-to-peer knowledge exchange between cities, including benchmarking performance and sharing best practice.” See: da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 8.

¹²² Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 94.

¹²³ This quote is an epigraph in the City Resilience Index, attributed to Allan, P. & Bryant, M. (2011) ‘Resilience as a framework for urbanism and recovery’. *Journal of Landscape Architecture* 6(2), p. 43. See: da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 9.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ “The account of the world envisaged and constituted by development agencies concerned with building resilient subjects is one which presupposes the disastrousness of the world, and likewise one which interpellates a subject that is permanently called upon to bear the disaster—a subject for whom bearing the disaster is a required practice without which he or she cannot grow and prosper in the world. This may be what is politically most at stake in the discourse of resilience.” See: Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 355.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³¹ Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric,” 143.

¹³² Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 363.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric,” 139.

- ¹³⁵ Ibid.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid., 141.
- ¹³⁷ Ibid.
- ¹³⁸ Ibid.
- ¹³⁹ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 355.
- ¹⁴⁰ Zolli, “Forget Sustainability. It’s About Resilience.”
- ¹⁴¹ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 361.
- ¹⁴² Katherine Gloede, “Resilience Beyond Disaster Recovery,” *Sustainability Institute*, July 18, 2016, <http://sustainableunh.unh.edu/blog/2016/07/resilience-beyond-disaster-recovery>.
- ¹⁴³ Carl Folke et al., “Resilience and Sustainable Development: Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformations,” *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment* 31, no. 5 (2002): 439.
- ¹⁴⁴ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 12.
- ¹⁴⁵ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 363.
- ¹⁴⁶ da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 5.
- ¹⁴⁷ Reid, “Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus,” 363.
- ¹⁴⁸ “OneNYC,” 227.
- ¹⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 223.
- ¹⁵¹ Leigh Taylor Graham, “Planning Tremé: The Community Development Field in a Post-Katrina World” (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010), 58, <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/62072>.
- ¹⁵² Nicole P. Marwell, “Privatizing the Welfare State: Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations as Political Actors,” *American Sociological Review* 69, no. 2 (2004): 265–291; Nicole P. Marwell, *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City* (University of Chicago Press, 2009), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YKN->

SIAEB0gC&oi=fnd&pg=PP8&dq=Bargaining+for+Brooklyn:+Community+Organizations+in+the+Entrepreneurial+City.&ots=cwxEa0ceJP&sig=wIjKw3mvNeXLxeYP98GXXa9dKbs; Brent C. Smith, "The Sources and Uses of Funds for Community Development Financial Institutions: The Role of the Nonprofit Intermediary," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (2008): 19–38.

¹⁵³ Kathe Newman and Robert W. Lake, "Democracy, Bureaucracy and Difference in US Community Development Politics since 1968," *Progress in Human Geography* 30, no. 1 (2006): 44–61.

¹⁵⁴ Mark C. Suchman, "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches," *Academy of Management Review* 20, no. 3 (1995): 571–610; Lynne G. Zucker, "Institutional Theories of Organization," *Annual Review of Sociology* 13, no. 1 (1987): 443–464.

¹⁵⁵ da Silva, "City Resilience Index," 1.

¹⁵⁶ Neil Smith, "The Evolution of Gentrification," *Herg, JaapJan, Kaminer, Tahl, Schoonderbeek, Marc, and Zonneveld, Joost. Houses in Transformation: Interventions in European Gentrification*, 2008, 39.

¹⁵⁷ da Silva, "City Resilience Index," 5.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁶⁴ David Harvey and Bruce Braun, *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference* (Wiley Online Library, 1996), <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1541-0064.1999.tb01365.x/full>; Richard Peet, Paul Robbins, and Michael Watts, *Global Political Ecology* (Routledge, 2010), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=MolaBwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Global+Political+Ecology&ots=tPD8vCcQcQ&sig=FagQiDU4imKFE-L9Q4wlvzR4DkY>; Swyngedouw and Heynen, "Urban Political Ecology, Justice and the Politics of Scale"; Joel A. Tarr, "The Metabolism of the Industrial City: The Case of Pittsburgh," *Journal of Urban History* 28, no. 5 (2002): 511–545.

¹⁶⁵ Erik Swyngedouw, "Globalisation or 'glocalisation'? Networks, Territories and Rescaling," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17, no. 1 (2004): 42.

- ¹⁶⁶ “OneNYC,” 42.
- ¹⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁹ Vanolo, “Smartmentality,” 894.
- ¹⁷⁰ Ibid.; Mike Davis, “Who Will Build the Ark,” *New Left Review* 61, no. 2010 (2010): 29–46.
- ¹⁷¹ Vanolo, “The Image of the Creative City.”
- ¹⁷² Saskia Sassen, “The Global City: Introducing a Concept,” *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 11, no. 2 (2005): 29.
- ¹⁷³ Ibid., 36.
- ¹⁷⁴ “OneNYC,” 42.
- ¹⁷⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁸ Sassen, “The Global City,” 35.
- ¹⁷⁹ “The NYC Tech Ecosystem: Catching Up to the Hype,” *Matt Turck*, July 13, 2016, <http://mattturck.com/2016/07/13/the-nyc-tech-ecosystem-catching-up-to-the-hype/>.
- ¹⁸⁰ Shueh, “Seeking ‘Techquity.’”
- ¹⁸¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁸² Zukin, *Naked City*.
- ¹⁸³ Vanolo, “The Image of the Creative City.”
- ¹⁸⁴ “OneNYC,” 43.
- ¹⁸⁵ Sassen, “The Global City,” 37.
- ¹⁸⁶ Vincent Mosco and Janet Wasko, *The Political Economy of Information* (Univ of Wisconsin Press, 1988), chap. 5, <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=P1Jiy1EZvHwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=mosco+1988&ots=5DakTD5O6x&sig=Fn0Pqluh8udEKUgewI1V-cudx9E>.

- ¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 5.
- ¹⁸⁸ Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin, *Telecommunications and the City: Electronic Spaces, Urban Places* (Routledge, 2002), 204, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=saKHAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=telecommunications+and+the+city&ots=B_mjIXcI08&sig=IJLJ5lzDs9VgKrtJLaCcgUKUxCY.
- ¹⁸⁹ Stephen Graham, *The Cybercities Reader* (Psychology Press, 2004), 326, <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=6Oe1m073C-0C&oi=fnd&pg=PA1964&dq=the+cybercities+reader&ots=iOobVx2TzT&sig=vnf390PmAhAxTGbEWRghXOjhd14>.
- ¹⁹⁰ Graham and Marvin, *Telecommunications and the City*, 205.
- ¹⁹¹ Susan Christopherson, “Market Rules and Territorial Outcomes: The Case of the United States,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 17, no. 2 (1993): 274–288.
- ¹⁹² Ken Ducatel, *Employment and Technical Change in Europe* (Edward Elgar Publishing, 1994), <http://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:elg:eebook:152>.
- ¹⁹³ Graham and Marvin, *Telecommunications and the City*, 206.
- ¹⁹⁴ Christopherson, “Market Rules and Territorial Outcomes”; Graham and Marvin, *Telecommunications and the City*.
- ¹⁹⁵ “OneNYC,” 42.
- ¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 43.
- ¹⁹⁷ Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.
- ¹⁹⁸ Betsy Sparrow, Jenny Liu, and Daniel M. Wegner, “Google Effects on Memory: Cognitive Consequences of Having Information at Our Fingertips,” *Science* 333, no. 6043 (2011): 776–778.
- ¹⁹⁹ “OneNYC,” 40.
- ²⁰⁰ John A. Bargh and Katelyn YA McKenna, “The Internet and Social Life,” *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 55 (2004): 573–590.
- ²⁰¹ Vanolo, “Smartmentality,” 890.
- ²⁰² Vanolo, “Smartmentality.”
- ²⁰³ Tim Hall and Phil Hubbard, *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime, and Representation* (John Wiley & Sons, 1998).

- ²⁰⁴ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 86.
- ²⁰⁵ Mock, “Does the OneNYC Sustainability Plan Really Address Equity?”
- ²⁰⁶ Nathaniel Rich, “The Prophecies of Jane Jacobs,” *The Atlantic*, November 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/11/the-prophecies-of-jane-jacobs/501104/>.
- ²⁰⁷ Bill Bodell, “The Death and Life of Future Networked Cities: Jane Jacobs and the Internet of Things,” Blog, *Libertecture*, (December 19, 2014), <https://libertecture.wordpress.com/2014/12/19/the-death-and-life-of-future-networked-cities-jane-jacobs-and-the-internet-of-things/>.
- ²⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ²¹⁰ Graham and Marvin, *Telecommunications and the City*, 174.
- ²¹¹ Nira Yuval-Davis, Floya Anthias, and Eleonore Kofman, “Secure Borders and Safe Haven and the Gendered Politics of Belonging: Beyond Social Cohesion,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, no. 3 (2005): 513–535; Keith N. Hampton, “Internet Use and the Concentration of Disadvantage: Glocalization and the Urban Underclass,” *American Behavioral Scientist* 53, no. 8 (2010): 1111–1132.
- ²¹² Mock, “Does the OneNYC Sustainability Plan Really Address Equity?”
- ²¹³ Swyngedouw and Heynen, “Urban Political Ecology, Justice and the Politics of Scale”; Martín Arboleda, “In the Nature of the Non-City: Expanded Infrastructural Networks and the Political Ecology of Planetary Urbanisation,” *Antipode* 48, no. 2 (2016): 233–251.
- ²¹⁴ Benjamin H. Bratton, *The Stack: On Software and Sovereignty* (MIT Press, 2016), 83, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=cUCdCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=bratton+the+stack&ots=F_ihb2Bh5E&sig=n7uCZZuEn8k0VtJON4L-cK1_fHk.
- ²¹⁵ Brett H. Robinson, “E-Waste: An Assessment of Global Production and Environmental Impacts,” *Science of the Total Environment* 408, no. 2 (2009): 183–191; Charles W. Schmidt, “Unfair Trade: E-Waste in Africa,” *Environmental Health Perspectives* 114, no. 4 (2006): A232.
- ²¹⁶ Steven J. Eagle, “Wireless Telecommunications, Infrastructure Security, and the Nimby Problem,” *Cath. UL Rev.* 54 (2004): 445.
- ²¹⁷ Bratton, *The Stack*, 95.

²¹⁸ Jochen Monstadt, “Conceptualizing the Political Ecology of Urban Infrastructures: Insights from Technology and Urban Studies,” *Environment and Planning A* 41, no. 8 (2009): 1924–1942.

²¹⁹ Arboleda, “In the Nature of the Non-City,” 247.

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ Bratton, *The Stack*, 105.

²²² “Neil Blomkamp’s film *Elysium* (2013) is based on the parable of two Earths, one wallowing in the Anthropocenic decay of a burned-out planet and one orbiting above in bucolic (if run-of-the-mill) privilege. 27 Like the Cloud megastructures discussed in the City layer chapter, feudal megastructures such as these always come in pairs. Bloomfield Hills comes with South Detroit; Silicon Valley comes with its San Joaquin Valley.” Ibid, p. 311. Also see: Arboleda, “In the Nature of the Non-City,” 247–48.

²²³ “OneNYC,” 43.

²²⁴ Sassen, “The Global City.”

²²⁵ Harvey, “Neoliberalism Is a Political Project.”

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ Sassen, “The Global City”; Haiven, *Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power*.

²²⁸ Jenny Che, “Here’s How Outrageous The Pay Gap Between CEOs And Workers Is,” *Huffington Post*, August 27, 2015, sec. Business, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/ceo-worker-pay-gap_us_55ddc3c7e4b0a40aa3acd1c9.

²²⁹ Nick Wingfield and Mike Isaac, “Tech Industry Frets Over Possible Immigration Changes,” *The New York Times*, January 27, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/business/technology-h-1b-visa-immigration.html>; Haiven, *Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power*.

²³⁰ Graham and Marvin, *Telecommunications and the City*.

²³¹ Vanolo, “The Image of the Creative City.”

CHAPTER FOUR

“One New York” Deferred: Covenant Renewal in the *OneNYC Progress Report*

The Covenant is Broken- Criticism and New Rhetorical Strategies

From the very first day of his successful 2013 New York City mayoral campaign, Bill de Blasio relied on the rhetorical frame of a “Tale of Two Cities” and his vision of “One New York” to compel NY citizens to align with and participate in government initiatives to help “vulnerable populations” combat economic and racial inequities. While his rhetoric regarding inequity was subject to accusations of “class-warfare” and racism from conservative pundits and even Mike Bloomberg,¹ de Blasio’s narrative propelled him to a landslide victory.² The narrative resonated with citizens’ that felt betrayed or abandoned by previous administrations.³ As argued in Chapters Two and 3, de Blasio’s vision of “One New York” as used in his campaign functioned as “civil religious construct.”⁴ Taking the form of a prophetic and priestly address,⁵ de Blasio’s announcement of *One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City (OneNYC)*, and his rhetorical choices within the text of the plan used the “Tale of Two Cities” as a jeremiad.⁶ Confessing the collective environmental and economic sin of New Yorkers, he called upon the citizenry to give up their wasteful ways. As repentance, he offers *OneNYC*’s policies as the path toward fulfillment of the City’s inaugural promise to be strong, just, and unified. While difficult to gauge broader acceptance of the narrative, local communities addressed by de Blasio’s speech reported being extremely motivated and

comforted by his rhetorical choices, hearing them as a call to action, and as declaration of civic commitment to their plight.⁷

Despite these successes during the campaign and with *OneNYC*, the effectiveness of de Blasio's narrative is in question due to political and social exigencies in the lead up to his 2017 re-election campaign.⁸ The end of 2016 and beginning of 2017 saw a flurry of criticism leveraged at de Blasio regarding income inequality,⁹ rates of homelessness,¹⁰ anti-union actions,¹¹ and pending federal investigations.¹² While experiencing relatively stable approval ratings at the beginning of 2017,¹³ de Blasio's base are losing confidence,¹⁴ and he fares very poorly amongst white people due to focus of rhetorical appeals on the plight of racial minorities and the impoverished.¹⁵ Mounting criticism has so severely limited de Blasio's rhetorical options that the idea of using his narrative of citywide unity to draw whites in "appears to have all but vanished as an argument."¹⁶ Intent on recuperating the base and extending his influence to the white youth demographic, de Blasio's strategic vision and rhetorical strategies have shifted in important ways.¹⁷

Extending the critical lenses developed in Chapters Two and Three, I argue that de Blasio uses his *OneNYC 2016 Progress Report (Progress Report)* to chart a new rhetorical strategy, modifying his vision of "One New York" to take the form of Puritan rhetoric of covenant renewal.¹⁸ In the 1600s, reform Puritan ministers used covenant renewal to reinvigorate the first generation's commitment to God, while also inculcating the second and third-generations within the Church's doctrines.¹⁹ Similarly, de Blasio's strategy in the *Progress Report* is a "civil religious construct"²⁰ whose epideictic functions attempt to call into being a shared identity, establish the new status of

governance, secure the base's commitment to *OneNYC*, and appeal to the disaffected white youth demographic.

This chapter develops in two parts. First, I briefly reiterate the covenantal rhetoric of de Blasio's speech announcing *OneNYC* and the document itself to understand its prophetic and priestly functions. Acting as prophet, de Blasio establishes a "protreptic 'we'" by situating the cause for economic and environmental disasters within the moral decay of his "parishioners." Taking up the priestly function, de Blasio offers New Yorkers redemption through support of *OneNYC*'s vision of a growing, equitable, sustainable, and resilient City. Second, I analyze the text of the *Progress Report* as rhetoric of covenant renewal, tracing the differences and similarities that contextualize de Blasio's new rhetorical strategy. In the *Progress Report* de Blasio foregoes the prophetic, abandoning the "Tale of Two Cities" portion of the narrative that framed both his announcement of *OneNYC*, and the *OneNYC* text itself. Instead of decrying his "parishioners," de Blasio's rhetoric externalizes crisis onto impending global economic and environmental catastrophes. Calling upon youth to embrace the resilience of New Yorkers past, and upon all New Yorkers to participate within community-driven resilience projects. Mayor de Blasio's rhetoric of covenant renewal compels the citizenry to internalize the struggle for resilience as civic duty.

However, by defining resilience as an inherent aspect of New Yorker's character, de Blasio establishes a "protreptic 'we'" whose associative structure enables de-politicizing, neoliberal models of citizenship that cement, rather than undo historic injustices. Specifically, shift in responsibility for resilience from government to individuals legitimates white youth's participation within a speculative entrepreneurial

economy aimed at buttressing “smart city” ideology and practices. Simultaneously, this ideological screen exacerbates inequity by shielding developers and administrators from responsibility for exceeding states of vulnerability faced by New Yorkers. The inability for New Yorkers to live up to their resilient legacy, the argument goes, falls exclusively on those unable to bear the burden of adaptation. The result of de Blasio’s updated vision of “One New York” is a community and individual resilience paradigm that strategically appeals to white youth, but does so in a way that endangers the fundamental intents of OneNYC to bolster rather than endanger the City’s most vulnerable communities.

I analyze two project proposals within the *Progress Report* to substantiate this claim. First, I look at the Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative proposal as exemplar of a rhetorical shift from “collaborative planning” in *OneNYC* to “community planning” in the *Progress Report*. There are implications for this shift. It is strategic naming as argument, displacing the burden and responsibility for “greening” the City’s parks and open spaces from government onto citizens. As definitional argument, the shift is in perspective from the “top-down” planning of Robert Moses that de Blasio’s accused of, to a “bottom-up” approach reflective of Jane Jacobs’ advocacy for “organized complexity.” The result, however, is a “pernicious paradox,”²¹ where projects intended to support social and climate resilience in “vulnerable neighborhoods” produce the walkable, livable neighborhoods Jacobs dreamed of in the 1960s. However, the rhetoric of social resilience acts as a screen from which inequitable effects of adaptive practice like decreasing social services and excessive rent gaps remain indecipherable. In effect, communities plan themselves right out of their own neighborhoods. Processes of

gentrification displace the existing communities who were once the constitutive focus of de Blasio's announcement of the OneNYC Plan.

Second, I analyze the proposal for the Brooklyn-Queens Connector (BQX), a sixteen-mile long streetcar line stretching from Astoria, Queens to Sunset Park, Brooklyn. In New York the transit systems primary focus is providing access to Manhattan's Central Business District (CBD). This orientation has produced intermittent, inefficient access to job opportunities for those living deep in other boroughs. By connecting multiple public housing developments with burgeoning "innovation clusters" at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn Army Terminal, and Cornell Tech campus on Roosevelt Island, the BQX reduces travel times and offers alternative options in case of climate-related transit blackouts. Mayor de Blasio's proposal attempts to reinvigorate the base by emphasizing how the BQX's service will assist "vulnerable neighborhoods" through a concomitant increase in social and economic resilience.

At the same time, de Blasio's pivot to "innovation clusters" participates within, and normalizes broader discourses of the "smart city,"²² and urban branding²³ of New York as "the global capital for innovation."²⁴ These discourses are particularly attractive to a burgeoning "creative class" of white entrepreneurial youth seeking rebranded space,²⁵ speculative real estate development, and accessibility to high-tech industries. Subject to increasing economic and social pressures, predominately black and brown neighborhoods surrounding the line experience "bright flight,"²⁶ an influx of white youth with "cultural capital to appreciate the aesthetics of heritage and the financial capital to buy into it."²⁷ In form and function, de Blasio's rhetorical choices in the *Progress Report* lay the ideological and political groundwork for gentrification.

The de Blasio Jeremiad

Due to a combination of racially targeted policing initiatives and focus on supply-side economic development, the mayoral tenures of Rudy Giuliani and Mike Bloomberg left the City prosperous, but reeling from substantial inequality.²⁸ The policies of these administrations accelerated a growing political divide along race and class lines.²⁹ While a rhetorical fixture in de Blasio's repertoire since the first day of his candidacy for mayor, the "Tale of Two Cities" narrative gained political coherence and codification through the *OneNYC* announcement speech and the text of the plan itself. Adopting metrics of city resilience developed by the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities network (100RC), de Blasio intended for the *OneNYC* platform to address and unify a city still reeling from the impacts of economic recession and Hurricane Sandy. As epideictic, de Blasio's speech provides explanatory context from which to interpret the still prescient events of economic collapse and Hurricane Sandy, praises the resilience of communities like The Point as emblematic of the city's highest values, and projects an image of the "strong and just city" as one brought about by fair governance. To establish his covenant with the people of New York, de Blasio's narrative of a "Tale of Two Cities" displays Charland's three ideological effects of constitutive rhetoric: constitution of a collective subject, constitution of a trans-historical subject, and production of an illusion of freedom.³⁰ Positing New Yorkers as inheritors of the inaugural promise for a "strong and just city," de Blasio's speech inspires a dedication to civic commitment through community-development projects and affirms the tenets of his *OneNYC* plan.

In his announcement speech for *OneNYC*, de Blasio uses the pronoun "we" to describe his government administration and its partners, and to describe a collective who

understand themselves as New Yorkers. Less than ten lines into his speech, de Blasio uses “we” and the possessive “our” to describe his administration’s dedication to resolving economic and environmental crisis, the administration’s intent to keep to their commitments, and that the prospects outlined are something his administration takes literally. In a different context, de Blasio uses “we” to describe all New Yorkers, and the possessive “our” to describe New Yorker’s inheritance, spurned responsibilities, and possible courses of action. The “we” and “our” used in the speech are what Griswold calls a “protreptic ‘we’.”³¹ Protrepsis describes any text that “calls the audience to a new and different way of life.”³² To produce his intended constitution of a collective subject, de Blasio invokes “we” and “our” to craft an associative structure from which New Yorkers draw perceptions of their relationships to community, place, and government, define the value-structure from which they judge the world, and compel themselves to action.³³

The associative structure that these protreptic functions occur within is a “civil religious construct,” where the narrative of a “Tale of Two Cities” serves both “prophetic” and “priestly” functions.³⁴ The narrative structure of de Blasio’s “Tale of Two Cities” reflects the Book of Isaiah, in which God’s chosen garden city Zion is contrasted to a prosperous but morally perverse city, Babylon.³⁵ As prophet, de Blasio identifies New York City as Zion, arguing that the City has an inaugural promise to become and remain a “global city” and a “strong and just city.” However, contemporary New Yorkers incognizance to the vulnerable and their wasteful lifestyles are civic sins that have produced a decidedly unethical, unsustainable society. Mayor de Blasio’s use of “we” and “our” in this portion of the speech primarily reflect his vision for government

and its responsibility to produce resilient communities. However, de Blasio invokes a “we” that stretches to all New Yorkers. This is especially clear when confessing his own part in promulgating environmental sins.³⁶ de Blasio effectively places himself within the collective subjectivity of New York not only as a leader, but as someone guilty of the sins that effect the well being of the community. Because all New Yorkers are responsible for the current state of affairs, de Blasio’s speech forwards, it also falls to them to work together to resolve it.

Turning to the priestly role, de Blasio identifies two possible trajectories for the City. The first is complacency. New Yorkers can “just keep our policies and our lifestyle the way it is,” but risk a “dangerous endpoint.”³⁷ A City that betrays its inaugural promise is due to become prosperous but soulless, a gilded city not unlike Babylon. Mayor de Blasio declares such a city “would no longer be New York.”³⁸ A way of life that produces such inequity and injustice, he warns, risks existential environmental and economic crisis. Yet, another path exists that produces the illusion of choice and freedom, the third step in Charland’s prescriptions for constitutive rhetoric. The mayor calls upon the citizenry to change their ways, for “[h]ere in New York City, we don’t buy into the complacency.”³⁹ Speaking as both a citizen of New York and as its leader, the mayor declares that “we will take the road less traveled” and that New Yorkers will “challenge ourselves to do things differently.” The citizenry have turned from God’s will, but by repenting through alignment with *OneNYC*’s policies and through communal-development, their repentance will “lead this city to a fairer and brighter future.”⁴⁰ This rhetorical move fulfills the three ideological functions. By identifying New Yorkers as the inheritors of an inaugural promise, the latest in a long line of resilient peoples, and by

enabling a vision of a prosperous, ethical New York, de Blasio secures a covenant between God and New Yorkers. However, as de Blasio claims, that covenant depends on pursuit of civic duties that bring the city closer to its vision.

The mayor extends the covenant and his vision for a unified City in the text of *OneNYC*. In his Letter from the Mayor at the very beginning of the document, de Blasio uses the pronoun “we” in the third line, and throughout his letter to reference universal citizenry that shares experience of the City and its unique challenges. Describing the lifeworld of this collective subject New Yorker, de Blasio explains *OneNYC* as a set of programs and principles critical to address challenges as “we approach the start of our fifth century.”⁴¹ The plan’s constitutive rhetoric calls upon a collective transhistorical subject New Yorker by situating them as the inheritors of four hundred years of place history, and projects the vision of “One New York” as the fulfillment of their inheritance. As epideictic, a critical role of the *OneNYC* front matter is to give context and explanation to a city still trying to make sense of these challenges, especially Hurricane Sandy and its aftermath. In a section titled “Introduction and Evolution,” Hurricane Sandy is framed as merely one in a long line of inevitable crises “that threaten the very fabric of our city.”⁴² To deal with these events effectively, de Blasio declares that *OneNYC*’s policies are a blueprint for the City “we want our children to inherit” and with their successful implementation, “we will be prepared for the shocks and stresses ahead, and have the ability to bounce back stronger.”⁴³ The operative assumption behind this blueprint is that there is no way to truly resolve issues related to economy or climate change, rather *OneNYC* charts “our plans” for “managing” climate change impacts, and “our approaches” to “dealing with” the effects of economic inequity.⁴⁴

The invocation of a “protreptic ‘we’” and “our” in *OneNYC* constrains the associative structure of New Yorkers, and hence responsive capacities within a value-system most aptly described as “resilience thinking.”⁴⁵ The “resilience thinking” value-system that *OneNYC*’s policies derive from are rooted in *100RC*’s approach to the city.⁴⁶ *OneNYC* hence takes the narrative of a “Tale of Two Cities” and converts its notion of a sustainable, resilient future from a metaphor to a set of metrics for analyzing adaptive capacity of city systems. It is by ensuring institutions, economy, and communities adapt as necessary that, “we pledge to keep the promise of opportunity that has made our city such a remarkable place for so many generations.”⁴⁷ As Burke explains, when the conceptual metaphor of a discourse extends into a generalized perspective, it will pre-determine any potential “program of action” for responding to a particular political exigency.⁴⁸ The epideictic functions of *OneNYC* constrain citizens’ ability to judge the world to the terms of city resilience, and instill civic responsibility through dedication to developing the adaptive capacities of communal place, space, and psychology. The covenant between God and New Yorkers depends then on collective dedication to the pursuit of resilience.

Failure to Launch: Progress Report as Covenant Renewal

Despite the coherence of de Blasio’s vision for “One New York,” difficulties in communicating his vision have produced a perceptual schism.⁴⁹ This schism constitutes grounds for a “definitional rupture”⁵⁰ within common conceptions of city resilience. Despite de Blasio’s claims that *OneNYC* policies would stimulate economic resilience by reducing inequity and provide social resilience necessary to bring down crime rates perceptual ineffectiveness,⁵¹ discontent with the plan is leading some to question if

attaining “One New York” is possible under his leadership.⁵² Faced with declining trust from the base and an increasing opposition from white youth, de Blasio altered his communicative practices and rhetorical approach in an attempt to reach across the aisle. That change in strategy is reflected in his 2016 *Progress Report* on the policies and vision outlined by *OneNYC*. Taking the form of Puritan rhetoric of covenant renewal, de Blasio calls upon his base to reinvigorate their belief in the vision and his sincere intent on providing support to the vulnerable, while simultaneously taking up several rhetorical maneuvers to inculcate those who remain skeptical, the white youth demographic excluded in his previous rhetorical focus.

In the front matter of the *Progress Report*, de Blasio’s Letter reiterates much of the same rhetoric used in the announcement speech and his *OneNYC* Letter, but does so under a celebratory rather than critical frame. The mayor’s letter begins with a reference to his announcement speech at The Point, reiterating the claim that *OneNYC* is the “blueprint” for a city that “works for all New Yorkers and that takes on the challenges of our time.”⁵³ Starting with his speech in the South Bronx, de Blasio attempts to reinvigorate the base by calling back to the covenantal address and its vision of equity and communal resilience. Yet, the introductory paragraph in the *Progress Report* abandons the *OneNYC* letter’s rhetoric describing the difficulty “many New Yorkers” face trying to “live here” and raise their families “with dignity.”⁵⁴ Attempting to minimize the effectiveness of “class warfare” criticisms leveraged at his narrative of a “Tale of Two Cities,” de Blasio’s choice to embrace a “dynamic, inclusive economy” in the *Progress Report* rather than reiterate crisis rhetoric functions to make discussion of economic inequality palatable to young white demographics.

Reflecting on the difference made over the year, de Blasio calls upon New Yorkers as a whole by invoking the “protreptic ‘we’,” stating that, “we are growing,” “we are more equitable,” “we are more sustainable,” and, “we are more resilient.”⁵⁵ Despite perceptions of continuing disrepair throughout the city, de Blasio attempts to extend New Yorkers visionary field and reinvigorate their dedication to civic duty by framing progress as “just a start.”⁵⁶ Reiterating the promise made in the *OneNYC* letter, de Blasio extends the “protreptic ‘we’” and its associative structure based in resilience by claiming that with the *Progress Reports* updated policies, “we will be prepared for the shocks and stresses ahead and will have the ability to emerge stronger.”⁵⁷ To deliver on these commitments, de Blasio reiterates the importance of “bold, innovative solutions,” a claim that appeared in his *OneNYC* letter. However, de Blasio uniquely adds to the *Progress Report* letter the importance of “strong partnerships,” explaining “New York City will be a model to inspire other cities around the world to do the same.”⁵⁸ This new emphasis on the central role of industry partnerships in the fulfillment of de Blasio’s “One New York” vision extends a comforting, inclusive hand to entrepreneurial white youth who felt previously scorned by perceived “class-warfare” rhetoric. Industry and pursuit of economic growth has always been a central aspect of the *OneNYC* suite of proposals. However, de Blasio’s rhetoric in the *Progress Report* letter reflects a strategic shift toward incorporation of the young white demographic within the vision in an attempt to make them feel included and necessary to the success of “One New York.”

The rhetorical shift toward inclusion of this previously scorned demographic is visible in the suite of new proposals and approaches to old proposals as outlined within the body of the *Progress Report*. I examine the Resilient Edgemere Community Planning

Initiative proposal, and the Bronx-Queens Connector streetcar line proposal to show how strategic naming and definitional argument change the contours of the *OneNYC* vision. These rhetorical shifts not only reflect an attempt to increase political capital with white youth, but also signal a change in the form and function of policies which have direct negative implications on claims of equity.

Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative

In the pursuit of community resilience outcomes, the *OneNYC* proposal emphasized the importance of “collaborative neighborhood planning.”⁵⁹ Intent on providing “vibrant multi-use communities,” while encouraging access to necessary resources for residents to thrive, the report emphasizes the importance of “engaging New Yorkers in the planning process.”⁶⁰ The *OneNYC* report outlines no projects, but describes the process as one based in collaborative data sourcing, community consultation, public review, and restricted to promoting opportunities for new housing that “complements and enhances neighborhood character.”⁶¹ The emphasis on incorporating community voices into the planning process evident in *OneNYC* are directly linkable to 100RC’s metrics indicating that “[e]ffective leadership and management” requires “proactive multi-stakeholder collaboration,”⁶² as inclusive consultation practice “contributes to a sense of shared ownership or a joint vision to build city resilience.”⁶³ However, collaborative planning is more broadly traceable to a “communicative turn”⁶⁴ in city planning and the introduction of “participatory planning” into public discourse on transportation infrastructure in the early 70s.⁶⁵ The pursuit of “collaborative neighborhood planning” has proven to create a multitude of beneficial outcomes by helping to avoid top-down decisions that take away from communal

cohesion, creating consensus and consistency on adaptation priorities and strategies, resolving feelings of governmental distrust, and empirically promoting durable decisions and plans that benefit the local community.⁶⁶ The rhetoric of “collaborative neighborhood planning” is itself compelling, its name delineating a shared space of communication and evenness of power between government entities and neighborhood residents.⁶⁷ As 100RC describes, framing the planning process as collaborative encourages agreement and ascent to projects, framing public comment as definitive to form and outcomes. Hence, community members not only feel that their voices are heard, but that their perspective is crucial to positive outcomes, and hence the vision of the neighborhood, and “One New York” as a whole.

Between *OneNYC* and the *Progress Report*, a rhetorical shift in naming occurs. The phrase “collaborative neighborhood planning” found in *OneNYC* is gone, replaced in the *Progress Report* by the phrase “community planning.” The phrase appears in several distinct contexts, including an East New York Neighborhood Planning proposal, as a header describing a place-based community brownfield planning program, as a process for understanding zoning as resilience in Sandy-affected neighborhoods, and in the Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative (RECPI).⁶⁸ The *Progress Report* explains that in the interim between *OneNYC*, the City launched several programs that “expressly include a new approach to public engagement.”⁶⁹ Led by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development, the RECPI “sought to directly communicate with local residents on issues surrounding flood risk, housing quality and affordability, waterfront access, transportation, and land use.”⁷⁰ The plan includes assisted housing projects, and green space modifications.⁷¹ These developments are investments in social

infrastructure, which enhance social resilience through interconnectivity and communal resilience by buffering climate change impacts and offering meeting places during storms or heatwaves.⁷² Describing the outcome as “phenomenal,” the City describes the work as a critical move toward “a shared vision of the future.”⁷³ The epideictic function is evident, as the community receives praise for its positive impact, the value it will add to the neighborhood, and the City as a whole. The rhetoric reflects an added effort to empower the role of communities, especially vulnerable communities, in the planning process. By elevating the role of communities beyond collaborators to directors of the vision, the effectiveness of the “One New York” narrative enhances.

However, despite the importance, and necessity, of participatory planning to the possibility of social equity in land-use, the rhetorical screen of “community planning” elides dangerous aspects of this particular process’s form and function. First, the emphasis on growth-dependence exhibited in every proposal on “community planning” in the *Progress Report* functions as a rhetorical screen that denies “Just Green Enough”⁷⁴ enhancements to existing infrastructure as sufficient. This ideological screen is not just rhetorical, it manifests in the process. For example, during the Creation Phase of the RECPI, people voiced, “concern about affordability of new housing and that people are already being priced out of the neighborhood.”⁷⁵ Despite concerns, one of the primary recommendations in the Finalize Phase was to “[s]upport the creation of market rate housing to promote economic diversity and encourage new businesses to open up in the community.”⁷⁶

While this is a particularly insidious example, considering the decision potentially flies in the face of what the community desired, an even more complex problem occurs

when the community gets exactly what it wants. For example, in the Finalize phase the community overwhelmingly chose to “[m]aintain low-density housing by building 1 and 2 family homes,”⁷⁷ a decision that spurs on the strategic retreat process moving people from the vulnerable coast properties to state-owned plots further inland.⁷⁸ Similarly, the community’s decision in favor of “public amenities such as more green space in the form of parks and a library”⁷⁹ combines with flood buffers and new beach openings to provide a new image of Edgemere that will “tend to attract more privileged residents with a higher purchasing (or rental) power.”⁸⁰ Due to unequal access to flood protective infrastructure,⁸¹ the opening of ferry service near Edgemere,⁸² and a series of waterfront real estate developments being plotted for increasingly cheap plots in the floodplain,⁸³ the process seems particularly amenable to incentivizing speculative developments that will likely price residents out over the long-term.

This “environmental justice tragedy”⁸⁴ seems intimately connected to the associative structures produced by de Blasio’s “protreptic ‘we’.” Communities are encouraged to empower themselves by taking advantage of state-incentive structures and are led to believe that their vision for the community is what will be carried throughout. However, as Burke and Charland reminds us, the definitional limits of the constitutive narrative delimit the field of action available to hailed subjects.⁸⁵ The rhetorical framing of growth-dependence renders freedom for the “protreptic ‘we’” as an exclusive function of new developments and infrastructure expansions. However, demands upon the community “to make Rockaway a destination”⁸⁶ through constant growth sets the groundwork for gentrification. Environmental Justice advocates have in recent years developed a paradigm called “Just Green Enough.”⁸⁷ This paradigm advocates improving

existing infrastructure only enough to improve communal quality of life, protect from climate risks, and decrease gentrification.⁸⁸ However, a growth-dependent frame rhetorically filters out these planning strategies. Any option less than growth is structurally unavailable as rhetorical strategy, and hence not available throughout the planning process. Simultaneously, the phrase “community planning” screens the collusive power of private-public partnerships from scrutiny, deferring responsibility for the implications of decisions to the people in the community itself. The argument is not that developers or the government intend to dispossess these populations. Rather, echoing Burke, the rhetorical framing that determines the possible courses of action restricts decision-making processes so that community members are unable to make decisions that do not risk dispossession, and this while developers focus on profit margins depoliticizes their purview. The result of de Blasio’s *Progress Report* vision of “One New York”, nonetheless, is a clearing of space where high-minority populations through a confluence of forces experience dispossession from the very process that were supposed to be a source of empowerment. The definition of “resilience” ruptures as communities are marginalized through processes of gentrification. This clearing of space is a particularly insidious function of “urban branding”⁸⁹ for speculative developers and the white youth seeking the green spaces and new developments that pushed vulnerable peoples out in the first place. The shift in strategic naming from “collaborative planning” to “community planning” creates a perceptual change. The assumption is that the dangers of a “top-down” planning strategy will be subverted, replaced with a “bottom-up” planning strategy such as that proposed by Jane Jacobs. Yet, such an assumption is incorrect. The domain of answerable questions and viable proposal options offered to communities are

not simply their own. They rely upon a rhetorical framing that filters out anything which does not align with dominant values, or produce the government's desired outcomes. In that sense, a definitional rupture over "community planning" and resilience as figured in these policies are ripe for a definitional rupture.

Bronx-Queens Connector and the Innovation Economy

One of the most crucial aspects of de Blasio's vision for "One New York" is the creation of a diverse and accessible economy throughout the five boroughs. A particularly large barrier to access for peoples living deep in the boroughs has been the emphasis on transport primarily oriented toward Manhattan's Central Business District (CBD). The result is from many places in the City transportation to work takes over an hour each way taking public transit, a severe burden that keeps people disengaged from the City's economy, which produces poverty. As described in Chapter Three, however, the rise of the "global city" framework has led to a concomitant rise in different "nodes," or miniature CBDs, cropping up across urban environments.⁹⁰ In a distinct way, the rise of climate change impacts means that cities must set up increasingly resilient transit infrastructure be it through redundancy of sources in case of climate-related blackouts or a hardening of existing infrastructure against the effects of flooding and other climate-related events. Because lack of transit options uniquely hurts communities who are already the most vulnerable, responding to these demands is critical to achieving an equitable and just city.

Responding to both of these demands, de Blasio's *Progress Report* puts particular focus on the development of the Brooklyn-Queens Connector (BQX), a 16-mile streetcar line facilitating access between "growing job hubs" and "residential neighborhoods" on

the riverfront.⁹¹ The BQX proposal does not appear in *OneNYC*, but figures prominently as a value-add for each of the four visions within the *Progress Report*. Preceded by an unsuccessful New York State Department of Transportation feasibility study on a streetcar line in Red Hook, Brooklyn from 2011,⁹² the current iteration's proposal went public in early 2016, funded by a group of developers under the moniker, "Friends of the Brooklyn-Queens Connector."⁹³ Touted as a "visionary"⁹⁴ transportation development, the BQX project's biggest draw is that it connects "innovation clusters" at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the Brooklyn Army Terminal, and the Cornell Tech campus on Roosevelt Island.⁹⁵ Part of the City's new focus on becoming "the global capital for innovation by supporting high-growth, high value industries,"⁹⁶ these sites feature prominently in the BQX project's impact statement in the *Progress Report*. Functioning as "step-out" spaces for entrepreneurs developing clean energy and "smart city" technologies, these sites have received "significant economic development investments."⁹⁷ While the clear emphasis is on the role that this project plays for entrepreneurs and high-tech developers, the BQX also figures as critical to making developing economic centers accessible for the thirteen NYCHA public housing communities the line will serve.⁹⁸ This is especially important because it will save on average ten to fifteen minutes on a New Yorker's commute, a critical development in achieving the *OneNYC* goal of reducing all commutes to less than 45 minutes.⁹⁹ The BQX proposal, as depicted, offers an inter-vision value by providing emissions-free transit, redundancies to increase resilience during climate-events, and connection to economic opportunities for both the affluent and the vulnerable.

Taking the form of covenant renewal, the *Progress Report* situates the BQX as a rhetorical bridge between disparate communities, bringing confidence and security to

previously scorned white youth by minimizing the rhetorical friction between themselves and so-called “vulnerable populations.” Not only does the BQX physically function as a connection between assisted housing, luxury housing developments, and budding deep-borough CBDs, it papers over the gap that de Blasio had rhetorically constructed between the “Two Cities” in *OneNYC*. Instead of stimulating infighting by figuring crisis within the congregation (citizenry), de Blasio’s rhetorical choice to focus on global leadership externalizes crisis onto the specter of global competition. This vision of “One New York” rhetorically sidesteps, and potentially sutures the conflict between high-tech industry cultivation and low-income accessibility by figuring global competition as the primary barrier to achieving broad scale economic achievement. The emphasis on “innovation economy” and the central role that tech industries play in the *Progress Report*’s vision of “One New York” attempts to persuade white youth to feel comfortable and included in the government and public vision of the City’s future. This move is important to undo the perceived figuration of white youth as enemies in the collective fantasy of *OneNYC*. In the economy of the future inclusion of white youth is no longer simply a sufficient aspect of creating a diverse, resilient economy. Instead, in the *Progress Report*’s reinvigorated covenant the cultivation of entrepreneurial pockets is figured as the lynchpin of global economic leadership and the source of “smart city” technologies critical to the functions of NYC’s increasingly “smart city” dependent infrastructure.

It is relatively difficult if not impossible to predict the success of these rhetorical maneuvers. However, several identifiable outcomes to this proposal should provoke hesitation in stakeholders pursuing equity and justice. First, the projects funding structure and service area bring significant question to the claim that this project will serve as a

value-add to vulnerable communities. While 100RC and resultant *OneNYC* projects have tended to reflect the “organized complexity” thesis of urban development started by Jane Jacobs, this plan “represents a shift to the kind of ambitious Robert Moses-style planning that New Yorkers more often associate with his predecessor, former Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, who made transportation a hallmark of his tenure.”¹⁰⁰ Complicity with developers to shift transit service and thus the very makeup of neighborhoods seem particularly antithetical to *OneNYC* and the *Progress Report*’s emphasis on equitable outcomes for vulnerable communities.

People who live in these communities rarely have cause to use an entrepreneurial step-out space, and as a community board member of the Farragut Houses, a subsidized community within the service area says, “[i]t’s really going to affect the life of everyone that lives there and not in a good way.”¹⁰¹ The rhetorical implications of prioritizing growth-paradigms within the development schema are not value-neutral and belie the attempted rhetorical elision of tension between goals. While touted in the *Progress Report* as a benefit to the economic sustenance of those living in assisted housing along the waterfront, the reality seems closer to Stein’s appraisal that, “the existing plan is inseparable from a longstanding project to remake the waterfront, and must be seen as part of a larger process of state-enabled gentrification and displacement.”¹⁰² That gentrification is not merely enabled by the material ordering of the project, but is accelerated by the rhetorical functions of the neoliberal associative structure that produces and is produced by the “protreptic ‘we’” of de Blasio’s new vision for “One New York.”

Neoliberalism and Urban Branding- A Recipe for Expulsions

An ideological shift toward individualism precedes and enables the neoliberal ordering of the economic system's functions.¹⁰³ In the *Progress Report's* rhetorical figuration of "One New York" the preferred outcome of resilience is not reliant on any external force, but is rather an internalized state, be it psychological, economic, social, or otherwise. In terms of "community planning" for instance, the decision-making capacity of the community is rhetorically figured as the strict determinant of communal resilience, obfuscating socio-historical legacies of domination and the structural form of city and global capital that determined their contemporary state of affairs, and enables their future dispossession.¹⁰⁴ On the other end of that individualist structure is the cultural fetish for entrepreneurship, with the alluring image of the self-made man situated as the defining image of contemporary capital.¹⁰⁵ The rhetorical frame of the *Progress Report* facilitates this growing cultural preoccupation by centralizing the "innovation economy" within the City's public image. In a particularly insidious form of "urban branding," the City's structural readjustment of its public narrative from fighting economic and social injustice through assistance, to fighting economic and social injustice through self-empowerment makes the city a perfect site for invasion by the "creative class."¹⁰⁶

Facilitated by strategic public and private investments in high-tech, high-growth industries situated in underserved communities, the cultural makeup of neighborhoods all across New York are rapidly shifting on the back-end of urban development and revitalization projects.¹⁰⁷ Representing a burgeoning demographic of technologically savvy suburban white youths, this process of "bright flight"¹⁰⁸ is inspired by "innovation clusters" and projects like the BQX, putting them on the front-end of the 21st centuries

reversal of white flight. In search of cultural and social capital with the financial capital to purchase it at incredibly high prices, these newly renovated spaces provide the “safe excitement of ‘riskless risk’” to a demographic seeking “authentic space.”¹⁰⁹ In simple terms, black space without black people.¹¹⁰ The impact on the social and communal cohesion of the populations that lived in and continue to live in these spaces is overwhelming, as the spaces that once supported their way of life give way to “new spaces of consumption” that become the very life support of a different cultural community altogether.¹¹¹ Quite antithetically to the stated intents of the *Progress Report* then, equity and justice are not the necessitated outcome of this renewed covenant, and in reality the exact opposite may be true.

In his 2017 State of the City Address, de Blasio spoke at the Apollo Theater in Harlem, addressing the continuing fight for affordable housing and against economic inequality as a battle for the “soul of the city.”¹¹² However, he shied from offering new policy initiatives other than a new fashion center for businesses in Brooklyn. If de Blasio had walked out of the Apollo and on to 125th Street, it would be evident from the waves of speculative real estate deals and high-rates of housing displacement in Harlem that the battle is already being lost.¹¹³ The New York Times opined that de Blasio’s shift in rhetorical focus toward an industry that rewards “youth and status above all” has an obvious political advantage, namely that it “has the potential for Mr. de Blasio to ingratiate himself to a segment of the population that has felt underappreciated by him.”¹¹⁴ Reflecting on de Blasio’s continuing investment in the strategy of covenant renewal, it is integral to ask hard questions about the true costs of these rhetorical elisions, and deeply interrogate the multifaceted means by which displacement occurs. As

de Blasio himself pondered on Earth Day 2015 when announcing the *OneNYC* plan in the South Bronx, city stakeholders must ask themselves what the value is of working toward the future of the City if it will be a gilded one. His answer is hauntingly clear. If it is a city “only for the most wealthy, it would no longer be New York.”¹¹⁵

Notes

¹ Jennifer Fermino, “Mayor Bloomberg: Bill de Blasio’s Campaign Is ‘racist,’” *NY Daily News*, September 8, 2013, <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/election/mayor-bloomberg-bill-de-blasio-campaign-racist-article-1.1448605>.

² Jill Colvin, “Bill de Blasio Elected City’s Next Mayor: NY1,” *Observer*, November 6, 2013, <http://observer.com/2013/11/bill-de-blasio-elected-citys-next-mayor-ny1/>.

³ Garance Franke-Ruta, “Bill de Blasio and New York City’s Liberal Comeback,” *The Atlantic*, November 5, 2013, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/11/bill-de-blasio-and-new-york-citys-liberal-comeback/281141/>.

⁴ Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion,” 40.

⁵ “Fundamentally, the prophet renders judgement and calls for repentance, while the priest provides comfort and praise.” See: *ibid*, 46.

⁶ M. Bostdorff, “George W. Bush’s Post-September 11 Rhetoric of Covenant Renewal,” 294.

⁷ Hirsch, “Mayor Unveils New Plan at The Point.”

⁸ J. David Goodman, “De Blasio Shifts Away From His Re-Election Message of ‘One City,’” *The New York Times*, June 6, 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/07/nyregion/de-blasio-shifts-away-from-his-re-election-message-of-one-city.html>.

⁹ Erin Durkin, “New York City’s Income Inequality Worsens under Watch of ‘tale of Two Cities’ Mayor de Blasio,” *NY Daily News*, December 13, 2016, <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/report-income-inequality-risen-mayor-de-blasio-article-1.2908470>.

¹⁰ Emma Whitford, “Homelessness Hits New Record High, City Says It Could Be Worse: Gothamist,” *Gothamist*, September 30, 2016, http://gothamist.com/2016/09/30/homeless_in_nyc_hits_new_record_hig.php.

¹¹ Terence Cullen, “De Blasio Is in a Bind When It Comes to Unions and Affordable Housing,” *Commercial Observer*, February 21, 2017, <http://commercialobserver.com/2017/02/bill-de-blasio-union-labor-construction-safety-city-council/>.

¹² William K. Rashbaum Goodman J. David and William Neuman, “Why Mayor de Blasio Is Facing So Many Investigations,” *The New York Times*, April 28, 2016,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/29/nyregion/the-de-blasio-inquiries-a-recap-and-whats-next.html>.

¹³ Josh Dawsey, “NYC Mayor Bill de Blasio’s Approval Rating Jumps,” *Wall Street Journal*, January 19, 2016, sec. US, <http://www.wsj.com/articles/nyc-mayor-bill-de-blasios-approval-rating-jumps-1453234226>.

¹⁴ Yoav Gonen, “Mayor de Blasio’s Approval Hits Record Low | New York Post,” May 24, 2016, <http://nypost.com/2016/05/24/mayor-de-blasios-approval-hits-record-low/>.

¹⁵ Michael Gartland, “New Yorkers Want de Blasio out despite Uptick in Approval Rating,” *New York Post*, November 16, 2016, <http://nypost.com/2016/11/16/new-yorkers-wants-de-blasio-out-despite-uptick-in-approval-rating/>.

¹⁶ Goodman, “De Blasio Shifts Away From His Re-Election Message of ‘One City.’”

¹⁷ “The shifting political landscape has forced Mr. de Blasio to retool his strategy: His aides said the new game plan was to highlight the mayor’s accomplishments, portray him as an able manager of its day-to-day and long-term needs, and shore up support among the core constituencies that have long backed him, including labor unions and liberal activists.” See: *Ibid*.

¹⁸ M. Bostdorff, “George W. Bush’s Post-September 11 Rhetoric of Covenant Renewal,” 293.

¹⁹ Robert G. Pope, *The Half-Way Covenant: Church Membership in Puritan New England* (Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2002), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YMpKAwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA99&dq=The+Half-Way+Covenant:+Church+Membership+in+Puritan+New+England&ots=AaWFLd2hbj&sig=eyVCZ6zr9G5N-pQnbaXcko1Ygrg>.

²⁰ Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion.”

²¹ Melissa Checker, “Wiped out by the ‘greenwave’: Environmental Gentrification and the Paradoxical Politics of Urban Sustainability,” *City & Society* 23, no. 2 (2011): 210–229.

²² Vanolo, “Smartmentality.”

²³ Vanolo, “The Image of the Creative City.”

²⁴ Mayor Bill de Blasio, “OneNYC 2016 Progress Report,” 19.

²⁵ Florida, “The Rise of the Creative Class, and How It Is Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life.”

²⁶ Yen, “Suburbs Losing Young Whites To Cities, Brookings Institution Finds.”

²⁷ Zukin, *Naked City*, 87.

²⁸ James Parrott, “Going Local in the Fight Against Inequality,” *The American Prospect*, October 12, 2016, <http://prospect.org/article/going-local-fight-against-inequality>.

²⁹ Tom Angotti, “Planning in New York City: Walls That Divide, Bridges That Unite,” *Progressive Planning Magazine*, Spring 2004, <http://www.plannersnetwork.org/2004/04/planning-in-new-york-city-walls-that-divide-bridges-that-unite/>.

³⁰ Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric.”

³¹ Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment*.

³² Diana M. Swancutt, “Paraenesis in Light of Protrepsis,” *Early Christian Paraenesis in*, 2006, 113.

³³ Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment*, 49.

³⁴ Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion.”

³⁵ McDonough, “A Tale of Two Cities (Revelation 17-22) - Bible Commentary.”

³⁶ “Look at how many people – particularly in the generations coming up – want a greener society and are willing to do things differently. I will tell you a simple story – yes, I used to sin.

[Laughter]

I used to use that other kind of water bottle, and Chiara would not lay off. It was like, when you’re going to stop using that? When you’re going to stop using that? When you’re going to stop using that? I see you’re using that still. When you’re going to stop – why is your water bottle [inaudible]? I mean, it went on for like weeks and weeks and weeks, and it’s finally like this is the best kind of [inaudible] – it was like, okay, I’ll be environmentally correct if you just stop.

[Laughter]

So, the fact is I do believe generational change is a big part of that. I think the generations coming up get – because they’ve lived with extreme weather and they’ve seen the outrageous waste of this society, and they want to do something about it. So, I

think the table is set for the changes we need to make, but it's also about constantly driving them. What will you add to explain how it works [inaudible]?" See: de Blasio, "Transcript," April 22, 2015.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ "OneNYC," 3.

⁴² Ibid., 9.

⁴³ Ibid., 3.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 9.

⁴⁵ Walker and Salt, *Resilience Thinking*.

⁴⁶ "New York City has a history of innovating in the face of change. This plan adopts the approach of the 100RC initiative, recognizing the need to address acute shocks and chronic stresses in securing the city's growth. Equity, sustainability, and resiliency are incorporated into OneNYC, including through the involvement of agencies across City government and extensive public engagement in creating the plan." See: "OneNYC," 13.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 10.

⁴⁸ Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 92.

⁴⁹ Laura Nahmias, "De Blasio Bemoans His Failure to Communicate," *Politico PRO*, accessed February 23, 2017, <http://politi.co/290BmJ1>.

⁵⁰ Schiappa, *Defining Reality : Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*, 9.

⁵¹ Toni Monkovic, "Ted Cruz Was Wrong on Murders in New York, but Perception Is Hard to Shake," *The New York Times*, April 21, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/22/upshot/ted-cruz-was-wrong-on-murders-in-new-york-but-perception-is-hard-to-shake.html>; David Freedlander, "Did Trump Save Bill de Blasio's Career?," *POLITICO Magazine*, December 11, 2016, <http://politi.co/2gKrQxC>; Gonen, "Mayor de Blasio's Approval Hits Record Low | New York Post."

⁵² Goodman, "De Blasio Shifts Away From His Re-Election Message of 'One City.'"

⁵³ Mayor Bill de Blasio, "OneNYC 2016 Progress Report," 3.

- ⁵⁴ “OneNYC,” 3.
- ⁵⁵ Mayor Bill de Blasio, “OneNYC 2016 Progress Report,” 3.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁹ “OneNYC,” 70.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., 77.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., 70.
- ⁶² da Silva, “City Resilience Index,” 18.
- ⁶³ Ibid., 7.
- ⁶⁴ John Forester, *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes* (Mit Press, 1999), https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ywJXreTLoBcC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=The+Deliberative+Practitioner:+Encouraging+Participatory+Planning+Processes&ots=WY4fd0HGM0&sig=Rw-qJ_sCVxBkQZMxiE9qYDZnHqQ.
- ⁶⁵ *Metropolitan Transportation Planning Seminars*. (Washington :, 1971), <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/ien.35556021061726>.
- ⁶⁶ Vanesa Castán Broto, Bridget Oballa, and Paulo Junior, “Governing Climate Change for a Just City: Challenges and Lessons from Maputo, Mozambique,” *Local Environment* 18, no. 6 (2013): 678–704; Eric Chu, Isabelle Anguelovski, and JoAnn Carmin, “Inclusive Approaches to Urban Climate Adaptation Planning and Implementation in the Global South,” *Climate Policy* 16, no. 3 (2016): 372–392; Patsy Healey, *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies* (UBc Press, 1997), https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=psW_hMb3AH8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR10&dq=Collaborative+Planning:+Shaping+Places+in+Fragmented+Societies&ots=ZmpuG6IacI&sig=6ncoHfhcWFMagBhAjaEQk8e56Pc; Judith E. Innes and David E. Booher, *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy* (Routledge, 2010), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2SGNAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&q=Planning+with+Complexity:+An+Introduction+to+Collaborative+Rationality+for+Public+Policy.&ots=wACq7m2xZb&sig=v3R7JOP84m5U23LC3nakbvrh6r0>; Ian Shapiro, *The State of Democratic Theory* (Princeton University Press, 2009), <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=N08vHnQXqPkC&oi=fnd&pg=PR1&dq=The+State+of+Democratic+Theory.&ots=SdD0bj5Acj&sig=2-nUKtRCubPFGULVKvu6kndv4yo>; Richard D. Margerum, *Beyond Consensus:*

Improving Collaborative Planning and Management (MIT Press, 2011), https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=gNLxCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&q=%22collaborative+planning%22+%22distrust%22&ots=r-by7uuTjZ&sig=VNtruzRNd-ArCrvefP11h_fuI68.

⁶⁷ Eugene J. McCann, “Collaborative Visioning or Urban Planning as Therapy? The Politics of Public-Private Policy Making,” *The Professional Geographer* 53, no. 2 (2001): 212.

⁶⁸ Mayor Bill de Blasio, “OneNYC 2016 Progress Report,” 9, 37, 103, 155.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ NYC HPD, “Resilient Community Edgemere Planning Initiative- FAQ” (NYC HPD, 2016), <http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdf/community/overview-faq-workshop-4.pdf>.

⁷² Mayor Bill de Blasio, “OneNYC 2016 Progress Report,” 160.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁷⁴ Jennifer R. Wolch, Jason Byrne, and Joshua P. Newell, “Urban Green Space, Public Health, and Environmental Justice: The Challenge of Making Cities ‘just Green Enough,’” *Landscape and Urban Planning* 125 (2014): 234–244.

⁷⁵ “Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative: Create Phase Feedback” (NYC HPD, April 2016), <http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdf/community/create-phase-feedback.pdf>.

⁷⁶ “Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative: Workshop 4: Compiled Comments from Sept. 24, 2016” (NYC HPD, September 2016), <http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdf/community/finalize-phase-summary.pdf>.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ Christopher Robbins, “Gentrified Aquarium: De Blasio’s Streetcar and the Tale of Two Waterfronts,” *Village Voice*, September 13, 2016, <http://www.villagevoice.com/news/gentrified-aquarium-de-blasios-streetcar-and-the-tale-of-two-waterfronts-9100323>.

⁷⁹ “Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative: Workshop 4: Compiled Comments from Sept. 24, 2016.”

⁸⁰ Isabelle Angelovski, “From Toxic Sites to Parks as (Green) LULUs? New Challenges of Inequity, Privilege, Gentrification, and Exclusion for Urban Environmental Justice,” *CPL Bibliography* 31, no. 1 (2016): 23–36.

- ⁸¹ Ibid.
- ⁸² “Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative: Create Phase Feedback.”
- ⁸³ Robbins, “Gentrified Aquarium.”
- ⁸⁴ Anguelovski, “From Toxic Sites to Parks as (Green) LULUs?”
- ⁸⁵ Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*; Charland, “Constitutive Rhetoric.”
- ⁸⁶ “Resilient Edgemere Community Planning Initiative: Create Phase Feedback.”
- ⁸⁷ Wolch, Byrne, and Newell, “Urban Green Space, Public Health, and Environmental Justice.”
- ⁸⁸ “Just Green Enough,” accessed October 6, 2016, <http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/gov-green-gentrification-series.html>.
- ⁸⁹ Vanolo, “The Image of the Creative City.”
- ⁹⁰ Sassen, “The Global City.”
- ⁹¹ Mayor Bill de Blasio, “OneNYC 2016 Progress Report,” 42.
- ⁹² “NYC DOT - Red Hook Streetcar Feasibility Study,” accessed February 24, 2017, <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/about/redhookstreetcar.shtml>.
- ⁹³ Greg Smith, “Developers along Planned Streetcar Route Donate to de Blasio - NY Daily News,” December 11, 2016, <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/developers-planned-streetcar-route-donate-de-blasio-article-1.2906024>.
- ⁹⁴ Mayor Bill de Blasio, “OneNYC 2016 Progress Report,” 42.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid., 45.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid., 17.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid., 45.
- ⁹⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁰ Michael M. Grynbaum, “Mayor de Blasio to Propose Streetcar Line Linking Brooklyn and Queens,” *The New York Times*, February 3, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/04/nyregion/mayor-de-blasio-to-propose-streetcar-line-linking-brooklyn-and-queens.html>.

¹⁰¹ Rachel Sugar, “Downtown Brooklyn Residents Say They ‘don’t Need’ de Blasio’s Brooklyn-Queens Streetcar,” *Curbed NY*, November 17, 2016, <http://ny.curbed.com/2016/11/17/13664854/brooklyn-queens-streetcar-downtown-brooklyn-residents>.

¹⁰² Samuel Stein, “The Streetcar Hustle,” *Jacobin*, February 19, 2016, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/02/de-blasio-streetcar-brooklyn-queens-gentrification-new-york-city-inequality/>.

¹⁰³ Harvey, “Neoliberalism Is a Political Project.”

¹⁰⁴ Anguelovski, “From Toxic Sites to Parks as (Green) LULUs?”

¹⁰⁵ Hall and Hubbard, *The Entrepreneurial City*.

¹⁰⁶ Vanolo, “The Image of the Creative City”; Florida, “The Rise of the Creative Class, and How It Is Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life.”

¹⁰⁷ John Stehlin, “The Post-Industrial ‘Shop Floor’: Emerging Forms of Gentrification in San Francisco’s Innovation Economy,” *Antipode* 48, no. 2 (March 1, 2016): 474–93, doi:10.1111/anti.12199; Enrico Moretti, *The New Geography of Jobs* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012), https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=br0S54w0u_sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP2&dq=%22new+york+city%22+%22gentrification%22+%22innovation+economy%22&ots=M uQw-804E2&sig=uIAjy5UNq2-0pPw_RYEIa4tpka8.

¹⁰⁸ Yen, “Suburbs Losing Young Whites To Cities, Brookings Institution Finds.”

¹⁰⁹ Zukin, *Naked City*.

¹¹⁰ “Gentrification and the Death of Black Communities,” *Common Dreams*, accessed February 24, 2017, <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/05/29/gentrification-and-death-black-communities>.

¹¹¹ Zukin, *Naked City*, 4.

¹¹² Bill de Blasio, “Transcript: Mayor de Blasio Presents 2017 State of the City,” *The Official Website of the City of New York*, February 13, 2017, <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/081-17/transcript-mayor-de-blasio-presents-2017-state-the-city>.

¹¹³ Marie Gørrild, Sharon Obialo, Nienke Venema, “Gentrification and Displacement in Harlem: How the Harlem Community Lost Its Voice En Route to Progress,” *Humanity In Action*, accessed February 24, 2017, <http://www.humanityinaction.org/knowledgebase/79-gentrification-and-displacement-in-harlem-how-the-harlem-community-lost-its-voice-en-route-to-progress>.

¹¹⁴ Ginia Bellafante, “Bill de Blasio Seeks a Runway to Vogue Voters,” *The New York Times*, February 17, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/17/nyregion/bill-de-blasio-state-of-the-city-address.html>.

¹¹⁵ NYC Mayor’s Office, *Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York*.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Summary and Findings

This thesis analyzed the discursive and material effects of resilience as organicist metaphor in Mayor Bill de Blasio's *One New York: The Plan for A Strong and Just City (OneNYC)*. In 2015, Mayor de Blasio announced his administration's vision for New York's future, The plan is organized around principles of equity, growth, resilience, and sustainability. I expected to find that in both form and function resilience acts as a master term whose definition determines and restricts the conceptual breadth of the other principles, despite their explicit separation from one another. To develop a full understanding of this concept, I undertook a historical analysis analyzing the term's origins, its cultural, societal and institutional development, and its manifestation in de Blasio's *OneNYC* announcement speech in the South Bronx on Earth Day 2015, the text of *OneNYC*, and the *2016 OneNYC Progress Report*. Critically unpacking the assumptions within resilience as a conceptual frame, I discovered discursive threads that produced several conclusions.

First, the rhetorical power of resilience relies on the assumption that it is scientific. The concept of resilience used in *OneNYC* is the product of a partnership between city government and the 100 Resilient Cities network (100RC), a Rockefeller Foundation funded institution. 100RC provides partners with a city resilience index with qualitative and quantitative metrics for analysis of city systems, and a common language

to describe the complexity of cities. Yet, the belief that resilience is an “objective” means of analyzing cities belies a discursive history from which the concept originates. In Chapters One and Three, I analyzed the development of resilience as organicist metaphor from its origins in ecological systems theory and Jane Jacobs’ thesis of “organized complexity” to its modern manifestation. I showed that this “objective” frame of resilience in actuality relies on a complex series of assumptions regarding the unproblematic equation of life science findings and methodology with the study of human social organization and economics. Far from a natural lens for city life, I showed that the concepts increasing relevance in modern urban planning and study speaks to the power of naturalism as a rhetorical frame. Naturalistic metaphors of resilience remain a powerful means of persuasion in public policy because their use and re-use successfully detaches perceptions of political intent from metrics used to study urban organization.

Second, resilience serves a constitutive function. 100RC’s holistic notion of resilience incorporates economic, environmental, and social resilience. Social resilience describes the adaptive capacity of a community to the effects of impending crisis, the strength of its internal cohesion, the preponderance of available social services, and the psychological organization of its people. The success of *OneNYC*’s policies aimed at social resilience rely on the targeted communities and individuals seeing themselves as resilient subjects. Analyzing the rhetorical form and effects of de Blasio’s “Tale of Two Cities” narrative in Chapters Two and Four, I showed its constitutive functions in terms of resilience. Taking the form of covenant and covenant renewal, de Blasio attempts to inculcate resilience within New Yorkers by calling them together as a collective, situating them within history as transhistorical subjects connected to place, and by projecting their

success in the future as dependent on their support of resilience projects and internalization of “resilient thinking.” This constitutive function plays out in the material manifestations of the process, especially in terms of participatory planning practice. By restricting the rhetorical domain for thinking civic action, resilience determines the course of action available to citizens and thus the decisions they can render.

Third, the rhetorical frame of resilience as rooted in “organized complexity” is subject to larger political projects, namely neoliberalism. My analysis of “organized complexity” as a conceptual frame in Chapter Three revealed that its development and acceptance in mainstream urban planning thought depends on a broader shift in political economy and ideology. The project’s goals are not apolitical; they rely on ontological and epistemological assumptions regarding the ideal urban form, the importance of scale, participatory democracy in municipal governments, the psychology of political subjects, and the political and economic trajectories of cities within a global system. In Chapters Three and Four, I analyzed the rhetorical justifications and material effects three distinct resilience projects within *OneNYC* and the *Progress Report*, showing how they buttress and naturalize neoliberalism in political decision-making. The neoliberal assumptions they rely on include competition as the driving force of human organization, growth-dependent urban planning, shifting of burden for social services from government to individual, increased privatization of public services and utilities, the dominance of transnational finance, and the psychological, economic, and political empowerment of the neoliberal self. Taken together, *OneNYC* charts a course for the future of New York City defined by a set of political, social, and economic assumptions that remain conceptually indecipherable from within the paradigm of “resilience thinking” that gives it coherence.

Fourth, resilience is inherently conservative in form and function. This does not mean that it is amenable to conservatives, rather that its rhetorical and material functions are intent on sustaining the status quo. In Chapter Three, I analyzed the shift in environmental paradigms from sustainability to resilience as a reflection of shifting assumptions regarding the domain of possible actions in political, economic, social, and environmental policymaking. Specifically, the adoption of a resilience paradigm within *OneNYC* relies on abandoning the assumption that humans are capable of resolving crisis. Instead, the resilience paradigm functions exclusively off metrics for analyzing how much damage a system can sustain before it collapses or shifts in organizational form. Resilience as a paradigm determines the means by which a system's engineer, be it government, scientist, capitalist, or citizen, can render their system resilient. However, it provides no metrics for analyzing power dynamics, leaving the question of *which* systems these actors should make resilient unanswerable. 100RC's metrics and their manifestation in *OneNYC* function to constrain the field of available actions, and hence sustain the contemporary organizations of political, social, environmental, and economic power. This conservative function accounts for and explains the contradictory impacts of resilience policies as analyzed in Chapters Three and Four.

Fifth, resilience analysis relies on a politics of scale. 100RC touts *OneNYC* and the *Progress Report* as the cutting edge of urban planning and municipal resilience policy due to the incorporation of holistic city-system thinking and the inclusion of regional impacts within the domain of study. I analyze the rhetorical functions of declaring analysis holistic of urban complexity as touted by de Blasio and 100RC in Chapter Three. I show that the scale of systems analysis determines what inputs are considered, and

hence restricts the questions that system engineers can consider in terms of systemic form and function. As any theory must be, resilience is a distillation of empirical realities and reductive means of apprehending the complexities of urban organization and structure. The rhetorical function, however, is to render the national and global implications of city resilience policy indecipherable. The city government's declaration that New York's economic, environmental, and social systems are internally resilient has the rhetorical function of eliding any question of the resilience of the broader economic and social systems or how the system's functions impact the broader system writ-large. Failure to account for these complexities can result in contradictory impacts for resilience policies, which I showed in Chapter Three by analyzing the deleterious implications that can arise from the hardening and expansion of New York's "tech ecosystem." This is not merely a scientific incapacity; it is a political one rendering New York's political, economic, environmental, and social functions subject to broader political projects of neoliberalism.

Implications

This thesis has important implications for public policymakers and system analysts, provides new insights into the expansive cross-disciplinary study of resilience, and gestures toward some novel applications of rhetorical theory in analyzing scientific paradigms and public policy. City resilience is an increasingly common paradigm within municipal policymaking across the planet. Accelerated by the 100RC network's partnerships with many of the world's largest cities and the increasingly central role that cities are playing in the global economy's form and function, resilience has risen to a dominant discourse status. This thesis does not advocate, or prove the case for why resilience is a fundamentally irredeemable paradigm for determining municipal policy.

Rather, the contours of what this thesis has analyzed in terms of the construction and outcomes of city resilience policy I offer as a corrective, an attempt to add to the conversation regarding what is valuable and necessary to consider when implementing such policies. At no point have I argued that policymakers intend to produce contradictory outcomes, and I do not doubt de Blasio, his administration, or 100RC's sincerity or commitment to the goals they set. This thesis' deconstructive approach to resilience is important for two reasons.

First, it offers important questions that policymakers and system analysts must answer to ensure their metrics and policies produce desired outcomes. Specifically, I have questioned the structural restrictions on analyzing power dynamics within the resilience paradigm, the at times contradictory ways that neoliberal subjectivity and growth-dependence impact social, economic and environmental resilience, and the trade-offs resilience policies produce at a level of scale. I am not the first to pose these questions, even in the context of OneNYC. However, as a stakeholder in the development of New York, I add my voice to the wave of critics who find it incumbent on municipal policymakers and system analysts to account for these increasing complexities when determining metrics for city resilience and to incorporate disparate impacts at a level of scale when determining desired outcomes.

Second, this thesis offers pragmatic recommendations for policymakers and system analysts in determining rhetorical strategy for communicating resilience policies. Policymakers and system analysts should have an acute understanding of the historical and institutional development of the concepts they wield, and must apprehend the ontological and epistemological assumptions that come with them to increase their

rhetorical dexterity and the effectiveness of their persuasive appeals. As a paradigm intimately reliant upon citizen's inculcation of belief in themselves as resilient subjects, failure to understand how to persuasively explain the paradigm, situate citizens within history effectively, or call them to civic action each provide a blockade to the effectiveness of messages and achievement of goals. Simultaneously, as shown in analysis of de Blasio's new rhetorical strategy in Chapter Four, policymakers and system analysts must understand how their rhetorical strategies can themselves contribute to impacts contradictory to their intent. Rhetorical analysis of conceptual history and the effectiveness of messages in relaying that concept to the public, then, are of increasing importance for stakeholders in the city planning and development process.

This thesis is important to the study of resilience because it is the first to discuss the historical development of Jane Jacobs' "organized complexity" into its modern usage within 100 Resilient Cities and *OneNYC*. While there is much work on resilience as a political project, this thesis' application of institutional and historical analysis is unique in the conceptual lineage studied. It provides an important literature review and historical trajectory from which to determine the form and function of 100 Resilient Cities' usage of resilience, and to understand how it will develop within and because of its usage within *OneNYC*. Despite the swath of research on city resilience, this dearth is increasingly unthinkable considering the explicit invocation of Jacobs' conceptual frame by the Rockefeller Foundation and 100 Resilient Cities. Considering the centrality of 100 Resilient Cities within the modern movement for adoption of resilience strategies and policy plans across the world, it is incumbent upon critics interested in the origins and manifestations of city resilience to apprehend and interrogate these histories.

This thesis is important for rhetorical critics in a few ways. First, it extends the demand by Cox¹ and Ivie² for rhetorical critics to understand themselves as active stakeholders in the policy process, and provides a model for how rhetorical critics should situate themselves within the process of literalizing and de-literalizing conceptual metaphors within discourse on policy. Second, it offers an example of how to integrate ideological and close-reading methodologies. In the context of Chapter Two and Four where I analyze the form and functions of resilience and the narrative frame of “One New York” as “civil religious construct,”³ de Blasio does not invoke God. Yet, the constitutive functions of the narrative take on a form that is culturally and socially ingrained, yet is increasingly found within a secular world. It is important for rhetorical critics to continue investment in the process of close reading in texts, attending to internal form and structure. However, rhetorical critics must also employ ideological criticism as it provides an important means to understand the ingrained nature and absent presence of Biblical narrative and form, even and especially within increasingly secular narratives.

Third, by analyzing “organic complexity” and the “protreptic ‘we’”⁴ of de Blasio’s discourse as associative structures,⁵ I have extended what is a decidedly underutilized, but incredibly fruitful paradigm for analysis of strategic naming and definitional argument. When studying the manifestations of resilience’s institutional and historical manifestations, study of associative structure enables the rhetorical critic to analyze the life-world, the differential influences and contexts that contribute to the domain and complexity of the conceptual frame. Understanding the implicit worldview that a concept brings through its very utterance provides important contours to strategic naming as argument. In terms of definitional argument, being able to identify the

replicative nature and differences in manifestation of “organized complexity,” even when not explicitly referenced, is critical to a well-rounded and deep understanding of the concepts manifestations and implications in resilience metrics and outcomes. The definition of a concept may not be evident in the text itself. However, it becomes readily apparent to the critic who is attentive to the ways that a concept and text’s figuration within a historical and institutional lineage delimits the associative structure of meaning from which it emerges.

Limitations and Future Research

The limitations of this analysis are primarily in the methodologies own limited scale. Due to the linearity of my own analysis of resilience within *OneNYC* and the *Progress Report*, my study has necessarily cherry-picked a few of over 200 distinct policy proposals. Despite my analysis of potential negative effects, it is entirely possible that the introduction of many distinct policies incentivizing economic uplift, environmental sustainability, and social resilience significantly reduce or even negate the implications I have isolated here. In a similar manner, the impacts I derive from these scenarios are in some ways hyperbolic, constantly moving to the worst-case scenario. In reality, the results will always be somewhere between the intended goals and the worst-case scenarios I have depicted. However, despite these limits, I think this approach is valuable for it introduces a variety of scenarios that question the conceptual limits and introduces questions of complexity within a paradigm that presumes the importance of anticipating as many factors as possible. By introducing these worst-case scenarios into the study of resilience policies, it can produce more reflexive, interpretive, and inevitably beneficial metrics and outcomes.

Future research is necessary to understand the breadth and severity of trade-offs in resilience produced by a politics of scale. With the aid of 100 Resilient Cities, urban centers are increasingly becoming aware of their growing importance to the global economy, and the rise of an inter-city system of exchange of resources including financial capital, human capital, technology, and knowledge. These circuits have become sites for intense scrutiny in a variety of scholarly circles, including most prominently the Urban Political Ecologists (UPE) who propose that the best way to apprehend the city's form and function is in terms of its metabolic processes.⁶ By tracing the ways that increasingly de-centralized urban environments control the flow and distribution of waste, energy, and many other inputs, UPEs are providing new and compelling metrics for understanding the politics of scale.⁷ What remains severely under analyzed is the offsets and trade-offs that occur with city resilience, and how the internal resilience of potentially economically and environmentally detrimental processes scale-up and beyond the city into the regional, national, and international system. This seems like a fruitful place of analysis, as it will contribute significantly to the means by which system analysts conceive the complexity of the urban environment and provide government officials new and compelling ways to construct persuasive messages while sustainably increasing the international role and standing of their city.

Final Thoughts

Without reiterating the tried and true rhetorical maneuver of declaring how many people will live in cities in the near future, I hope it is apparent that the increasingly global impact and preponderance of city forms demands increasing attention to how to make them not just livable, but ethical, and the least-environmentally intrusive as

possible. There is no turning back the clock on humanity's impact on the environment, nor a way to undo the ongoing shift toward urbanity. Resilience is far from perfect, but with a complex analytic frame, and with questions of power dynamics and equitable outcomes at the forefront, plans like *OneNYC* offer not only the promise of a strong, but a just city as well. City resilience as conceived by municipal governments remains intimately connected to conservative, neoliberal forms of apprehending urban form. Yet alternatives like metabolic system analysis provide not only a more ethical and potentially effective frame for buttressing communities from climate change, economic crisis, and social decay. They also provide an alternative rhetorical tool, another organicist metaphor for municipal governments and city stakeholders to design persuasive messages that will meet with positive outcomes on the frontier of the global city.

Notes

- ¹ Cox, “Nature’s ‘Crisis Disciplines.’”
- ² Medhurst et al., *Cold War Rhetoric*.
- ³ Dorsey, “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion.”
- ⁴ Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment*.
- ⁵ Karlyn Campbell, Suszn Huxman, and Thomas A. Burkholder, *The Rhetorical Act: Thinking, Speaking and Writing Critically* (Nelson Education, 2014), 119–20.
- ⁶ Swyngedouw and Heynen, “Urban Political Ecology, Justice and the Politics of Scale.”
- ⁷ Heynen, Kaika, and Swyngedouw, *In the Nature of Cities*; Swyngedouw, “Globalisation or ‘glocalisation’?”; Monstadt, “Conceptualizing the Political Ecology of Urban Infrastructures”; Arboleda, “In the Nature of the Non-City.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 100 Resilient Cities. “About Us,” No Date. http://www.100resilientcities.org/about-us#/_/.
- . “City Resilience.” *100 Resilient Cities*. Accessed February 17, 2017. <http://www.100resilientcities.org/resilience>.
- “100 Resilient Cities | Arup | A Global Firm of Consulting Engineers, Designers, Planners and Project Managers.” Accessed February 17, 2017. http://www.arup.com/projects/100_resilient_cities.
- Saskia Sassen, *The Global City*, Accessed February 13, 2017. <http://www.saskiasassen.com/pdfs/publications/the-global-city-brown.pdf>.
- Adger, W. Neil. “Social and Ecological Resilience: Are They Related?” *Progress in Human Geography* 24, no. 3 (September 1, 2000): 347–64. doi:10.1191/030913200701540465.
- Anguelovski, Isabelle, and Joan Martínez Alier. “The ‘Environmentalism of the Poor’ revisited: Territory and Place in Disconnected Glocal Struggles.” *Ecological Economics* 102 (2014): 167–176.
- Arup, and 100 Resilient Cities. “City Resilience Framework.” The Rockefeller Foundation, November 2015. http://www.100resilientcities.org/page/-/100rc/Blue%20City%20Resilience%20Framework%20Full%20Context%20v1_5.pdf.
- Audirac, Ivonne, Anne H. Shermeyen, and Marc T. Smith. “Ideal Urban Form and Visions of the Good Life Florida’s Growth Management Dilemma.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 56, no. 4 (1990): 470–482.
- Avirgan, Jody. “Why The Bronx Really Burned | FiveThirtyEight.” *FiveThirtyEight*, October 29, 2015. <http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/why-the-bronx-really-burned/>.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *The Transparency of Evil: Essays on Extreme Phenomena*. Verso, 1993.
- Beatley, Timothy. *Green Urbanism: Learning from European Cities*. Island Press, 2012. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=dIMuQxpjCgsC&oi=fnd&pg=PR2&dq=Green+urbanism:+learning+from+European+cities.+&ots=rOTU4jMLMt&sig=YjfO_ssnQThoKDke50AKjniEY4.

- Berke, Philip R., Joe MacDonald, Nancy White, Michael Holmes, Dan Line, Kat Oury, and Rhonda Ryznar. "Greening Development to Protect Watersheds: Does New Urbanism Make a Difference?" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69, no. 4 (2003): 397–413.
- Berke, Philip R., Yan Song, and Mark Stevens. "Integrating Hazard Mitigation into New Urban and Conventional Developments." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 2009.
<http://jpe.sagepub.com/content/early/2009/04/24/0739456X09331550.short>.
- Blasio, Bill de. "Transcript: Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City." *The Official Website of the City of New York*, April 22, 2015.
<http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/259-15/transcript-mayor-de-blasio-releases-one-new-york-plan-strong-just-city>.
- Bodell, Bill. "The Death and Life of Future Networked Cities: Jane Jacobs and the Internet of Things." Blog. *Libertecture*, December 19, 2014.
<https://libertecture.wordpress.com/2014/12/19/the-death-and-life-of-future-networked-cities-jane-jacobs-and-the-internet-of-things/>.
- Borosage, Robert. "New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio: A Powerful Populist Voice." *Campaign For America's Future*, October 16, 2014.
<https://ourfuture.org/20141016/new-york-city-mayor-bill-de-blasio-a-powerful-populist-voice>.
- Brand, Fridolin, and Kurt Jax. "Focusing the Meaning(s) of Resilience: Resilience as a Descriptive Concept and a Boundary Object." *Ecology and Society* 12, no. 1 (June 5, 2007). doi:10.5751/ES-02029-120123.
- "Brentin Mock." *CityLab*. Accessed September 2, 2016.
<http://www.citylab.com/authors/brentin-mock/>.
- Bricker, Brett Jacob. "Feigning Environmentalism: Antienvironmental Organizations, Strategic Naming, and Definitional Argument." *Western Journal of Communication* 78, no. 5 (2014): 636–52. doi:10.1080/10570314.2013.835065.
- Broda-Bahm, Kenneth T. "Finding Protection in Definitions: The Quest for Environmental Security." *Argumentation and Advocacy; River Falls* 35, no. 4 (Spring 1999): 159–70.
- Brown, Nina. "Park, Robert, and Ernest Burgess: Urban Ecology Studies, 1925." *Center for Spatially Integrated Social Science*, November 14, 2002.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20021114154941/http://www.csiss.org/classics/content/26>.

- Bsumek, Peter K., Jen Schneider, Steve Schwarze, and Jennifer Peebles. "Corporate Ventriloquism: Corporate Advocacy, the Coal Industry, and the Appropriation of Voice." In *Voice and Environmental Communication*, 21–43. Springer, 2014. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137433749_2.
- Bures, Regina, and William Kanapaux. "Historical Regimes and Social Indicators of Resilience in an Urban System: The Case of Charleston, South Carolina." *Ecology and Society* 16, no. 4 (November 17, 2011). doi:10.5751/ES-04293-160416.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. University of California Press, 1969.
- . *Attitudes Toward History*. University of California Press, 1984.
- . *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. University of California Press, 1966.
- The World Conservation Union IUCN, "Business and Biodiversity Programme Annual Report 2005." Switzerland, March 5, 2008. <https://www.iucn.org/es/node/1132>.
- Business, Sustainable. "New York City's plan to fuse sustainability, social equity and resilience." Text. *GreenBiz*, April 29, 2015. <https://www.greenbiz.com/article/new-york-citys-plan-fuse-sustainability-social-equity-and-resilience>.
- "Canons of Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism: A Companion to the Charter of the New Urbanism." Congress of the New Urbanism, 2008. https://www.cnu.org/sites/default/files/Canons_0.pdf.
- Caro, Robert A. *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York*. Random House, 2015.
- Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Quebecois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, no. 2 (1987): 133–150.
- Che, Jenny. "Here's How Outrageous The Pay Gap Between CEOs And Workers Is." *Huffington Post*, August 27, 2015, sec. Business. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/ceo-worker-pay-gap_us_55ddc3c7e4b0a40aa3acd1c9.
- City-Data. "Poverty Rates in Bronx." *City-Data.com*. Accessed February 11, 2017. <http://www.city-data.com/poverty/poverty-Bronx-New-York.html>.
- CNU. "HUD HOPE VI." Text. *CNU*, July 14, 2015. <https://www.cnu.org/our-projects/hud-hope-vi>.
- . "The Charter of the New Urbanism." Text. *CNU*, 1996. <https://www.cnu.org/who-we-are/charter-new-urbanism>.

- . “What is New Urbanism?” Text. *CNU*, May 18, 2015.
<https://www.cnu.org/resources/what-new-urbanism>.
- Collins, James P., Ann Kinzig, Nancy B. Grimm, William F. Fagan, Diane Hope, Jianguo Wu, and Elizabeth T. Borer. “A New Urban Ecology Modeling Human Communities as Integral Parts of Ecosystems Poses Special Problems for the Development and Testing of Ecological Theory.” *American Scientist* 88, no. 5 (2000): 416–425.
- Condit, Celeste Michelle, and Stephen Depoe. “Environmental Communication: Environmental Studies in Mass Communication.” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 14, no. 4 (1997): 367–372.
- Congress of the New Urbanism. “HUD HOPE VI.” Text. *CNU*, July 14, 2015.
<https://www.cnu.org/our-projects/hud-hope-vi>.
- County Health Rankings & Roadmaps. “Bronx County.” *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps*, 2016. <http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/app>.
- Cox, Robert. *Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere*. SAGE, 2010.
- . “Nature’s ‘crisis Disciplines’: Does Environmental Communication Have an Ethical Duty?” *Environmental Communication* 1, no. 1 (2007): 5–20.
- Davidson, Mark. “Parallax Perspectives on the Urban Problem.” *Journal of Urban History*, 2009.
<http://juh.sagepub.com/content/early/2009/11/18/0096144209351656.full.pdf>.
- “De Blasio’s Long-Term Transportation Plans Face Criticism on Staten Island | SILive.com.” Accessed September 2, 2016.
http://www.silive.com/news/index.ssf/2015/04/onenyc_transit_staten_island.html.
- Dean, Linda P. Fried, DeLamar Professor of Public Health, and Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health. “Public Health and the New York Primary.” *The Huffington Post*, 01:22 400AD. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-p-fried/public-health-and-the-new_b_9662320.html.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. “A Wilderness Environmentalism Manifesto: Contesting the Infinite Self-Absorption of Humans.” *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement*, 2007, 27.
- . “Salvaging Wilderness from the Tomb of History: A Response to The National Parks: America’s Best Idea.” *Environmental Communication* 4, no. 4 (2010): 484–493.

———. “Trains in the Wilderness: The Corporate Roots of Environmentalism.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4, no. 4 (2001): 633–652.

Director, Steven Cohen Executive, and Columbia University’s Earth Institute. “From PlaNYC to OneNYC: New York’s Evolving Sustainability Policy.” *The Huffington Post*, 48:22 400AD. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-cohen/from-planyc-to-onenyc-new_b_7151144.html.

Dorsey, Leroy G. “Preaching Conservation: Theodore Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of Civil Religion.” In *Green Talk in the White House : The Rhetorical Presidency Encounters Ecology*, edited by Tarla Rai Peterson, 37–61. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
http://baylor.summon.serialssolutions.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/#!/search/document?ho=t&l=en&q=preaching%20conservation&id=FETCHMERGED-scopus_primary_2553182932.

Downs, Anthony. *Neighborhoods and Urban Development*. Brookings Institution Press, 1981.

Dreier, Peter. “Jane Jacobs’ Radical Legacy.” *NHI- Shelterforce Online*, Summer 2006. <http://nhi.org/online/issues/146/janejacobslegacy.html>.

Duany, Andres. Neo-Traditionalist Architect Andres Duany Explains How to Build Better Communities, November 2002. http://syracusesthenandnow.org/SettlementPlan/Duany_Interview.htm.

Duany, Andrés, and Michael Mehaffy. A Conversation with Andrés Duany, December 2002. <http://www.katarxis3.com/Duany.htm>.

Duffield, Mark. *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*. Polity, 2007.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=P__CWicYcN0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR4&dq=Development,+Security+and+Unending+War:+Governing+the+World+of+Peoples&ots=NACs0gVh1M&sig=XxiiZoaR9b-Kg81vo8MftTQuqJo.

Dwiartama, Angga. “Resilience Thinking, Fluidity and the Agency of a Quasi-Actant.” *Dialogues in Human Geography* 6, no. 1 (2016): 28–31.

Eakin, Emily. “Architecture’s Irascible Reformer.” *The New York Times*, July 12, 2003. <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/07/12/books/architecture-s-irascible-reformer.html>.

Edsall, Thomas B. “Bill de Blasio and the New Urban Populism - The New York Times.” *The New York Times*, October 22, 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/23/opinion/edsall-bill-de-blasio-and-the-new-urban-populism.html>.

- “Environmental Justice Alliance Says de Blasio’s OneNYC Plan Falls Short in Combating Climate Change | New York’s PIX11 / WPIX-TV.” Accessed September 2, 2016. <http://pix11.com/2016/04/04/environmental-justice-alliance-says-de-blasios-onenyc-plan-falls-short-in-combating-climate-change/>.
- “Environmentalists Spar Over Corporate Ties | Worldwatch Institute.” Accessed February 16, 2017. <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5934>.
- Ervine, Kate. “The Greying of Green Governance: Power Politics and the Global Environment Facility.” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 18, no. 4 (2007): 125–142.
- Eyman, Douglas. “Digital Rhetoric: Theory, Method, Practice.” *Digital Humanities*, 2015. doi:10.3998/dh.13030181.0001.001.
- Faber, Daniel, and Shelley McDonough Kimelberg. “Sustainable Urban Development and Environmental Gentrification: The Paradox Confronting the U.S. Environmental Justice Movement.” In *Uprooting Urban America: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Race, Class and Gentrification*, edited by Amor Kohli, Horace R. Hall, and Cynthia Cole Robinson, 77–92. New York: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Fairbanks, James David. “The Priestly Functions of the Presidency: A Discussion of the Literature on Civil Religion and Its Implications for the Study of Presidential Leadership.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1981): 214–232.
- Farbstein, Jay, Emily Axelrod, Robert Shibley, and Richard Wener. “2009 Rudy Bruner Award: Silver Medal Winner- Hunts Point Riverside Park.” Bruner Foundation, 2009. <http://www.rudybruneraward.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/05-Hunts-Point-Riverside-Park-1.pdf>.
- Farquhar, Brodie. “Wolf Reintroduction Changes Ecosystem.” *Yellowstone Park*, June 21, 2011. <http://www.yellowstonepark.com/wolf-reintroduction-changes-ecosystem/>.
- Fessenden, Ford, Haeyoun Park, Tim Wallace, and Derek Watkins. “How de Blasio Turned Conventional Wisdom on Its Head.” *The New York Times*, September 11, 2013, sec. NY Region. <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/09/11/nyregion/mayoral-primary-vote-analysis.html>.
- Flood, Joe. “Why the Bronx Burned | New York Post.” *New York Post*, May 16, 2010. <http://nypost.com/2010/05/16/why-the-bronx-burned/>.
- Folke, Carl, Steve Carpenter, Thomas Elmqvist, Lance Gunderson, Crawford S. Holling, and Brian Walker. “Resilience and Sustainable Development: Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformations.” *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment* 31, no. 5 (2002): 437–440.

- Fox, Julia D. "Leasing the Ivory Tower at a Social Justice University Freeport McMoRan, Loyola University New Orleans, and Corporate Greenwashing." *Organization & Environment* 10, no. 3 (1997): 259–277.
- Fraade, Jordan. "Exile on H Street." *The Baffler*, October 8, 2014. <http://thebaffler.com/blog/exile-h-street>.
- Fraprie, Frank Roy. *American Photography*. American Photographic Publishing Company, 1913.
- Frerks, Georg, Jeroen Warner, and Bart Weijs. "The Politics of Vulnerability and Resilience." *Ambiente & Sociedade* 14, no. 2 (2011): 105–122.
- Geddes, Patrick. *Cities in Evolution : An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics*. London, UK: Williams & Norgate, 1915. <https://archive.org/stream/citiesinevolutio00gedduoft#page/12/mode/2up>.
- Giannetti, Charlene. "Majora Carter-Greening the Bronx." *Woman Around Town*, February 22, 2009. <http://www.womanaroundtown.com/sections/woman-around-town/woman-around-town-majora-carter-greening-the-bronx>.
- Gill, John Freeman. "A Slow Renaissance for a Struggling Neighborhood - Living In/Hunts Point-Longwood, the Bronx." *The New York Times*, November 12, 2010. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/14/realestate/14Living.html>.
- Gloede, Katherine. "Resilience Beyond Disaster Recovery." *Sustainability Institute*, July 18, 2016. <http://sustainableunh.unh.edu/blog/2016/07/resilience-beyond-disaster-recovery>.
- Goodman, J. David. "De Blasio Shifts Away From His Re-Election Message of 'One City.'" *The New York Times*, June 6, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/07/nyregion/de-blasio-shifts-away-from-his-re-election-message-of-one-city.html>.
- Gottdiener, Mark, Ray Hutchison, and Michael Ryan. *The New Urban Sociology*. Westview Press, 2014.
- "Governor Cuomo Announces Designation of 12 New Brownfield Opportunity Areas." *LongIsland.com*. Accessed September 2, 2016. <http://www.longisland.com/news/08-22-16/cuomo-new-brownfield-opportunity-areas.html>.
- Graham, Leigh Taylor. "Planning Tremé: The Community Development Field in a Post-Katrina World." Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010. <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/62072>.

- Grassi, Ernesto, and John Michael Krois. *Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition*. SIU Press, 2000.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=1P7yDPPaFS8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=ernesto+grassi+rhetoric+ingenium&ots=zF18x-6lT-&sig=81mNIAFQ2H8SxW_NgtKxGmBj460.
- Grynbaum, Michael M., and Sharon Otterman. “Mayor de Blasio Emerges as an Unexpected Champion of Religion.” *The New York Times*, March 18, 2015.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/19/nyregion/mayor-de-blasio-emerges-as-an-unexpected-champion-of-religion.html>.
- Gutenschwager, Gerald. “Architecture in a Changing World: The New Rhetoric of Form.” *Journal of Architectural Education* (1984-) 49, no. 4 (1996): 246–58.
 doi:10.2307/1425297.
- Hagan, Susannah. “Ecological Urbanism.” *Architectural Review*, March 16, 2015.
<https://www.architectural-review.com/archive/viewpoints/ecological-urbanism/8679977.article>.
- Haiven, Max. *Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power: Capitalism, Creativity and the Commons*. Zed Books, 2014.
- Hampton, Keith N. “Internet Use and the Concentration of Disadvantage: Glocalization and the Urban Underclass.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 53, no. 8 (2010): 1111–1132.
- Hardcastle, Jessica Lyons. “Major NYC Businesses Cut Waste 50% — But Can They Achieve Zero Waste by 2030? · Environmental Leader · Environmental Management News.” Accessed September 2, 2016.
<http://www.environmentalleader.com/2016/07/13/major-nyc-businesses-cut-waste-50-but-can-they-achieve-zero-waste-by-2030/>.
- Hariman, Robert, and Ralph Cintron. *Culture, Catastrophe, and Rhetoric: The Texture of Political Action*. Berghahn Books, 2015.
- Harvard Law Review. “Organic and Mechanical Metaphors in Late Eighteenth-Century American Political Thought.” *Harvard Law Review* 110, no. 8 (1997): 1832–49.
 doi:10.2307/1342046.
- Harvey, David. “Neoliberalism Is a Political Project.” *Jacobin*, July 23, 2016.
<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/07/david-harvey-neoliberalism-capitalism-labor-crisis-resistance/>.

- Hayden, Tom. "Bill de Blasio: Harbinger of a New Populist Left in America." *The Guardian*, November 6, 2013, sec. Opinion.
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/nov/06/bill-de-blasio-new-populist-left>.
- Helie, Mathieu. "Leon Krier's Lesson in Architecture | Emergent Urbanism." Blog. *Emergent Urbanism*, December 29, 2009.
<http://emergenturbanism.com/2009/12/29/leon-kriers-lesson-in-architecture/>.
- Hirsch, Joe. "Mayor Unveils New Plan at The Point." *The Hunts Point Express*, April 22, 2015. <http://brie.hunter.cuny.edu/hpe/2015/04/22/mayor-unveils-sustainability-plan-at-the-point/>.
- "History of the Bronx - Yes The Bronx." Accessed February 11, 2017.
<http://www.yesthebronx.org/about/history-of-the-bronx/>.
- Hoyt, Homer. *The Structure and Growth of Residential Areas in American Cities*. Washington D.C.: Federal Housing Administration, 1939.
<https://archive.org/stream/structuregrowtho00unitrich#page/n3/mode/2up>.
- Hu, Winnie. "The Bronx Struggles to Escape Its Image as the 'Burning' Borough." *The New York Times*, June 2, 2013, sec. N.Y. / Region.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/03/nyregion/the-bronx-struggles-to-shed-burning-borough-image.html>.
- Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Vintage Books, 1961.
- Jacques, Peter J., Riley E. Dunlap, and Mark Freeman. "The Organisation of Denial: Conservative Think Tanks and Environmental Scepticism." *Environmental Politics* 17, no. 3 (June 1, 2008): 349–85. doi:10.1080/09644010802055576.
- Jorgensen, Jillian. "Two Top de Blasio Environmental Officials Departing City Hall." *Observer*, June 30, 2016. <http://observer.com/2016/06/two-top-de-blasio-environmental-officials-departing-city-hall/>.
- Kaplan, Dave H., and Steven Holloway. *Urban Geography*. Wiley Global Education, 2014.
- Kirsch, Stuart. *Mining Capitalism: The Relationship between Corporations and Their Critics*. Univ of California Press, 2014.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=uMubAwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=P1&ots=Psgc_Uifj_&sig=4mVfc_Gh61AwSJVd9vsnwq22ug.

- Krause-Jackson, Flavia, and Henry Goldman. “Bronx Burns No More as NYC’s Poorest Borough Comes Back: Cities.” *Bloomberg*, March 6, 2015. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-03-06/bronx-burns-no-more-as-nyc-s-poorest-borough-comes-back-cities>.
- Krier, Léon. “Memory and Project.” *Katarxis* 3 (2004). http://www.katarxis3.com/Krier-Memory_Project.htm.
- Laestadius, Linnea I., Roni A. Neff, Colleen L. Barry, and Shannon Frattaroli. “‘We Don’t Tell People What to Do’: An Examination of the Factors Influencing NGO Decisions to Campaign for Reduced Meat Consumption in Light of Climate Change.” *Global Environmental Change* 29 (November 2014): 32–40. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.08.001.
- Latour, Bruno. “Love Your Monsters -- Why We Must Care for Our Technologies As We Do Our Children.” *The Breakthrough*, Winter 2012. <http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/journal/past-issues/issue-2/love-your-monsters#foot7>.
- Laufer, William S. “Social Accountability and Corporate Greenwashing.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 43, no. 3 (2003): 253–61.
- Laurence, Peter L. “Contradictions and Complexities: Jane Jacobs’s and Robert Venturi’s Complexity Theories.” *Journal of Architectural Education (1984-)* 59, no. 3 (2006): 49–60.
- Lipton, Eric, and Clifford Krauss. “Fossil Fuel Industry Ads Dominate TV Campaign.” *The New York Times* 13 (2012). http://www.climateaccess.org/sites/default/files/Lipton%20%26%20Krauss_Fossil%20Fuel%20Industry%20Ads%20Dominate%20TV%20Campaign.pdf.
- Lopate, Phillip. “Rethinking Robert Moses.” *Metropolis*, September 2002. <http://www.metropolismag.com/December-1969/Rethinking-Robert-Moses/>.
- Ludwig, David. “New York’s Unfinished Tale of Two Cities.” *The Atlantic*, January 1, 2015. <https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2015/01/bill-de-blasio-one-year-later/383658/>.
- MacDonald, Kenneth Iain. “The Devil Is in the (Bio) Diversity: Private Sector ‘engagement’ and the Restructuring of Biodiversity Conservation.” *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (2010): 513–550.
- Madlener, Reinhard, and Yasin Sunak. “Impacts of Urbanization on Urban Structures and Energy Demand: What Can We Learn for Urban Energy Planning and Urbanization Management?” *Sustainable Cities and Society* 1, no. 1 (2011): 45–53.

- Madrigal, Alexis C. "Gallery: Why Nixon Created the EPA - The Atlantic." *The Atlantic*, December 2, 2010. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2010/12/gallery-why-nixon-created-the-epa/67351/>.
- Mahler, Jonathan. "'Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bronx Is Burning.'" *The New York Times*, April 24, 2005. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/24/books/chapters/ladies-and-gentlemen-the-bronx-is-burning.html>.
- Maier, Carmen Daniela. "Communicating Business Greening and Greenwashing in Global Media: A Multimodal Discourse Analysis of CNN's Greenwashing Video." *International Communication Gazette* 73, no. 1–2 (2011): 165–177.
- Martire, Agustina. "STREETSPACE: The Quote of the Week. Bernard Rudofsky." *STREETSPACE*, January 5, 2015. <http://streetspacearchitecture.blogspot.com/2015/01/the-quote-of-week-bernard-rudofsky.html>.
- Marwell, Nicole P. *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City*. University of Chicago Press, 2009. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YKN-SIAEB0gC&oi=fnd&pg=PP8&dq=Bargaining+for+Brooklyn:+Community+Organizations+in+the+Entrepreneurial+City.&ots=cwxEa0ceJP&sig=wIjKw3mvNeXLxeYP98GXXa9dKbs>.
- . "Privatizing the Welfare State: Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations as Political Actors." *American Sociological Review* 69, no. 2 (2004): 265–291.
- Mayer, Brian. "A Framework for Improving Resilience: Adaptation in Urban Contexts." In *Resilience, Environmental Justice and the City*, edited by Beth Schaefer Caniglia, Manuel Vallee, and Beatrice Frank. Routledge, 2016. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=P2muDQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT14&dq=Resilience,+Environmental+Justice+and+the+City&ots=8E7Zt9XLP2&sig=m5QEDvpDQFR_S2eImT5_wll6_Vo.
- McDonough, Sean. "A Tale of Two Cities (Revelation 17-22) - Bible Commentary." *Theology of Work Project*, 2016. <https://www.theologyofwork.org/new-testament/revelation/a-tale-of-two-cities-revelation-17-22/>.
- McLennan, Blythe, Martin Mulligan, and Tarnya Kruger. "Has the 100 Resilient Cities Challenge Benefited Melbourne?" *The Conversation*, June 1, 2016. <http://theconversation.com/has-the-100-resilient-cities-challenge-benefited-melbourne-60307>.
- Medhurst, Martin J., Robert L. Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert L. Scott. *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*. MSU Press, 1997.

- Meyer, Marnee. "Wheeze- Environmental Racism in New York." Zine. *Make Zine*, Fall 1999. <http://www.makezine.enoughenough.org/wheeze.html>.
- Miall, David S. *Metaphor, Problems and Perspectives*. Harvester Press, 1982.
- Miller, Barbara M., and Julie Lellis. "Audience Response to Values-Based Marketplace Advocacy by the Fossil Fuel Industries." *Environmental Communication* 10, no. 2 (2016): 249–268.
- Miller, Donald L. *Lewis Mumford, a Life*. Grove Press, 2002.
- Mock, Brentin. "Does the OneNYC Sustainability Plan Really Address Equity?" *CityLab*, April 13, 2016. <http://www.citylab.com/politics/2016/04/does-the-onenyc-sustainability-plan-really-address-equity/477852/>.
- . "How Environmental Injustice Connects to Police Violence." *CityLab*. Accessed September 2, 2016. <http://www.citylab.com/politics/2016/07/how-environmental-injustice-connects-to-police-violence/492053/>.
- Monin, Nanette, and Janet Sayers. "Art Rules? Brokering the Aesthetics of City Places and Spaces 1." *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 9, no. 02 (2006): 119–127.
- Mostafavi, Mohsen. "Why Ecological Urbanism? Why Now?" *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring/Summer 2010. <http://www.harvarddesignmagazine.org/issues/32/why-ecological-urbanism-why-now>.
- Mueller, Gavin. "Liberalism and Gentrification." *Jacobin*, September 26, 2014. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/09/liberalism-and-gentrification/>.
- Mumford, Lewis. "Mother Jacobs' Home Remedies." *The New Yorker*, December 1, 1962.
- . *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1961.
- Murtagh, Ellie. "CITY RESILIENCE STRATEGIES – UNDERSTANDING FOR DESIGN & IMPLEMENTATION." presented at the DACAS Sao Paolo, Sao Paolo, June 23, 2016. http://dacas.complexurban.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/DACAS_02_Lecture-06_Murtagh.pdf.
- "New York Mayor Bill de Blasio's OneNYC Sustainability Plan Needs to Address Equity, Say Environmental Justice Leaders - CityLab." Accessed September 2, 2016. <http://www.citylab.com/politics/2016/04/does-the-onenyc-sustainability-plan-really-address-equity/477852/>.

- “New York Mayor Champions Economic Justice in Sustainability Plan.” Accessed September 2, 2016. <http://insideclimatenews.org/news/24042015/new-york-mayor-champions-economic-justice-sustainability-plan>.
- Newman, Kathe, and Robert W. Lake. “Democracy, Bureaucracy and Difference in US Community Development Politics since 1968.” *Progress in Human Geography* 30, no. 1 (2006): 44–61.
- NYC Mayor’s Office. *Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City*, 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SL1D42BWQaM>.
- “N.Y.’s Zero Waste Challenge Helped Divert More Than 36,000 Tons of Waste from Landfill.” *Waste360*, July 13, 2016. <http://www.waste360.com/landfill/ny-s-zero-waste-challenge-helped-divert-more-36000-tons-waste-landfill>.
- Office of the Mayor. “Mayor de Blasio Releases One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City.” *The Official Website of the City of New York*, April 22, 2015. <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/257-15/mayor-de-blasio-releases-one-new-york-plan-strong-just-city>.
- “Officials and Community Members React to Mayor de Blasio’s OneNYC Initiative.” *The Official Website of the City of New York*, April 22, 2016. <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/388-16/officials-community-members-react-mayor-de-blasio-s-onenyc-initiative>.
- “One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City.” New York, NY: Office of the Mayor- NY Government, April 20, 2015. <http://www.nyc.gov/html/onenyc/downloads/pdf/publications/OneNYC.pdf>.
- Parguel, Béatrice, Florence Benoît-Moreau, and Fabrice Larceneux. “How Sustainability Ratings Might Deter ‘greenwashing’: A Closer Look at Ethical Corporate Communication.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 102, no. 1 (2011): 15–28.
- Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick Duncan McKenzie. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- Peeples, Jennifer A. “Aggressive Mimicry: The Rhetoric of Wise Use and the Environmental Movement.” In *The Environmental Communication Yearbook, Volume 2*, edited by Susan L. Senecah, 184, 2012. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jennifer_Peeples/publication/249873731_Chapter_One_Aggressive_Mimicry_The_Rhetoric_of_Wise_Use_and_the_Environmental_Movement/links/5744c06508ae9f741b4081aa.pdf?origin=publication_detail.

- Peebles, Jennifer, and Stephen Depoe. *Voice and Environmental Communication*. Springer, 2014.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Ue5CBAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Voice+and+Environmental+Communication&ots=_nrlzMB1Pi&sig=bxMnUvcZMqanvAE-CwDwbWkCmks.
- Pickett, Steward T. A., Mary L. Cadenasso, Daniel L. Childers, Mark J. McDonnell, and Weiqi Zhou. "Evolution and Future of Urban Ecological Science: Ecology In, Of, and for the City." *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability* 2, no. 7 (July 1, 2016): n/a-n/a. doi:10.1002/ehs2.1229.
- "Planning for Disaster | Jacobin." Accessed September 2, 2016.
<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/08/climate-change-bloomberg-warming-disaster-plans/>.
- Plec, Emily, and Mary Pettenger. "Greenwashing Consumption: The Didactic Framing of ExxonMobil's Energy Solutions." *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture* 6, no. 4 (2012): 459–476.
- Plitt, Amy. "A Brief History of the Bronx: From First Settlers to Modern Megaprojects - Curbed NY." *Curbed New York*, April 11, 2016.
<http://ny.curbed.com/2016/4/11/11404772/bronx-new-york-history-timeline>.
- "Psychogeography and Speculative Design." *Public Seminar*. Accessed October 27, 2016. <http://www.publicseminar.org/2016/10/uu/>.
- Punch, Michael. "The Politics of Memory: The Socio-Cultural Contradictions of Globalisation and Urban Regeneration in Dublin.," 2006.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00750770609555880>.
- "Red Hook's Promised Flood Preparation Funds Shrinking." *DNAinfo New York*. Accessed September 2, 2016. <https://www.dnainfo.com/new-york/20160427/red-hook/red-hooks-promised-flood-preparation-funds-shrinking-locals-fear>.
- Reid, Julian. "Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus." *International Political Sociology* 7, no. 4 (December 1, 2013): 353–67. doi:10.1111/ips.12028.
- . "The Disastrous and Politically Debased Subject of Resilience." *Development Dialogue* 58, no. April (2012): 67–80.
- Rich, Nathaniel. "The Prophecies of Jane Jacobs." *The Atlantic*, November 2016.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/11/the-prophecies-of-jane-jacobs/501104/>.

- Richards, Lynn. Trends in New Urbanism: A Conversation with CNU's Lynn Richards. Interview by Matt Carmichael, January 28, 2015. <http://livability.com/blog/city-amenities/trends-new-urbanism-conversation-cnus-lynn-richards>.
- Robbins, John Charles. "Miami Affordable Housing Plan Could Double Some Densities." *Miami Today*, January 10, 2017. <http://www.miamitodaynews.com/2017/01/10/miami-affordable-housing-plan-double-densities/>.
- Robinson, Brett H. "E-Waste: An Assessment of Global Production and Environmental Impacts." *Science of the Total Environment* 408, no. 2 (2009): 183–191.
- Rosengren, Cole. "Funding against Storms Falls Short, Say Planners." *The Hunts Point Express*, January 20, 2015, sec. Economy/Environment. <http://brie.hunter.cuny.edu/hpe/2015/01/20/funding-against-storms-falls-short-say-planners/>.
- Rudofsky, Bernard. *Architecture without Architects: A Short Introduction to Non-Pedigreed Architecture*. UNM Press, 1964. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=F_khGKj2sKwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq=bernard+rudofsky+architecture+without+architects&ots=tDT4jQY41Q&sig=qcaiPZDSv_y92P8lFYjFjjWZcdE.
- . *Streets for People: A Primer for Americans*. Doubleday Garden City, NY, 1969. <http://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/clc/126814>.
- Sassen, Saskia. "How Jane Jacobs Changed the Way We Look at Cities." *The Guardian*, May 4, 2016, sec. Cities. <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2016/may/04/jane-jacobs-100th-birthday-saskia-sassen>.
- . "The Global City: Introducing a Concept." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 11, no. 2 (2005): 27–43.
- Schapiro, Julie. "The Next American System - The Master Builder." Documentary. *Blueprint America*. New York: PBS, 2010. <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/blueprintamerica/reports/the-next-american-system/video-the-master-builder-1977/925/>.
- Schiappa, Edward. *Defining Reality: Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*. Rhetorical Philosophy and Theory. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003. <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=104400&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Schmidt, Charles W. "Unfair Trade: E-Waste in Africa." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 114, no. 4 (2006): A232.

- Schneider, Jen, Steve Schwarze, Peter K. Bsumek, and Jennifer Peeples. "Under Pressure." In *Under Pressure*, 1–24. Springer, 2016.
http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/978-1-137-53315-9_1.
- Seligsohn, Deborah. "Will Clean Air and Water Survive EPA's Scott Pruitt?," February 16, 2017. <https://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/9612-Will-clean-air-and-water-survive-EPA-s-Scott-Pruitt->.
- Senecah, Susan L. "The Trinity of Voice: The Role of Practical Theory in Planning and Evaluating the Effectiveness of Environmental Participatory Processes." *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decision Making*, 2004, 13–33.
- Senecah, Susan, and Michael Netzley. "What Is the Case for an SCA Environmental Communication Commission?" In *Legislative Council of the Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA*. Retrieved August, 3:2006, 1996.
- Shueh, Jason. "Seeking 'Techquity': Preparing for Industry While Preserving Diversity." *Government Technology*, August 2016. <http://www.govtech.com/civic/Seeking-Techquity-Preparing-Industry-While-Preserving-Diversity.html>.
- Siegel, Charles. "The progressive roots of New Urbanism." Text. *CNU*, April 21, 2016. <https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/progressive-roots-new-urbanism>.
- Silva, Jo da. "City Resilience Index." Rockefeller Foundation, Arup, 2013.
- Slater, Tom. "The Resilience of Neoliberal Urbanism." *openDemocracy*, January 28, 2014. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/tom-slater/resilience-of-neoliberal-urbanism>.
- Smith, Brent C. "The Sources and Uses of Funds for Community Development Financial Institutions: The Role of the Nonprofit Intermediary." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (2008): 19–38.
- Smith, Kyle. "There's One Thing Dividing New Yorkers: Bill de Blasio." *New York Post*, June 12, 2016, sec. Opinion. <http://nypost.com/2016/06/12/theres-one-thing-dividing-new-yorkers-bill-de-blasio/>.
- Smith, Neil. "The Evolution of Gentrification." *Herg, JaapJan, Kaminer, Tahl, Schoonderbeek, Marc, and Zonneveld, Joost. Houses in Transformation: Interventions in Europe's Gentrification*, 2008, 15–27.
- Steil, Lucien, Brian Hanson, Michael Mehaffy, and Nikos Salingaros. "New Science, New Urbanism, New Architecture?" *Katarxis* 3 (September 2004). <http://www.katarxis3.com/Introduction.htm>.

- Storring, Nathan. "Jane Jacobs on Gentrification." *Nathan Storring*, October 29, 2014. <http://www.nathanstorring.com/2014/10/29/jane-jacobs-on-gentrification/>.
- Suchman, Mark C. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 20, no. 3 (1995): 571–610.
- Sung, Hyungun, Sugie Lee, and SangHyun Cheon. "Operationalizing Jane Jacobs's Urban Design Theory: Empirical Verification from the Great City of Seoul, Korea." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 2015. <http://researchswinger.org/teaching/operationalizing.pdf>.
- Talen, Emily. "Connecting New Urbanism and American Planning: An Historical Interpretation." *URBAN DESIGN International* 11, no. 2 (June 2006): 83–98. doi:10.1057/palgrave.udi.9000166.
- Tarver, Denton. "The New Bronx- A Quick History of the Iconic Borough." *The Cooperator*, April 2007. <https://cooperator.com/article/the-new-bronx>.
- TerraChoice. "The Seven Sins of Greenwashing." Summary Report. Environmental Claims in Consumer Markets. North America: TerraChoice, April 2009. <http://sinsofgreenwashing.com/index3c24.pdf>.
- "Text of Bill de Blasio's First State of the City Address." *The New York Times*, February 10, 2014. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/11/nyregion/text-of-bill-de-blasios-first-state-of-the-city-address.html>.
- The Bible- The New Revised Standard Version*. Accessed February 10, 2017. <http://biblia.com/books/nrsv/Is1.1>.
- "The Politics of Meaning: Power and Explanation in the Construction of Social Reality: Peter C. Sederberg: 9780816508600: Amazon.com: Books." Accessed February 15, 2017. <https://www.amazon.com/Politics-Meaning-Explanation-Construction-Reality/dp/0816508607>.
- "The Powell Memo (Also Known as the Powell Manifesto)." *Reclaim Democracy!*, April 3, 2004. http://reclaimdemocracy.org/powell_memo_lewis/.
- The Rockefeller Foundation. "Building Climate Change Resilience in Cities: The Private Sector's Role." New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 2014. <https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20141218195822/c17e6a74-b3b6-427a-9864-8e4225b6b695-urban.pdf>.
- The Town Paper. "Links to TND and New Urban Neighborhoods." Accessed February 16, 2017. <http://www.tndtownpaper.com/neighborhoods.htm>.

- Till, Karen E. "New Urbanism and Nature: Green Marketing and the Neotraditional Community." *Urban Geography* 22, no. 3 (2001): 220–248.
- Toly, Noah. "Cities Play Key Role in Climate Action." *100 Resilient Cities*, March 25, 2016. <http://www.100resilientcities.org/blog/entry/>.
- Trudeau, Dan. "New Urbanism as Sustainable Development?" *Geography Compass* 7, no. 6 (2013): 435–448.
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. "The World's Cities in 2016." Data Booklet. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2016. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/urbanization/the_worlds_cities_in_2016_data_booklet.pdf.
- "Upcoming Announcement: Our Newest Cities." Accessed February 24, 2017. <http://www.100resilientcities.org/blog/entry/>.
- US EPA, OA. "EPA History." Collections and Lists. Accessed February 13, 2017. <https://www.epa.gov/History>.
- Venturi, Robert. *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*. Vol. 1. The Museum of modern art, 1977. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=dyPusXZQ6YIC&oi=fnd&pg=PA6&dq=venturi+complexity+and+contradiction&ots=88NLXNBORr&sig=YKkf-Et7wX8Ak7o94Eoh4m_6RKs.
- W, Li, and Huynh M. "Summary of Vital Statistics 2014 The City of New York." Accessed February 9, 2017. <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/vs/2014sum.pdf>.
- Walker, Brian Harrison, and David Andrew Salt. *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World*. Island Press, 2006.
- Warner, Michael. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 4 (November 2002): 413–25.
- "Where Do Electric Vehicles Fit Into de Blasio's OneNYC?" Accessed September 2, 2016. <http://www.cheatsheet.com/automobiles/where-do-electric-vehicles-fit-into-de-blasios-onenyc.html/?a=viewall>.
- Whitford, Emma. "De Blasio Reveals Ambitious Plans To Reduce NYC's Environmental Impact & Economic Disparity." *Gothamist*. Accessed September 2, 2016. http://gothamist.com/2015/04/22/by_2030_de_blasio_wants_to_reduce_n.php.

- Wickman, Chad. "Rhetorical Framing in Corporate Press Releases: The Case of British Petroleum and the Gulf Oil Spill." *Environmental Communication* 8, no. 1 (2014): 3–20.
- Wingfield, Nick, and Mike Isaac. "Tech Industry Frets Over Possible Immigration Changes." *The New York Times*, January 27, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/business/technology-h-1b-visa-immigration.html>.
- "World Conservation Strategy." IUCN, UNEP, WWF, 1980. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/wcs-004.pdf>.
- Wynn, Terry. "South Bronx Rises out of the Ashes." *NBC News*, January 17, 2005. <http://www.nbcnews.com/id/6807914/#l>.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira, Floya Anthias, and Eleonore Kofman. "Secure Borders and Safe Haven and the Gendered Politics of Belonging: Beyond Social Cohesion." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, no. 3 (2005): 513–535.
- Zimmerman, Jeffrey. "The 'nature' of Urbanism on the New Urbanist Frontier: Sustainable Development, or Defense of the Suburban Dream?" *Urban Geography* 22, no. 3 (2001): 249–267.
- Zimmerman, Rae. "South Bronx Environmental Studies- Public Health and Environmental Policy Analysis." New York University, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service: Institute for Civil Infrastructure Systems, September 2002. <http://www.icisnyu.org/admin/files/PhaseIWagner930.pdf>.
- Zolli, Andrew. "Forget Sustainability. It's About Resilience." *The New York Times*, November 2, 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/03/opinion/forget-sustainability-its-about-resilience.html>.
- Zucker, Lynne G. "Institutional Theories of Organization." *Annual Review of Sociology* 13, no. 1 (1987): 443–464.
- Zukin, Sharon. "Jane Jacobs (1916-2006)." *Architectural Review*, October 26, 2011. <https://www.architectural-review.com/rethink/reputations/-jane-jacobs-1916-2006/8621634.article>.