



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Theoretical Collision in Urban Sociology: Chicago Legacy and L.A. School

Kharlamov, Nik

Publication date:
2008

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Kharlamov, N. (2008). *Theoretical Collision in Urban Sociology: Chicago Legacy and L.A. School*. National Research University, Higher School of Economics.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Theoretical Collision in Urban Sociology: Chicago Legacy and L.A. School

August 31, 2008 Rough Copy

Nikita A. Kharlamov

*Researcher,
Center for Fundamental Sociology
Institute for Theoretical and Historical
Studies in the Humanities
State University - Higher School of
Economics
12 Petrovka Street, office 182
Moscow, Russia, 107031
+7 926 532 8842
nkharlamov@hse.ru*

Moscow

2008

Contents

Contents	2
Project History and Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Introduction: Locating the Theoretical Collision	5
Chapter 1. Paradigmatic Cities in Urban Theory	7
1.1. Landscape of Contemporary Urban Theory	7
1.1.1. <i>On the Meaning of ‘Theory’</i>	7
1.1.2. <i>Neo-Marxist Theorizing and Political Economies of Urbanized Regions</i>	7
1.1.3. <i>Theorizing the Urban Everyday Life</i>	8
1.2. Chicago, IL: The City and Its School	9
1.2.1. <i>The City of Chicago</i>	9
1.2.2. <i>The Department and the School</i>	10
1.2.3. <i>Theory and Research of the Chicago School</i>	10
1.2.4. <i>The Legacy of the School</i>	11
1.3. Los Angeles, CA: Excavating the Future of Urban Theory in Southern California	12
1.3.1. <i>The City of Future?</i>	12
1.3.2. <i>The L.A. School of Urban Studies</i>	12
1.3.3. <i>The Ideas of the L.A. School</i>	14
Chapter 2. Los Angeles School Dissected	15
2.1. Why Talk of Schools? On the Notion of Scientific School and its Relevance to the Study of Urban Theory	15
2.1.1. <i>Tiryakian’s Treatment of the Concept of School</i>	15
2.1.2. <i>Usage of the Concept in Codification of Urban Theory</i>	16
2.2. Claiming the Legacy: Image of Chicago School in L.A. School Writings	16
2.2.1. <i>Using Legacies, Constructing Images</i>	17
2.2.2. <i>Los Angeles School of Urbanism vs. Chicago School of Sociology</i>	17
2.2.3. <i>L.A. School: Project as Described by the Proponents</i>	18
2.2.4. <i>The Strange Fate of Human Ecology and Other Chicago Ideas</i>	18
2.2.5. <i>The Angeleno Image of the Chicago School</i>	19
2.2.6. <i>Why Reduce?</i>	20
Chapter 3. More Breaks than Continuities: Changing Concepts and Conflicting Models in the Evolution of Urban Theory	21
3.1. Theoretical Foundations: From Human Ecology to Postmodern Fragmentation	21
3.1.1. <i>Postmodernist Fragmentation: Reflecting the Field</i>	21
3.1.2. <i>Postmodernizing Urbanism</i>	22
3.2. Basic Model: From Single-Centered City to Polycentric Region	23
3.2.1. <i>Modeling Urban Process</i>	23
3.2.2. <i>Regional Models of Urban Space</i>	23
3.2.3. <i>No More Urban vs. Rural</i>	24
3.3. Vision of Process: From Natural Competition to Power Struggles	24
3.3.1. <i>Biotic Competition as a Natural Process</i>	24
3.3.2. <i>Struggles for Power</i>	25
3.4. Theoretical Collision and Methodological Unity	25
3.4.1. <i>Los Angeles as a ‘Paradigmatic City’</i>	25
3.4.2. <i>‘Park’s Principle’</i>	26
Conclusion: From Chicago to Los Angeles and Beyond	26
References	27

Project History and Acknowledgements

The research reported in this paper was commenced in Winter 2007 during the preparation of a term paper on sociology of science (Professor: Andrey A. Kozhanov, Reader in Sociology, Department of Analysis of Social Institutions, Faculty of Sociology, State University – Higher School of Economics). Since then it has become a full-scale research project. The preliminary results were reported at the State University – Higher School of Economics Faculty of Sociology *Day of Science* conference (March 19, 2007). The first version of this paper was presented at *The Legacy of the Chicago School* conference at the University of Manchester (September 13-14, 2007) and at the *Communities-2* Seminar at State University – Higher School of Economics Sociology Faculty (November 23, 2007). Revised and updated version was discussed at the State University – Higher School of Economics Center for Fundamental Sociology *Workshop* (May 28, 2008).

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Svetlana P. Bankovskaya for her support throughout the project. I wish to thank all those who have contributed in some way to this project, including the participants and conveners of the aforementioned and other events and conferences, and to all those with whom I shared my thoughts over the last years. I am particularly grateful to Nail Farkhatdinov, Alexander Filippov, Herbert Gans, Galina Ivanchenko, Daria Khlevnyuk, Natalia Komarova, Andrey Kozhanov, Vassily Kuzminov, Vladimir Nikolaev, Nikita Pokrovsky, Vadim Radaev, Roger Salerno, Mario Small, Pavel Stepanov, Javier Treviño, Victor Vakhstain, Jaan Valsiner, my friends and colleagues at the Center for Fundamental Sociology, Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities, Faculty of Sociology at the State University – Higher School of Economics, Faculty of Sociology and Political Science at the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences, and many other places. I would also like to thank all members of ASA CUSS – ISA RC21 E-Mail List-Serve for continuous flow of news, thoughts, ideas and references on state-of-the-art urban research. I thank Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences Library staff and State University – Higher School of Economics Library staff for their helpfulness and for their lasting patience in renewing my ruthless book loans week after week. I am particularly grateful to Vladimir Pislyakov of Higher School of Economics Library for his help in using HSE electronic subscriptions. Members of Livejournal PDF community helped me to locate a number of important sources. I am grateful to the Librarians of Clark University and Lancaster University for their kind permissions to use their libraries during April 2007 and July 2008 respectively. Finally I wish to apologize to my dear friends whom I was at times unable to spend time with because of the project. The responsibility for the text, the views expressed, and for all mistakes, exaggerations and misinterpretations, is mine in its entirety.

The project would have been impossible to accomplish without the financial support of State University – Higher School of Economics Scholarships (2003-2008), Oxford Russia Fund Scholarship (2005-2007), Oxford Russia Fund Adam Smith Scholarship (2007-2008), and travel grants and funds awarded by the Higher School of Economics Center for Fundamental Sociology, Higher School of Economics Scientific Fund, and Higher School of Economics Innovational Educational Program.

THEORETICAL COLLISION IN URBAN SOCIOLOGY: CHICAGO LEGACY AND L.A. SCHOOL*

Abstract

The key point of reference for the field of urban studies is the classical Chicago School of Sociology. The paper evaluates the development of urban theory since the Chicago School using the so-called Los Angeles School of Urbanism as a second point of reference and presents an attempt to chart the current status of the field. It is argued that urban theory has gone through a radical theoretical change. This change is evaluated on the basis of comparison of Los Angeles School and Chicago School along three crucial dichotomies-transitions: from human ecology to postmodern theoretical fragmentation, from concentric ring model of urban structure to regional approaches and the vision of sprawl, and from the understanding of urban process as natural to the understanding of it as driven by power and interest groups conflicts. An account of the contemporary theoretical landscape and descriptions of the two Schools are provided in order to frame the comparison. An excursus into the way Los Angeles School uses the legacy of the Chicago School and into the ensuing reductionist image of Chicago School serves as a starting point for the discussion of theoretical (r)evolution. The key reported finding is the paradoxical coexistence of a theoretical collision and a methodological affinity embodied by the Los Angeles School that powerfully reinstitutes the methodological principle of 'paradigmatic city' originating in the works of Robert Park and his collaborators. The paper concludes with a discussion of this principle.

* Paper length: 16 064 words. Please note that Title page, Contents, Project History and Acknowledgements, and References are considered Appendixes and are not included in this word count.

Introduction: Locating the Theoretical Collision

A mere thirty years ago some of the more creative futurologists predicted the total *disappearance of cities as forms of human settlement*. These visions have been disproven, for now. While a number of Western industrial cities had undeniably entered a prolonged post-Fordist crisis, not only have they not melted into air, but new cities have since 1970-s emerged or refitted themselves as post-industrial metropolitan command and control centers of the global economic system. Many *non-Western urban areas* have come forward as the new manufacturing centers. Today swarming megalopolises in Asia, Africa and Latin America defy customary imaginations. The world's tallest skyscrapers no longer belong to New York but to Kuala Lumpur, Taipei and Dubai. And the world's worst slums are found in Nairobi, Rio de Janeiro, Phnom Penh and Mumbai. The classics of sociology would probably have not recognized these cities were they able to see them today. "Can one really call Mexico City a 'city' when it includes perhaps twenty-five million people and is more populous than the continent of Australia?" (Ingersoll 2006: 3).

As a discipline urban sociology began with the legendary Chicago School of Sociology. The Chicago School embarked on creating *the agenda for American social science* at the time when European societies and sociologies were ravaged by tumultuous events surrounding the two World Wars. A body of theory and a vast corpus of empirical research made Chicago perhaps the best studied city in history. The School left a legacy of scholarship that continues to inspire urban researchers to these days. It provides an example of a 'paradigmatic' approach in theory and research that is a rare commodity these days. This example is written into sociologists' minds since their junior university years and often the since first course in sociology.

Current urban theory is diverse and fragmented. If anything, it is *bustling*. In a world where more than fifty percent of population inhabit the great human invention that together with agriculture made *civilization*, it is only natural for the city to once again become, in Robert Park's words first articulated in 1915, "a laboratory or clinic in which human nature and social processes may be conveniently and profitably studied" (Park 1925: 46). Pressing social, economic and environmental problems provide rich material and steady demand for urban knowledge and yet these concerns are addressed in a daunting variety of ways.

In the last two decades the Chicago legacy has attracted attention beyond introductory textbooks and history of social science. *The position of 'The School' of urban research is a worthy status*. Since 1980-s it has been challenged by a vibrant group of young scholars, the self-proclaimed 'Los Angeles School (of Urbanism)', that is claiming itself as successor to the classical Chicago School. Dwelling on the idea of radical restructuring of urban realm and adhering to openly postmodernist orientation, it has drawn particular attention to *the urban region of Los Angeles and Southern California*. Angeleno scholars led by Michael J. Dear refer to the Chicago School as a source of ideas and concepts, and as a body of knowledge that they seek to transcend. In the process, they conjure up a *particular image of the Chicago legacy* in which much work done by Robert Park and his collaborators is ostensibly absent. L.A. School has spurred a range of heated debates and received its share of rude comments from fellow urbanists. Nevertheless it has succeeded in establishing Los Angeles as one of the top iconic urban places for urban science.

The story of Los Angeles School and its quest for 'scientific school' status is in itself an interesting case for sociology of science. But it also facilitates asking a range of *general questions about urban theory and its evolution*. The image of Chicago School found in Los Angeles School writings is strange enough to puzzle everyone familiar with the extent of Chicagoan writings. Reducing the entire legacy of the School to one statement on urban structure and development and to one diagram drawn by Ernest Burgess in 1925 might not grant proper respect to architects of modern sociology. Nevertheless it perhaps more than anything else underscores the extent of *change and break with the past* in urban theory. And yet... there also

exists an important *similarity* between the schools which again brings to the forefront crucial problems and challenges that urban theorists face.

Focusing on the strange fate of Chicago School legacy in L.A. School writings, the present paper aims to expose *the radical theoretical collision* between the classical heritage and contemporary ideas in urban theory and thus explicate the path trod by the field on its way to current postmodern fragmentation and necessity to deal with fluid and elusive world. The case of L.A. School indicates *an important and paradoxical affinity* between the two bodies of knowledge: behind the visible theoretical break and collision L.A. writings powerfully reinstate the methodological principle of 'paradigmatic city'. This principle of researching the current state of urban world in an emblematic city was founded in Chicago. Los Angeles is argued by Angeleno scholars to be such a city for the twenty-first century. This principle is evident in much urban research elsewhere.

The aims and findings of the paper may be summarized in the following way.

- **The first aim is to examine the way the link with the Chicago School is constructed by Los Angeles scholars and to scrutinize the image of the Chicago legacy conjured up in L.A. School's 'Scientific School' project. The key finding is that L.A. School offers a tailor-made reductionist image of Chicago School and its ideas. The image serves as the key element in L.A. School's own pursuit of 'Scientific School' status. It is further suggested that because of the break between the bodies of knowledge, the Chicago School cannot serve as a viable theoretical resource for L.A. School.**
- **The second aim is to examine more generally the theoretical evolution that the L.A. School embodies in its intended 'replacement' of Chicago ideas. It is argued that theories and models offered by L.A. School represent a distinct theoretical (r)evolution from those found in the Chicago School corpus. This theoretical change, however, hides the rebirth of the crucial Chicagoan methodological principle of singling out a particular city and making it into the icon of urban reality.**

These findings are presented through an investigation of the corpora of Chicago School and L.A. School writings and of the existing critical literature. This work, which is properly done within *the logic of history of science*, necessitates invoking *the logic of sociology of science* to the extent that the field in question is itself so thoroughly structured by the phenomenon of the Chicago School and its successive Los Angeles School. While the primary task is the comparative juxtaposition of classical and contemporary ideas¹ in urban theory, a commentary on the phenomenon of 'Scientific School' was deemed relevant to properly *frame the discussion of theoretical evolution from one school to another*.

The structure of the paper reflects the logic of its goals. Chapter 1 sets the *background* for the discussion by offering an account of the landscape of contemporary urban studies and of the place of the two schools of urban theory. Chapter 2 offers an excursus on *the notion of 'scientific school'* and on the way this notion was invoked by the Los Angeles School against the legacy of the Chicago School. The reductionist *image* of the Chicago School presented in Los Angeles writings is discussed. Chapter 3 juxtaposes classical (Chicago School) and contemporary (Los Angeles School and contemporaries) urban theoretical ideas along *a number of oppositions*. The chapter concludes by exposing *a paradox of theoretical collision between the opposing ideas coexisting with methodological unity of 'paradigmatic city' principle*. Conclusion reflects on the methodological and epistemological consequences of this paradox.

Two *caveats* are necessary at the outset. Firstly, I will not attempt to reconstruct either the Chicago legacy or the Los Angeles School research in their entirety. This is a nearly impossible

¹ However compromised this distinction may be, and despite the suspicion towards dichotomies and dualities fostered by the philosophical context of the past two decades, I find this particular distinction viable for the field in question primarily because it is found internally within the rhetoric of the field itself. Therefore my goal is not that of *disproving* the distinction but rather of *elucidating* it.

task and I have no illusion that I will reach the rigor and meticulousness of magisterial studies such as those of Martin Bulmer (1984) and Andrew Abbott (1999). I will try to achieve a more modest objective: that of trying to *highlight* a number of crucial problems by using Schools as reference points to structure the field. I will necessarily leave out much interesting developments in urban theory; however, this is a necessary sacrifice one has to make in dealing with fluid and ever developing body of knowledge. Secondly, at no point throughout the text will I be concerned with giving an account of the *actual* urban condition. My work is strictly limited to *questions of codification of theoretical knowledge*. Hence I am neither doing a *critique* of urban understandings nor proposing a *theory of my own*, but only making a *comparison* of theories.

Chapter 1. Paradigmatic Cities in Urban Theory

The birth of *distinctively urban theory and research* is associated with the Chicago School of Sociology. Although the classics of sociology now and then addressed the phenomenon of cities, it was relatively marginal to most of their writing. It was the Chicago School that has truly made sociology into a *research oriented academic and scientific discipline*. Simultaneously it gave birth to the *field of urban studies* as more than a number of standalone writers and thinkers. Since the 1980-s the field saw the development of the so-called Los Angeles School which spurred a range of debates and even attempts to counter it with other place-based ‘schools’. But these two schools serve as crucial reference points for urban theory. An overview of the current situation in the field and a recap of the two Schools in question are offered in the present chapter.

1.1. Landscape of Contemporary Urban Theory

1.1.1. On the Meaning of ‘Theory’

Urban theory may be roughly described as a field attempting to derive the general parameters and patterns of development of cities. As a subset of the field of urban studies – a multidisciplinary scientific enterprise devoted to the study of cities and urban life – it is concerned with the development of general presuppositions, fundamental models and core concepts that guide research². The task of theory is to provide tools for research, generalization, and specification³.

The key problem for contemporary urban theory is *accounting for the array of ongoing changes* that during the last thirty years have considerably transformed the world urban landscape. This is a shared challenge with general social theory and urban theory thereby attempts to see the particularly *urban manifestation* of the alteration.

1.1.2. Neo-Marxist Theorizing and Political Economies of Urbanized Regions

Just as social science paid thorough attention to the technological and consequent economic changes, coming up with the notions of post-Fordism and post-Industrialism, urban theory since 1970-s invoked Marxist theorizing to come up with a variety of *political economies of cities and urbanization*. This strand of urban research can be called mainstream⁴, as indicated

² I borrow the list from the left side of Alexander’s (1982: 2-3 *passim*) continuum of scientific knowledge.

³ It is useful to bear in mind that *not all stuff written about the city is ‘urban’, ‘theory’, or ‘urban theory’*. Accordingly, many ideas that are found in urban studies are not specifically urban-theoretic. For example, much of what is written about gender relations in the city is rather an application of general sociological ideas to the city than a development of urban theory proper. This view is rather restricted and may usefully be compared with, for instance, John Rennie Short’s (2006: 2) view that theory is something (everything?) that arises “from people looking at cities” and therefore urban theory is “less ... a formalized set of ideas and more ... a response to the spectacle of the city”. To wrap up the example of gender, it can be argued that most of what Short (2006: Ch.8) writes about ‘gendered city’ is concerned with the properties of social life in general. A Russian review of Short’s book is offered in Kharlamov 2007.

⁴ There are many ‘Marxisms’ and many theoretical attempts can qualify as ‘Marxist’ only in that they share Marxist attention to economic side of social life and to the role of technology in society. Therefore this suggestion does not contradict the statement of the field’s heterogeneity above.

by, for example, skimming through recent books attempting to present an overview of urban theory (e.g. Gottdiener and Hutchison 2006, Short 2006, Soja 2000): all these books start their discussion of contemporary theory with political economies of urbanism and urban globalization.

The key topic addressed by political economies of urbanism is *the effects of technological advances, transformations in industrial production, and the consequent shift towards service and information economy, on the functions of cities, on their structure, and on urban life*. Among the key ideas was the observation that the primary urban function is no longer that of accumulating concentrated industries and working class, but services, coordination, management, control and governance. Therefore crucial urban dynamics are the dynamics of real estate and business services. Particular attention was paid to the *new urban poverty in deindustrializing cities of the West* and to the fate of urban ‘underclass’ (see Gans 1995, Wacquant 2008, Wilson 1996 for a summary of decades of debate and research; see Small 2007 for a critique)⁵. Since the beginning of 1990-s the notion of *globalization* provided a powerful impetus for the development of urban thought as cities are increasingly seen as a worldwide interconnected system, or network (see Sassen 2007 for a number of illuminating papers on the problem).

Exemplifying this strand of theory are the theories of Saskia Sassen and Manuel Castells. Sassen’s notion of *global city* (Sassen 2001) captured the role of *central cities* – for Sassen they are London, New York and Tokyo – as the key nodes of command and control of worldwide economy. A variety of other cities – such as Miami (Sassen and Portes 1993, Nijman 2000) – are discussed as global cities. Manuel Castells (2000) put cities in the context of his general theory of *network society* and informational capitalism by drawing attention to networked urban agglomerations such as one in Chinese Pearl River Delta containing Hong Kong. Castells suggested that these manufacturing-cum-management urban agglomerations in what used to be called ‘Third World’ are *the face of urbanization* in the third Millennium. They form the essential examples of the *informational city* characterized by dense informational and communicative networks. Mega-cities are “nodes of the global economy, concentrating the directional, productive, and managerial functions all over the planet: the control of the media; the real politics of power; and the symbolic capacity to create and diffuse messages” (Castells 2000: 434). Their essence is “being globally connected and locally disconnected, physically and socially” (Ibid.: 436). Castells and Sassen share the interest in *spatial aspects* of globalized cities in that they underscore the consequences of being global for the structure of urban space.

The key contemporary insight relating to the study of urban spatial and territorial structure is the imagination of *urbanized region*. The key proponents of regional approach, Mark Gottdiener and Ray Hutchison describe the new urban condition in the following way. “Today the city has exploded... we now call home the expanding regions of urbanization that are associated with a mix of cities, towns, suburbs, and exurban areas. This new form of settlement space is called the *multicentered metropolitan region (MCMR)*, and it is the first really new way people have organized their living and working arrangements in 10,000 years” (Gottdiener and Hutchison 2006: 5). They attribute two *primary characteristics* to this new form. “It extends over a large region, and it contains many separate centers, each with its own abilities to draw workers, shoppers, and residents” (Ibid.: 5). These arguments emphasize that the urbanized region is an agglomeration of permanent settlements that are part of a region-wide *network* of consumption, communication and mobility that can be seen even in the basic statistics of regional mobility and connectivity patterns (Parr 2007). In a way, regional approach perhaps best underscores the general acknowledgement of the widely defined process of globalization.

1.1.3. *Theorizing the Urban Everyday Life*

A different plane of urban theory looks at *everyday life in the city*. Perhaps the most significant development in this vein after Georg Simmel, Walter Benjamin and Louis Wirth was

⁵ An overview of these debates in Russian is offered in Kharlamov 2008, forthcoming.

the Marxist critique of urban everyday life offered by French philosopher and sociologist Henri Lefebvre (1987, 2000 [1971]) whose work always had a distinctly urban trait. Everyday life in urban setting is also narrated in postmodernist writings (e.g. Baudrillard 2000 [1986], Chambers 1991) and cultural studies that are concerned with interpretive reading of the urban as texts (see for example Highmore 2005). However, sociology of everyday life (represented by writers such as Alfred Schuetz (e.g. 1945), Harold Garfinkel (1967), Erving Goffman (1986 [1974], 1990 [1959])) as such has seldom explicitly concerned itself with urban environment. Generally urban everyday life remains undertheorized⁶.

The so-called *material turn* in social theory and the emergence of actor-network theory (see Latour 2005 for a recent authoritative introduction and summary) focus on including material objects into sociological sphere, and human geography-influenced sociological studies of space and spatiality (often called 'spatial turn' and tightly intertwined with ANT, e.g. Law 2002, Mol and Law 1994, Soja 2000, Thrift 1996; see Law 2004 for a recent synthesis of ANT-influenced social topology) open a pathway for a possible sociological treatment of everyday life in urban setting. Yet it still remains a work for future (see Amin and Thrift 2002 for a recent attempt at conceptualization⁷).

To sum up, the current landscape of urban theory is dominated by a variety of Marxist and neo-Marxist conceptions that often differ from each other beyond recognition and yet share the general concern with *the effects of societal change on urban environment*. If anything, the common idea is that the current urban world is at least considerably different from the one existent as late as 1950-s. This idea is brought to the forefront by the Los Angeles School of Urbanism. While the classical Chicago School stands as a common point of critical reference. Therefore a comparison between the two bodies of knowledge allows for a better understanding of the current theoretical context.

1.2. Chicago, IL: The City and Its School⁸

The importance of Chicago for the development of urban sociology stems from a remarkable constellation of a variety of factors. The prime among these are the exceptional position of the city in America and the existence of a research university and a vigorous sociology department. Coupled with the iconic personality of Robert Ezra Park, the mix was potent enough to set the academic landscape for years to come.

1.2.1. The City of Chicago

Historically the city of Chicago stood on the *verge* of two American worlds – the industrialized West and the agricultural East. In less than sixty years it grew from a 10 000 township (1837) to a city with more than a million inhabitants in the year of the Columbian Exposition in 1893. Chicago was a *hub* for money flows and migration mobilities (Hunter 1997). Its location in space at the time of rapid industrialization and expansion made Chicago into a *booster landscape of multiple immigrant communities* that accepted immigrants from all over Europe. The land of urban revolution and cultural fusion, Chicago of the beginning of XX century was at the forefront of urban change. Roger Salerno aptly compares the Chicago School to *noir* literature and cinema, writing that the Chicagoan “[s]ociology noir emerged from a host of social forces associated with urbanization and modernization. It was a response to those same conditions that worked to produce tabloid journalism and cheap fiction” (2007: 20).

⁶ For example, in a highly popular book David Thorns (2002) devotes a whole chapter to everyday life and yet covers the problem of home and domestic life, and community studies. Both these spheres, however important, are not concerned with everyday life *in the city*.

⁷ Reviewed in Russian in Kharlamov 2008.

⁸ The section is based on a range of primary and secondary sources: Park 1936, Park et al. 1925, Wirth 1938, Zorbaugh 1965 [1929] were particularly useful among primary sources, and Becker 1999, Bulmer 1984, Harvey 1987, Gottdiener and Hutchison 2006, Salerno 2007, Short 2006 among the secondary ones.

1.2.2. *The Department and the School*

The University of Chicago was founded in 1891 and launched its activities in 1892 as a research-oriented institution. Department of Sociology was founded in 1892 and became *the very first full-scale department of sociology* in the USA and in the world. ‘The Chicago School’ is a label attached to the community of sociologists working in Chicago Department in 1910s-1930s⁹. Commonly the School is associated with the leading role of Robert Ezra Park who arrived at the department in 1914 after a long career in journalism and social policy. The ‘Golden Age’ of the Chicago School is usually located in Park’s years at the department (1915-1935), although a number of important scholars, such as Jane Addams and William I. Thomas, worked there before Park. After Park’s retirement the first School was largely over but the subsequent generations of Chicago scholars such as those advocating symbolic interactionism continued the fame of the Department.

The most prominent figures of the first School include Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie and Louis Wirth. They, their students and their colleagues produced *the body of research now referred to as the School*. The agenda for Chicagoan urban sociology was outlined in *The City* (Park et al. 1925), a collection of essays authored by Park, Burgess and McKenzie and supplemented with a bibliography of community research compiled by Wirth. The corpus of empirical research was primarily presented in the form of monographs published by the University of Chicago Press in *Sociological Series*¹⁰. *The Hobo* (Nels Anderson, 1922), *Family Disorganization* (Ernest R. Mowrer, 1927), *The Gang* (Frederick M. Thrasher, 1927), *Suicide* (Ruth Shonle Cavan, 1928), *The Ghetto* (Louis Wirth, 1928), *The Gold Coast and the Slum* (Harvey W. Zorbaugh, 1929), *The Negro Family in Chicago* (E. Franklin Frazier, 1931), *The Taxi-Dance Hall* (Paul G. Cressey, 1932), *Vice in Chicago* (Walter M. Reckless, 1933) form the core of studies regarded as belonging to the Chicago School. Many of the authors were doctoral students of Park and Burgess. Some of the studies were supported by the Chicago City Council, the Chicago Vice Commission, and other public bodies.

1.2.3. *Theory and Research of the Chicago School*

Theoretical base of Chicago research is complex. While Robert Park is generally acknowledged as the *intellectual leader* of the School, Burgess, McKenzie and Wirth also played a significant role. The Chicago scholars were influenced by William Isaac Thomas and the Chicago pragmatist philosophy of William James, Charles Sanders Peirce and John Dewey¹¹. In terms of ideas, several distinct *conceptual and methodological schemes* could be discerned.

Attributed primarily to Robert Park, the Chicago School advocated an *ecological approach* to the study of human life. Human ecology was a theoretical scheme built on the basis of plant ecology by Park (1936) and McKenzie (1925). They saw social life as a *natural process* similar to that in biotic life. Human community was seen as a natural habitat: “(1) a population, territorially organized, (2) more or less completely rooted in the soil it occupies, (3) its individual units living in a relationship of mutual interdependence that is symbiotic rather than societal” (Park 1936: 4). Park argued that the society had a *biotic, ecological basis*, and that culture and morals were the levels above in a hierarchy of control. Hence the natural process of competition and competitive cooperation was conceived as primary to human communal living although

⁹ The Chicago scholars themselves never referred to their community as a ‘School’. The label probably originated in outside discussions and was first widely used in academic writing on Chicago sociology as late as 1950s (Harvey 1987).

¹⁰ The Series was to be opened by William I. Thomas’s *The Unadjusted Girl* but the University of Chicago Press had cancelled all its relations with Thomas following his accusation in ‘immorality’, ‘extramarital affair’ and ‘disorderly conduct’, the subsequent press scandal, and Thomas’s eventual expelling from the University. In the end, the book was published in 1923 by another publisher. See Salerno 2007: Ch.3 for the story of the book.

¹¹ While George Herbert Mead worked with John Dewey in Chicago at the time, Mead’s influence on Chicago School is now believed to be *marginal*, contrary to earlier versions. Harvey (1987) lists Mead and symbolic interactionism influence as one of the myths of the first School. And yet Salerno (2007: 60) reminds that Mead and Thomas were interacting closely although not necessarily citing each other in printed work. See Lewis and Smith (1980) for a thorough analysis of Mead’s relation to Chicago Sociology.

superseded and subverted by secondary social processes of economic, political and moral control. Territorial dynamics of human populations were thought of as a result of biotic competition for space and resources. The community thus occupied a *natural area*. The modern city – in their case, Chicago – was inhabited by multiple constantly competing populations and thus constituted a perfect biological-cum-sociological laboratory for the study of natural ecological process. Constant immigration was regarded as the fundamental drive behind urban growth.

Ernest Burgess (1925) created the famous *spatial model of urban growth* on the basis of ecological understanding of developmental dynamics. He described the expansion of the city (originating from the influx of immigrants) as dynamics of zones that were successively arranged in *concentric circles* stemming from the Central Business District (CBD). The principal dynamic behind the urban settlement was the *center-periphery growth*. This model is one of the (if short of ‘the’) best known and most influential models in the history of urban sociology, despite being heavily criticized and eventually disproven even for Chicago itself¹².

Essentially urban (human) ecology and zoning models dealt with the way territorial patterns are shaped by human population dynamics. As Mark Gottdiener and Ray Hutchison suggest, there was another dimension to Chicago ideas. Robert Park and his colleagues “came to view spatial patterns in the city as the result of powerful social factors... [Louis Wirth] emphasized the way the city, as a spatial environment, influenced individual behavior” (Gottdiener and Hutchison 2006: 49). In other words, while Park investigated the way human formed the city, *Wirth studied urban environmental influence on human*. Wirth’s famous ‘Urbanism as a Way of Life’ thesis¹³ (Wirth 1938) dealt with the way the city – population size, density and heterogeneity – led to the shift from primary to secondary relations, substitution of competition and social control for solidarity, social disorganization, anonymity, fragmentation of personality. Wirth painted a bleak picture of urban personality and everyday life.

The Chicago School is also regarded as originating the *celebrated ethnographic research* that later served as the foundation for much of the contemporary qualitative research. However, the Chicagoan methodology encompassed much more: Thomas and Znaniecki brought in the biographic and documentary analysis, geographical mapping was already done by Hull House scholars and later formed one of the constitutive traits of Chicago research, and quantitative surveys and statistical analyses were also widely used, contrary to a popular belief¹⁴.

1.2.4. *The Legacy of the School*

In the twenty years of the School, students of Robert Park and his colleagues created a *lasting legacy* of research on Chicago urban zones, social groups, migration dynamics, racial and religious relations, crime patterns, family structures. Much of this research was solidly grounded in Chicagoan theoretical and methodological foundations. While there was a widely acknowledged diversity and heterogeneity within the community, a particular combination of certain traits of the School is to be found in almost any study published there at the time. *Perhaps more than anything else, common commitment to the study of a common location¹⁵ guided the Chicagoan research and made it into a more or less coherent corpus of research, and the city of Chicago of the time into one of the most thoroughly studied single objects in the history of social sciences.*

¹² Burgess himself admitted that it was an ideal model that did not represent any existing city: “It hardly needs to be added that neither Chicago nor any other city fits perfectly into this ideal scheme” (Burgess 1925: 52). However, the model was at the heart of many empirical studies of his students. The model was later augmented into different versions (e.g. by Homer Hoyt into a sectoral model) but the principle was the same (see Hall 1998 for an overview).

¹³ Formulated in continuity to Simmel’s essay *The Metropolis and The Mental Life* (Simmel 1950 [1903]).

¹⁴ Becker 1999, Bulmer 1984, Harvey 1987, Harvey 1997. Recently new dimensions were opened in the examination of the Chicago School legacy, such as its investigations of traditional and non-traditional sexuality (see Heap 2003).

¹⁵ Thomas Gieryn (2006) underscores the importance of location for Chicago School. The accordant principle of ‘paradigmatic city’ is discussed below in Chapter 3.

1.3. Los Angeles, CA: Excavating the Future of Urban Theory in Southern California¹⁶

Thanks to the ubiquitous produce of Hollywood movie industry Los Angeles holds iconic status amongst world cities. Indeed, all too often the audience sees Hong Kong or London on the screen that was actually filmed somewhere in the depths of Los Angeles movie studio grounds or on multicultural streets of the City of Angels. Thanks to the efforts of Los Angeles based community of researchers Los Angeles since 1980-s holds an important place for urban theory as the city that is thought by some people to replace Chicago as the iconic city of our times.

1.3.1. The City of Future?

Even for America, Los Angeles is a young city-region whose population has exploded since late XIX century to make Southern California urban agglomeration into *one of the largest metropolitan areas in the world* however defined. Carey McWilliams once stated that even 'boom' does not correctly identify Los Angeles population growth history: "[e]very city has had its boom, but the history of Los Angeles is the history of its booms. Actually, the growth of Southern California since 1870 is the history of its booms" (McWilliams 1973 [1946]: 114). Edward Soja continues this observation, suggesting that L.A.'s urban growth is "the rhythm of virtually continuous expansion, occasionally slowed down somewhat but never reversed by national and global recessions" (2000: 122). *It is a land of paradoxes and oppositions*. For urban sociology Southern California with Los Angeles as its de-jure center has presented an *exemplar in the rural-urban confusion*. Already in 1946 McWilliams wrote that "[f]or all practical purposes, it is a non-rural region; there are few strictly rural districts. In effect, Southern California constitutes a single metropolitan district which should be characterized as rurban: neither city nor country but everywhere a mixture of both" (McWilliams 1973 [1946]: 12). If Chicago was the boundary town between parts of America, Los Angeles signifies the *westernmost frontier*, the final place where everything 'comes together' (Soja 1989). With about 15 million inhabitants the region increasingly attracted the attention of urban scholars over the last decades¹⁷.

1.3.2. The L.A. School of Urban Studies

A new group of scholars has emerged in 1980s in Los Angeles to claim the throne of *the School in urban studies*. The 'Los Angeles School' devoted itself to the exploration of the region that, according to Michael Dear, has recently become "not the exception but rather a prototype of the city of future" (Dear 2002b: vii). Since its inception the Los Angeles School was an *intellectual project* of a group of scholars actively promoting themselves as a school and endorsing this identity (as opposed to the Chicago School).

One of the most fervent advocates of the L.A. School, Michael Dear has exposed the history of conceptual and institutional development of the School in a range of publications (see

¹⁶ The title of this part is an obvious reference to the title of the well known book on Los Angeles «City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles» by Mike Davis (2006), widely regarded as one of the most thorough historical and social studies of contemporary L.A. In writing this section I relied primarily on the works of Michael Dear (2002a, 2002b, 2002c), Steven Flusty and Michael Dear (1998), Edward Soja (2000), Mike Davis (2006 [1990]). I also relied on secondary discussions: Cenzatti 1993, Short 2006, and on a number of journal symposia – *Antipode* 1999, *City and Community* 2002, *Urban Geography* 1999. The School is alive and provoking further debate at the time of writing. As I was in the final stages of preparing the present manuscript I became aware of a number of newly published debates on Los Angeles School, particularly of Dear and Dahmann 2008 and a special issue of *Urban Geography* 2008. Due to time constraints I was only able to incorporate them partly into the present discussion although a quick review shows that the new information does not contradict what is reported here.

¹⁷ The history of the region prior to 1970s is documented in three best known books: *South California: An Island on the Land* (Carey McWilliams, 1946), *The Fragmented Metropolis* (Robert Fogelson, 1967) and *Los Angeles: The Architecture of Four Ecologies* (Reyner Banham, 1971). Interestingly enough, as early as 1915 Emory Bogardus, an offspring of the Chicago School, established a sociology department at the University of Southern California and started a research program centered on urban racial relations and particularly on the Mexicans in Los Angeles.

Dear and Flusty 2002 for a recent version). The project was born in 1980-s, when a group of scholars mostly in geography and urban planning began publishing studies of the region. In 1986 a special issue of *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* was edited by Allen Scott and Edward Soja and was entirely devoted to understanding Los Angeles. October 11-12, 1987, is designated as the semi-official 'birth date' of the School. In those days a group of scholars "gathered at Lake Arrowhead in the San Bernardino Mountains... to discuss the wisdom of engaging in a Los Angeles School" (Dear and Flusty 2002: 10). The most prominent *people* in the L.A. School are Michael Dear, Steven Flusty, Mike Davis, Allen Scott, and Edward Soja. Perhaps the single most debatable piece of the L.A. School is the article *Postmodern Urbanism* authored by Michael Dear and Steven Flusty (Dear and Flusty 1998). The article has spurred a number of debates among urban geographers on the grounds of its proclaimed postmodernism¹⁸.

From early on, the L.A. School works were affiliated closely with *postmodernism and postmodernist epistemology*. In one of the first treatments of the 'School' phenomenon, Marco Cenzatti writes that "[v]ery broadly defined, the name 'Los Angeles School' identifies the work of a group of local researchers who, from the early '80s onwards, discovered in Los Angeles a series of social, economic and spatial trends symptomatic of a general transformation currently taking place in the entire U.S. urban and social structure" (Cenzatti 1993: 5). He does not hesitate, though, to add that the L.A. School was not creating a new totalizing image such as one Cenzatti identified in the Chicago School. Contrariwise, L.A. scholars attempted to 'deflate' the logic of one unified explanation, trying to create a "critique of totalizing and linear narratives of modernism, of its reliance on a center, and of its teleological search for a *causa prima*" (Cenzatti 1993: 7). The absence of a unified and linear pattern is, according to Cenzatti, characteristic not only of L.A. School epistemology but of its theory and of its object of research. Hence "the possibility of constructing a more comprehensive framework without falling back into dominating master theories that neglect the meaning and importance of specificity and diversity" (Cenzatti 1993: 21).

Among the most notable appearances of the L.A. School work in print are the *two edited volumes* that contain collections of articles documenting the rise of Los Angeles as the new frontier of urban change. Revealing of the editors' willingness to challenge the Chicago School legacy are the very titles: *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century* (Scott and Soja 1996) and *From Chicago to L.A.: Making Sense of Urban Theory* (Dear 2002a). 1996 was the year when two more edited volumes appeared, *Rethinking Los Angeles* (edited by Michael J. Dear, H. Eric Shockman and Greg Hise) and *Ethnic Los Angeles* (edited by Roger Waldinger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr). The following books should be mentioned among other works belonging to the school: *Postsuburban California: The Transformation of Orange Form since World War II* (edited by Rob Kling, Spencer Olin and Mark Poster, 1991), *The Postmodern Urban Condition* (Michael J. Dear, 2000), *Variations on a Theme Park* (edited by Michael Sorkin, 1992), *Technopolis: High Technology Industry and Regional Development in Southern California* (Allen J. Scott, 1993). A complex picture of L.A. human/urban geography has been developed throughout the two decades by Edward W. Soja in his *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (1989), *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (1996a) and *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions* (2000). The last volume is particularly interesting in that in addition to developing a conceptual framework for urban research, exploring the geographic history of human urban settlement, and attempting to re-create an account of the riots that took place in L.A. in 1992 following the Rodney King case¹⁹, Soja devotes the largest second part of the book to a sweeping survey of urban studies reminiscent of Louis Wirth's (1925)

¹⁸ See *Urban Geography* 1999 for one of the most heated discussions in print.

¹⁹ Soja devotes a lot of attention to explorations on two episodes in recent history of L.A., the 1965 Watts Riots and the 1992 Justice, or Rodney King Riots. He sees these events of urban turmoil as indicative of vital urban dynamics and of the transition from, in his words, 'crisis-generated restructuring to restructuring-generated crisis' (see Soja 1996b for an account).

Bibliography of Urban Community. In describing the ‘Six Discourses on the Postmetropolis’ Soja effectively creates an intellectual mapping of the landscape of contemporary urban research as seen through the perspective of the Los Angeles School.

Institutionally the school was based in a multitude of places, primarily in the South California Studies Center in University of South California, Los Angeles, and in the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning in UCLA (recently reformed into Faculty of Urban Planning²⁰).

1.3.3. *The Ideas of the L.A. School*

The L.A. School ideas are centered on two traits that unify the School according to its adherents. These ideas are *radical contemporary restructuring of urban world* and the *explicit postmodernist orientation* (Cenzatti 1993, Flusty and Dear 1998, Soja 2000). The contemporary city is seen to be radically changing into something radically new. Edward Soja writes of a ‘postmetropolitan transition’, the revolutionary change in the structure of urban environment that is going through the processes of “selective deconstruction and still evolving reconstitution of modern metropolis” (Soja 2000: 148). Economic, social, political and cultural phenomena are postulated as entering a new *postmodern state*. For example, the economic basis of Southern California – light industry and knowledge and high technology production – is understood as the expression of a post-Fordist industrial regime of flexible accumulation. However, because of the intellectual diversity it is hard to discern any *single synthetic idea* that would lie behind L.A. School works. In general terms, however, a Marxist foundation and attention to the questions of power and economy, and a common interest in spatiality and questions of urban built environment seems to lie behind much Los Angeles theorizing (many of Los Angeles School ‘members’ are human geographers with neo-Marxist education).

Within the School itself there are at least two versions of intellectual mapping of the School, the aforementioned Soja’s ‘Discourses on the Postmetropolis’ (Soja 2000: Part II) and the one presented by Steven Flusty and Michael Dear in their construction of a postmodern urbanism (Flusty and Dear 1998). The former are worth reciting at some length. Soja describes six ‘discourses’, bodies of texts based on a common object (LA region) and topic. The first pair of discourses – ‘Postfordist Metropolis’ and ‘Cosmopolis’ – touches upon the causes of the new urban restructuring processes. The second pair – ‘Exopolis’ and ‘Fractal City’ – deals with the spatial and social realization and consequences of these processes. The third pair – ‘Carceral Archipelago’ and ‘Simcities’ – addresses the question of how people continue to live and survive under these changing conditions. Soja’s outline indicates the internal diversity of Los Angeles School that looks more like an agenda for research than a coherent school of thought²¹.

Throughout the works of the L.A. School’s main proponents – Michael Dear, Steven Flusty, and Edward Soja – the Chicago School is depicted as the corpus of knowledge they refer to and are seeking to transcend. Particularly illuminating is the 2002 Dear edited volume that is organized as a set of articles ‘responding’ to different aspects of 1925 *The City* book. In the process, Chicago School is portrayed in a *debatable reductionist fashion*. However, it should be mentioned that there is an important affinity between the two schools in the shared *methodological principle of ‘paradigmatic city’*. I will comment on this principle in the third chapter after examining the problem of ‘Schools’ in urban theory. The key question at this point is why the ostensive attempt to ground the research in the Chicago legacy was done in such a way as to present an image grossly underrepresenting the Chicago ideas. A tentative answer is that the two bodies of research are more or less *incompatible* with each other.

²⁰ There is a special section of USC website devoted to the LA School (http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/la_school/).

²¹ Paradoxically, it is similar in this respect to Park’s article *The City* in 1925 book (Park 1925). First published in 1915, it was less concerned with questions of theory (these were covered in other chapters of the book and in other publications) than with setting an agenda for research that, viewed in retrospect, looks less an outline of urban sociology than of general sociology that followed it albeit with wholly different theories and methodologies.

Chapter 2. Los Angeles School Dissected

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the way Los Angeles School of Urbanism proponents use the legacy of the Chicago School to advocate their version of urban theory. The image, it is argued, is *a reductionist one*: it strips most of the ‘stuff’ done by the Chicago scholars off the ‘Chicago School’ and presents it only as *a single model* developed by one of the School’s members. This excursus will serve as the starting point for the last chapter which is concerned with theoretical evolution and its continuities and breaks. Two methodological problems with such a discussion will require additional treatment. Firstly, the problem of what a ‘Scientific School’ is and why do we talk of ‘Schools’ at all when studying urban theory. Secondly, what is meant by an ‘image’ in this context and what are the ways one can refer to a classical legacy in a contemporary work of science. Methodologically I will in all cases *follow the published texts and try to understand why a rather weird image was produced in L.A.* In the process I will be working with eerie epistemological monsters: what I will be reconstructing are essentially *second-order images*, images of images. Yet I hope to shed some light both on the particular case of evolution of ideas and on the general historical processes of intellectual change in the field I identify with.

2.1. Why Talk of Schools? On the Notion of Scientific School and its Relevance to the Study of Urban Theory

Codification of knowledge is an essential part of theoretical work in a scientific discipline. One of the notions that are at times used for codification is the notion of ‘scientific school’. It belongs to the group of notions that includes such concepts as ‘theory groups’ (Mullins 1973) and ‘invisible colleges’ (Derek de Solla Price, 1963). The key distinctive trait of this group – as opposed to notions like ‘concept’, ‘idea’, ‘theory’, ‘postulate’ and even ‘paradigm’ – is that it explicitly takes into account *the social parameters and context of scientific knowledge*. In other words, it is concerned not only with ‘pure ideas’ but with those who develop and share them, with the institutional, group and communicative structure and dynamics of scientific enterprise.

2.1.1. Tiryakian’s Treatment of the Concept of School

The systematic use of this concept in sociology of science probably originates with Edward Tiryakian who in 1979 gave a sociological theoretical treatment to it. Tiryakian’s ambition was to draw on Thomas Kuhn’s account of scientific knowledge. Kuhn’s (2003 [1962]) idea that science develops through revolutionary change in the basic axiomatic structures, theoretical presuppositions and methodological principles and the ensuing concept of *paradigm* presented a radical break with the traditional vision of scientific knowledge as being evolutionary accumulation of facts and ideas. However, in his original treatment Kuhn did not cover the issue of who makes the change. In a later appendix (2003 [1969]) he briefly addressed the phenomenon of scientific communities as the bearers of paradigms but had little to say about the social processes *pertaining* to these groups.

Following Kuhn’s ideas Nicholas Mullins (1973) introduced the notion of *theory group* and described its development in a four-stage model which had communicative processes at its core. Mullins studied the development of American sociology and other sciences such as biology using the concept of theory group. Tiryakian also took Kuhn as a starting point and elaborated the concept of *scientific school*. He defined it as “a real group of intellectuals, a small community of persons whose origin and formative period can be localized in time and place... a scientific community integrated around a central figure, an intellectual charismatic leader, and a paradigm of empirical reality which is subject to investigation” (Tiryakian 1979: 216, 218). A scientific school in Tiryakian’s view thus has a central authoritative figure and a group of converts and disciples and it is the schools that are responsible for paradigm shifts. Tiryakian identified Durkheimian, Chicago and Parsonian schools as the three foundational schools that successively shaped sociology since the beginning of XX century and up until 1980-s (he

suggested, echoing Alvin Gouldner, that sociology contemporary to him was in ‘anomic’ state). The novelty of Tiryakian’s treatment as compared to the earlier uses of the idea of scientific school (e.g. by Pitirim Sorokin) was primarily in its detailed explanation of role structure and group dynamics of a scientific collective.

2.1.2. Usage of the Concept in Codification of Urban Theory

Tiryakian’s definition explicitly addressed the *structure of groups* that produce scientific knowledge. His treatment was then widely used by students of Chicago School, most notably by Martin Bulmer (1984) in his seminal book on the history of the School and in a series of publications by Lee Harvey (1987, 1997). Although the latter offers a number of critical arguments concerning the ‘myths’ of the Chicago School, explicitly challenges Tiryakian²², and most notably criticizes the notion that Chicago was a ‘School’ (for example by documenting the absence of this word in the lexicon of Chicago sociologists themselves), he in the end acknowledges Bulmer’s usage as being closer to what Chicago School really was. Recently Howard Becker (1999), himself a Chicago student of late forties, suggested that the Chicago School was less a *school of thought* unified by common theories or methodologies but rather a *school of activity* whose members were engaged in teaching, fundraising and day-to-day management of the first American sociology department in its golden years. Still Tiryakian’s definition and the Bulmer’s version of it remain more or less constant in discussions of the Chicago School.

This much said about defining scientific school, an observation of a different plane is topical: while Tiryakian’s definition and what was later made of it was primarily *an instrument in codification* – that is a concept used to structure the body of existing knowledge and literature – and therefore was applied ‘externally’ (as so many discussions of Chicago School underscore), Los Angeles School of Urbanism introduced an interesting twist into the concept’s usage. Not only does it systematically refer to the Chicago School as a proven, existing *fact of history* (I will have more to say of this expression below); for about two decades it uses the notion of ‘(scientific) school’ *to refer to itself*. It therefore engages in an exercise of structuring the entire field of urban sociology along the lines of two schools²³ – the classical modernist Chicago School and the contemporary postmodernist Los Angeles School. As the chief L.A. School proponent Michael Dear himself admits: “First, the Los Angeles School exists as a body of literature... Second, the Los Angeles School exists as a discursive strategy demarcating a space both for the exploration of new realities and for resistance to old hegemonies” (Dear 2002; the ‘old hegemonies’ being first and foremost the ideas of the Chicago School). It is this *discursive strategy* that I will explore a bit further in the next section, bearing in mind what was said about the ‘conventional’ ‘substantive’ usage in literature on history of sociology.

2.2. Claiming the Legacy: Image of Chicago School in L.A. School Writings

The idea of ‘scientific school’ as a reflexive discursive project of a community of researchers presents itself as quite different from an *a posteriori* discovered phenomenon discussed earlier. Los Angeles School is engaged in a *consistent strategy aimed at the establishment of the group as a scientific school and at obtaining recognition in the profession*. This recognition may have the form of mentions of a ‘school’ as such, references to its texts and members, including textbooks and dictionary entries, discussions and debates of the ‘school’ and its status in professional journals, and the emergence of external histories and systematizing

²² Harvey, it should be noted, does this on somewhat strange grounds: he attempts to show that Tiryakian moves away from Kuhn’s formulations and ‘sociologizes’ them – precisely what Tiryakian himself admits to being his aim.

²³ Let me state for the sake of clarity that since I am dealing with the sphere of urban theory and not general sociology, I am not concerned with Durkheimian, Parsonsian, or any other sociological school that may have existed in the history of sociology. Such a concern, instructive for sociology of scientific schools, obviously would fall out of the scope of the present paper for which the concern with scientific schools is instrumental.

attempts. A 'negative' reception is criticism, critical texts, open peer resistance, or the ignoring of the 'school'. Evidently, Los Angeles School has provoked it all.

The reference to the Chicago School which the Los Angeles School is engaged in in the process is most relevant for the present discussion. Evidently this reference serves as part of the School's discursive strategy. It allows the school to claim the 'symbolic capital' of the classical Chicago School present in all textbooks and deserves some further evaluation.

2.2.1. *Using Legacies, Constructing Images*

Provisionally two general ways of dealing with the legacy of the Chicago School could be discerned. The first way is dealing with the School as a *historical fact*. It involves reconstructing the School as an episode in the development of twentieth century sociology that *has been* and the place of which is in the annals of scientific history²⁴. Its relevance for contemporary research is considered more or less marginal. While effectively founding the discipline, the School is considered to be mostly aged knowledge that has long since been superseded by consequent research. What is still used is no longer actually connected to the body of Chicago School research (and to the constituent texts) itself but is part of the *basic disciplinary knowledge*. It is the way the Chicago School is dealt with in most textbooks and reference books on urban sociology (and sociology in general). It is described in a few short paragraphs or perhaps a chapter, the key people are named, the key works are listed, and then the narrative goes on to completely different matters. To put it bluntly, tearing out the parts devoted to the Chicago School in many textbooks on urban sociology would not really inhibit the understanding of the rest.

The second way is using the Chicago School material as a *theoretical resource* in the construction of theory and methodology. In this case the Chicago School legacy is regarded as a source of ideas to create and develop new research. The new research may both continue and break with the Chicago School. The School's legacy can be used partially or more or less entirely to construct *new agendas* for sociology. For example, the 'Second Chicago School' used the original Chicago School to construct symbolic interactionist theory, ethnographically oriented qualitative methodology and much more²⁵.

Both ways of dealing with the School entail creating *a certain image of the Chicago School*. This image is a product of historical re-construction, re-interpretation and in effect re-imagination. It could be based on narrowly taken corpus of texts (e.g. those designated as 'the works of the Chicago School'), on wider archival material (e.g. relating to biography and institutional history), and on first-hand research such as personal experience and interviews with the contemporaries. Like any image, it will necessarily entail shadowy elements and omissions. To borrow a notion from contemporary methodology, *together with presence it will necessarily produce absence, an othering of certain traits and parameters*²⁶. Construction of an image is unavoidably guided by certain assumptions, goals, values, and contains an element of *choice*. The latter could be considered a political choice in the broad sense, an instance of 'ontological politics', to borrow the notion further. Disciplinary history can be subject to various alterations and modifications that at times turn into creation of complex mythologies.

2.2.2. *Los Angeles School of Urbanism vs. Chicago School of Sociology*

Theoretical continuities are thorny and messy things to analyze. On the one hand, some important links may well be obscured or left out because sometimes the authors might not mention their intellectual references. On the other hand, existing references do not always show the actual continuity in the 'train of thought'. The analysis of the image of the Chicago School that is produced by Los Angeles School adherents is closer to the latter situation. *The references*

²⁴ This is not to say that purely historical work with scientific legacy is in any way 'inferior' to 'creative use'. It is just to single out an approach, a logic, an 'ideology' of work.

²⁵ See the collection of papers detailing the 'Second Chicago School' of 1940s-1960s in Fine 1995.

²⁶ See Law 2004: 83-85.

are there but is there an actual continuity and connection? In this case the analyst is left to contemplate on his or her own.

In this section I will follow the references made by Michael Dear (2000, 2002b), Steven Flusty (Flusty and Dear 1998, Dear and Flusty 2002)²⁷, and Edward Soja (2000) along with those made in the 2002 Dear-edited volume *From Chicago to L.A.* These Angeleno scholars often make references to the Chicago school as their predecessor and as the foundation that they both have to build on and transcend. Instructive for my analysis will be the notable *absence* of references to the Chicago School and its works in Scott and Soja-edited volume *The City* of 1996, and in Soja's books *Thirdspace* (1996a) and *Postmodern Geographies* (1989). Earlier I have discussed the human ecology as a theoretical and conceptual foundation of the Chicago School, Burgess's concentric ring model as the model of urban form, and Wirth's 'urbanism as a way of life' thesis. This might serve as a provisional 'historical fact' version of the Chicago School. The L.A. version is a different one.

2.2.3. *L.A. School: Project as Described by the Proponents*

In his introduction to the 2002 volume Michael Dear directly states that among the goals of the book are uncovering 'the underlying assumptions of the Chicago School of urbanism' and jettisoning 'an obsolete lexicon of concepts that have hitherto blocked out our understanding of Southern Californian cities' (Dear 2002b: xviii). He then goes on to list *the three main assumptions of the Chicago School*: an 'individual-centered understanding of the urban condition' where the 'individual subjectivities of urbanites' explain the urban condition; a "modernist" view of the city as a unified whole' in which 'the center organizes its hinterland'; and 'a linear evolutionist paradigm... in which processes lead from tradition to modernity...' (Dear 2002b: ix). The L.A. School is seen by Dear as embarking not just on 'simple refutation' of the Chicago School but on *overcoming it* as an 'analytical paradigm that remained coherent for most of the twentieth century'. *Instead, the new School is supposed to counter Chicago conceptions with a wholly new view.* The 2002 Dear-edited volume is created by the authors who "adopt[ed] some reference point from *The City* (typically part of a chapter or topical focus) and develop[ed] his or her own meditation on the state of contemporary urban theory" (Dear 2002b: x). In the subsequent chapters this is done by citing a large passage from *The City* and then moving on almost instantly to Los Angeles problematic virtually leaving the quote behind. This discussion of Chicago School almost never exceeds one or two pages devoted to finding out that the particular focus – such as industry and urban economy – was either underrepresented or not represented at all in Chicago writings. *Essentially, the entire book successfully reduces the Chicago School to one Park-Burgess-McKenzie book of 1925.* Similar stance is taken by Dear and Flusty and Soja in their discussions elsewhere. Little of Chicago ideas had found its actual way into Los Angeles writings.

2.2.4. *The Strange Fate of Human Ecology and Other Chicago Ideas*

Human ecology, the crucial theoretical background for the Chicago School ideas, appears to be *irrelevant* for Los Angeles school research. In fact, what is done in Los Angeles is a different kind of ecology more in the vein of contemporary actor-network theory influenced formulations²⁸. The idea is to address the connection between city life and city population and the natural resources, natural environment, non-human life, and natural hazards. In a nutshell, the critique is formulated by Jennifer Wolch, Stephanie Pincetl and Laura Pulido (2002: 369): "apart from recognition that cities rely on natural resources, the [Park-Burgess-McKenzie] book is silent about the appropriation of ecosystems for urban expansion, the impacts of urbanization on the quality of the natural environment and availability of wildlife habitat, the urban politics of nature preservation, natural hazards, and environmental degradation". Their treatment aims at presenting *a different urban ecology* where all these phenomena would be taken into account. A similar stance is taken by Edward Soja: the Chicago "use of the term ecology was itself an

²⁷ See note 44 on some complexities regarding Flusty and Dear's 1998 account.

²⁸ See Amin and Thrift 2002 for an exposition in relation to urban studies.

abstraction, an almost metaphorical adoption of a natural science point of view and epistemology rather than a scientific analysis of the relation between the city and its natural environment” (Soja 2000: 86). A few years before Mike Davis in *The Ecology of Fear* (1999 [1998]) famously painted a picture of the city in the middle of an ongoing natural disaster. Yet *these critiques seem misleading* as they miss the crucial point of Chicago School human ecology: it was not about the relation between human communal world and natural environment; rather it was about human communal world itself and a particular way of explaining it that was borrowed from another science! This radical *incompatibility* is perhaps why the Chicago ecology is inapplicable in Los Angeles writings.

Louis Wirth’s ‘Urbanism as a Way of Life’ thesis that used to be subject of much discussion in urban studies is once again largely absent in Los Angeles writings, mostly due to the fact that Los Angeles School is generally concerned with restructuring of urban space rather than urban individual. The spatial orientation of the Los Angeles School precludes it from attending to *peculiarities of human mental life* that famously fascinated Wirth (1938) and before him – Simmel (1950 [1903]).

Nor are the other elements of Chicago School presented in Los Angeles School works. The vast heritage of ethnographical studies, pragmatist theories of action, subjectively oriented sociologies of William Thomas and George Herbert Mead seemingly bear no relevance for contemporary Los Angeles research (except a few remarks suggesting precisely their irrelevance). *The Chicago School has a certain image in Los Angeles, and this image is strangely devoid of the core of its own basis!*

2.2.5. *The Angeleno Image of the Chicago School*

In a reply to Michael Dear’s polemical article in *City in Community* Andrew Abbott has written that Dear “has mistaken Burgess’s little diagram for the whole of an enterprise of which he and his colleagues are, like the rest of us, lucky legatees” (Abbott 2002: 34). The remainder of this chapter looks in more detail at this ‘mistake’. Michael Dear (Dear 2002: 14) summarizes his (and by extension, the L.A. School) vision of the Chicago legacy in three basic assumptions²⁹. *The Chicago School vision, according to Dear*, was: a modernist view of the city in which ‘the center organizes the hinterlands’; an individual-centered understanding of the urban world that is grounded in the subjectivities of inhabitants; and a vision that was linear and evolutionist, one that stressed the transitions from traditional to modern. The first assumption is an obvious reference to Burgess model; the second is probably influenced by Simmel’s and Wirth’s urbanite portraits and also by interactionist and situational-analytic Chicagoan subtext; and the third thesis seems to be a reference not only to the conceptual schemes but to the general ameliorist and social-reformist impulse of the Chicagoans.

Perhaps the only feature of the Chicago school that is present in Los Angeles discussion of it (and in essence, it is the feature that the Chicago school is reduced to) is the *famous Burgess concentric circles zoning model of urban structure*. As Michael Dear and Steven Flusty remark, it is “the most enduring of the Chicago School models... the *zonal or concentric ring theory*, an account of the evolution of differentiated urban social areas” (Flusty and Dear 1998: 51). It is in discussion of this model that urban ecology is mostly mentioned by L.A. scholars. This model is said to represent one of the most general Chicagoan ideas: that the city is fundamentally organized around its center. Dear goes on to conclude that the fundamental shift between the Chicago and Los Angeles School conceptions of the city, from the modern to postmodern city in his words, is that “*it is no longer the center that organizes the urban hinterlands, but the hinterlands that determine what remains of the center*” (Dear 2002c: 16; italics in original).

Thus the constructed image is finished. The image is that firstly, Chicago School was almost exclusively concerned with *urban phenomena*. Secondly, it was concerned with the *spatial dynamics* of urban growth as exemplified by the Burgess diagram. Thirdly, all the rest of the Chicago School legacy is of *marginal interest*. Such an image *reduces* the Chicago heritage

²⁹ That he attributes to Robert Park and Park’s colleagues’ writings in *The City* (Park et al. 1925).

to a number of straightforward propositions and a model, the propositions being themselves an induction from the Chicagoan texts, and the model – the concentric ring theory – being taken as is without mentioning the references to its abstract character that were made even by Burgess himself in the original source. *Two-step reduction* from a coherent sociology to urban sociology and then to a standalone model of urban process is paradoxical: attempting to work with the Chicago legacy as a theoretical resource, it instead cuts out most of this legacy, leaving only the single, simple and not obviously central idea.

The result is *a short, coherent and simple presentation that is easy to construct an opposition to and then to leave it behind*. The bulk of conceptual apparatus employed in Chicago texts, most notably the human ecology, is left in shadows, thus disallowing the questioning of its relevance and testing for contemporary validity. This constructed image serves as the point of reference, a base that is to be eventually overcome and transcended in the work of L.A. scholars. It is as if the Los Angeles scholars intentionally produced an Othered³⁰ conception of the Chicago School, an epistemological iceberg of easy-to-deal-with tip of Presence and a looming, shadowy base of Absence. Interestingly enough this construction seems to have been installed between 1996 and 2002. While there is no mention of the Chicago School in relation to Los Angeles School whatsoever in the works of Edward Soja of 1989 and 1996 (Soja 1996a) and in the 1996 Scott and Soja-edited volume (save the latter's title), these same authors engage in discussions of Chicago heritage already in 2000.

2.2.6. Why Reduce?

A possible explanation is that in postulating a radical break with the Chicago ideas and in instating a new 'paradigmatic' School in urban theory the Los Angeles scholars have taken the Chicago School legacy as *a justification mechanism for 'scientific school' status claims*. Such a use of the Chicago School is not new. Lee Harvey wrote of a type of construals of the Chicago School that is designed in order to proclaim "some sort of Chicago heritage", such as 'urban studies', 'ethnography' or 'symbolic interactionism' (Harvey 1987: 5). Seems like the Angeleno image of the Chicago School belongs precisely to this category.

The reductionist image created in this way is widely used by L.A. scholars in their advocacies of their 'School' status. Yet the result looks, so to say, suspicious precisely because what is offered in Los Angeles is *completely incompatible* with the Chicago School. The critiques of the Chicago School on the grounds that the Chicagoans did not take into account economic relations in the city or the non-human natural world are convenient but they serve to mask what perhaps is most interesting in the development of urban theory in Los Angeles. *I would suggest that it is precisely the necessity to marry the radically different theories and methodologies with the classical legacy in order to legitimize the new 'School' status that has led to the peculiarly limited and reduced picture of the Chicago School found in LA writings.*

The final chapter takes off from this radical break into a more general stance. I will attempt to show that this break mirrors the general shift of urban theory and yet retains what Edward Tiryakian back in 1979 has called "Park's great innovation ... a methodological one, namely, to view the city as a natural laboratory for sociological investigation and to frame this research in terms of an ecological model derived from botany" (Tiryakian 1979: 227)³¹. Once again, a paradox: a theoretical break *and* a methodological continuity.

³⁰ In the sense explored by John Law (2004: 83-85).

³¹ To be sure, ecological model is a theoretical idea rather than a methodological one. For the sake of clarity I hold that 'Park's principle' is contained in the first half of Tiryakian's expression.

Chapter 3. More Breaks than Continuities: Changing Concepts and Conflicting Models in the Evolution of Urban Theory

The previous chapter has documented the troubled history of the legacy of the classical Chicago School in the writings of the key proponents of the self-proclaimed Los Angeles School of Urbanism. The key insight I propose to draw from the exposition of reductionist character of the Chicago School image conveyed by L.A. writers is that *the very incompatibility of the two 'Schools' reflects the general shift in theoretical orientation of urban theory*. This chapter charts this general shift in more detail. Los Angeles School adheres to broadly postmodernist standpoint and claims that the contemporary cities exhibit a radically new pattern of spatial organization and causal process whereby it is the periphery that organizes and produces the center within a regional context of urban agglomeration. This general position can be evaluated as a set of transitions³². I will explore *three such transitions*: from urban ecology to postmodern fragmentation in theory; from single-centered-city to polycentric region spatial imaginary; and from natural competition and natural process to power struggles in explanations of urban dynamics. In the concluding part of the chapter I argue that despite these vital transitions the L.A. School and urban theory in general seems to retain the key methodological principle – ‘Park’s principle’ of paradigmatic cities.

3.1. Theoretical Foundations: From Human Ecology to Postmodern Fragmentation

Lee Harvey argued that the view of Chicago sociology as having “no strong theoretical orientation and its work, in the main, [being] a descriptive exercise” (Harvey 1987: 18) is a myth – “a pervasive taken-for-granted account... [a] generalized connotation” (Ibid.: 22). Indeed, human ecology – an approach developed by Robert Park (summarized in Park 1936) on the basis of plant ecology and further developed by his colleagues Roderick McKenzie (1925) and Louis Wirth – was *nearly omnipresent* in Chicago School writings of the time, particularly in the basic imagination that the city (and human life in general) was organized into natural areas – into territorial ecological habitats for particular human groups. The search for these theoretically informed the often overlooked cartographic dimension of the Chicago School: although it has developed well before Park’s arrival to the university (particularly by the Hull House group)³³, it has taken on a new turn with the development of ecological concepts.

3.1.1. Postmodernist Fragmentation: Reflecting the Field

In Chapter 1 I have made a brief sketch of contemporary urban theory and suggested that it is not guided by a unified and coherent theoretical orientation. The same could be said about Los Angeles School. The School’s published work offers the reader a variety of topics and concepts and the School’s main proponents repeatedly describe their orientation as *postmodern*. In a forthcoming article Michael Dear and Nicholas Dahmann attempt to clarify the meaning of ‘postmodernism’ in L.A. School’s description and suggest that it is at once a *style*, an *epoch*, and a *philosophy or method* each implying “the notion of “radical break,” that is, a fundamental discontinuity between past and present practices” (Dear and Dahmann 2008, forthcoming: 4). In a particularly revealing passage they suggest that “Postmodernism as philosophy or method [represents] a set of philosophical and methodological discourses that are antagonistic to foundational constructs of whatever persuasion and (most particularly) the hegemony of any single intellectual persuasion” (Ibid.). They further argue that the logic of postmodern urbanism implies precisely the same heterogeneity and multiplicity. And they identify “five principal

³² I am aware that I am employing the mechanism of establishing a set of theoretical dualities. While dualities are perhaps questionable on postmodernist grounds, I do not subscribe to this critique here and humbly admit that I was not able to find any better way of framing the observed flux of ideas.

³³ See Deegan 1997 for a recent reflection on the work of Hull House and on *Hull House Maps and Papers*. I am grateful to A. Javier Treviño for sharing his thoughts with me on this matter (personal communication, 2007).

social dynamics underlying the altered geography of today's urban world": globalization (emergence of certain cities as centers of command and control in a world economy), network society (and cyber-cities), polarization (and the 'digital divide'), hybridization (of identities and culture) and sustainability (or rather admittance of the ongoing global environmental crisis) (Ibid.: 6-7).

Just as these dynamics appear to be widely acknowledged in current urban studies, they also are markedly undeveloped theoretically. Indeed, *recognizing* a global environmental crisis is one thing but *theorizing* it is a wholly different one. While we seem to have lots of the former at the moment³⁴, we also seem to have (too) little of the latter. The aforementioned book by John Rennie Short (2006) is illuminating in that it organizes 'urban theory' under a variety of explored topics³⁵ (such as 'The City and Nature' or 'The Erotic City') and thus underscores the multiplicity of approaches and the absence of specifically urban theorizing: all chapters of Short's book (arguably with the exception of 'The Designed City') address not *theories* but *topics* and all of these are more or less general sociological problems that stand forth at the beginning of the new millennium.

3.1.2. Postmodernizing Urbanism

The idea of *postmodern urbanism* deserves further exploration here (although it will be also covered in the next section). This invention of Steven Flusty and Michael Dear (1998) was subject to a range of critical discussions³⁶. In a nutshell, Flusty and Dear follow the well-trodden path of singling out a number of features (that they find in Southern Californian urban landscapes) – the list includes 'edge cities', 'privatopia', 'cultures of heteropolis', 'city as theme park', 'fortified city', 'interdictory space', 'politics of nature'³⁷. They then suggest that these features require "reconstruct[ing the] evidence into a postmodern urban problematic" (Flusty and Dear 1998: 60) which is guided by the need to "account for the evolution of society over time and space" (Ibid.). "The structuring of time-space fabric is the result of the interaction among ecologically-situated human agents in relations of production, consumption, and coercion. We do not intend any primacy in this ordering of categories, but instead emphasize their *interdependencies* – all are essential in explaining postmodern human geographies" (Ibid.: 72). What follows is an impressive *exercise* in conceptual and metaphorical construction using a variety of neologisms (e.g. 'citistat', 'communities', 'pollyannarchy') presented as characterizing postmodern urbanism in the context of 'Keno capitalism' – a particular spatial pattern resembling a lottery game board (with a visual model intended to replace Burgess's rings, of which more will be said in the next section). I will not be going into detail with discussing their conception; suffice it to say that it is seemingly not shared even by most of the other presumed members of the Los Angeles School, much less outside it. Similarly, Soja's 'trialectics of cityspace' – a theory of space developed on the basis of Henri Lefebvre (1991) seminal treatment – remains an exercise of one theorist, not a school at large.

The conclusion to draw here is that to the extent that urban theory and urban research are different things and the former is not exhaustively covered by an array of descriptions of

³⁴ To the extent that Dennis Judd (2005) found it appropriate to warn, using L.A. School as an example, against overly apocalyptic and hyperbolic *noir* stance in urban research.

³⁵ Short is not nearly the first to use an approach that organizes scientific knowledge along explored topics to address urban studies and urban theory. For example, Setha Low (1996) and Edward Soja (2000) adopt similar stance (although Soja's is partly guided by his particular theoretical scheme developed in other parts of his book) in documenting urban research. Steven Flusty and Michael Dear (1998) adopt it to describe Los Angeles School research. There is, to a certain extent, a similarity in these attempts with textbooks on urban sociology (e.g. Gottdiener and Hutchison 2006, Thorns 2002).

³⁶ See *Antipode* 1999, *City and Community* 2002, *Urban Geography* 1999 for a selection of debates on L.A. School's 'postmodern urbanism'.

³⁷ Due to the limitations of space and for the sake of respecting Flusty and Dear's original style of presentation I refer the reader to one of their multiple presentations of postmodern urbanism over the last decade (e.g. Flusty and Dear 1998; see note 44). I quote from original 1998 version.

particular traits of urban world, Los Angeles School does not offer a coherent theory of urbanism and in this it reflects the field in general.

3.2. *Basic Model: From Single-Centered City to Polycentric Region*

“The city... is something more than congeries of individual men and of social conveniences... than a mere constellation of institutions and administrative devices... The city is, rather, a state of mind, a body of customs and traditions and of the organized attitudes and sentiments that inhere in these customs and are transmitted with this tradition... [The city] is a product of nature, and particularly of human nature... The city is, finally, the natural habitat of civilized man” (Park 1925 [1915]: 1-2).

3.2.1. *Modeling Urban Process*

These words of the Robert Ezra Park shoot us straight to the heart of the Chicagoan studies of the city. Robert Park firmly situated Chicago sociological enterprise in the *urban world*. The city was understood as a *natural product of civilization*, as a form of human habitation that is rooted in human nature just as the ant-hill is in the ant nature. The vision of the city as a natural habitat was reflected in the Chicago understanding of urban territorial dynamics. Ernest Burgess (1925) devised a seminal model of the *universal urban form – the concentric circles pattern*. He saw the set of concentric circles expanding from the urban center to the periphery as an abstract model of urban process, as an expression of the general ecological processes of expansion and succession whereby one population overtakes the territory of another. The center-periphery growth was seen as the principal dynamic behind the urban settlement. The famous Burgess diagram represented the typical process of expansion to be found more or less clearly in all cities. It has become one of the (if short of ‘the’) best known and most influential models in the history of urban sociology, despite being heavily criticized and eventually disproven even for Chicago itself. The Chicagoan understanding of the city was that the city is a fundamental form of *communal settlement of the people, a form of attachment to land and territory*. It was an understanding of the city as *a territorially and spatially well-defined, dense, and bounded entity with a distinct center and the ‘centrifugal’ developmental core to periphery dynamic underlying the process of urbanization*.

3.2.2. *Regional Models of Urban Space*

I have already mentioned that today urban development is widely viewed as regional. *The city is seen to give way to a polycentric and diffuse urban/metropolitan region with an essentially different (not opposite!) developmental trend*. This form of habitation is portrayed as a unique and novel invention of human civilization entering the new millennium. This vision is essentially a move away from Chicago formulations of the nature of urban form and deserves some further examination. Most importantly, it represents the blurring of the fundamental distinction operative in classical urban theory: the *distinction-cum-opposition of urban vs. rural living*.

The postulations of revolutionary change in the structure of urban environment going through the processes of “selective deconstruction and still evolving reconstitution of modern metropolis” (Soja 2000: 148) that Edward Soja has called ‘postmetropolitan transition’ are widely echoed, for instance by the aforementioned Mark Gottdiener and Ray Hutchison (2006: 5). Flusty and Dear’s postmodern urbanism formula is based on the assertion of “postmodern urban process in which the urban periphery organizes the center within the context of a globalizing capitalism” (Flusty and Dear 1998: 65). The new form of human urban habitation remains essentially *a transformation of physical space into artificial landscape* (Gans 2002), yet the resulting space is no longer seen to be bounded and confined to dense urban fabric. Suburban areas are being included into the city on the basis of their connections to the city in that they share consumption and labor market.

The process is no longer envisioned as a center-periphery growth the way Burgess conceptualized it. Instead, *it is seen as agglomeration or sprawl* timely accepted by Dear and Dahmann as “the principal formal expression of the postmodern urban process”

(2008, forthcoming: 10). Sprawl is the form of Castells's informational mega-cities (Castells 2000) and Sassen's global cities (Sassen 2001: 347). *Sprawling and differentiating agglomerations are principally polycentric and their growth dynamic is regional, not centrifugal*. It is increasingly approached as a cultural phenomenon as well, for example, by Richard Ingersoll (2006) who explores the new urban world from the standpoint of perception. Ingersoll suggested that the *vast expanses of 'suburban' settlement that lose the very character of 'urban'* require new metaphors, such as weather: accurately defining sprawl is "as difficult as predicting the weather. Because of its scale and variety, sprawl defies analytical description" (Ingersoll 2006: 8). Sprawling urbanism is reinforced by new forms of connectivity and communication that enable people to live distanced forms of communities not necessarily requiring *dense* urban living (Amin and Thrift 2002).

3.2.3. No More Urban vs. Rural

The transition from the Chicago School models to the contemporary treatments encompasses the shift in the basic distinction *between 'urban' and 'rural'*. Simmel (1950 [1903]) already opposed the city to an essentially rural lifestyle of villages and small towns. This distinction was perpetuated by Wirth (1938) and institutionalized in the subdisciplines of urban and rural sociology. The *shifts* that came with the realization that suburbia was a realm of its own (see Gans 1968 [1962] for a programmatic statement) necessitated the rethinking of this distinction. However, it was only with the regional approaches in 1980's that the understanding of a novel urban form ripened. The city as a concept virtually vanished when the entire world came to be argued to be essentially urban, becoming urban, or in a certain way connected to urban. *Yet at the same time the spatial dimension remains at the core of defining the urban*. Whether defined as a postmodern sprawl, a poly-centric region, or an informational-cum-global entity, *the city remains the fundamental form of human settlement in physical space*.

There is an important insight offered in Los Angeles School. According to Edward Soja, the *spatial specificity* that distinguishes urbanism from other spaces means "particular configurations of social relations, built forms, and human activity in a city and its geographical sphere of influence" (Soja 2000: 8). This resembles what Park wrote of the city. But if 'urban' refers to the material-and-symbolic settlement process of transformation of physical space and the outcomes of this process, then urban sociology is becoming *sociology of human settlement and habitation*.

Los Angeles School theorizing consequently underscores two fundamental shifts within urban theory since the Chicago School. The first shift is in the understanding of the core dynamics of urban development and the second shift is in the understanding of the basic distinction underlying the very definition of 'urban'. Contemporary urban theory sees cities as regional spatial phenomena of human territorial settlement that are developing in a decentered way under the influence of global and regional growth processes. These *processes* and their *causes* are also seen in a different way.

3.3. Vision of Process: From Natural Competition to Power Struggles³⁸

3.3.1. Biotic Competition as a Natural Process

The third important line of contrast is *the vision of underlying forces* that are thought to lie behind processes of urban growth and evolution of city form. Chicagoan views on the nature of those forces were directly derived from ecological understanding of the city and from research on Chicago. The concept of natural area entailed an essentially *natural, biotic* process of succession of territorial habitats. Chicagoan understanding of the relation between area / territory / space and human population / community is evident in the extended quote from Roderick McKenzie. "The essential difference between plant and animal organism is that the animal has

³⁸ I am grateful to Roger Salerno (personal communication, 2008) for the initial suggestion of this important contrast.

the power of locomotion which enables it to gather nutriment from a wider environment, but, in addition to the power to move in space, the human animal has the ability to contrive and adapt the environment to his needs. In a word, the human community differs from the plant community in the two dominant characteristics of mobility and purpose, that is, in the power to select a habitat and in the ability to control or modify the conditions of the habitat” (McKenzie 1925: 64-65). The process of *biotic competition* between the communities for natural resources and territory was seen as the basis for *territorial change and dynamics*. Its fundamental drive – evident in the biological-cum-sociological laboratory the city of Chicago was at the time – was the *population growth* due to constant immigration and hence of constant arrival of new populations.

3.3.2. *Struggles for Power*

Los Angeles School underscores a rather different understanding. Its unit is no longer a natural population but *a flux of groups of interests and agents of power* (such as community organizations and Not In My Back Yard – NIMBY – groups succinctly described by Mike Davis – 2006: Ch.3). In this vein Michael Dear and Nicholas Dahmann call for attention towards the new anti-political processes whereby urban politics is eliminated by private groups (2008, forthcoming: 10-12). In a more general vein the growth dynamics of cities are today viewed as part of more global processes whereby new technological and economic conditions that facilitate informational production and networked connections between different parts of the world (see Castells 2000-2004 for a well known formulation). Interestingly enough, the explanations presented by the advocates of information epoch are quite often explicitly technocratic in nature, that is, they overtly or implicitly link the transformations in the world to technological advances (Webster 2004 [2002]).

Thus the third dimension of theoretical shift is from urban process as a relatively local phenomenon organized according to natural forces of ecological competitions to a vision of urban process as part of global transformations (sometimes viewed in a neo-Marxist fashion as grounded in technological change and change in structures of production and consumption).

3.4. *Theoretical Collision and Methodological Unity*

The first three sections of this chapter documented breaks and collisions in urban theory. The present section covers an important *methodological principle* that was invented in Chicago and that was taken over and expanded by Los Angeles School. It is the principle of ‘paradigmatic city’ as a ‘sociological laboratory’.

3.4.1. *Los Angeles as a ‘Paradigmatic City’*

As the names suggest, Chicago School of Sociology and Los Angeles School of Urbanism share a common principle of *naming*: they are named after the cities they study. Los Angeles School is documented to have been at odds with whether they were going “model themselves after the ‘Chicago School’ (named principally after its *object* of research), or the ‘Frankfurt School’ (a philosophical current named after its *base*)” (Davis 2006: 84)³⁹. This ambiguity seems resolved now that Los Angeles has for twenty years been framed as an *exemplar city*. This highlights the important affinity that serves as the key methodological principle for urban studies since the times of the Chicago School: *the principle of paradigmatic city*. The expression ‘paradigmatic city’ originates in the work of Edward Soja and Allen Scott who in 1986 in an Editorial for a special issue of *Environment and Planning D* on Los Angeles proclaimed L.A. “the paradigmatic industrial metropolis of the modern world” (cited in Curry and Kenney 1999: 2). This expression was powerfully reiterated by Soja in *Postmodern Geographies* (1989) in an illuminating chapter *It All Comes Together in Los Angeles*: “one might call the sprawling urban region defined by a sixty-mile (100 kilometre) circle around the centre of the City of Los Angeles a *prototopos*, a paradigmatic place; or, pushing inventiveness still

³⁹ See Cenzatti 1993: 6 for an interpretation that claims that the novelty of Los Angeles as opposed to Chicago is that Chicago School was “squarely focused on the urban as an independent object of analysis”.

further, a *mesocosm*, an ordered world in which the micro and the macro, the idiographic and the nomothetic, the concrete and the abstract, can be seen simultaneously in an articulated and interactive combination” (Soja 1989: 191)⁴⁰.

3.4.2. ‘Park’s Principle’

Jan Nijman explored the concept and defined it as “the city that displays more clearly than other cities the fundamental features and trends of the wider urban system” (Nijman 2000: 135). For Nijman⁴¹, the *paradigmatic city* is an exception that illuminates the future pathways, a city where the general trends are reflected most vividly and perhaps exaggeratedly. More generally, the principle of paradigmatic city seems to be a *universal methodological device for urban theory* that may for convenience be called ‘Park’s principle’ as it goes back to one of the most famous quotations in the history of sociology.

Robert Ezra Park famously stated that the city is “a laboratory or clinic in which human nature and social processes may be conveniently and profitably studied” (Park [1925]: 46). One should not hastily read ‘the city’ in Park’s expression as ‘any city’: evidently, for Park and his colleagues Chicago was *the* paradigmatic city of their time⁴². Thomas F. Gieryn (2006) discusses the *epistemological stance* taken by the Chicago School that made the city into a hybrid *truth-spot* deriving claims for scientific truth from the city both as a *laboratory* (a ‘made’ place where under laboratory conditions universal knowledge for ‘everywhere’ is produced by emotionally ‘detached’ scientists) and a *field site* (a ‘found’ natural place where local knowledge of a particular ‘here’ is produced by anthropologically ‘immersed’ researchers). Gieryn stresses that “Chicago school urban studies were in Chicago, of Chicago, and about Chicago” (2006: 10). While Gieryn suggests that Los Angeles School takes an almost opposite postmodernist stance by building its credibility on ‘weakness’ and by “invit[ing] its audiences to co-construct the place” (2006: 26), his important observation on epistemic claims still holds. Both schools iterate the principle of referring to a certain particular case-place-city as nearly Weberian ideal type, as a paradigmatic city, as a *harbinger of future*. This principle seems to be shared by many researchers: for example, Nijman (2000) arguing about Miami, Sassen (2001) exploring chosen command and control nodes of London, New York and Tokyo and implicitly expanding the principle to other cities, or John Mollenkopf (2008, forthcoming) arguing that New York should be juxtaposed with Chicago and Los Angeles in order to construct a viable urban theory that would, in his words, ‘stand on more than one leg’.

Conclusion: From Chicago to Los Angeles and Beyond

Throughout the paper I have attempted to show that the *theoretical evolution* from the classical urban theoretical ideas of the Chicago School incorporated by Los Angeles School reflects the *general trends of urban theory*. In a nutshell, the L.A. School attempts to refer to Chicago legacy but their references repeatedly fail to strike a chord: it cannot be used as a theoretical resource for the construction of Los Angeles School urban theories. The reductionist character of the image may hint at the sheer impossibility of even opposing to the Chicago School in the strict sense.

This image-making is illuminating. It reflects the more general theoretical shifts that I have attempted to document: these shifts in the understanding of the city are more than just *quantitative shifts* or *corrections of a model*. These are the *fundamental changes in the way we*

⁴⁰ Note the easiness of L.A. scholars’ transition from claiming Los Angeles an ‘industrial metropolis’ to asserting ‘postmodern urbanism’. This transition well underscores their fascination with postmodern theory while retaining the adherence to the tenets of Marxist political economy.

⁴¹ Nijman argues that paradigmatic city of postmodern epoch is not Los Angeles – which he portrays as a late industrial city – but Miami. Cf. Sassen and Portes 1993 on Miami.

⁴² There is an interesting parallel with Walter Benjamin’s (1999a [1935], 1999b [1939]) observation of Paris as a ‘capital of nineteenth century’. Yet Chicago School made more than an observation: theirs was an agenda for a community of researchers.

understand our settlements, their nature, constitution and future. I suggest that Los Angeles School of Urbanism may be viewed less as a ‘school’ in a strict Tiryakian’s sense but as a ‘wave’ of research: a relatively inconsistent aggregate of authors and texts that ‘caught the moment’ of radical restructuring of urban space and urban environment and based itself in a specific place – in Los Angeles, being, to remember Thomas Gieryn speaking of Chicago, in Los Angeles, of Los Angeles and about Los Angeles. In other words, Los Angeles School is in a certain way ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ – the community that was in a proper moment called ‘a scientific school’ began to be recognized as such and to recognize itself as such. Currently there are little competing directions that have comparable symbolic power (such as the claims for Chicago School legacy).

And yet I would suggest that the true *challenge* that urban theory faces at the moment lies precisely in the Chicagoan methodological principle. ‘Park’s principle’ of paradigmatic city seems to have a firm hold over urban research. Every year new debates emerge about whether Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, London, Miami, Tokyo, or some other city is the laboratory of future urban sociology is desperately looking for.

Perhaps a more fruitful way would be to rethink the very notion of the city. For urban lifestyle and connectivity increasingly penetrates what used to be non-urban human settlement. It is no longer exhausted by metropolises. And neither is it exhausted by cities in the ‘leading’ countries of the ‘old West’. Mario Small (2007) in a review of Loïc Wacquant’s recent book (2008) warns against “assuming that assuming that the South Side of Chicago represents [all American] poor black neighborhoods” (Small 2007: 413) – all while Wacquant himself attempted to show that American ghettos do not represent the ‘universal’ way urban poverty exists... by comparing Chicago and Paris! Could Rio de Janeiro, Mexico City, Dhaka, or Moscow be studied on the basis of studying Los Angeles alone? Or Paris and London? Is urban theory only beginning to accept the postcolonial challenge? Could it only look at ‘small cities’ as ‘smaller’ expressions of the same processes that are active in shaping metropolitan centers? Maybe it should first and foremost rethink its basic spatial metaphors? In the recent decades the spatial turn in the social sciences has led to the emergence of an ample supply of different spatial concepts. For example, Annemarie Mol and John Law suggest using the metaphors of ‘network’ and ‘fluid’ alongside ‘region’ (Mol and Law 1994, Law 2004). John Urry (2000, 2007) argues for a fundamental shift of attention in sociology from societies to mobilities. These concepts are just a few of those that urban studies have to examine and possibly appropriate if a sound theoretical approach to urban phenomena applicable beyond a few supposedly ‘leading’ cities is to be developed.

References

1. **Abbott, Andrew. 1999.** *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred.* Chicago, IL and London, UK: The University of Chicago Press.
2. **Abbott, Andrew. 2002.** ‘Los Angeles and the Chicago School: A Comment on Michael Dear. *City and Community*, Vol.1 No.1 (March), pp.33-38.
3. **Alexander, Jeffrey. 1982.** *Theoretical Logic in Sociology. Volume I: Positivism, Presuppositions, and Current Controversies.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
4. **Amin, Ash and Nigel Thrift. 2002.** *Cities: Reimagining the Urban.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.
5. **Antipode 1999** Vol.31 No.1, pp.1-44.
6. **Baudrillard, Jean. 2000 [1986].** *America.* Russian translation by D.Kalugin: *Amerika.* Saint-Petersburg, Russia: Izdatelstvo «Vladimir Dal».
7. **Becker, Howard S. 1999.** ‘The Chicago School, So-Called’. *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol.22 No.1, pp.3-12.

8. **Benjamin, Walter. 1999a [1935].** 'Paris, the Capital of the Nineteenth Century (Exposé of 1935)'. Pp.3-13 in: Benjamin, Walter. 1999. *The Arcades Project* [translated by H.Eiland and K.McLaughlin]. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
9. **Benjamin, Walter. 1999b [1939].** 'Paris, the Capital of the Nineteenth Century (Exposé of 1939)'. Pp.14-26 in: Benjamin, Walter. 1999. *The Arcades Project* [translated by H.Eiland and K.McLaughlin]. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
10. **Bulmer, Martin. 1984.** *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago, IL and London, UK: The University of Chicago Press.
11. **Burgess, Ernest W. 1925.** 'The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project'. Pp.47-62 in: Park, Robert Ezra, Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie, with Louis Wirth. 1925. *The City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
12. **Castells, Manuel. 2000.** *The Rise of the Network Society. 2nd Ed. (Volume 1 of The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture)*. Oxford et al.: Blackwell Publishing.
13. **Cenzatti, Marco. 1993.** *Los Angeles and the L.A. School: Postmodernism and Urban Studies*. Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design.
14. **Chambers, Iain. 1990.** *Border Dialogues: Journeys in Postmodernity*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
15. **City and Community 2002** Vol.1 No.1 (March), pp.5-57.
16. **Curry, James and Martin Kenney. 1999.** 'The Paradigmatic City: Postindustrial Illusion and the Los Angeles School'. *Antipode*, Vol.31 No.1, pp.1-28.
17. **Davis, Mike. 1999 [1998].** *Ecology of Fear: Los Angeles and the Imagination of Disaster*. New York: Vintage Books.
18. **Davis, Mike. 2006 [1991].** *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles. 3rd Ed. With a New Preface*. London, UK and New York, NY: Verso.
19. **Dear, Michael J. 2000.** *The Postmodern Urban Condition*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
20. **Dear, Michael J. (ed.) 2002a.** *From Chicago to L.A.: Making Sense of Urban Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA et al.: Sage.
21. **Dear, Michael J. 2002b.** 'Preface'. Pp.vii-xi in: Dear, Michael J. (ed.) 2002. *From Chicago to L.A.: Making Sense of Urban Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA et al.: Sage.
22. **Dear, Michael J. 2002c.** 'Los Angeles and the Chicago School: Invitation to a Debate'. *City and Community*, Vol.1 No.1 (March), pp.5-32.
23. **Dear, Michael J. and Nicholas Dahmann. 2008, forthcoming.** 'Urban Politics and the Los Angeles School of Urbanism'. *Urban Affairs Review*. [Published at Urban Affairs Review OnlineFirst on June 16, 2008 as doi:10.1177/1078087408320240, accessed at <http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/1078087408320240v1> on August 29, 2008].
24. **Dear, Michael J. and Steven Flusty. 1999.** 'Engaging Postmodern Urbanism'. *Urban Geography*, Vol.20 No.5, pp.412-416.
25. **Deegan, Mary Jo. 1997.** 'Hull-House Maps and Papers: The Birth of the Chicago Sociology'. Pp.5-19 in: Plummer, Ken (ed.) 1997. *The Chicago School: Critical Assessments. 4 Vols. Vol.II: Theory. History and Foundations*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
26. **Fine, Gary Alan (ed.) 1995.** *A Second Chicago School? The Development of a Postwar American Sociology*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
27. **Flusty, Steven and Michael J. Dear. 1998⁴³.** 'Postmodern Urbanism'. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.88 No.1, pp. 50-72.

⁴³ Slightly abridged versions of this article were reprinted as: Flusty, Steven and Michael J. Dear. 1999. 'The Postmodern Urban Condition'. Pp.64-85 in: Featherstone, Mike and Scott Lash (eds.) 1999. *Spaces of Culture:*

28. **Gans, Herbert J. 1968 [1962].** 'Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life'. Pp.34-52 in: Gans, Herbert J. 1968. *People and Plans: Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions*. New York, NY and London, UK: Basic Books, Inc.
29. **Gans, Herbert J. 1995.** *The War Against the Poor: The Underclass and Anti-Poverty Policy*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
30. **Gans, Herbert J. 2002.** 'The Sociology of Space: A Use-Centered View'. *City and Community*, Vol.1 No.4 (December), pp.329-339.
31. **Garfinkel, Harold. 1967.** *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
32. **Gieryn, Thomas. 2006.** 'City as Truth-Spot: Laboratories and Field-Sites in Urban Studies' *Social Studies of Science*, Vol.36 No.1, pp.5-38.
33. **Goffman, Erving. 1986 [1974].** *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
34. **Goffman, Erving. 1990 [1959].** *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London, UK et al.: Penguin Books.
35. **Gottdiener, Mark and Ray Hutchison. 2006.** *The New Urban Sociology. 3rd Ed.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
36. **Hall, Tim. 1998.** *Urban Geography. 2nd Ed.* London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
37. **Harvey, Lee. 1987.** *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology*. Aldershot, UK et al.: Avebury.
38. **Harvey, Lee. 1997 [1987].** 'The Nature of 'Schools' in the Sociology of Knowledge: The Case of the 'Chicago School''. Pp.134-163 in: Plummer, Ken (ed.) 1997. *The Chicago School: Critical Assessments. 4 Vols. Vol.I: A Chicago Canon?*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
39. **Heap, Chad. 2003.** 'The City as a Sexual Laboratory: The Queer Heritage of the Chicago School'. *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol.26 No.4 (Winter), pp.457-487.
40. **Highmore, Ben. 2005.** *Cityscapes: Cultural Readings in the Material and Symbolic City*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
41. **Hunter, Albert. 1997.** 'Why Chicago? The Rise of the Chicago School of Urban Social Science'. Pp.62-73 in: Plummer, Ken (ed.) 1997. *The Chicago School: Critical Assessments. 4 Vols. Vol.II: Theory. History and Foundations*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
42. **Ingersoll, Richard. 2006.** *Sprawltown: Looking for the City on Its Edges*. New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press.
43. **Judd, Dennis R. 2005.** 'Everything is Always Going to Hell: Urban Scholars as End-Times Prophets'. *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol.41 No.2 (November), pp.119-131.
44. **Kharlamov, Nikita A. 2007.** 'Review Essay: John Rennie Short. 2006. *Urban Theory: A Critical Assessment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.' In Russian: *Sotziologicheskoye Obozreniye*, T.6 No.3, pp.60-63.
45. **Kharlamov, Nikita A. 2008.** 'Review Essay: Amin, Ash and Nigel Thrift. 2002. *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Cambridge: Polity.' In Russian: *Sotzialnaya Realnost: Zhurnal Sotziologicheskikh Nablyudenii I Soobschenii*, Vol.1 (23) (February), pp.117-123.
46. **Kharlamov, Nikita A. 2008, forthcoming.** 'The Worlds of *Urban Outcasts*'. In Russian: 'Miry Gorodskikh Otverzhenykh'. *Pushkin*.

City-Nation-World. London, UK et al.: Sage; and as Flusty, Steven and Michael J. Dear. 2002. 'Los Angeles as Postmodern Urbanism'. Pp.61-84 in: Dear, Michael J. (ed.) 2002a. *From Chicago to L.A.: Making Sense of Urban Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA et al.: Sage. For the sake of continuity 1998 version is referenced to throughout the present paper.

47. **Kling, Rob, Spencer C. Olin and Mark Poster (eds.) 1991.** *Postsuburban California: The Transformation of Orange County Since World War II*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
48. **Kuhn, Thomas S. 2003 [1962].** 'The Structure of Scientific Revolutions'. Russian translation by I.Naletov: 'Struktura nauchnykh revolutsiy'. Pp.9-223 in: Kuhn, Thomas S. 2003. *Struktura nauchnykh revolutsiy*. Perevod s angl. Sostavitel V.Kuznetsov. Moscow, Russia: OOO «Izdatelstvo AST». 2003.
49. **Kuhn, Thomas S. 2003 [1969].** '1969 Postscript'. Russian translation by I.Naletov: 'Posleslovie 1969 goda'. Pp.224-268 in: Kuhn, Thomas S. 2003. *Struktura nauchnykh revolutsiy*. Perevod s angl. Sostavitel V.Kuznetsov. Moscow, Russia: OOO «Izdatelstvo AST». 2003.
50. **Latour, Bruno. 2005.** *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
51. **Law, John. 2002.** 'Objects and Spaces'. *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol.19 No.5-6, pp.91-105.
52. **Law, John. 2004.** *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
53. **Lefebvre, Henri. 1987.** 'The Everyday and Everydayness' [translated from French by C.Levich]. *Yale French Studies*, No.73, pp.7-11.
54. **Lefebvre, Henri. 1991 [1974].** *The Production of Space* [translated from French by D.Nicholson-Smith]. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
55. **Lefebvre, Henri. 2000 [1971].** *Everyday Life in the Modern World* [translated by S.Rabinovitch]. London, UK and New York, NY: Continuum.
56. **Lewis, J. David and Richard L. Smith. 1980.** *American Sociology and Pragmatism: Mead, Chicago Sociology, and Symbolic Interactionism*. Chicago, IL and London, UK: The University of Chicago Press.
57. **Low, Setha M. 1996.** 'The Anthropology of Cities: Imagining and Theorizing the City'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol.25, pp.383-409.
58. **McKenzie, Roderick D. 1925.** 'The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community'. Pp.63-79 in: Park, Robert Ezra, Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie, with Louis Wirth. 1925. *The City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
59. **McWilliams, Carey. 1973 [1946].** *Southern California: An Island on the Land*. Layton, UT: Gibbs Smith, Publisher.
60. **Mol, Annemarie and John Law. 1994.** 'Regions, Networks and Fluids: Anaemia and Social Topology'. *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 24, pp.641-671.
61. **Mollenkopf, John. 2008, forthcoming.** 'School Is Out: The Case of New York City'. *Urban Affairs Review*. [Published at Urban Affairs Review OnlineFirst on August 5, 2008 as doi:10.1177/1078087408321870, accessed at <http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/1078087408321870v1> on August 29, 2008].
62. **Mullins, Nicholas C. 1973.** *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology. With the Assistance of Carolyn J. Mullins*. New York, NY et al.: Harper and Row, Publishers.
63. **Nijman, Jan. 2000.** 'The Paradigmatic City'. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.90 No.1 (March), pp.135-145.
64. **Park, Robert E. 1925⁴⁴.** 'The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment'. Pp.1-46 in: Park, Robert Ezra, Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie, with Louis Wirth. 1925. *The City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

⁴⁴ This article was first published as: Park, Robert E. 1915. 'The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behaviour in the City Environment'. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.20 No.5 (March), pp.577-612.

65. **Park, Robert E. 1936.** 'Human Ecology'. *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.42 No.1 (Jul.), pp.1-15.
66. **Park, Robert Ezra, Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie, with Louis Wirth. 1925.** *The City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
67. **Parr, John B. 2007.** 'Spatial Definitions of the City: Four Perspectives'. *Urban Studies*, Vol.44 No.2 (February), pp.381-392.
68. **Salerno, Roger A. 2007.** *Sociology Noir: Studies at the University of Chicago in Loneliness, Marginality and Deviance, 1915-1935*. Jefferson, NC and London, UK: McFarland and Company, Inc., Publishers.
69. **Sassen, Saskia. 2001 [1991].** *The Global City. 2nd Ed.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
70. **Sassen, Saskia (ed.) 2007.** *Deciphering the Global: Its Spaces, Scales and Subjects*. London and New York: Routledge.
71. **Sassen, Saskia and Alejandro Portes. 1993.** 'Miami: A New Global City?'. *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 22 No.4 (July), pp.471-477.
72. **Schuetz, Alfred. 1945.** 'On Multiple Realities'. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Vol.5 No.4 (June), pp. 533-576.
73. **Scott, Allen J. and Edward W. Soja (eds.) 1996.** *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
74. **Short, John Rennie. 2006.** *Urban Theory: A Critical Assessment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
75. **Simmel, Georg. 1950 [1903].** 'The Metropolis and Mental Life' [translated by H.H.Gerth and C.W.Mills]. Pp.409-424 in: Wolff, Kurt H. (ed.) 1950. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Glencoe: Free Press.
76. **Small, Mario Luis. 2007.** 'Is There Such a Thing as 'The Ghetto'? The Perils of Assuming that the South Side of Chicago Represents Poor Black Neighborhoods'. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*. Vol.11 No.3 (December), pp.413-421.
77. **Soja, Edward W. 1989.** *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London, UK and New York, NY: Verso.
78. **Soja, Edward W. 1996a.** *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
79. **Soja, Edward W. 1996b.** 'Los Angeles, 1965-1992: From Crisis-Generated Restructuring to Restructuring-Generated Crisis'. Pp.426-462 in: Scott, Allen J. and Edward W. Soja (eds.) 1996. *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
80. **Soja, Edward W. 2000.** *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
81. **Sorkin, Michael (ed.) 1992.** *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
82. **Thorns, David C. 2002.** *The Transformation of Cities: Urban Theory and Urban Life*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
83. **Thrift, Nigel. 1996.** *Spatial Formations*. London, UK et al.: Sage.
84. **Tiryakian, Edward A. 1979.** 'The Significance of Schools in the Development of Sociology'. Pp.211-233 in: Snizek, William E., Ellsworth R. Fuhrman and Michael K. Miller (eds.) 1979. *Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective*. Westport, CT and London, UK: Greenwood Press.
85. **Urban Geography 1999** Vol.20 No.5, pp.393-416.
86. **Urban Geography 2008** Vol.29 No.2 (February-March), pp.97-186.
87. **Urry, John. 2000.** *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*. London, UK: Routledge.
88. **Urry, John. 2007.** *Mobilities*. Oxford: Polity.

89. **Wacquant, Loïc. 2008.** *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
90. **Waldinger, Roger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr (eds.) 1996.** *Ethnic Los Angeles*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
91. **Webster, Frank. 2004 [2002].** *Theories of the Information Society. 2nd Edition*. Russian translation by M.V.Arapov and N.V.Malykhina, edited by Ye.L.Vartanova: *Teorii informatsionnogo obtschestva*. Moscow: Aspekt Press.
92. **Wilson, William Julius. 1996.** *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Vintage Books.
93. **Wirth, Louis. 1925.** 'A Bibliography of the Urban Community'. Pp.161-230 in: Park, Robert Ezra, Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie, with Louis Wirth. 1925. *The City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
94. **Wirth, Louis. 1938.** 'Urbanism as a Way of Life'. *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.44 No.1, pp. 1-24.
95. **Wolch, Jennifer, Stephanie Pincetl and Laura Pulido. 2002.** 'Urban Nature and the Nature of Urbanism'. Pp.367-402 in: Dear, Michael J. (ed.) 2002. *From Chicago to L.A.: Making Sense of Urban Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA et al.: Sage.
96. **Zorbaugh, Harvey Warren. 1965 [1929].** *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.