9

Legacies and Remnants of the Chicago School

Lineage-making and Interdisciplinary Urban Research at the University of Chicago

Pranathi Diwakar and Joshua Babcock

Introduction

On a humid, sunny afternoon in June 2018, a small group of University of Chicago students (doctoral, Master's, and undergraduate), faculty, and neighbourhood residents convened outside the Saieh Hall for Economics, a recently renovated neo-Gothic building located at 5757 South University Avenue in Chicago's Hyde Park neighbourhood. The building was formerly home to the Chicago Theological Seminary and Seminary Co-Op Bookstore before being slated in 2008 for an extensive adaptive-reuse project that converted the ecclesiastical site into mixed-use classroom, conference, seminar, collaborative work, and office space, home to the Department of Economics and the Becker Friedman Institute for Research in Economics.[1]

This group came together after several months of planning, meetings, archival research in the holdings of the University of Chicago Special Collections, and key interviews with long-time Hyde Parkers. The stage had been set by an initial meeting in the early winter quarter 2017, hosted by the University of Chicago's Urban Workshop. The workshop's more than 30 attendees offered input on the project's focus, scope, format, and aims. Over the course of winter and spring 2018, volunteers laid the groundwork for the live-narrated 'test drive' of the Hyde Park Walking Tour (hereafter 'Walking Tour'), an opportunity for this group with various connections to the university to think collectively about the shifting relationships between

[1] This institute itself was formed in 2011 through the merger of the then three-year-old Friedman Institute and the Becker Center on Chicago Price Theory.

Companion to Urban and Regional Studies. Edited by Anthony M. Orum, Javier Ruiz-Tagle, Serena Vicari Haddock
© 2021 John Wiley & Sons Ltd
ISBN: 9781119316916

university and neighbourhood, between scholarship and praxis, and how changing institutional arrangements within the university had driven neighbourhood change, both past and present.

The Walking Tour's main product will be an audio guide focused on the 'urban renewal' period in Chicago's history, between the 1950s and late 1970s (Davis and Vinci, 2013), during which time the character and built form of the Hyde Park neighbourhood changed dramatically. The route begins at the intersection of 57th Street and South Lake Park Avenue along the 57th Metra commuter railway station. It passes a number of murals under the Metra underpasses along 57th, 56th, and 55th Streets – whose artwork reflects in various ways on neighbourhood change in Hyde Park – and the I.M. Pei-designed University Apartments, an important site in the neighbourhood's urban renewal period. Along the way, it reflects on the closing of a hardware and drugstore; multiple bars and jazz clubs; as well as large-scale evictions and demolitions of houses occupied by poor, Black residents as a way to combat 'blight' (ibid.: 295). Such development sought to promote a 'racially integrated stable housing' situation for middle- and upper-class residents (ibid.: 311). The walk continues down South Blackstone Avenue to reach 53rd Street, now part of the rebranded 'Downtown Hyde Park', whose multiple storefronts and restaurants have been developed through the efforts of the South East Chicago Commission (SECC) – a major player, along with the university, in early urban renewal efforts in the neighbourhood (Condit, 1974; Hirsch, 1983; Mayer and Wade, 1969). 'Downtown Hyde Park' has received significant university support to 'revitalise' the neighbourhood with new entertainment and leisure amenities. When the final Walking Tour is complete, we hope that, through it, participants will reflect not only on the transformations that have taken place over the decades, but also draw their own parallels to the current trends of neighbourhood redevelopment and 'revitalisation'.

We outline the Walking Tour here because the present chapter emerged nearly concurrently with the Urban Workshop's collaboration on the project. When we began thinking about the Walking Tour, we had just started as the Urban Workshop's co-organisers. University workshop culture itself has a long history, with workshops serving as places for graduate students, faculty, interested members of the public, the occasional undergraduate student, and invited faculty guests from various institutions to gather and provide feedback on scholarly works-in-progress. At the Urban Workshop's helm, we were in an advantageous position to observe and reflect on the workshop's changing attendee demographics. As biographic individuals, we ourselves index some of these changes. As a linguistic anthropologist (Babcock) and sociologist (Diwakar), respectively, both researching in substantive areas outside the mainstream of our disciplines, both conducting fieldwork in non-US cities, we have spent the vast majority of our academic careers, and broader intellectual lives, paying explicit attention to the relationships between institutional legacies and groups' and individuals' life opportunities. In terms of workshop attendance, although PhD students continued to be the majority population of presenters at the workshop in our year as co-organisers, we saw increased attendance from residents of the Hyde Park–Kenwood area, to whom the workshop is open. More than anything, we were surprised by the way in which the perspectives of these neighbourhood residents – welcomed stakeholders in the workshop community – were often met with bewilderment to outright hostility from the academic attendees.

Beyond the mere temporal convergence of these three things – the Walking Tour, our terms as workshop co-organisers, and the present chapter – we elaborate this case here because we think it provides a good overview of the ways that institutional legacies, new developments, and structural dynamics are shaping urban research at the university. In the context of Hyde Park's embittered, even violent history in the neighbourhood, from Black displacement to the growing attendance of community members at the Urban Workshop, it becomes all the more important to think about the connections between the university, its scholarship, its institutional arrangements, and the people who inhabit its physical and imagined geographies.

We have so far managed this extended introduction without any mention of the 'Chicago School', which is, in the end, this chapter's overt substantive focus. The 'Chicago School' is a historically and historiographically constituted object, invoked to refer to many things – methods, theoretical approaches, conceptual activities, topical frameworks – whether inclusively or exclusively. Abundant and extensive research has made this point, showing how (or serving as examples of how) invocations of the 'Chicago School' are used to form and contest academic lineages, oppositional stances, or invitations to debate. It is not our intention either to challenge or amend this literature as such, nor do we seek to be comprehensive in our treatment of topics or key works.[2] Rather, this piece relies and builds on this work from our own positions as doctoral students at the University of Chicago to reflect on the 'Chicago School' as it stands in the present moment. In the following sections, we outline the multiple ways that this category functions in the literature in order to then take a closer look at the ways in which the 'Chicago School' is currently situated at the intersection of university, department(s), discipline(s), and interdisciplinary developments. Rather than treat the 'Chicago School' in isolation, in this chapter we focus on some of the ways in which it has developed, historically, out of interdisciplinary engagements. Above all, we reflect on the status of the school's historical connection to '(the) city' in the context of an interdisciplinary and institutional impetus to focus on '(the) urban'. While acknowledging the many critiques of the content of urban- and sociological scholarship produced by what was retroactively constituted as the 'Chicago School', we turn to these interdisciplinary engagements – both conceptual and methodological – to bring a new perspective to extant debates over the 'Chicago School's' legacies.

The chapter proceeds in four sections. In the first section, we provide a brief overview of extant scholarship on the many ways that the 'Chicago School' has been treated. The second part of this section outlines our own conceptual and theoretical understandings of lineage-making as it relates to concepts drawn from anthropology and the sociology of knowledge. The second section reflects, first, on some of the substantive historical overlaps between concepts developed by anthropologists and sociologists during the early years of department formation, especially theorisation of race and the rural–urban continuum. Next, it highlights how insights from science, technology, and society (STS) research and the history of cartography provide new ways of reflecting on the growing interest in cartographic methods. We consider

[2] For an overview of the disciplinary history – albeit without a discussion of historiographic difficulties or controversies (Abbott, 1999: 4) – see e.g. Plummer (1997); for a comprehensive bibliographic survey, see Kurtz (1984).

how these early developments are linked to trends in computational and spatial analytic approaches at the university today. In the penultimate section, we outline the present institutional arrangements for urban research at the University of Chicago before offering concluding remarks in the last section.

Approaches to 'The' 'Chicago School'

This part gives an overview of what is at this point a familiar history of the 'Chicago School'.[3] The category towards which this label points can be broad – as in anyone researching, teaching, or receiving an education at the University of Chicago, or participating in some quintessentially 'Chicago' way of doing things – or specific – for instance, a particular time period (e.g. 1915–1935), a set of professors (e.g. Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, Ellsworth Farris, W.I. Thomas, Herbert Blumer, Louis Wirth), a set of students (e.g. Herbert Blumer, Louis Wirth, Everett Hughes, Harvey W. Zorbaugh, Ernest R. Mowrer), and/or a body of work. Many historical and historiographical overviews of the Chicago School have attempted to situate the Chicago School with respect to some particular context(s): for instance, the institutional setting of the University of Chicago social science (Bulmer, 1984); a commitment to American liberal values (Smith, 1988); corporate interests (e.g. the Rockefeller fortune that bankrolled the early university; ibid.); a generalised, if loose, approach to processual sociology (Abbott, 1999); the emergence at the university of other 'schools', like that of philosophy; intellectual movements (e.g. pragmatism, ecology); or the City of Chicago.

Adopting the more specific 'customary view' (ibid.: 5) of the Chicago School – including a time period, set of professors, group of students, and body of work – the research produced between 1915 and 1935 still cannot easily be summarised according to a single paradigm. However, much of this research was brought together by the fact that the City of Chicago acted as its practitioners' backyard. The view of the city as young, raw, turbulent, and constituted by paradox – a view echoed in literature, scholarly writing, social reform manifestoes, journalistic reportage, and the like – had a strong impact on the ways in which the school's early researchers undertook their work. It also imparted a sense of urgency to that work (Bulmer, 1984: 13–16). Within the historical context of Chicago's explosive growth, destruction and rebuilding, and rapid demographic and urban transformation, the University of Chicago had early on made a name for itself through its school of philosophy, associated with the pragmatists Dewey and Mead, much earlier in the decade.[4] However, the first description of a school of Chicago *sociology* came with Milla A. Alihan's critique of Chicago's 'ecological school'. Characterising it as a 'school' surrounding Park and associates, her 1938 *Social Ecology: A Critical Analysis*, nevertheless iden-

[3] Our use of inverted commas around 'Chicago School' is intended to draw attention to its multiplicity and contestation. Though we do not include them from this point forward, they should be implied.

[4] In 1903, William James had praised the 'Chicago University' school of philosophy as uniting both 'thought' and a 'school', a feat that set it apart from both Harvard and Yale universities (James 1903, cited in Smith, 1988: 28).

tified it as having a particular style of analysis, body of work, a group of adherents, and a theoretical canon (Alihan, 1938).

After Alihan, the next period in which writing about the Chicago School *qua* 'school' began to effloresce was during the 1960s. Abbott (1999: 15–33) identifies three major periods of writing about the Chicago School: *colligation* (1960s and 1970s), *consolidation* (1970s–early 1980s), and *complexification and revisionism* (1980s–1990s). During the *colligation* period, scholars worked to delimit the school's methods, members, and provenance, thereby condensing a set of facts that could be located as an object of investigation. The period of *consolidation* introduced historical and historiographical complexity to the Chicago School as a now-defined object of investigation. The interpretations that emerged during this period were divided between emphases on social psychology, on the one hand, and, on the other, fieldwork and the ecological tradition (ibid.: 13). During this period, the school also became an object of focus in the European social sciences, as the Swedish anthropologist Ulf Hannerz (discussed further in the section on interdisciplinary conceptualisations) took up the Chicago School to claim a lineage for the still-condensing field of urban anthropology; other scholars translated influential theoretical essays, such as Wirth's 'Urbanism as a Way of Life', into French (ibid.: 13–14). Finally, during the *complexification and revisionism* phase of the 1980s and 1990s (and continuing into the present), scholars sought to return the Chicago School to the 'flow of the historical process … No school is an island, these works say, either in social space or in social time' (ibid.: 30).

Across these periods, a number of figures worked assiduously to constitute the Chicago School, creating the resources that would make possible future historical and historiographical research. One such figure is Morris Janowitz, who not only championed the hiring of key faculty to the Department of Sociology, but also established the *Heritage of Sociology* series, which from the 1960s onwards republished and reintroduced the Chicago School's work. Gary Fine (1995) similarly worked to trace 'common pattern[s] of thought' as they spread through the diaspora of University of Chicago graduates who moved to places like Kansas, CUNY, Arizona, and Brandeis during academia's post-war expansion (Abbott, 1999: 19–20). In general, as Abbott also points out, most work invoking the Chicago School takes it as foundational in current debates on '(the) city'. But the formal ecological and successional conception of '(the) city' that University of Chicago sociologists developed in the period 1915–1935 was only systematically challenged as emblematic of a *school of thought* since the late 1970s (ibid.: 23). As such, despite the longer histories of production of scholarship and diversity of thought that has come to be colligated as the 'school', in much current debate the Chicago School is framed as 'a tradition to be transcended or an orthodoxy to be overthrown' (ibid.). This is not to deny the existence and impact of Marxist and neo-Marxist critiques from scholars such as Harvey, Lefebvre, and Castells, which began in the prior decade. Rather, we draw attention instead to the point made by Abbott (1999): that the purported unity of a *school* as the object of critique was the result of its retrospective creation as an object in the 1970s and 1980s. As a result of this retrospective creation, the existence of a singular Chicago School view of the city has become presumable as such. This object creation has itself also shifted over time in response to broad shifts in the conditions under which it has come to be seen as necessary to orient, affirmatively or negatively, to disciplinary pasts, thereby strategically bringing those pasts into the present.

Lineage-making, Predecessors, and Legacies

Before continuing our discussion of interdisciplinary conceptualisations and methodologies in the making of the Chicago School, it is first important to clarify: what do we mean by *lineage*? How is it related to other theoretical tools developed to describe and explain uses of the past in the present? Our purpose in asking and stating our positions on these questions is to make clear that lineages always emerge out of projects of lineage-making. Another way of saying this is that prior forms do not simply continue from the past into the present (what might be referred to as a cultural *survival*; see Tylor, 1883: vol. I, 70–159), but instead are actively brought out as constituting a history.

Talal Asad refers to a 'discursive tradition' as a set of didactic instructions regarding the 'correct form and purpose of a given practice that, precisely because it is established, has a history' and which is used, via appeals to that history, to link a past to a future through a present (Asad, 2009 [1986]: 20). Such discursive traditions often rely on ostensibly past things, but this should not be understood – following Kuhn and later scholars in the social study of science – to involve processes of cumulative accretion, but of creative reinterpretation (Camic, 1992: 431). While the Chicago School, as a heterogeneous object, can productively be understood as having been formalised as a discursive tradition (perhaps more accurately, as many discursive traditions), our project here takes inspiration from Charles Camic's now-classic historiographical re-evaluation of the development of Talcott Parson's sociology. Against the 'content-fit model' of predecessor selection – a view according to which a thinker chooses their predecessors due to 'fit' between 'the arguments, concepts, themes, materials, orientations, or methods of certain earlier figures and some aspect(s) of the work of the thinker under study' (ibid.: 423) – Camic draws our attention to the 'socioinstitutional circumstances', including reputational mechanisms (ibid.), that lead to selective uptake of some but not other alternatives from among a range of more or less intersubstitutable positions (ibid.: 421–422). In short, one actively chooses one's predecessors (albeit in ways afforded by institutional arrangements, historical contingencies, and individual- or group goals), thereby establishing one's own position as inheritor of an intellectual legacy. Though 'legacy' can refer to an artefact of a prior period that has found its way into present forms and arrangements, as in the term's use in computing, originally borrowed from the 'legacy effects' described in ecology (see Clements, 1916), we use the term more in its colloquial sense as something taken up from a predecessor. By emphasising this process of uptake, we draw attention to the fact that the past never simply *is*. Rather, it is constantly made and remade, whether as history (Trouillot, 1995: 26), invented tradition(s) (Hobsbawm, 2003 [1983]), academic lineage(s), or otherwise.

Interdisciplinary Conceptualisations

In this section, we examine the Chicago School's engagements with '(the) *urban*' in relation to the category's shifting disciplinary engagements within and beyond sociology. We consider, on the one hand, Chicago School sociologists' explicit empirical engagement with a modern American city (Chicago) to think about present-day

legacies and transformations in conceptualisations of urbanism. At the same time, we draw attention to the ways, historically, in which key Chicago School concepts and approaches developed out of interdisciplinary engagements, in particular between sociology and anthropology. Though theorisation of 'the urban' has changed over time in response to exogenous factors – changing city forms; a meteoric rise in the number of cities across the United States and the world; shifts in patterns of urban settlement, movement, segregation, growth, and inequality – our aim in this section is not to explicate these transformations. Rather, we draw attention to Chicago School sociologists' early connection with anthropologists at the university, which produced important – if under-recognised – mutual impacts on conceptualisations of 'the urban' within sociology, both through overt borrowing, and through divisions of intellectual labour that defined both disciplines' subject matter through a presumed contrast with the other.

In the early decades of its founding, the University of Chicago was noted for the extent and intensity of its interdisciplinary exchange. In the early years, this was due in part to its small size; it was also due to a self-consciousness of the university's own newness, which afforded its faculty and administrators the possibility to oppose the perceived orthodoxy of older Eastern Seaboard universities. This interdisciplinary exchange similarly emerged out of scholars' close physical proximity to one another, both in their spaces of work – like the Social Science Research Building (completed 1929) – and leisure – like the Quadrangle Club, where on any given day, one could overhear lively mealtime conversations among philosophers, zoologists, sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, and others. Finally, it was also due to the organisation of the university's departments, which were interdisciplinary in the sense generally meant by the term's uses today: until 1929, Albion Small's Department of Social Science was a joint department of sociology *and* anthropology.

These exchanges were also inter-institutional and extra-disciplinary: Albion Small helped to elevate the University of Chicago's profile in Europe through his work with the 1904 Saint Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences, which put him in close contact with figures like Max Weber and Gustav von Ratzenhofer (Bulmer, 1984: 34). Further, as Smith (1988) has argued, far from being cloistered away in the university's Gothic towers, this particular manifestation of a long-standing Chicago tradition of a liberal critique of capitalism brought faculty and graduate students alike into contact with Chicago-area reformers, policymakers, community organisations, and professional- and para-professional groups with whom they shared general goals, if not values, methods, or theoretical ambitions. The 'customary view' of the Chicago School tends to rest on a distinction between the predominantly women sociologists at Hull House and the almost entirely men sociologists of 'the Chicago School', framed as a contrast between reformist, policy-oriented zeal – part of the Hull House mission, after all, was 'to investigate and improve the conditions in industrial districts of Chicago' (Addams, 1990 [1889]: 66) – and a discipline imbued with theoretical and empirical rigour. However, historiographical writing on Hull House has shown that such easy distinctions are complicated by overlapping membership, methodological similarities, and sociological substance. There was extensive intellectual borrowing and collaboration between scholars at Hull House – such as Jane Addams, Florence Kelley, and Grace Addams – and faculty at the Department of Sociology such as Albion Small, George Herbert Mead, and

Charles Zueblin (Deegan, 2017). Faculty like Burgess, Zueblin, and Mead worked at Hull House, carrying out statistical surveys or reform efforts alongside women sociologists. The 1895 publication *Hull House Maps and Papers* was spearheaded by Florence Kelley and other women sociologists at Hull House. It contained essays, maps, and statistical information on a range of topics such as labour, residence, and employment in Chicago. The work surpassed any contemporary publication in its meticulous attention to data collection, its commentary on urban sociological concerns (e.g. labour and housing conditions), and its methodological tools (e.g. interviews, surveys, and maps). The University of Chicago faculty often cited this publication in their lectures and writing.

Despite these collaborations and the rigour of sociological scholarship at Hull House, the women of Hull House are rarely credited for their scholarship and meticulous recording of social facts in nineteenth-century Chicago. In order to develop a discipline with an eye towards generalizability, the sociologists who would come to be known as founders of the Chicago School began to distance themselves from the reformist and action-oriented research taking place at Hull House. By contemporary standards of sociological research, the women members of Hull House were as instrumental, if not more, to the development of a Chicago School as their male counterparts, a fact that is elided in much writing on the school's genesis. Beyond this, Chicago School sociologists' ambivalence on the correct form of social change has been noted, and is especially apparent in Park's cycle theory of race relations, which displays Park's hallmark aversion to radical thought or action around racial reform. This theory emphasised the 'inevitability' of racial assimilation and acceptance of the Black minority into American cities (Salerno, 2013). Against the backdrop of violent racial riots during the 1916–1919 Black migration into the city, this perspective is telling of Park's own self-consciously 'moderate' approach, which was heavily influenced by Booker T. Washington. It has also been noted that while he showed no overt discrimination towards his graduate students – Horace Cayton, St. Clair Drake, Oliver Cox, and Allison Davis, among others – there is ample documentation of his disdain for the scholarship of W.E.B. DuBois, and no evidence of any voiced opposition to segregation laws (ibid.).

The role of the Chicago School in the production and legitimation of race – both as an analytic category and normative ordering project – is relatively well known. Even when its practitioners aimed at denaturalising the widely accepted link between race (especially Blackness), immigrant status, and criminality, its reform and advocacy efforts nevertheless continued to presuppose and entrench race as a necessary category for understanding social groups in the United States, especially via the production of race-based crime statistics and discourses on Black criminality (Muhammad, 2010). Less emphasised, however, are the exchanges between anthropologists, sociologists, and reformers in the constitution of race as a dominant category – and as a transposable model for differentiation of all kinds – in policy, research, and social life. While these various groups were drawing on highly distributed, broadly available discourses of the period, they were also producing them in new ways via direct intellectual influence. That is, such influences were not just abstract or diffuse, part of a broader social milieu of racialism and racism, but were due also to the sharing of ideas between key intellectual figures, who in turn implemented these ideas in their institution-building efforts.

Franz Boas – often called the 'father of American anthropology' – is one such point of contact. Noted for his active involvement in public debates on race, racism, nationalism, and war (Baker, 2004) – though perhaps especially on the 'Negro question' and Native North American tribal policy – Boas was also an explicit influence on the investigative methods and scholarly conceptions being developed by Chicago School social scientists. Though he never held a teaching post at the University of Chicago, he worked in Chicago as assistant to the director of the 1893 World Columbian Exposition's anthropology department. For decades, the sociologist and polymath W.E.B. DuBois corresponded with Boas; Robert Park also corresponded with Boas during the early years of the formation of Chicago's Social Science department. W.I. Thomas, one of the early institution-builders at the university – who was an anthropologist by training and self-identification – was deeply influenced by Boas's and Boas's students' empirical and theoretical work. In his influential essay on 'The City', Park cited Boas's work (and the work of Boas's student Robert Lowie) as models for the burgeoning sociological discipline:

> The same patient methods which anthropologists like Boas and Lowie have expended on the life and manners of the North American Indian might be even more fruitfully employed in the investigation of the customs, beliefs, social practices, and general conceptions of life prevalent in Little Italy on the lower North Side of Chicago, or in recording the more sophisticated folkways of the inhabitants of Greenwich Village. (Park, 1984 [1925]: 3)

Boas's student, the celebrated linguist and ethnographer Edward Sapir, was remembered by sociology graduate students as one of the most noted influences on their education during his time teaching at the university, second only to scholars in the department of philosophy (Carey, 1975: 159–163).

Robert Park – through his interaction with Thomas, his work as secretary to Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee, and his direct correspondence with Boas – was aware of the anthropological literature on race, and of its relationship to broader debates during the period (which informed, among other things, his participation as a member of the Chicago Board for Race Relations). Park was also influenced later in life by his relationship to his son-in-law, the anthropologist Robert Redfield, whose work on 'folk society' helped in the 1940s to solidify the intellectual sense of a rigorously defined rural–urban continuum (Howe, 1990), thereby providing the 'rural' double to the urban way of life being articulated by scholars like Louis Wirth (Jones and Rodgers, 2016). Park also corresponded with Bronisław Malinowski, the great populariser of the fieldwork approach in anthropology and a key figure in British social anthropology. Speaking later of the functionalist school of British social anthropology – represented at the University of Chicago from 1931 to 1937 by Alfred Radcliffe-Brown – Park would say that it was 'nothing more or less than sociology, with the qualification that it is mainly concerned with primitive peoples' (cited in Stocking, 1979: 21).

Because of an historical imaginary of anthropology as grounded in 'folk' traditions in 'rural' settings, urban anthropology has been a vexed area of research. In a now-classic critical intervention into the field of urban (social) anthropology, Ulf Hannerz

poses the question, 'what is urban about urban anthropology, and what is anthropological about it?' (Hannerz, 1980: 3). Versions of this critique appeared earlier as well. In 1968, Anthony Leeds pointed out urban anthropologists' tendency to produce knowledge in cities, rather than on cities generally (Leeds, 1994 [1968]: 233); that is, research was 'conducted *in* urban areas not *of* urban areas' (Howe, 1990: 37; emphasis added). Hannerz and others noted the ways in which anthropologists were late arrivals to urban research, pulled away from 'primitive' people and locales into cities, as the people they studied were drawn into newly urbanising and industrialising locales of the developing world through the dynamics of colonial rule, globalisation, and the like. Anthropologists producing the famous Copperbelt ethnographies on urbanisation and rural–urban migration were also, it turns out, early proponents of the world systems theory (Smart and Smart, 2003: 265; see also Ferguson, 1999). This move to focus beyond '(the) city' and '(the) urban' to more encompassing global political-economic dynamics is a longstanding tendency in urban anthropological research.

Though anthropologists – especially archaeologists – have long been concerned with cities and urbanism (disciplinary imaginaries notwithstanding), it was from the 1960s onwards that urban ethnographies began appearing in large numbers. Such works continue to take various approaches to '(the) city' and '(the) urban' as a broader context for the specific practices that they analyse.[5] Along with these kinds of monographs, works reviewing urban anthropology scholarship have periodically assessed the state of the field, linking it to a set of specific contemporary concerns: for instance (again, this list is non-exhaustive), urban typology in cultural context (Fox, 1977), globalisation (Smart and Smart, 2003), interdisciplinary borrowings (Low, 1996), and political ecology (Rademacher, 2015).

One after-effect of the separation of the departments of anthropology and sociology at the university, along with the more general growth of both as disciplines, is the present situation of relatively fortified boundaries between the two areas of study. In part this is related to the ways in which pressures towards specialisation and increased pressure on publication (linked to the growth in the number of academic journals), brought about by the halt in the growth of academia after 1975 (Altbach, 1995: 30; Henry, 1975), have produced inward-looking intellectual tendencies. Within American urban sociology, this inward-looking tendency is evident in the under-problematised American-centric characterisations of 'urban' life that have dominated until fairly recently. Because American cities underlay urban sociologists' model-building, there has been intense grappling over substantive topics such as neighbourhood, neighbourhood change, depopulation, suburbanisation, immigration, and gentrification. While there is now a growing body of literature that utilises models of cities from outside the American norm, our agenda calls for the definitive dissolving of such boundaries. While specialised theoretical formulations may be an inevitable consequence of the academic demands of publishing,

[5] This can be seen in works such as – among many others – *Bottleneck* (Melly, 2017), *Endangered City* (Zeiderman, 2016), *Speculative Markets* (Peterson, 2014), *The Spectacular City* (Goldstein, 2004), *Expectations of Modernity* (Ferguson, 1999), *French Modern* (Rabinow, 1995), *The Modernist City* (Holston, 1989), and *Soulside* (Hannerz, 2004).

reading widely across disciplines will only enrich the geographical, theoretical, and conceptual insights of urban sociology, anthropology, and related fields.

Interdisciplinary Methodologies

As mentioned before, many historiographical accounts of the Chicago School from the 1960s to the 1980s emphasise the school's early ethnographies of communities within Chicago, thus creating its image as exclusively qualitative and ethnographic. However, this unidimensional characterisation elides the extensive use of survey, statistical, and cartographic methods employed by sociologists in making sense of social groupings extant within the city. Urban sociologists of the Chicago School, particularly Ernest Burgess and his students, spent decades devising statistical methods capable of revealing these 'small territorial groupings', or communities, to the sociologist (Collins and Makowsky, 2005: 169, 171). In this section, we attend to the cartographic, statistical, and quantitative developments that shaped not only the foundations of urban sociology, but also the administration of the City of Chicago.

At the same time, we seek to bring a critical sensibility to recent efforts at reclaiming the Chicago School's cartographic pasts (Owens, 2012). Scholars working in the history of cartography have insisted on the historical character and construction of maps and cartographic methods, insisting, among other important points, on their uses as instruments of power, rather than straightforward representations of (spatial) realities (Cosgrove, 2007; Harley, 1988, 1989). STS scholarship has also emphasised the way that expert technical instruments, like maps, gain authority in and through their discursively constructed claims to scientific 'objectivity', which makes them interpretable as transparent by non-experts (and also, sometimes, by experts; Rankin, 2016). Here we consider these insights alongside the exhibition *Mapping the Young Metropolis: The Chicago School of Sociology, 1915–1940*, on view at the Special Collections Research Center's (SCRC) Gallery from 22 June to 11 September 2015. The exhibition offered a selection of material drawn primarily from the holdings of Ernest Burgess and his students. This exhibited material (accessible as online exhibit[6]) highlights maps' uses as technologies that produce the spatial and social realities that they are often taken merely to reveal. We delineate these cartographic approaches to reflect on the resonance between such methods and present methodological innovations and interdisciplinary exchanges in urban sociology, while also reflecting on the disjunctures between cartographic methods of early Chicago sociologists and present urban sociologists.

The materials presented in *Mapping the Metropolis* demonstrate some of the ways in which Robert Park and Ernest Burgess made use of existing technologies (census maps, tabulation methods, diagramming) to represent the City of Chicago according to what they saw as a self-consciously 'sociological' view of the city. According to this view, the city was a new kind of community, a large-scale agglomeration comprised of many other communities, each a 'world in itself' that was nevertheless part of a larger-scale formation:

[6] www.lib.uchicago.edu/collex/exhibits/mapping-young-metropolis

> Mr. Park and Mr. Burgess looking over the city saw it as an aggregation of many small territorial groupings … Each of these districts they looked upon as a distinct cultural complex, as a world in itself with its own characteristic institutions and its own distinct mode of life. (Report by Vivian Palmer, 1929, 'The Study of the Growth of the Local Communities of Chicago', in Ernest Watson Burgess Papers)

The initial quantitative- and spatial framework in which these communities' existence was sought came from the US Censuses of 1920, 1930, and 1934. Until at least 1930, the community areas were identical with the US Census Bureau's Census Tracts. As of the 1930 Census, however, the reverse was true: the Census Tracts had been brought into alignment with the sociological neighbourhood areas. Burgess's cooperation with the US Census Bureau, including extensive work by his students, eventually led to the re-division of Chicago into 75 Community Areas. These areas have been adopted broadly, and are now used in domains as varied as real estate marketing, city administration, journalism, and further social research.[7] The new 'sociological' map, beyond being incorporated into the Census Bureau's toolkit, served as an authorising framework for the distributional mapping of a dizzying array of other phenomena by students of Chicago sociology, brought together by virtue of their common classification as urban 'problems' – manic depressives, those receiving public aid, households containing 'Others' (i.e. non-kin), or the distribution of 'Licensed Motion Picture Theatres by Seating Capacity' – all tabulated by Community Area.

The maps' seemingly straightforward visualisations belie both the methods by which the maps were generated and the complex and conflictual histories of disciplinary and departmental ground-clearing that motivated their production in the first place. As an exercise in disciplinary and departmental ground-clearing, Burgess's and students' mapping techniques, though involving statistical methods, were carried out in contrast to both the Columbia University sociology department's advocacy for the 'survey movement' as a method of 'variables and correlations' and to the 'social surveys' approach conducted by 'social workers or their ancillaries in the charity organisation movement'(Abbott, 1999: 206). Though the 'community areas' programme was never verified through this extensive empirical research, it nevertheless has a continuing social salience to this day. Artefacts such as the Community Area maps and (in)famous Concentric Zone diagram continue to circulate into the present as evidence, for some, of efforts at situating spatial modelling outside any temporal, social, or contextual dimensions. As an exercise in methods, or techniques of production, Chicago School mapmakers attempted to standardise data-collection procedures into more or less detailed techniques of the body (Mauss, 1973 [1934]) – and pen – through methods handbooks. Some of these directions were very specific, such as admonitions to mark 'householder names' in black ink, with head of household first, followed by wife in parentheses. Others involved more abstract descriptions of how to fill out tables and calculate regressions, generate population pyramids, administer and analyse personality surveys, and so forth. Others were taught through coursework in ways never fully formalised

[7] Due to later subdivisions and the inclusion of O'Hare, there are now 77 Community Areas.

or standardised in handbooks or the like: student maps could be made and filled in with things like coloured pencil, crayons, and store-bought stickers.

In contrast to this crayon cartography, the present moment in social scientific research is characterised by a turn to digital tools and data. Chicago School cartography's lasting legacy lies in a concern with space as ordering social relations. The availability of instruments such as geographic information systems (GIS) – and the growth of spatial data sciences and allied computational social scientific methods – have polarised this spatial (re)turn through the development of technical methods with which to examine sociological phenomena. Urban sociologists currently stand somewhat split over a quantitative–qualitative divide, a situation that motivates calls for reconciliation, such as Brown-Saracino's (2016) agenda to unite macro- and micro-level studies of urban processes by bridging the work of quantitative and qualitative sociologists. Writing about gentrification scholarship, Brown-Saracino argues that quantitative methods allow us to understand the concentration of wealth and inequality within spaces, while qualitative methods facilitate investigation into the mechanisms whereby these forms of segregation are produced (ibid.).

Such calls to bridge these divides point to the new methodological alignments within urban sociology. There is often a sense that quantitative and qualitative methods are 'speaking past' one another, rather than excavating 'the urban' at various scales. Spatial analytic methods have been fortified by the allied data sciences, built on computer languages and software like R, Python, GIS, GeoDa, etc. Methods built on these technologies have, in turn, driven theory-making: Anselin's (1999) recent development of the concept of 'spatial autocorrelation', referring to the tendency for observations that are near each other in space to have similar values, was made possible by spatial analytic software. At the same time, the concept can be seen as a twenty-first-century extension of Robert Park's claim that social distance is correlated with spatial distance. Similarly, Logan et al. (2002) have examined characteristics of ethnic neighbourhoods in Los Angeles using spatial clustering methods, which speak to Burgess's invasion-succession models of urban growth.

New spatial methods also draw attention to challenges regarding the availability of and methods for obtaining data in cities of the Global South, where bureaucratic and infrastructural conditions limit such methods' applicability. Sociologists in these contexts thus rely on first-hand data collection – which is often arduous and time-consuming – or in filling the gaps with qualitative, ethnographic, and interview-based data. While this section has focused primarily on interdisciplinary alignments and innovations in spatial *quantitative* methods, this is not to downplay the ethnographically rich and insightful research that is not only expanding the conception of '(the) urban' as being potentially more expansive than '(the) city', but is also questioning what it means to be doing *urban* research, especially urban sociology. As the historical work on Chicago School cartography has highlighted, 'the city' is in part a product of the technologies through which it is rendered knowable (De Certeau, 2011; Hull, 2012: 212–213; Scott, 1998), and 'the urban' has come to encompass a broad range of production, consumption, cultural, social, and informational processes that reach beyond any one pattern or model for constituting it as an object of research.

Shifting Institutional Arrangements for 'Urban' Research at the University of Chicago and Beyond

Chicago social scientists' engagement with 'the city' is now moving in the direction of a category considered by its users to be more encompassing: '(the) urban'. The complex interplay between and frequent interchangeability of these terms reflect a range of disciplinary, institutional, and material processes at work. First, the ever-expanding domain of '(the) urban' has come to replace not only *the*, but also often *a* city as the object of analysis for urban scholars. '(The) urban' sometimes conceptually supersedes '(the) city', standing for a wide range of activities, concepts, and dynamics extending beyond, and traversing, multiple geographies, even while being linked to and emergent out of particular locales. At other times, invocations of '(the) urban' serves to complement understandings of '(the) city', suggesting the apparently globalised processes – inequality, residence, movement, occupation, citizenship claims – that appear in cities, albeit in ways that vary both locationally and relative to stratifying variables like race, class, gender, and other master statuses (see Hughes, 1963).

Urban sociology in particular has had to contend with the enlarged scope ascribed to 'urban' processes in the wake of critiques of the Chicago School, critiques that appealed to the inadequacy of the City of Chicago as a site for more broadly 'urban' theorisation. Though not the first critique, one prominent urban sociological critique was inaugurated by Michael Dear's 'invitation to debate', in which he criticised the ostensive myopia of Park, Burgess, and colleagues for their school's City of Chicago-centric theory-, concept-, and model-building (Dear, 2002). Dear pointed to new phenomena characterising the growth and settlement patterns of cities like Los Angeles, whose 'edge cities' and forms of internal diversity were inexplicable via the Chicago School toolkit. Dear's critique was important in that it explicitly sought to eke out disciplinary space for a new 'school' in opposition to what had come to be accepted as a coherent, cohesive Chicago School. Responding to the invitation, sociologists like Andrew Abbott (2002) and Terry Clark (2006) outlined how Park, Suttles, Thomas, and Zorbaugh did in fact address the spirit, if not the substance, of these new urban phenomena. However, such contestations over the agenda for an 'urban' sociology reveal the chimera-like nature of the object of analysis. Efforts at delimiting '(the) urban' as here distinct from merely a model based on *a* city is an enduring source of contention for urban sociologists and scholars.

'(The) urban' is increasingly a category through which to gain access to funding, sponsorship, and institutional resources. This seems to be true broadly, but our focus in this section is in tracing the way that this expanded focus on '(the) urban' is reflected in the shifting institutional arrangements for University of Chicago's 'urban' research. Our aforementioned Walking Tour, in its relationship with the Urban Workshop, is an outgrowth of this 'urban' turn. The Urban Workshop has historically received part of its funding from the University of Chicago's Council on Advanced Studies (CAS), which funds other university workshops across the Divinity School and Divisions of the Humanities and Social Sciences (workshops range in subject matter, as of the 2018–2019 academic year, from *medieval studies* and *art and politics of East Asia* to *language processing,*

acquisition, and evolution); it also receives funding from UChicago Urban, an urban research institute that will soon be superseded by the Mansueto Institute for Urban Innovation. The institute overtook UChicago Urban following a landmark gift from the eponymous Rika and Joseph Mansueto, who made their fortune from the Morningstar financial consultancy. As the institute describes in a section on its website titled 'Our Challenge', growing urbanisation – meaning an unprecedented increase in cities' population rate – is leading to a 'new chapter in human history' worthy of research utilising 'dynamic relationships with … data', thus 'empower[ing] people and their governments to realize the positive potential of our increasingly urban world'. It also emphasises looking at cities globally, since 'all cities share common characteristics with other places' and advocates a mode of study that defies disciplinary boundaries. The emphasis on the novelty of urban population growth, discourses on urbanisation, and an interdisciplinary approach all seem, rhetorically, to characterise the 'innovative' aspect of the Mansueto Institute for Urban Innovation.

The availability of new data-related methods; the search for solutions to the 'problem' of urban density, particularly in cities of the Global South, and an interdisciplinarity that seeks to draw together previously unrelated disciplines marks the university's current institutional arrangements. Whereas the Chicago School's focus on 'the city' drew inspiration from the modern City of Chicago situated in its backyard, organisations like the Mansueto Institute are driving the search for 'innovative' solutions that allow large, cross-city comparisons using computational and spatial techniques in addition to other quantitative methods, augmented by insights from the humanities and the arts. The appearance of the Mansueto Institute also coincides with the launch of new degree programmes – like the two-year MA in Computational Social Sciences (MACSS) – and research institutions – like the Center for Spatial Data Science. This constellation of new organisations all take the complexity of 'the urban', hence the necessary 'interdisciplinarity' of urban *research*, as their authorising warrant. The institute explicitly articulates its focus as a 'global' approach that takes cities across the world as proceeding along a similar, if not identical, path to urbanisation. Its partner organisations, some new, some well-established, include the Center for Gender and Sexuality Studies; the Center for Data Science and Public Policy; the Data Science for Social Good, a project of the Knight Foundation-funded Place Lab; the Center for Study of Race, Politics, and Culture; and the Division of the Social Sciences. The Division of the Social Sciences houses departments such as sociology, anthropology, and political science, all of which have had historical connections in doing 'urban' research, but which have since become relatively discrete, disciplinary formations. In its present form, the 'interdisciplinary' focus of the institute continues to rely on the discreteness of disciplines, even while calling for their bridging. Shifting institutional arrangements within the University of Chicago have also crucially reoriented the funding and resource-allocation available for research on '(the) urban' as detachable from '(the) city'. Reflecting on the legacies of the Chicago School in the present moment provides historical context to situating these changing institutional arrangements and their impact in producing new forms of scholarship, methods, and expertise characterising 'urban' research presently at the university.

Conclusion

To return to Hannerz's question – 'what is urban about urban anthropology, and what is anthropological about it?' (Hannerz, 1980: 3) – which has also been asked for urban sociology by Saunders (1981), the answer could be given, on the one hand, that urban anthropology exists as such by virtue of its positioning vis-à-vis a discursive tradition, established through lineage-making projects with earlier urban anthropology and urban sociology (and in contrast to other alternatives). On the other hand, the fact that these questions continue to be asked suggests that 'the city' – as a site of study, object of analysis, set of processes and dynamics, a way of life, or the like – seems, through its construction, to trouble disciplinary and other boundaries, whether methodological, conceptual, theoretical, or imaginative.

In reflecting on these histories and transformations, we return also to the Urban Workshop, which offers a mutable starting point from which, and object with which, to trace the relationship of the university to its surrounding neighbourhood of Hyde Park. While it has always been informally referred to as the 'Urban Workshop', in the early 2000s it was rechristened as the 'Workshop on Social Structures and Processes in Urban Space'; in 2007, it was renamed 'City, Society, and Place' to 'broaden [the workshop's] constituency to include the wide range of researchers originally envisioned in the creation of the workshop'.[8] According to an email sent by then-coordinator David Schalliol, the name was changed 'to reflect a broader emphasis on the culture and social organisation of life within the urban environments, rather than focusing on research that is "urban"'. Even in 2007, the workshop's primary audience was sociologists, but also included graduate students from anthropology, economics, the Department of Comparative Human Development, and public policy. By 2010, the name again changed to just the 'Urban Workshop'. It was around this time that endowments and funding for 'urban' research reached an unprecedented high, and the number of activities, workshops, and associations branded as 'urban' proliferated: besides the Urban Workshop, UChicago Urban and the Mansueto Institute began to host series of talks and events, and urban policy students at the Harris School of Public Policy began to organise a growing, and increasingly visible, number of events.

In our introduction to this chapter, we briefly outlined our motivations to develop a walking tour of the University of Chicago's surrounding neighbourhood of Hyde Park, bringing attention to its violent history of urban renewal, depopulation, and Black displacement. University of Chicago administrators and social scientists, who also doubled as chairpersons of the SECC and neighbourhood block clubs, were instrumental in facilitating urban renewal in order to combat perceived blight that would affect land values and residence in and around the university campus. In talking about Chicago as the backyard for the Chicago School, what often remains

[8] David Schalliol, private correspondence. Information about the history of the Urban Workshop was curated through oral histories collected from University of Chicago-trained sociologists that held positions as organisers, faculty sponsors, or participants at the workshop during their time as graduate students at the university. We thank Terry Clark, David Schalliol, Gordon C.C. Douglas, and Jeffrey N. Parker for their invaluable insights on the history of the Urban Workshop.

elided is this lesser-known, contentious connection between the University of Chicago and Hyde Park, as well as the university's continued involvement in residential and business restructuring within the surrounding neighbourhoods. At the time that we began to organise the sessions of the recently (re-)renamed Urban Workshop, both of us found ourselves unable to ignore this glaring connection between the University of Chicago's administration, social scientists, and the shifting fortunes of Hyde Park's community members. We also began to reflect upon the stakes of situating the workshop as 'urban', which in common parlance is used not only as a more or less encompassing category related to '(the) city', but also as a coded reference to the intersection of race – more particularly, Blackness – and class – specifically 'poverty'. In these multiple contexts in and around Hyde Park, we found it all the more urgent to re-evaluate ways in which to critically address connections between the university, its scholarship, and its effects on the community surrounding it.

Rather than unhesitatingly exalting projects of Park, Burgess, his students, and others, we have sought also to draw attention to the interdisciplinary entanglements out of which theories in and about 'the city' have emerged, and have come to have deleterious effects that continue into the present, in domains of scholarship, social reform, policymaking, and beyond. Park- and Boas-inspired intellectual assimilationist or amalgamationist (Baker, 2010) theories have been criticised for their minimisation of dynamic events such as urban Black migration, racial violence, and 'New Negro' resistance, as 'they posed direct threats to his [Park's] paradigm of cultural cohesion and order' (Rocksborough-Smith, 2018). Burgess's involvement in the carving-up of community areas in Chicago have left a troubled legacy, with the continued clustering of Black communities on the south and west sides in community areas that receive lesser funding for public works than their predominantly White counterparts (Burgess, 1967). All this to say, the legacies and remnants of the Chicago School cannot be flattened into a singular story of mere intellectual curiosity, innovation, and exploration. In the turn (back) to '(the) urban', it is also important to infuse this sense of urban *space* with the specificity of *place*. In other words, the Chicago School, as it informs urban research in the present, needs to be continually re-situated in the context of its immediate environs, its uneasy and violent racial legacies, and the role of scholars from within the university in shaping the still-persistent violence in the City of Chicago and beyond.

References

Abbott, A. 1999. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Abbott, A. 2002. Los Angeles and the Chicago School: A comment on Michael Dear. *City & Community*, 1(1): 33–38.

Addams, J. 1990 [1889]. *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Alihan, M.A. 1938. *Social Ecology: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Altbach, P.G. 1995. Problems and possibilities: The US academic profession. *Studies in Higher Education*, 20(1): 27–44.

Anselin, L. 1999. Interactive techniques and exploratory spatial data analysis. In P.A. Longley (ed.), *Geographical Information Systems. Volume 1: Principles, Techniques, Management and Applications*, 251–264. New York: Wiley.

Asad, T. 2009 [1986]. The idea of an anthropology of Islam. *Qui Parle*, 17(2): 1–30.

Baker, L.D. 2004. Franz Boas out of the ivory tower. *Anthropological Theory*, 4(1): 29–51.

Baker, L.D. 2010. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Brown-Saracino, J. 2016. An agenda for the next decade of gentrification scholarship. *City & Community*, 15(3): 220–225.

Bulmer, M. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burgess, E.W. 1967. The growth of the city: An introduction to a research project. In R.E. Park and E.W. Burgess (eds), *The City*, 47–62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Camic, C. 1992. Reputation and predecessor selection: Parsons and the institutionalists. *American Sociological Review*, 57(4): 421–445.

Carey, J.T. 1975. *Sociology and Public Affairs: The Chicago School*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Clark, T.N. 2006. The New Chicago School – Not New York or LA, and why it matters for urban social science. In R.P. Green, M.J. Bouman, and D. Grammenos (eds), *Chicago's Geographies: Metropolis for the 21st Century*, 242–258. Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers.

Clements, F.E. 1916. *Plant Succession: An Analysis of the Development of Vegetation*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institute of Washington.

Collins, R. and Makowsky, M. 2005. *The Discovery of Society*, 8th edn. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Condit, C.W. 1974. *Chicago, 1930–1970: Building, Planning, and Urban Technology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cosgrove, D. 2007. Mapping the world. In J.R. Akerman and R.W. Karrow Jr (eds), *Maps: Finding Our Place in the World*, 65–115. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davis, S.O. and Vinci, J. 2013. *Chicago's Historic Hyde Park*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dear, M. 2002. Los Angeles and the Chicago School: Invitation to a debate. *City & Community*, 1(1): 5–32.

De Certeau, M. 2011. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deegan, M.J. 2017. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918*. New York: Routledge.

Ferguson, J. 1999. *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fine, G.A. 1995. *A Second Chicago School? The Development of a Postwar American Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fox, R.G. 1977. *Urban Anthropology: Cities in Their Cultural Settings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Goldstein, D.M. 2004. *The Spectacular City: Violence and Performance in Urban Bolivia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hannerz, U. 1980. *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward an Urban Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hannerz, U. 2004. *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harley, J.B. 1988. Maps, knowledge, and power. In D. Cosgrove and S. Daniels (eds), *The Iconography of Landscape*, 277–312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, J.B. 1989. Deconstructing the map. *Cartographica*, 26(2): 1–20.

Henry, D.D. 1975. *Challenges Past, Challenges Present: An Analysis of American Higher Education since 1930*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hirsch, A.R. 1983. *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940–1960*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hobsbawm, E. 2003 [1983]. Introduction: Inventing traditions. In E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*, 1–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holston, J. 1989. *The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Howe, L. 1990. Urban anthropology: Trends in its development since 1920. *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology*, 14(1): 37–66.

Hughes, E. 1963. Race relations and the sociological imagination. *American Sociological Review*, 28(6): 879–890.

Hull, M.S. 2012. *Government of Paper: The Materiality of Bureaucracy in Urban Pakistan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jones, G.A. and Rodgers, D. 2016. *Anthropology and the City: Standing on the Shoulders of Giants?* (Working Paper Series), Vol. 21. Amsterdam: Centre for Urban Studies.

Kurtz, L.R. 1984. *Evaluating Chicago Sociology: A Guide to the Literature, with an Annotated Bibliography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leeds, A. 1994 [1968]. The anthropology of cities: Some methodological issues. In R. Sanjek (ed.), *Cities, Classes, and the Social Order*, 233–246. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Logan, J.R., Alba, R.D., and Zhang, W. 2002. Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review*, 67(April): 299–322.

Low, S.M. 1996. The anthropology of cities: Imagining and theorizing the city. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25: 383–409.

Mauss, M. 1973 [1934]. Techniques of the body. *Economy and Society*, 2(1): 70–88.

Mayer, H.D. and Wade, R.C. 1969. *Chicago: Growth of a Metropolis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Melly, C. 2017. *Bottleneck: Moving, Building, and Belonging in an African City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Muhammad, K.G. 2010. *The Condemnation of Blackness: Race, Crime, and the Making of Modern Urban America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Owens, B.R. 2012. Mapping the city: Innovation and continuity in the Chicago School of sociology, 1920–1934. *The American Sociologist*, 43(3): 264–293.

Park, R.E. 1984 [1925]. The city: Suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the urban environment. In R.E. Park and E.W. Burgess (eds), *The City*, 1–46. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, K. 2014. *Speculative Markets: Drug Circuits and Derivative Life in Nigeria*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Plummer, K. 1997. *The Chicago School: Critical Assessments*. New York: Routledge.

Rabinow, P. 1995. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rademacher, A. 2015. Urban political ecology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44: 137–152.

Rankin, W. 2016. *After the Map: Cartography, Navigation, and the Transformation of Territory in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rocksborough-Smith, I. 2018. *Black Public History in Chicago: Civil Rights Activism from World War II into the Cold War*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Salerno, R.A. 2013. Was there a Black Chicago School? In J. Low and G. Bowden (eds), *The Chicago School Diaspora: Epistemology and Substance*, 47–60. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Saunders, P. 1981. *Social Theory and the Urban Question*. London: Hutchinson.

Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Smart, A. and Smart, J. 2003. Urbanization and the global perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 32: 263–285.

Smith, D. 1988. *The Chicago School: A Liberal Critique of Capitalism*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Stocking, G.W., Jr. 1979. *Anthropology at Chicago: Tradition, Discipline, Department*. Chicago: Joseph Regenstein Library.

Trouillot, M.-R. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Tylor, E.B. 1883. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*, Vol. I. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Zeiderman, A. 2016. *Endangered City: The Politics of Security and Risk in Bogotá*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.