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Abstract

In-depth studies of, and attempts to theorize or conceptualize, resistance to gentrification have been somewhat side-lined by attention to the causes and effects of gentrification in the now rather extensive gentrification studies literature. Yet resistance to gentrification is growing internationally and remains a (if not the) key struggle with respect to social justice in cities worldwide. In this paper we address this gap head on, we do so by (re)asserting the value of ‘survivability’ for looking at resistance to gentrifications around the globe. American urban scholars have been at the forefront of writing about resistance to gentrification, especially in cities like San Francisco and New York City, but in a situation of planetary gentrification it is imperative that we learn from other examples. Critically we argue that practices of survivability can be scaled up, down, and inbetween, enabling the building of further possibilities in the fight against gentrification, the fight to stay put. There needs to be a stronger and more determined international conversation on the potential of anti-gentrification practices worldwide and here we argue that survivability has a lot to offer these conversations.
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Resisting Planetary Gentrification: the value of survivability in the fight to stay put

Introduction

Over the past 50 years gentrification scholars have produced one of the largest literatures in urban studies, yet until more recently there have been relatively few academic studies of resistance to gentrification. Detailed studies of anti-gentrification protests, struggles and activism have been side-lined by attention to the causes and effects of gentrification. Academic writings on resistance to gentrification are now growing, perhaps not surprising given the fact that resistance to gentrification is growing internationally and remains a (if not the) key struggle with respect to social justice in cities worldwide. But in this growing
literature there has been little consideration of what constitutes (successful) resistance, and how gentrification scholars conceptualise resistance. In this paper we mull over these issues, focusing specifically on the value of survivability as a practice of resistance that we think deserves much more attention from gentrification scholars.

Survivability is a critical concept, we argue, that holds real promise for a properly global gentrification studies. Vinthagen and Johansson (2013) discuss how survivability is constantly negotiated in and through informality, invisibility, temporalities, and the limits to solidarity. Given that informality is a new area in global gentrification studies it also makes good sense to draw on work from development studies\(^1\) in a Global South context where survival is a matter of daily life. In addition the concept of survivability introduces a welcome perspective of individual action into the field of gentrification studies, which has perhaps tended to make assumptions about the collective nature of resistance. Indeed, in this paper we make the crucial point that any understanding of resistance to gentrification needs to be tempered by the fact that individuals need to focus foremost on their individual survival and welfare, in addition to that of their families. In reality, planetary resistance to gentrification is composed of both overt opposition and everyday (often invisible) resistances, which are entangled and in a constant process of becoming.

Like Harvey (1973) we see social justice as contingent on the nature of urbanization and urbanism and something that is inherently geographical. Harvey wrote *Social Justice and the City* spurred on by events in US cities in the 1960s and by the work of Marxists interested in
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\(^1\) On the need to strengthen the nexus between development studies and gentrification studies see Lees (2012), although interestingly this has faced some kick back from some development geographers.
community based urban social movements; forty years later, in Rebel Cities Harvey (2013), like ourselves, was spurred on by similar yet different events. Our focus on social justice and the city in this paper is specific to escalating processes of planetary gentrification and resistance to them. Unlike Harvey (1973) we take our lens further than Anglo-American cities, and in so doing pay proper attention to more cosmopolitan readings of gentrification and resistance to it. And unlike Harvey (2013) we seek to provide a deeper framework for researching social struggles and their internal dynamics. We are also three female scholar-activists writing in a sea of male urban geographical scholarship, the result is perhaps a different reading of resistance to gentrification and the fight for social justice in the city (cr. Gibson-Graham, 1996, 2006). Ours is a neo-Marxist reading of gentrification and resistance to it that harnesses the power of Marxist analysis at the same time as enabling the epistemic authority that comes out of marginalised people’s everyday lives. Following Koopman (2015) we look at resistance through critical engagement with the politics of everyday life.

It is interesting to note that Harvey (1973) said a lot about gentrification without actually mentioning the word. He talks about how the spatial structure of the city will change if the preferences of richer groups change. Indeed he states ‘they can with ease alter their bid rent function and move back into the centre of the city’ (p.135). His discussion of the elimination of ghettos, polarisation, Hausmannization, and what he calls ‘urban renew’ are all questions that are at the centre of C21st gentrification studies if in a different way; even if in 1973 he did not consider the spread of gentrification beyond the central city and beyond the Global North. What Harvey (1973 or 2013) does not do is investigate urban social movements fighting for social justice in any detail, or for that matter individuals fighting for the survival of themselves and their families. Revisiting resistance to gentrification and (re)asserting the
value of survivability is especially important in the context of the everyday, visceral, realities of eviction/displacement, or threat of eviction/displacement due to gentrification globally.

Studies of resistance to gentrification usually talk about it in relation to eviction, yet eviction is a process that has been described as the most understudied mechanism of reinforcing inequality (Desmond, 2016) and it remains a hidden housing problem (see Hartman and Robinson, 2003). Urban scholars have sought to conceptualise the right to the city, the right to stay put, but they have spent less energy on conceptualizing the actual fight to stay put in the face of gentrification. In focusing on the fight to stay put, in this paper, we hope not only to put research on the everyday resistances of ordinary people at the centre, not the margins, of gentrification studies, but also to inform that literature by attention to practices of survivability.

**Resistance to planetary gentrification**

At the turn of the C21st Hackworth and Smith (2001) proclaimed that resistance to gentrification was all but dead, but since the global financial crisis and Arab Spring this is no-longer the case. In recent years anti-gentrification resistance has made international headline news, as Gezi Park in Istanbul, Occupy London, and the Tsunami Tour in Rome, amongst others, testify to. Not since the Tompkins Square Park riots in New York City (see Smith, 1996) had anti-gentrification resistance made headline news. Resistance to gentrification has also transcended the neighbourhood and indeed city scale to become national, for example, the Abahlali baseMjondolo movement in South Africa. There is also now recognition that anti-gentrification resistance outside of the Global North is not new, for resistance to gentrification was happening in South Korea in the 1980s before gentrification authors in the West even began to discuss a global gentrification. It began to organise systematically and
was supported by other social movements such as the democracy movement and the labour movement (Lees, Shin and Lopez-Morales, 2016).

Outside of the detailed discussions of Chester Hartman’s scholar-activism in San Francisco (see Hartman, 1974,1984; Hartman, Keating and LeGates, 1982), up until more recently, discussions of resistance in the gentrification literature have tended to be sketchy, with little to no in-depth research involved. Although there is evidence now that this is changing as the recent special issue in Cities (2016) on resistance to the gentrification of public housing around the globe attests to. The literature on resistance to gentrification has also, until recently, been dominated by Euro-American case studies, when in a situation of planetary gentrification it is imperative that we learn from examples outside of Europe and North America. The gentrification literature has said even less about successful resistance (one exception is NION in Hamburg, see Novy and Colomb, 2013), it would seem though that ‘success’ is on the increase as the new gentrification tax in Vancouver and the Milieuschultz Law in Berlin attest to? In London campaigners fighting against the gentrification of Europe’s largest public housing estate also had a rare win2. There has, however, been discussion of successful resistances in the Global South, and it is here that the Global North would do well to learn.

In an anti-displacement campaign run in the Coyoacan neighbourhood in Mexico City, artisans and street vendors successfully practiced anti-gentrification strategies by organising outdoor exhibitions aimed at tourists and the media alike (see Crossa, 2013). In Chacao, Venezuela, women mobilised against the gentrification of their barrio (see Velásquez Atehortúa, 2013). Their resistance was also peaceful but it was helped by the support of the
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2 See https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/aylesbury-estate-cpo-ruling-what-went-wrong/10012171.article
Socialist majority in the National Assembly who then passed a series of reforms that supported the People’s Power (El Poder Popular). The government allowed the barrio women to build a pioneer’s camp (a Campamento de Pioneros) on the land to begin the process of building a Socialist Community for 600 families. This became a new model of social policy development that involved people contesting neoliberalism by the marginalised being involved in executing government programmes. In partnership with the Socialist state they could stand up to the power of real estate elites, bankers and developers etc. In so doing they successfully fought off an ‘urban renewal’ project that was to gentrify the Old Market in Caracas. Betancur (2014) argues that unlike in the Global North, gentrification in Latin America has run into stubborn resistance from the (informal) self-help/self-employment spaces that the lower classes live in. As a result gentrification has been much more limited than expected. Indeed in Lima residents organized around the Comite Promotor para la Renovacion Urbana with ‘Renovacion urbana sin Desalojos (Urban renewal without evictions)’ and in Colombia opponents of gentrification named the Office of Urban Development the Office of Urban Displacement! But what does success really mean in terms of resistance to gentrification? Is success purely about winning the fight to stay put? What if the fight to stay put is lost, but the fight has mobilized national or international attention? For a struggle might lose on one level but obtain incredible visibility able to inform other levels of action. Defining successful resistance is both important and strategic.

Samara, He and Chen (2013) claim that consciousness of the ‘right to the city’ and cross-class alliances are increasingly being formed in newly industrialised countries. We would add that this is also the case in less industrialized countries also being impacted by the speculation

3 See www.habitants.org/zero_evictions_campaign/world_zero_evictions_day_2008/vigilias_por_el_derecho_a_vivir_en_el_centro_historico_de_Lima
in the secondary circuit of capital that is the defining feature of C21st planetary
gentrification. For example, the Mahigeer Tahreek (indigenous coastal fisherfolk
communities of Pakistan) movement successfully fought off attempts to gentrify Karachi’s
coastline (and privatise its public beaches) from global capital and Dubai and Malaysia based
real estate companies (see Hasan, 2015\textsuperscript{4}). In 2007 they wrote a letter ‘Development to
Destroy Nature and Displace People’, the outcome of discussions between various
stakeholders, but especially local communities. As well as outlining the destruction of nature
– from green turtles, to mangroves, to fish and birds, they also were clear that it would
displace people – the fishing communities who had been living on the coast for centuries. The
project it was claimed would impact their livelihoods which were based on subsistence
fishing and beach leisure activities. Despite more than 100 villages being in the project area,
their future was not mentioned at all in the project proposal. The letter also claimed that given
that lower and lower middle class Karachiites would not be able to go to the beach this would
increase the divide between the rich and poor in society. The letter was followed up by public
demonstrations and a press campaign. Meetings were held with the Chief Secretary along
with prominent civil society individuals and because of opposition from all segments of
society the developer Limitless backed out of the project in 2009.

Resistance to gentrification is not a singular entity, there are many different forms and
practices and these need to be researched in context. Furthermore, the concept of resistance
itself can be highly relative and context-dependant, and there is an urgent need to unpack it
further. There have been a number of recent reviews of the literature on resistance to
gentrification (eg. Gonzales, 2016; Lees and Ferreri, 2016; Annunziata and Rivas-Alonso,

forthcoming). In their detailed review of the academic literature, Annunziata and Rivas-Alonso (forthcoming) usefully identify the main practices as: institutional prevention - the implementation of public housing policies, enforcing tenants’ protections, and community planning tools (eg. Newman and Wyly, 2006); mitigation measures - delaying eviction, compensation (eg. Kolodney, 1991; Gallaher, 2016); plus legal strategies and counter narratives (eg. Blomley, 2004); and the production of alternatives (see Holm and Kuhn, 2011; Janoschka, 2015). Resistance to gentrification, of course, can encompass a number of these different practices enacted simultaneously or consequently by the same or different groups. Much less attention, however, has been paid to practices of resistance that draw on the strategic mobilisation of identity and cultural practices deeply rooted in the everyday (see Soymetel, 2014). Practices that are not overtly antagonistic and not very visible can produce resistance and indeed can demonstrate more innovative approaches to survival in the face of gentrification.

There is a tendency for global scholars to articulate resistance at an abstract level, for example, Leitner, Sziarto, Sheppard and Maringanti (2007) and Mayer (2009), who seek solidarity across different classes so as to challenge the uneven spatiality created by neoliberal governance and globalisation. This can appear grounded at times, for example, Routledge (2012) discusses their performances on the ground, but grounded is not
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5 Annunziata and Rivas-Alonso (forthcoming) argue that the most useful academic writings on resisting gentrification are from scholar-activists who are involved in the fight to stay put (eg. Chester Hartman mentioned earlier; and more recently The London Tenants Federation, Lees, Just Space and SNAG, 2014 [for the Swedish version see https://koloni.info/Ratt_att_b_o_kvar_2016.pdf]; also Andrej Holm’s blog https://gentrificationblog.wordpress.com). And they argue that it is not academic texts but handbooks, blogs (see http://35percent.org/), mapping (antievictionmap.org), passionate writing (Colau and Alemany, 2012), documentaries/movies and artist-activist works (see lefthandrotation.com) that have the most practical value. They are first of all accessible, easy to read and understand, do not intellectualise the problem at stake and go directly to possible solutions. They are written for and with communities and imply the participation of those directly impacted by displacement (see also Annunziata and Lees, 2016, on resistance to gentrification movements in Southern European cities).
contextualised and being against capitalism and neoliberalism per se is not necessary the same as being against gentrification. Other work has tried to connect the local with the global context, for example, Maeckelbergh (2012) connects neoliberalism, the outbreak of the subprime mortgage crisis in the US, and its three by-products – the housing crisis, gentrification and foreclosure – through East Harlem based social movements’ autonomous struggle.

There is also a significant difference between the storm the barricades type of anti-gentrification battle and the everyday practices of resistance (Lees, 1999). Fighting gentrification does not always have to be confrontational, indeed direct confrontation is too dangerous (or even less likely to succeed for cultural and political reasons) in some parts of the world, as seen in the case of Chinese resisters adopting ‘rightful resistance’ (Erie, 2012). When faced with rent hikes and/or eviction from their homes displacees often simply prioritise the moment. Considering all the different practices people employ in order to stay put is important if we want to escape analysis that merely describes landscapes of despair and offers little more than blanket statements about neoliberal hegemony. The reality is that every day millions of people faced with gentrification and threatened by displacement/eviction face situations that are not as black and white as some of the gentrification scholarship would have us believe, delicate decisions have to be made in relation to the present and presumptions about the future. These decisions are more often within a world of shrinking possibilities as the paths for capital accumulation are stabilised further. Following Koopman (2015) we turn now to look at resistance to gentrification through critical engagement with the politics of everyday life. We argue that ‘staying put’ is not just a seductive slogan, critically it is a matter of survivability and that survivability is part of the fight to stay put.
(Re)asserting the value of survivability in resisting gentrification

The value of survivability in gentrification studies was noted in a discussion of the differentiated ideas of resistance, reworking and resilience with respect to state-led gentrification in London (Lees, 2014). Drawing on Katz (2004) it was suggested we consider ‘an oppositional consciousness that achieves emancipatory objectives (resistance), an impact on the organisation of power relations if not their polarised distribution (reworking), and an enabling of survival in circumstances that do not allow changes to the causes that dictate survival (resilience)’ (cr. Cloke et al., 2010:12). DeVerteuil’s (2016) recent work on resilience to gentrification in Los Angeles, Sydney and London has also recognised the utility of the notion of survivability. But deeper conceptual work needs to be done. In thinking more about how gentrification scholars might conceptualise survivability we can learn from resistance studies, for example, Vinthagen and Johansson’s (2013) epistemological framework for the study of resistance that includes: 1) repertoires of everyday resistance practices; 2) the relationships of agents; 3) spatialization; and 4) temporalization of everyday resistance (p.39). They also suggest intersectionality as the way forward, for it allows us ‘to capture the construction of multiple and shifting identities of agents of resistance and the interplay between these, as well as the contradictory positions of being both dominant and subordinate, depending on which system/context/relationship subjects are positioned and position themselves in’ (p.424).

In our introduction we mentioned that Vinthagen and Johansson (2013) discuss how survivability is constantly negotiated in and through informality, invisibility, temporalities, and the limits to solidarity. Informality is an essential part of everyday survival, and studies of informality in the gentrification literature have looked beyond ambiguous homeownership situations to the eviction of street vendors and other informal activities from central cities
The way that informality is enacted allows for different escape routes, and the most effective networks of support are embodied in informality; in connections, whether acquaintances or family relations, social capital is mobilised when there is a need for help, and where the promise of a future leverage widens the possibilities available. Regulating visibility is a key tool in order to stay put. In more authoritarian settings the more visible someone is, the bigger the risk of being made to disappear. In this context, those affected by gentrification fine tune their visible involvement depending on the circumstances, what there is to gain and/or lose. Those in more precarious positions might decide to step back, get involved in movements in subtler ways, and eventually make use of more visible tools of protest if momentum is gained. Making the invisible visible is a political act (cr. Lees and Ferreri, 2016).

Vinthagen and Johansson (2016) are interested in ‘how everyday resistance in the form of activities, social relations and identities, is spatially organized and how everyday resistance is practised in and through space as a central social dimension (p.425). The issue of the spatiality of resistance opens up a whole set of issues around positionality, marginality, and scale. For resistance is ‘localised, regionalised and globalised at the same time that economic globalisation slices across geopolitical borders’ (Chin and Mittelman, 1997: 35). But in as much as resistance is spatialized it is also temporarily organized. Hartman, Keating and LeGates (1982) point out how acting timely is crucial in the capacity for stopping demolition, eviction and displacement. Solidarity networks can solidify or dissipate depending on how well a position is negotiated and when survival is compromised solidarity among those under threat can be limited.
Harvey (1973, 2013), amongst others, would argue that resistance is oriented towards the change of a larger system that perpetuates injustice, but this is not always possible, and it pays little attention to the smaller, more intimate scale of resistance to gentrification. This is where the value of survivability as related to everyday practices comes in. The concept of survivability, we would argue, can be used to scale up from the micro to macro scales of resistance (from the individual to the neighbourhood, city, nation and internationally, see Smith, 1992); in addition, scaling can also be done in between. The value of a scaled survivability is that it enables us to focus both on the survival of the collective and also critically - the individual. The potential of individual practices of resistance, which have often been much more successful than big organised resistance (Vinthagen and Johansson, 2013, 2016), have been overshadowed in the gentrification studies literature. Indeed it is important to study resistance at the micro scale because we are confronted by a coherent and hegemonic urban neoliberal order that pushes people into vulnerability and survivability. Survivability allows us to talk radically about geography, the focus being on the fundamental, material, need to survive. Heynen (2006:191) relates survivability to ‘meeting basic human needs’; feminist geographers such as Katz (2004) have discussed the relationship between survivability and social reproduction, and define survivability as a precondition for resistance.

Chatterton and Heynen (2011) also defend a renewed focus on the everyday tactics of resistance in the face of the fact that a far-reaching revolution is rarely possible and this allows us to redefine resistance as always relational, situated in space; as a multiplicity of actions, not necessarily emancipatory or oppositional. These everyday resistances can often occur where we don’t necessarily expect them to, they can be visible or invisible (we would argue that the invisible practices need much more attention), intentional or non-intentional,
and they are not necessarily politically conscious. We recognise, as Butler, Gambetti, and Sabsay (2016) point out, that vulnerability can be both a result of resistance, especially in the increasingly violent contexts in which resistance to gentrification takes place, and a precondition. As they explain, the body itself is put at risk, but also vulnerability anticipates resistance when resisting people are extremely precarious individuals. When people organise, their precarious position is exposed, politicised and performed bodily. As collective infrastructures fail, vulnerability, and with it the possibility of resistance, emerges. Törnberg (2013) stresses the need to explore how the materiality of things influences resistance, urging us to consider survivability as a key component within processes of resistance, as access to fundamental material goods become the priority.

In thinking about survivability we can also draw on John Holloway's (2002, 2010) work (which itself draws on the struggle of the Zapatista movement of Chiapas, Mexico) which breaks with the traditional left in arguing that the possibility of revolution resides in day to day acts that refuse domination by capitalist society rather than seeking power through state apparatuses. His is a more optimistic view of resistance, one that the South African, anti-gentrification, shack-dweller movement, Abahlali baseMjondolo, lauds as ‘refreshing in the sense that it engenders hope’, breaking with the traditions of authoritarian and vanguardist leftism in Marxist revolutionary struggles (http://abahlali.org/node/9157/). He is interested in the ordinary politics of ordinary people, what Abahlali baseMjondolo call ‘living politics’. For Holloway, like for many fighting gentrification, resistance occurs in and through the cracks in capitalism, in interstices. He recognises that the most violent force is the force of the state (and we see this in the state’s heavy involvement in planetary gentrification) and restores human beings, individuals, in struggles. Drawing on Holloway survivability is a moment, even explosion, of creation where the state is pushed aside, but significantly it will
not always have momentum. We must not over-emphasise continuity, as survivability might not last, but this does not make it any less successful or important, because simply surviving is also a matter of dignity and self-esteem (what Holloway calls the refusal to accept humiliation and dehumanization). This does not, however, rule out the fact that context-dependent relationships can develop between everyday practices and organised struggle (DeFilippis and North, 2004:74). For the everyday building of solidarities in place is important and can at times be scaled, individuals and neighbourhoods can act as both platforms for the organisation of resistance but also as objects of resistance (cf. Butler et al., 2016).

**Conclusion**

We have begun the work here of developing an analytical framework for researching resistance to gentrification globally that is strengthened by attention to survivability in everyday practices of resistance. We argue that research on resistance to gentrification needs to extend much more towards individual, as well as collective, actions that are not organized, formal or necessarily public or even intentionally political; actions that are linked to configurations of power in everyday life. For we have found in our own scholar-activist research on resisting gentrification⁶ that resistance is not always a call to arms and a storming of barricades, more often it is small-scale, haphazard, and simply reactive practices of survivability, which in some cases eventually sparks collective organising but in others does not. Resistance to gentrification can constitute a small scale (geo)politics undertaken by

---

⁶ We have not the space here to reflect on our own personal experiences and contributions as scholar-activists involved in resisting gentrification in London, Rome and Istanbul, and elsewhere, but such reflections are important in a neoliberal academic environment that leaves little time or energy for deep community work. Any academic investigation of survivability entails working with vulnerable people (threatened with eviction/displacement) in the field, and we also need to be resilient (to survive emotionally, personally) as researchers in the face of disturbing, vicious gentrifications that disrupt and ruin people’s lives. We also have an ethical responsibility not to exploit these awful stories of poverty, pain and oppression for academic gain and/or intellectual ruminations.
rational, emotional and embodied urban citizens, some of their acts are visible, some invisible. Through a post-colonial lens, survival per se can be seen as success in the face of brutal, hegemonic practices. Attempts to pacify, impose social and cultural norms and evict, can be met with subaltern insurrections: the ability of not conforming to imposed norms, of continuing to relate to the city as an ‘other’ in the face of acute marginalisation and indeed criminalisation. Bayat’s (2007) critique of Scott’s (1985) ‘weapons of the weak’ pushes the idea of the mere defensive mechanisms of the disenfranchised towards a notion of active, ‘offensive’, mechanisms that go on to build further possibilities. Our notion of survivability reflects the ability of threatened people to act on their agency.

Prioritising basic material needs, like a home, is fundamental to survival. Anchoring resistance in the material, fundamental logic of survival, as Chatterton and Heynen (2011) suggest, moves us away from binary interpretations of resistance, and allows us to focus on contradictions, the different identities produced and the various scales where a re-worked concept of resistance is performed. Indeed scale is important, for although surviving and/or staying put are key areas for actions, at some point more organised resistance could be needed either to hold on to that survivability or to scale up the fight. Butler et al. (2016) argue that we need platforms because without them we cannot mobilise, we would argue that platforms can occur from practices of survivability, but there is no demand that they do so. Survivability gives dignity to those threatened by gentrification, but it also has the potential to be scaled up, down, and in between, the individual and the collective. Scaling it up to the city level and globally in the fight against gentrification (cr. Smith, 1992) is perhaps easier than scaling down, and this may have implications for the Right to the City, national and global movements. In future research on resistance to gentrification cases ought to be examined as the loci where relationships are established. In so doing we might look again at
Massey's (2005) work on the reclaiming of spaces as ‘the product of interrelations’, where actors become entangled with each other more or less willingly, and where battles of all sizes are won sometimes by the sheer ability to belong to a threatened landscape.

There needs to be a stronger and more determined international conversation on the potential of all anti-gentrification practices worldwide. We hope that this brief paper goes some way towards starting such an international dialogue, the aim being to forge more successful resistances to gentrification. As part of this conversation gentrification researchers must also ask probing questions of themselves in relation to ethics, positionality, and their working with marginalized or vulnerable groups in everyday resistance against gentrification - failure to do so will only reproduce the hegemony of gentrification itself.
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