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ABSTRACT

STILL GOT THE BLUES – NO TIME BUT HERE, NO PLACE BUT NOW: GEOGRAPHIES OF ARTS & ACTIVISM IN THE WORK OF CLYDE WOODS

Jake Mace

19 April 2023

The fight against displacement and dispossession in the increasingly inequitable process of reterritorialization is arguably the most pressing struggle of the modern city – and it is articulated through cultural production as much as through political debate and economic development. Yet research that is at the nexus of critical, urban, and cultural studies and which explores the resistant potential of countercultural production rather than the hegemonic impact of mainstream cultural production is underdeveloped. Clyde Woods’s blues epistemology offers a guide to reading cultural production of marginalized groups as maps of meaning that offer alternative visions of the past, the present, and the future. However, research that substantially leverages the blues epistemology has been limited, is rarely conducted within the field of urban studies, and tends to approach Woods’s multifaceted blues in a piecemeal fashion. This dissertation explores extant blues epistemic research as critical, urban, cultural studies and it asks what methodological themes are necessary for nuanced, blues-based social investigation, how we might perform that investigation with a consistent emphasis on radical change, and how that call for change might be refocused by putting Clyde Woods’s socio-spatial sensibilities directly into conversation with Herbert Marcuse’s consistently utopic
thinking. The resulting papers reposition Woods’s work to a broader audience, revitalizing and operationalizing blues epistemologies as they amplify the (harmonic and melodic) voices of marginalized groups and illustrate how their cultural production has grappled with inequality and has sought to keep that struggle at the forefront of the urban imagination.
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SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

How are cities formed and reformed? What places do we want to live in, who is empowered to live where they want, and what happens to the people already living in places that become more desirable? Who is involved in making these decisions and how are those decisions enacted or contested? How do these ongoing processes shape the way we think about our cities – how are these thoughts expressed and where are they reflected? The fight against displacement and dispossession is the most pressing problem of the modern city (Zanfagna and Werth 2019; Atkins and Morales 2020). The fight against displacement and dispossession is typically framed as an attempt to contest and transform the material landscape of our cities, but it also takes place in and through our collective imagination and it affects our image of the city itself (See Appadurai 1996; Çinar and Bender 2007; Lindón 2007; Prakash 2008; Zusman 2013; Howie and Lewis 2014; Vandevoordt and Verschraegen 2018; Lindner and Meissner 2019). Both mainstream and critical urban scholars have long conducted research that explores the battle for body and soul of the city referenced on debate stages, considered at ballot boxes, and enacted through politically charged tangles of legal codes, housing, economic development, and education systems (See Davies and Imbroscio 2010; Judd and Simpson 2011; Jayne and Ward 2017). But these battles are waged in the cultural sphere, as well, and they are reflected in informal, quotidian processes of cultural production and consumption (Zanfagna and Werth 2019; Atkins and Morales 2020; Oosterlynck et al 2021. See also Zukin 1991; Zukin 1995; Zukin 2009; Fraser 2015).
The role of power disparities and socio-economic inequality in shaping our environment is a fundamental concern of both urban studies and cultural studies – as well as the many academic disciplines they draw upon (Jayne and Ward 2017). However, research that is at the nexus of critical, urban, and cultural studies and which explores the resistant potential of the cultural production of marginalized groups rather than the hegemonic impact of mainstream cultural production is underdeveloped. Such research is particularly vital in the context of Louisville, Kentucky – a city that has drawn global attention recently in the wake of political protests and social contestation sparked by forms of violence that are firmly rooted in the city’s long history of socio-economic inequality (Poe and Bellamy 2020).

Clyde Woods’s work on blues epistemologies – created, explicated, and sustained across his entire professional career – is the body of theory I have found most engaging in trying to understand these relationships between culture, place, imaginaries, and contestation in the city. Woods was “a scholar of the blues, and an academic both studying and organizing social and cultural justice, and forms of political resistance” (Banet-Weiser 2011, vii):

The urgent questions he raised for scholarship on Black life are of a piece with how he conducted himself as a scholar of Black life. Trained in geography and urban planning, he taught in the Department of Black Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Clyde was theoretically innovative, empirically fearless, creatively interdisciplinary, and committed to the dignity and liberation of all oppressed peoples. Dr. Woods’s “blues epistemology” is a guide to discovering not only counternarratives but also alternative development visions. His generosity, particularly with students, is legendary, as is the breadth of his projects. (ibid.)

The blues epistemology is Woods’s most well-known and cited contribution to academic thought. The blues epistemology explores how marginalized peoples “have constructed a
system of explanation that informs their daily life, organizational activity, culture, religion, and social movements” (Woods 1998, 16): it is both a way of thinking and a grammar with which to communicate it (2010, 35). Blues epistemology represents a way of life that draws on – both pulls from and inscribes upon – the dynamic nexus of diasporic groups of people that identify with each other, the places they inhabit, and the cultural forms that mediate these relationships. It helps us read the cultural production of marginalized populations as radical critical texts to better understand the political-economic contexts in which they are produced – uniting cultural studies and activist praxis (See Banet-Weiser 2011; Brahinsky 2012; Campbell 2012; Costa Vargas 2012; McKittrick 2012; Ruddick 2012; Soja 2012; Wilson 2012; Lipsitz 2014; Mahtani 2014; Hawthorne 2019; Wright 2019; Osuna 2021). This dissertation is formed around three articles I have written and will submit for publication that center around Clyde Woods and his blues epistemology.

Research that substantially leverages the blues epistemology has been limited, and resulting publications tend to rely upon limited aspects of Woods’s work. Moreover, such research has rarely been conducted within the field of urban studies – despite Woods having been an urban planner and urban geographer whose research centered upon New Orleans, New York City, Los Angeles, and Baltimore. In the first article, I analyze both Woods’s work and the work of those who have attempted to apply, extend, reframe, and leverage his writing in their own work. I find and explicate five major themes that are critical to research and writing in a blues epistemic: (1) vernacular epistemologies & organic intellectualism, (2) cultural studies & activist art/istry, (3) environmental catastrophe & ecological crisis, (4) uneven development & spatial imaginaries, and (5)
political praxis & better futures. I argue that these are his key contributions, representing
the theoretical toolkit he has offered those who aspire to write with a blues methodology,
and I highlight them for that purpose: this paper provides a partial foundation for using
the blues epistemology as a method of research.

While Woods’s writing consistently sought to unite cultural studies with activist
praxis, he tended to reframe his blues to fit given projects, never settling on the best
terminology with which to capture his multifaceted understanding of the blues as both a
body of explanation and an engine of change. Moreover, this lack of consistency is
reflected in a bifurcated secondary literature on the blues epistemology that tends to
center either the former or the latter. In the second article, I argue that the theoretical
contributions of Clyde Woods are most accurately and productively understood as blues
imaginaries: imaginaries – geographic, social, historical, political – hold significant
potential to unite critical explanation with critical activism. I make this argument by
tracing connections between literature on imaginaries, cultural studies, black geographies,
and blues epistemologies. I conclude that remapping urban imaginaries through the lens
of blues epistemologies reshapes our understanding of urban imaginaries by highlighting
the voices of the marginalized, focuses our understanding of the blues by recentering
praxis, and creates spaces for diverse groups of people with radical epistemologies to
reimagine radical futures.

The Frankfurt School is credited with pioneering both critical studies and cultural
studies and it has been criticized in its approach to each: for lacking a consistent focus on
space and spatiality and for neglecting to attend to racialization as guiding principle of
capitalism in the first case, and for tending toward elitism and failing to recognize how
culture can be grounds for contestation and resistance ‘from below’ in the second. The Black Radical Tradition and the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies have served as two powerful post-Frankfurt interventions, and the work of Clyde Woods is well-informed by both. He offers a particularly nuanced approach to critical and cultural studies that centers on the spatial sensibilities of marginalized groups, written and read in cultural texts, as radical social-political critique. However, the secondary literature on the blues epistemology has approached these multifaceted projects in a piecemeal fashion. If the first article asks what themes are necessary for a nuanced, blues-based social investigation and the second article asks how we might perform that investigation with a consistent emphasis on change – performing investigation without sacrificing prescription for description – the third article refocuses this call for change by putting the blues directly into conversation with the Frankfurt School’s critical and cultural studies. In it, I pair Clyde Woods’s socio-spatial sensibilities with Herbert Marcuse’s consistently utopic thinking, extending recent work to spatialize Marcuse’s oppositional politics and emancipatory praxis as well as furthering recent work to reposition the blues epistemology to a broader academic audience, revitalizing the former and operationalizing the latter. I draw connections between Woods and Marcuse across (1) the Black Radical Tradition (BRT), (2) multiracial working-class solidarities, (3) self-reflexive critique, and (4) praxis and better futures, before forging a fifth site of theoretical and political convergence in the body of Walker’s (2022) Marcusean triadic topology.

Finally, I conclude by offering a vignette intended to open avenues of study that connect Louisville’s contemporary political and cultural landscape with racial relations
and the cultural production of marginalized groups across its history – arguing that the former can be traced to aspects of the latter. Specifically, I trace connections between the racist production of urban spaces in Louisville, public-private development interests in the city, the murder of Breonna Taylor, the protests of that murder that erupted in the city and across the nation in 2020, and the #DefundThePolice movement that was briefly held up as an alternative vision of the future during that year. This vignette is not intended to be a thorough analysis of blues epistemologies but rather an entry point to future projects I can pursue throughout a research career. In the first two cases, the University of Louisville’s Ekstrom Library has substantial archives of material related to those music scenes in the city’s history that have not yet been substantially explored in research. The third case would rely upon interviewing and ethnography. With the three articles explicated across this dissertation as a foundation, I can analyze Louisville’s cultural history and current cultural climate as both counternarrative explanation and alternative visions of the future over the course of a career in blues utopic imaginaries.

As noted, I make an argument in my second article for putting theories of urban imaginaries into conversation with the blues epistemology using cultural production and our collective sense of place as a bridge between the two – and I will examine urban imaginaries in greater depth over the course of that article. But I will open this dissertation with a review of literature highlighting major theoretical themes and debates within cultural studies and studies of culture and discuss how academics have leveraged our understanding of cultural production towards an understanding of the process of placemaking. After explaining my interpretation of these concepts, I will discuss the relationships between them – focusing on music, acknowledging that these concepts all
tend to push against each other and to slide into one another, and with an understanding that sophisticated analysis of these concepts is necessarily interdisciplinary in nature.
SECTION II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Cultural Production

Cities are inherently cultural. Culture is the aspect of the city that we are all most aware of experiencing – our entire “way of being in the world” (Glee 1996, 127; Turner 2002, 43). The amalgamation of affective concerns and tangible forms we think about when we call cities to mind are cultural at their foundation and it is impossible to understand any city without understanding cultural production. This breadth and depth of research object leads to a rich variety of perspectives and methods for approaching research on cultural production. I will open by attempting to bring together working definitions for these concepts before reviewing some debates and tensions in the literature and then close with a brief overview of the major schools of thought in the field of cultural studies, as all three of my articles will be centered at the nexus of a critical & urban cultural studies.

Elements of Culture, Abstracted

Culture cannot be defined in a way that feels intuitive or satisfying for anybody, let alone everybody (Storey 2009, 1-2). Researchers often attempt to define culture through their own ideological, disciplinary, or practical views and to do so in ways that are either so broad that culture becomes an empty signifier (everything is culture) or – if narrowed even a tiny bit – in ways that exclude elements of culture that other researchers
have spent entire careers investigating (Mitchell 1995, 107-108). Depending on the
definition used, culture is used to describe

at least five things: (i) the actual, often unexamined, patterns and differentiations
of a people (‘culture’); (ii) the processes by which these patterns developed
(‘culture’ makes ‘cultures’); (iii) the markers of differentiation between one
people and another (individuals are part of ‘a culture’); (iv) the way all these
processes, patterns and markers are represented (‘cultural activity’); and (v) the
hierarchical ordering of all these activities, processes, productions and ways of
life (comparing ‘cultures’). (Mitchell 1995, 107-108)

Each element of this definition is significant and points towards much larger and often
interrelated areas of study (Barker 2002 183, 196-197, 206-207, 31-32, 118-120, 172,
199. See also Barker 2004; T. Barnes and Duncan 2006, 5-12; Oswell 2006; Edwards
2007; Low 2009; Storey 2009; Wyer et al 2009; Chandler 2019). We should briefly look
at each element. Cultural production is as difficult to pin down. If culture is the sum of
human experience, is cultural production the group process of creating humanity,
comprising our ways of being and everyday life (Williams 1998 [1961])? Or is it more
specifically the artistic act of deliberately making cultural forms, and the social
conditions under which those actions are undertaken (Bourdieu 1994; Born 2010)?
Perhaps cultural production places an emphasis on being intentional in deciding which
cultural forms we interact with (Peterson and Anand 2004)? Or is there a contrast
between creating culture and consuming culture (Featherstone 1993)? Is it an argument
that the consumption of culture creates subjectivities and shapes identities (O’Connor and
Wynne 1996)? Or just a governmental framework that cities use to capitalize on cultural
forms (Scott 2001)? ‘Cultural production’ is a sliding signifier that will have different
meanings depending upon who is fighting over it – but I use it to emphasize process.
What is crucial about cultural production is that every day, we enact culture in context. In
every case, context is a crucial object of analysis. The results of cultural production, however defined – cultural products – are frequently referred to in the literature as cultural forms and as cultural texts: collections of symbols that can be both written and read (Cosgrove 1989, 568). This terminology stems from the analysis of literature, but studies of music, film, video games and other cultural products use textual analysis often and the tools of literary criticism are often applied to multiple media. Textual analysis of cultural products can be discussed as aesthetics (artistic merit) or meaning (intentional and interpreted) (Barker 2004, 3-4). But culture is a process, a way of being, and a system of daily life – never just texts.

Understanding that culture is socially constructed rather than essentially preordained leads us to conclude that the process of cultural production and the resultant cultural products should be privileged over culture itself per se (Mitchell 1995). Art, for example, is not a static object reducible to textual meaning and aesthetics only, but rather the sum of many contextual interactions. We must “dispense with the notion of an ontological culture and begin focusing instead on how the very idea of culture has been developed and deployed as a means of attempting to order, control, and define others in the name of power or profit” (Mitchell 1995, 104). Culture may be just an idea but “ideas are real and they are real in their consequences” (Duncan and Duncan 1996, 576). Wrestling with these ideas is the impetus for cultural studies.

---

1 “They regard text as a set of beliefs made intelligible through the organization of space as a symbol, and in spatial symbols as such. Dominant meanings are ascribed to places and landscapes are ‘produced’. Interpretation of such meanings in textual landscapes is, of course, always unstable and contested through the production of alternative meanings.”
In academic literature, studies of culture start with a foundational assumption of the intrinsic value of cultural products and proceed with an assessment of quality and a search for meaning. This field tends to be much more focused on art and tends to be dominated by scholars in the fine arts and the humanities. Literary criticism is the dominant mode of analysis. Studies of culture often privilege cultural products and get picky about what objects count as cultural (Serafini 2016, 1). Cultural studies – long dominated by social theorists – are less concerned with inherent value and more fascinated with how societal values are reflected in cultural forms. Modes of analysis focus less upon aesthetic expression of artists and artisans or textual meaning and focus more upon the contexts in which those texts are produced and consumed. Does culture merely reflect society or is society always already cultural? If cultural studies assume that art can provide data about civilization, which one shapes the other? The question of causal directionality pits culturalists against structuralists. The former argues that everything we perceive as time, space, and society are just manifestations of culture while the latter sees time, space, and society as independent variables that determine culture (Serafini 2016, 1). The debates revolve around causality but in reality, the relationships are perpetually recursive. These debates were explicated in classic form by Weber and Durkheim, respectively – although they have never been settled, nor has the stalemate precluded contemporary entrants to the fray (Weber 1922; Durkheim 1972; Vandevoortd and Verschraegen 2018). Cultural studies, as a scholarly signifier, can be used to point towards two closely related bodies of work: cultural studies (plural) are vaguely discrete, subdisciplinary projects like cultural sociology and cultural geography
while cultural studies (singular) are an independent yet interdisciplinary project that is seen as its own field of study.

The close relationship between culture and society led to a renewed emphasis on culture in many disciplines beginning in the middle of the last century (Serafini 2016; Lindón 2007, 36). There has been a “meteoric rise of culture and its study to a position of prominence across the social sciences and humanities” as a reaction to “deep-rooted transformations” in “social and political landscapes” across the globe and “these changes have placed culture in the spotlight and made it a central focus of struggles over identity, belonging, and justice in the contemporary world” (H. Scott 2004, 34). Cultural studies – as various subdisciplines projects – have been concerned with the tracing relationships between space, culture, politics, and economics, have been grounded in feminist scholarship, and have been reinvigorated by post-structural and post-colonial theory (ibid.).

Anthropology, of course, has always been invested in culture (Trigger 1998; Ortner 1999; Wolf 1982). Sociologists debate questions of cultural sociology vs. the sociology of culture (Serafini 2016, 1; Peterson and Dowd 2004; Peterson and Anand 2004; Alexander 2021). Cultural geographies have been discussed frequently. Typically, the discussion calls for a renewed emphasis on culture within a broader study of human geographies rather than a discrete subdiscipline (Cosgrove and Jackson 1987; Cosgrove 1989; Jackson 1989; Duncan and Ley 1993; Mitchell 1995; Duncan and Duncan 1996; Lees 2002; Barnett 1998; H. Scott 2004; Zusman 2013; Cresswell 2013). Still, landscape studies were always cultural studies (Lees 2002, 101). And cultural geographers have attempted to convince their colleagues that “culture is not a residual category, the surface
variation left unaccounted for by more powerful economic analyses; it is the very medium through which social change is experienced, contested and constituted” – although this still seems to privilege the social as distinct from the cultural (Cosgrove and Jackson 1987, 95. Geographies of culture were less commonly analyzed (but, see A. Barnes 2019). Additionally, geographers have emphasized a further distinction between geographies of culture, cultural geography, and a cultural turn in geography, for “the cultural turn refers not to what is happening in cultural geography itself – which has, of course, always been interested in the cultural – but to the opening up of the various other subfields within geography, such as economic or political geography, and their objects of study to a greater consideration of cultural and historical specificity” (Duncan and Duncan 1996, 577).

Some scholars have pushed back against the “purely theoretical nature” of these distinctions, calling for a renewed re-materialization of analysis that leaves behind the theater of the abstract and the “excesses of the cultural turn” (as well as linguistic turns, interpretative turns, and postmodern turns) towards a renewed focus on empirical research and material culture (Lees 2002, 101-102). Many scholars have expressed concern over “indiscriminate overshadowing and colonization of economic, political, and social concerns by the cultural, and the consequent overstretching of the term culture almost to the point of meaningless” (H. Scott 2004, 26). They have also questioned the perpetual siloing of knowledge reaffirmed in subdisciplinary projects like cultural anthropology, cultural sociology, and cultural anthropology. The “complex global processes of the contemporary world cannot be studied or comprehended through separate disciplines” (ibid., 31). While historical distinctions between the studies of
culture, the cultural studies, a cultural studies, and the cultural turns are important to acknowledge and to bear in mind in reviewing the literature, the contemporary field of cultural studies is a broadly interdisciplinary project that attempts to unite questions of textual interpretation and aesthetic evaluation with questions of who produces and consumes what, where, when, why, and to what ends. These cultural studies will be discussed in more detail in a review of the Birmingham School. For now, suffice it to say, we should strive to reconcile texts with contexts, analyze the values reflected in and by each, and recognize that culture is always more than texts.

Cultural Classification

Cultural products, like individual pieces of art for example, both communicate value (descriptively, proscriptively, and predictively) and are valuable in and of themselves – as the media of that communication, as economic commodities, and as aesthetic and artistic expressions. How do we decide which cultural forms are more valuable than others? How do we go about assigning relative value to cultural production or to individual pieces of art? Can we sort cultural production into categories like high class and low class with even a modicum of objectivity? Which people are enabled to make these decisions (Bourdieu 1994, 16. See also Mitchell 1995 111-112)?² From its “earliest extensions, culture was an idea used to differentiate and to classify” (Mitchell 1995, 104). “Classification is fundamental to social life. It is the prerequisite to all other social activity” (Yung and Espeland 2018). Throughout human history we have attempted

² All these questions are addressed at length in introduction. While Bourdieu pushes against strict high/low culture, per se, he does still separate (classify) cultural production when he offers a triad of sorts in bourgeois art, social art, and arts for art’s sake.
to sort ourselves into groups based upon perceptions of similarity and difference and these resulting classes in turn result in stratification and reification – classes are “usually organized into systems of division and hierarchy, of more and less, better and worse” (ibid.). The work of sorting people into groups is often combined with the assumption that some groups (and therefore individuals within them) are inherently inferior or superior to other groups and these sorting processes do the actual work of perpetuating the similarities, differences, and inequities they claim to observe. Classes – high, middle, and low – can be arranged according to social, political, racial, sexed, gendered, religious, intellectual, cultural, or economic hierarchy (ibid.). The resulting classes relationships are always shot through with power dynamics, they’re perpetually socially contested, and they’re intersectionally inflected (ibid.). And social and cultural studies have always been “concerned with how classifications emerge, spread, or change over time” (ibid.). Some classification systems have extended hierarchies – e.g., studying economic classes as high, middle, and low with room for subdivisions like upper middle class – while others are more binary, e.g., Marx’s analysis of economic class as bourgeoisie and proletariat (ibid.). In the study of cultural classes, discourse has historically tended to focus on high class vs. low class, holding up the former as an elite monolith positioned against a latter that has been allowed increased nuance as cultural studies have developed.
Searching High and Low

Debates about cultural class center around the question of whether we can lump cultural products into – initially, at least – two broad categories (ibid.). High class (high culture, highbrow) is characterized by formal education/training, intentional expression of values and deeper meanings, intellectual sophistication, and aesthetic merit (ibid.). Low class (low culture, low brow) is characterized by informal education and autodidacticism, expressions of surface meanings from which value can be extracted, emotional honesty, and practical use (ibid.). High culture is oriented towards the intelligentsia who have good taste (note the sensory reference) and can appreciate such cultural production, while low is oriented toward the average person and the great unwashed (ibid.). In common discourse, musical high culture is the western canon of classical music – Mozart, Beethoven, Stravinsky, etc. (ibid. See also Barker 2004, 19). Musical low culture is hugely varied. Upon what criteria do we deem any culture production to be high or low? By whom produces it? By whom consumes it (or is intended to)? Or by the aesthetics of cultural product itself? Often, high culture is defined only in opposition to low – the two have no clear or consistent standards, they’re simply held up in relation to each other. But the “differential valuation of cultures has been present throughout history in a variety of nations and is maintained through an array of institutional practices” (ibid.).

Detailing the Low

Cultural critics and researchers have used a number of categorical constructs to point at cultural production that they don’t see as elite. (Kellner, 1997; Barker 2002;
Working class culture is produced by people in the spaces of everyday life without need for formal training or structure – music under this heading might be called vernacular music or folk music. Working class culture is distinguished both from high culture and from mass and popular culture (Carrabine 2007, 232). All societies have folk culture traditions. However, the imposition of western cultural standards dovetailed with western economic exploitation and political dominion in the project of colonialism and has had an impact upon popular conception of folk music. Vernacular traditions in societies that also came to produce what we think of as classical music are often elided. And in the American context, folk music is impossible to outline. What we call folk music has been over-determined at the root, pruned of its racial stakes, fruitfully commercialized more often than not, and branched out in twisted fashion. In the United States, music culture has been a battleground over which Western music rules and notation have been imposed – to various degrees of success – onto the folk music products of black people in an ongoing process that has spawned nearly every genre of music for over a century (Oliver 1983, 380-383; Hall 1993, 105; Perchard 2015; Morrison 2017). This combination has been precarious and often illuminates serious cracks in the foundation of the high/low categorization.

Critics tend to position mass culture and popular culture as additional and more modern forms of lower culture – especially in an American context (Hall 1993, 104; Morrison 2017). Popular culture concerns cultural production that may (or not) be produced by skilled creators with sophisticated production techniques but is oriented to
low class rather than elite consumers. Mass culture is the realm of cultural forms that are mass produced and specifically intended for a mass audience, but mass culture may or not become popular (Storey 2009; Sokolowski and Mazury 2012). In practice, of course, the borders are constantly shifting. Both high and low cultural forms may be mass produced and/or gain widespread popularity at various times and in various places and the distinction between high and low is nebulous, shifting, and untenable (Barker 2004, 115-117, 147-148).

Cultural studies theory also makes frequent distinction – offers an analytical binary – between mainstream cultures and countercultures. Mainstream culture sits at the (producing and consuming) intersection of mass culture and popular culture and is consequently the most legible cumulative text of the values a given society collectively endorses and perpetuates. Working class culture and folk culture is usually seen as part of the mainstream, as well. A counterculture exists to provide explicit and deliberate opposition to both elite values and mainstream values (Barker 2004, 36.).

Problematising Class

Cultural categories are imprecise, slippery, and rarely hold up to scrutiny. More significantly, they’re often problematic: high and low cultural classes tend to correspond to high and low economic classes and when cultural production and consumption reify these false dichotomies, they perpetuate class conflict and preserve capitalistic hegemonies (Bourdieu 1996, 24; Low 2009, 28; Jackson 1989). High and low categorization rests upon inherently classist and typically racist assumptions about cultural tastes and ask us to (literally) buy into a system in which those who can afford
exposure to sophisticated cultural products have a better appreciation for all forms of
culture than those who cannot. “In politics, religion, and social spheres, the presence of
commodity fetishism accounts for what qualifies people as classy” (Ibe 2019, 459). The
field of cultural studies has always resisted these assumptions:

Cultural studies developed in part through criticism of the notion of universal
aesthetic criteria and the class-based cultural elitism that it contains. The
anthropologically oriented understanding of culture as ‘ordinary’ that forms a
bedrock assumption of cultural studies was developed in opposition to the elite
notion of culture as being concerned only with high culture, that is, cultural forms
that elite critics defined as the aesthetically good. The policing of the boundaries
of a canon of good works by aesthetic theory had historically led to the exclusion
of popular culture. However, writers interested in popular culture have argued that
there are no universal grounds for drawing lines between the worthy and the
unworthy so that evaluation is not a sustainable task for the critic. (Barker 2004,
4)

Evaluating cultural production is something that we all do in practice, but formal
evaluation must consider context, avoid subjective aesthetic judgments, and reject elitist
distinctions in cultural classification. A better strategy is to reject the false dichotomy of
high and low in favor of a view of cultural production that “applies similar critical
methods to all cultural artefacts” and assumes an ever-shifting spectrum rather than fixed
categories (Kellner 1997, 22). Rather than sorting cultural production into high and low,
we should undertake a project of unsettling these class distinctions by asking to whom
cultural production is oriented, by whom it is received, and to what effects.

These class distinctions are often racially inflected, as well. The way in which
cultural theorists and musicologists analyze black cultural production proceeds too
frequently from the assumption that these cultural forms should be positioned in
opposition to high cultural production (Hall 1993, 105; Perchard 2015; Morrison 2017).
Classic, racist discourses in the study of music assume that white music has an
intellectual propensity towards sophisticated harmonies and melodies (Oliver 1983). Evoking images of tribal drums and dark, primitive Africa, black music is thought to have an emotional gravitation to rhythm, syncopation, and groove because black musicians are more in touch with (closer to) nature (ibid.). Even scholars with a visible and self-professed love of black music can unintentionally do the work of reifying these class, race, and power dynamics when they speak of black musicians having an innate ability to play music – an ability that is impressive, desirable, or inscrutable. Discussing inherent black abilities assumes a natural essence of race itself (Hall 1993, 105; Perchard 2015; Morrison 2017). In 2021, we cringe when we hear sports analysts aver that black people simply run faster than white people. That intellectual gag reflex is less developed when fans and even musicologists suggest that black drummers have a better feel for a groove. This discussion points to the debate over authentic culture, essential culture, and cultural ownership that I need briefly to summarize.

Cultural Studies from Frankfurt to Birmingham

Having distinguished cultural studies from studies of culture, and I want to dig more deeply into the latter. Cultural studies is “a discursive formation, that is, a cluster (or formation) of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about…a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society…constituted by a regulated way of speaking about ‘objects’ that cultural studies brings into view and that cohere around key concepts, ideas and concerns” (Barker 2004, xiv). To conclude this section on cultural production I want to offer a brief genealogy of the major schools of thought that have influenced this field of study, with reference to the foregoing discussions of cultural
debates. They are at their root a path-breaking redirect of studies of culture that take critical studies into account – and “critical theory is generally associated with the ideas of the University of Frankfurt’s Institute for Social Research” (Durham 2017. See also Barker 2004, 36-37).

The Frankfurt School and Critical Studies

Critical Studies are a multi-disciplinary field of study founded upon Critical Theory – and “Critical Theory” is associated with the ideas of the University of Frankfurt’s Institute for Social Research (Durham 2017. See also Barker 2002, 36-37). “The critical theory of the Frankfurt School was a blend of philosophical reflection and social scientific inquiry [and] at the center of this political and theoretical project was the transformation of the concept of critique” (Benhabib 2018). This animating spirit unites much of the scholarship of the Frankfurt School. These scholars varied as individuals and their individual scholarship varied across the length of their careers. But they created between them a body of research guided by an impulse to critique hegemonic structures, to critique the mediums (media) of their communication and perpetuation, and to critique those who would ignore or rationalize these processes, towards radical and emancipatory praxis. It is a body of research which engages in a neo-Marxist project of analyzing the effects of capitalistic domination upon political, social, and cultural reproduction as well as the role of modern media and mass communication in the changes driven by these dynamic processes of reproduction (Kellner 2007, 49. See also Storey 2009, chapter four). Seeking exile from Hitler’s Germany in the United States, they saw continuity in the way communication media influenced and was influenced by those respective
societies: Nazi government controlled German media produced submission to fascism while American media was controlled by corporations and produced apathy through the sedative effect of leisure time pervaded by commercial entertainment (Kellner 2007, 49). In both cases, the “industrialization and commercialization of culture under capitalist relations of production” was the common feature that cut through socio-political differences (ibid.). Horkheimer and Adorno pointed to this feature as a specific object of analysis in their cultural industries critique (ibid.). In culture, they argued, “technology produced mass culture that habituated individuals to conform to the dominant patterns of thought and behaviour, and thus provided powerful instruments of social control and domination” (Kellner 1997, 14). This analysis essentially launched the fields of cultural studies, media studies, and communications studies (Kellner 1997, 13).

Cultural Studies are a multi-disciplinary field seeking to examine linkages between power and culture – specifically, how mass media is involved in the reification of capitalistic hegemony (Oakley and Connor 2015, 1; Kellner 1997; Barker 2002, 145-146). The Frankfurt School’s political-economy-of-culture perspective gained ascendency in academic circles as petty debates over aesthetics and meaning of cultural texts were abandoned in favor of analyzing products of cultural contexts that make legible societal forces. It made culture as legible to the social sciences as to the humanities and brought “grim analyses” about mass/popular culture due to “the leveling and stupefying effects of capitalist culture” (Peterson and Anand 2004, 335). This pessimistic focus intensified as the closing of that century saw an accelerated convergence between cultural and economic forces in urban spaces and “in their view, mass culture and communications stand in the center of leisure activity, are important agents
of socialization, mediators of political reality, and should thus be seen as major institutions of contemporary societies with a variety of economic, political, cultural and social effects” (Kellner 2007, 50). Research produced under the banner of the political economy of culture tends to be gloomy about power, cultural production, and people caught in between.

The scholarship of the Frankfurt School has been “stigmatized as elitist and reductionist” (Kellner 1997, 12) for tending to reify distinctions between high and low culture. Frankfurt School analysts thought that only under-educated people were vulnerable to the hegemonic effects of the cultural industries, and they thought that low culture functioned only as a tool of the cultural industries (Barker 2002, 115-117). Their predictions for the “end of the individual” were grossly exaggerated and blinded them to the agency of people producing and consuming culture-from-below to their own ends (Kellner 2007, 62). While the influence of mass culture upon working class leisure time is significant, “where there is consumption there is pleasure, and where there is pleasure, there is agency” (Kellner 1997, 19-20). Frankfurt School scholarship “never presented a united front; it was, after all, a gaggle of intellectuals” and some of their cultural critique could be more sophisticated along these lines (Ross 2014). Benjamin, for example, argued that the vast variety and accessibility of cultural forms in mass culture could serve to knock the artist off the pedestal and demystify high culture (Kellner 2007, 71; Kellner 1997, 14-15). The more cultural forms consumed by an average citizen, the more they can start discerning, evaluating, and criticizing cultural production on their own, without the need for formal training (Kellner 2007, 51-52). And such self-trained individuals had
the potential to harness the means of mass cultural production towards their own socio-political ends (ibid.).

British Schools and the Cultural Studies in Transition

Hoggart, Williams, and Thompson – pioneers of British cultural studies – also pushed back against the analysis of the Frankfort school (Garlitz 2019; Turner 2002, 33). Hoggart and Williams were professors of English literature; Thompson was a professor of History. All three championed traditional, working-class cultures. Their combined scholarship helped to reverse the emphasis on high culture by applying the theoretical tools of literary analysis on cultural forms like music and magazines – thereby granting them legitimacy – and by connecting literary theory with social theory through a practical criticism that required a consideration of the entire way of life and lived experiences of the people who consumed a given cultural form prior to evaluating it, condemning it, or dismissing it (ibid.). They connected the elitism of social historians, literary critics, and cultural theorists who failed to consider their own privileged positionality before criticizing low culture (ibid.). And they argued that class (economic, social, political, or cultural) did not exist in any given time or place but could only be artificially imposed through retrospective analysis – thus they began to categorically reject the inherent superiority of elite culture (ibid.). Finally, they demonstrated the connections of public culture like pubs and sports with private life such as family and gender roles, and they argued that the democratic and egalitarian values communicated by low culture were superior to the exclusionary aristocratic values communicated by high culture (ibid.).
While these scholars defended traditional working-class culture over elite culture, they often eschewed (‘implacably opposed’) popular culture and criticized the latter for eroding the former (ibid.). But all four scholars were enthusiastic about studying the ordinary, the routine, and the mundane, seeing great significance in the cultural production and consumption of previously overlooked and unheralded sites (Storey 2009, chapter three). Their work foreshadowed and led to the formation of the Birmingham School of cultural studies, which eagerly championed popular culture (Rowe 2017, 1).

The Birmingham School and Culture-from-Below

In the mid-1960s, researchers there examined unusual aspects they perceived in the relationships between capitalist forces and members of young, working-class subcultures (Turner 2002. See also Kellner, 1997; Barker 2002; Edwards 2007, chapter four; Edgar and Sedgwick 2008). Birmingham scholars explored “how young people take the products tendered to them” and “recombine them” as a form of resistance and identity creation (Peterson and Anand 2004, 325. See also Kellner 1997, 17). Corporations, they noted, exploited countercultural forms, and repackaged them as commodities to sell back to the youth (ibid.). These pre-packaged cultural forms are themselves repurposed, in an ongoing dialectic. These studies concluded that the interplay between economic and cultural forces is more dynamic and contested than previously assumed. “Popular culture is one of the sites where this struggle for and against a culture of the powerful is engaged: it is also the stake to be won or lost in that struggle. It is the arena of consent and resistance” (Hsu 2017).
The Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) was “a maverick interdisciplinary research-based unit” founded by Hoggart and often identified with his successor Stuart Hall (Rowe 2017, 1). Although Frankfurt scholars were certainly conducting cultural studies by most contemporary definitions, Birmingham scholars are credited with explicitly writing cultural studies into existence (Barker 2002, xv). Hoggart, Hall, and colleagues often rejected an elitist adoration of high culture, condescending assumptions about the inanity of mass and popular culture, and submissiveness of consumers to socio-political domination (Rowe 2017, 4; Kellner 1997, 15. See also Ibe 2016). Frankfurt Schoolers saw popular culture as vapid and controlling while Birmingham Schoolers viewed it as inherently valuable while also noting that such ‘culture-from-below’ was a potential site of resistance to hegemony (Ibe 2016; Hsu 2017).

Frankfurt, the early British School, and Birmingham shared a Marxist critique of capitalist structures: Nazi Germany enabled fascist political domination through government-controlled media; midcentury America encouraged political apathy; and pre-Thatcherite Britain endorsed law and order through media discourses of moral panic in the face of youth countercultures (Kellner, 1997, 16-17; Rowe, 2017, 2 & 4). This perspective focused on class rather than individuals: the Birmingham School championed the resistance potential of cultural production by marginalized and outsider populations, but typically as a function of working-class resistance. The emphasis on class that Birmingham shared with Frankfurt has been a frequent critique of Birmingham studies, which were later “overtaken by…the rise of identity-based political movements didn’t believe in ‘last instance’ class-based determinism” (Rowe 2017, 4). While their support
of popular culture and culture-from-below provided a powerful antidote to Frankfort at the time, it had the incidental effect of reifying assumed distinctions between high culture and low culture (Kellner 1997, 18). Since the decay of the Birmingham School in the 1980s, the field of cultural studies is still vibrant and productive today, but Buchanan (2018, 131) rightly argues that unfortunately it no longer carries a coherent mission, method, or critique. The body of literature resulting from the path-forming cultural studies of the Frankfurt School and the path-breaking cultural studies of the Birmingham School – as well as subsequent research deriving from them – are a solid foundation upon which to construct an analytical approach to examining the cultural texts of Louisville and the socio-political economic contexts in which they were produced (Ibe 2019, 456). Frankfurt insisted on studying culture through its effects; Birmingham reminded us to look for agency (Barker 2004, xviii). Both are important for studying the cultural production of marginalized groups with an eye towards how they take space and make place.
2. Placemaking

The process of placemaking leverages culture into the collective project of imagining space into place. Space and place “have long histories and bear with them a multiplicity of meanings and connotations which reverberate with other debates and many aspects of life” (Massey 1994, 1). They “are concepts to which we seem endlessly to return, and with good reason,” as “they are crucial organizing frames for the more general way in which we understand the world and make our way about in it” (Massey 1999, 245). The distinctions between them are conceived differently across various languages, disciplines, and intellectual eras. Moreover, space has been reclaimed and place problematized over the last few decades in a manner that has slightly blurred the distinction between them (Massey, generally). But space “always contains a degree of the unexpected, the unpredictable…and an element of chaos” that is sometimes unnerving or incomprehensible (Massey 1999, 8. See also Massey 1994, 1). Place is an integument we stretch out across pulsating space. It’s a very human, demotic attempt to ignore all that uncertainty and to pretend that space is fixed and comfortably inhabitable.

However, the spaces in which we live are not fixed or empty containers which already exist with or without us – rather, space is necessarily practiced (Low 2009, 24). Spaces are socially constructed as we live in them and act in them (Massey 2005, 1-4). Epistemological claims about the manner of construction do not negate the solidity of the resulting constructs, of course, and to say that environments are socially constructed is not to deny the reality of their effects on people and on society. The “construction of space and place is at the same time material and imaginative, the two not simply mapping on to each other but intersecting and cross-cutting in complex ways” (Massey 1996, 123).
Space is characterized by dynamic processes of difference, inequality, and contestation (Neely and Samura 2011). These processes have no beginning or end, and the questions of what space is for and whom space is for are never settled (A. Barnes 2019, 2-3). Space is a product of interrelations, space makes possible the existence of multiplicities, and space is open and without essence – always in the process of becoming (Massey 2005, 9 & 11-12; Massey 1993, 145; Massey 1999; Massey 1999, 246; Malpas 2012).

Places are built in, on, with, and through space. Therefore, place shares all these fundamental characteristics with space – in some ways, it’s more theoretically helpful to “refuse the distinction” and more politically helpful to admonish those who would counterpose the two in a way that essentializes either (Massey 2005, 6; Massey 2002). Neither spaces nor places are ever pre-existing or permanently settled (Massey 2005, 10). Each is created in a social and temporal context, and each is constantly being re-created. Each is meaningful, lived, and real (Massey 2004, 7-9). Both are taken for granted all too often. The former in the sense that we understand everything to be spatial but rarely spend enough time theorizing “of space.” The latter in the sense that we just assume that place is more meaningful than space without articulating why. Therein, though, lies some element of difference (Malpas 2012; Massey 2004).

Placemaking is the process of relating to space, whether incidentally or intentionally, and if place feels more comfortable or grounded than space, it’s because we’ve simply decided that it is – and that alone provides analytical insight into place. Although the social and political histories of spaces are important, “when one refers to a ‘sense of place’ it is not these analysed histories which are so relevant but rather the feelings which people carry round with them” (Massey 1993, 145). Space and place are
both produced in terms of social relations but “one view of place is as a particular…moment in those networks of social relations” (Massey 1994, 5). Place is space pointed at – an attempt to describe a blurry, briefly frozen snapshot in time (Latour 1993, 37).³ And if we understand place as a snapshot of a particular moment in the network of social relations, then the dynamic, contested nature of those relations makes the concept of place innately precarious and the continual process of placemaking vital to the imagination.

Transforming space into place – placemaking – is the process by which “people have their love of place confirmed, renewed, valued; their place attachment activates as place stewardship; which leads to increased social cohesion and well-being; which in turn results in a genuine formation of vibrant livable places” (Courage 2021, 3). Culture is the medium of this collective imaginative project – it is both how we produce our relation to place and the product of that relationship. “For some, place is the sphere of real and valued practices” and cultural production is the expression of those values (Massey 2005, 5). In the form of art, culture is a means for creating, claiming, challenging, and changing places. In the form of language, culture is a tool for communicating our ideas about places. In this section I will elaborate upon these two understandings of culture by reviewing literature on cultural production in placemaking and by reviewing literature about the how language mediates our imagination of place before asking how these concepts might help us to map cultural production.

³ “If you turn round suddenly, as in the children’s game “Mother, may I?” they will freeze, looking innocent, as if they hadn’t budged; here, on the left, are things themselves; there, on the right, is the free society of speaking, thinking subjects, values and of signs. Everything happens in the middle, everything passes between the two, everything happens by way of mediation, translation and networks, but this space does not exist, it has no place. It is the unthinkable, the unconscious of the moderns.”
Culture, particularly in the form of intentionally created artistic products and performance, has long been implicated in the process of placemaking. Arts and artists can have a significant impact on the process. “Not only will working with all that artists know, and with making art useful, and seeing the people of place as creative placemakers, result in a more […] integrated approach to cities, but it also makes possible a rethinking of the synergies between arts, community, and our urban place” (Courage 2020, 221). Whether formal or informal, structured or spontaneous, music and other forms of cultural production enable people to relate to the places in which they live by “fostering positive interactions, activating imaginations, and facilitating deliberative practices” (Borrup 2020, 280). Groups of people living in any space will come together to express their values and they are going to create art in the process. Artists can create art for the specific purpose of uniting their community together to contest existing problems or to realize new visions of the future. “People gain a greater sense of agency, common purpose, and shared vocabulary when they make something together than when they simply try to talk about it” (Borrup 2020, 273). Arts and placemaking can provide the medium for resistance (Fennell 2020, 227). They have significant impact on “spatial change and policy-making…social network building and organizing around social justice issues” (Borrup 2020, 276). Artists living and performing in communities gather and solidify shared interests into collective visions of place (Whitehead 2020, 248; Borrup 2020, 271; Fennell and Tucker 2020, 229). They harness these shared visions to contest existing narratives of place (Ong 2020, 238; Borrup 2020, 271). And they amplify other voices in the articulation of those visions (Borrup 2020, 271; Whitehead 2020, 248).
Artists are well-positioned to “create environments conducive to productive idea generation, discussion, and deliberation of solutions” (Borrup 2020, 271 & 280; Whitehead 2020, 249).

Making Place & Urban Planning

Often, these creative abilities are intentionally leveraged by governments and community organizations interested in vibrant and participatory urban planning (Courage 2020). “Artists of many disciplines working in community settings, since at least the 1960s, have developed an extensive array of techniques and practices to foster community building and promote engagement in social issues and civic affairs” (Borrup 2020, 276). Culture is the expression of a community’s values and urban planning is aspirational at its core – good urban planning requires full consideration of what all stakeholders find valuable about their neighborhoods and their cities. (Whitehead 2020, 249). This can take several forms. Urban planners can market a place’s existing or historical artistic production (Skelly 2020). Artists who base their art on their own experience of living in a particular place can rebuild “a sense of community which is inclusive of all those willing to engage with it” (ibid., 266). Urban planners can sponsor innovative performance arts as well as interactive art installations (Dobbin 2020). It’s not difficult to find currently working artists embedded in a community who “genuinely want to make dialogue with their cities” and keep “a creative soul of place alive” (ibid., 289). And urban planners can recruit artists themselves into the planning process and other municipal processes (Borrup 2020; Whitehead 2020). Research on urban planning that centers on cultural production has led to massive amounts of data (Lloyd 2004; Markusen
Artists-led, culturally attuned creative practices when applied to the public participation process can result in multiple outcomes. These include expanding the diversity of people involved, eliciting higher-quality local knowledge, and making participation more meaningful, enjoyable, productive, and less contentious. Well-planned and facilitated public process can build social connections, gather more and different data, approach challenged with fresh eyes, activate group imaginations, find common ground, lead productive co-design activities, reframe complex problems, strengthen participatory democracy, amongst other things. (Borrup 220, 270)

Researchers have offered a “cultural hypothesis” that assumes a primary role for art and artists in contributing to more culturally informed civic projects and “artists needn’t limit themselves to conventional materials. They might work with sound, movement, color, objects, buildings, spaces, neighborhoods, relationships, sense of identity, or social systems” (Whitehead 2020, 271). In summary, the relationship between culture and place is well-recognized, frequently leveraged, and hugely diverse.

Making Place & Community Activism

None of this should imply that formal organizations have any sort of monopoly on these processes. Arts-led placemaking is just as frequently informal and communal – if still intentional and aspirational. As noted, government agencies and community organizations often look to already existing art scenes when attempting to marketplaces. Much of this type of placemaking discourse “positions placemaking as a bottom-up, radically democratic, or civic activity” and it may be difficult to tease out the differences between arts-led placemaking and grassroots political movements when it comes community protest organizing (Fennell 2020, 227). Both projects need to “struggle
against professionalization in order to retain what is really important about both – people taking control of their own lives and environments” (ibid., 228). And in both cases, sometimes organizers suppress their subversive instincts in the search for cooperation and community support (Whitehead 2020, 249). These similarities fade in the case of countercultural production. Grassroots political movements crave popularity – they must court mainstream success to reach their political goals (Fennell 2020, 227-228). “Any serious understanding of any one place necessitates standing back, taking a broader view, and setting it in a wider context” (Massey 1993, 144). Forces like urban renewal and displacement shape the character of artistic production of a place (Dobbin 2020, 283; Skelly 2020, 258). The physical location in which art “claims space, makes noise, and draws attention” is “itself an important part” of the art (Skelly 2020, 263). And “artists will teach venues about creative potential they hadn’t tapped” (Dobbin 2020, 289). The study of art and placemaking unites texts and contexts in exactly the way demanded by critical and cultural studies (ibid., 293; Skelly 2020, 276; Whitehead 2020, 248). And this “framework privileges integration, multi-valency, and the creation of new working models, not the maintaining of borders or old modalities” (Whitehead 2020, 248).

Making Place…for Whom?

It’s important to note that – while robustly beneficial in theory – arts-led placemaking is frequently criticized in practice “along the lines of race and power, and vis-à-vis regeneration and gentrification” (Courage 2020, 220). This is particularly the case with official and formal processes of placemaking. Are governments really trying to make places? Or simply to make spaces marketable to affluent potential taxpayers
Government led placemaking – artistic or otherwise – is primarily about development (ibid., 225-226). It can be an empty gesture and a smokescreen (Borrup 2020, 279). “Arts in place has been used as a salver to smooth over social cleansing and to give a veneer of community-located authenticity or acceptability, a placewash” (Courage 2020, 220). It can be exclusionary (Fennell 2020). Strategies of creative placemaking and cultural governance are consistently open to healthy critique (Courage 2020, 219-220. See also Zukin 1995; Markusen and Nicodemus 2019). This is not to say that government sponsored art-led placemaking should be condemned out-of-hand; we need to scrutinize these processes as they unfold. For whom are places being made and to what ends (Fennell and Tucker 2020, 228)? Who do we engage with in the process – who is included and who is left out as we make place with art (ibid)? Community based artists often form “strong partnerships with local residents” and “particularly seek to engage with vibrant, young people” (Skelly 2020, 260). It is important to ask who and what counts as vibrant (Fennell and Tucker 2020, 225-226). Local context matters and artists who want to engage in creative placemaking must be reflexive about their own positionality and must seek community participation (Iversen 2020, 299).

Keeping & Thinking Place

Placekeeping and place-thought may be critical remedies to the worst tendencies of formal placemaking. Performance art creates spaces of counternarratives that give new understandings of the world and re-make existing places (Ong 2020). If there are people occupying any space, they have already related to it and have therefore made it into
place. We don’t need to make already existing places – we need to enable their occupants to improve their environment (Fennell and Tucker 2020, 230-232). An important caveat here is that the conversation about enablement need not center on discourse of empowerment (ibid., 232). Community arts projects often start with an assumption of disempowered residents (Skelly 2020, 260). Discourse of empowerment positions communities – positions people in place – as already or always powerless (Ong 2020 239). Instead, we should approach placemaking as an opportunity to relate to each other differently and loudly in the cocreation of new knowledges (ibid.). Placekeeping discourse is inherently critical and better assumes people’s inherent power to shape space into place (Fennell 2020, 230-231). Arts-led placemaking must enable communities by allowing them to express their values through making decisions and by producing the resources necessary for achieving their visions of place.

The emphasis on vision, here, points to place-thought discourse. Placemaking is frequently understood as a “vision of collective life” but much of the scholarship on placemaking emphasizes attempts to realize that vision rather than inquiring into the process of envisioning it (ibid., 229). But “place and thought were never separated because they never could or can be separated” and place-thought theory assumes that the process of placemaking is a process of imagining our environment (Whitehead 2020, 254). Seeking to trouble existing narratives of place, these discourses “open up the possibility of initiating alternative relationships with people in place and, therefore, a counternarrative of place” (Ong 2020, 238). Place-thought shifts the emphasis from questions about what places are being made and how they are made towards questions about who is doing the imaginative work of deciding what to make. It asks us to look for
these thoughts from somewhere outside the mainstream and it proceeds from assumption that the making of knowledge and of place is an inherently value-laden proposition (Whitehead 2020, 255). “Artists are celebrated for their imaginative powers” and “the tools of the artist are an essential part of how we imagine cities: through stories, image, metaphors, exploring possibilities as well as critiques” (Borrup 2020, 269 & 271). In seeking to understand how we relate to space through culture we must grapple with how these thought processes function in the imaginative realms of culture and of place.

Expressing Place through Metaphor

Places exist (come into being) because collectively we imagine them to, and a common language of some sort is necessary for this communal project to take place. “The first issue that one encounters in beginning to explore the concept of space, place, or any other concept concerns language” (Malpas 2020, 232). Whether this shared language is visual, oral, or written, we need it to communicate ideas to one another – to leverage symbolic images into texts and texts into discourse. The “form in which discourses can be presented, shaped and can gain authority is as metaphors” (T. Barnes and Duncan 2006, 9). As a symbolic system of mediation, all language is metaphor – indeed, all thinking is metaphorical (Howitt 1998, 49; Duncan et al 2013, 57). “Analogies have an ancestry in what might broadly be called geographical thought…capacity for analogical reasoning developed close links between all these metaphors, using their semantic complexity to develop holistic understanding through a play of metaphorical meaning” (Duncan et al 2013, 57). They shape the way we imagine both the material and the immaterial and “if we consider the ways in which key new metaphors (or new uses of
existing metaphors) shape the way we think, speak and teach about aspects of complex and dynamic geographies, we can glimpse the power of metaphor to illuminate the issues with which we work” (Howitt 1998, 49). As a method of developing understanding and relating concepts, metaphorical language can build bridges between theories, fields, and disciplines and allow us to see the world differently than could be imagined without the metaphors (T. Barnes and Duncan 2006, 11).

A Spatial Sensibility

Many scholars, for example, have noted the ubiquity of geographic metaphors in attempts to understand and to talk about social and cultural phenomenon (Howitt 1998, 50). “In particular, we have seen wide adoption and adaptation of spatial metaphors beyond the discipline of geography” (ibid., 49). We tend to think of geographic sensibility as a willingness to think in terms of space and place (Cresswell 2013, 103). Rather, we are unable to think otherwise:

The geographic world constitutes a generally accessible and very comprehensive realm of experience for people. It not only includes a complete array of forms, colors, textures, and patterns, but it is also associated with a wide range of basic sensorimotor, cognitive, and affective experiences (walking, climbing, exploring, returning home). Indeed, “geography is essential to survival”: evolution has endowed all intelligent creatures with an instinctive understanding of geographic relationships. (Couclelis 1998, 209)

The construction of place (and the construction process of placemaking) pervades our thoughts; geographical metaphors enable our thought processes. “Spatial cognition has been an active field of research in behavioral geography, cognitive psychology, and cognitive linguistics” for decades and “spatial metaphor also abounds in the so-called ‘cultural studies’ literature” (Couclelis 1998, 213; Price-Chalita 1994, 252).
Spatial metaphors function across spatial scale. At a bodily scale, feminist writers have noted the prevalence of standpoint, positionality, and sites of struggle as spatial metaphor (Price-Chalita 1994, 240). “A close reading of critical feminist scholarship reveals that some women, particularly women of color, lesbians, and women writing from non-western hegemonic countries, do indeed appear to have a ‘proper place’…when these women write of their experiences of disempowerment, many tend to do so using highly spatial language.” They speak of being displaced and they speak of being out of place. On a household scale, there are the aspects of the kinds of spaces that are familiar to people from everyday experience: those of working areas, of rooms, buildings, or of larger geographic-scale spaces. Spatializations work by allowing the establishment of metaphors linking a particular task domain with a familiar domain of experience in such a way that the modes of thought and action appropriate in the familiar domain are also appropriate in the task domain. (Couclelis 1998, 209)

Scholars have also written about how spatial metaphors operating at a domestic scale enable us to think through information technology by relying upon everyday household objects like files, folders, and webs – while noting that although “spatial imagery is everywhere in current visualizations and geographical user interfaces, the cognitively ad hoc nature of even the better designs leads to mixed metaphors (e.g., activating ‘buttons’ and ‘windows’ on a ‘desktop’ using a ‘mouse’)” (Couclelis 1998, 210). Additionally, academics working with queer theory have written about the closet as spatial metaphor in discussion of sexuality, and critical theorists have famously written about destroying the master’s house (Brown 2006; Lorde 2007).

On a larger scale, the “spatial – employed at the level of the text itself – provides firm ground for politics” (Price-Chalita 1994, 236-237). We explore margins, marginalization, and the marginalized and we move from the margins to the center
We examine the relationships between the core and the periphery, and the “notion of de-territorialization assumes a territory from which one is displaced, and which one negotiates, dismantles, perhaps returns to” (Wolff 1993, 235).

We use “the trope of borderlands” and we love to talk of travel (Price-Chalita 1994, 239-240; Wolff 1993). Who gets to travel freely in social circles and political realms? Who gets access to which sites and when? “Social and cultural theory are then reconceptualized as a kind of tourism, or sightseeing, founded on the search for authenticity and the attempt to make sense of the social” (Wolff 1993, 225). “Culture is represented in terms of spheres, maps, levels or domains” and critical and cultural studies “literature employs the metaphors of travel, boundaries, frontiers, borders, and again, the map” (Mitchell 1995). We even think of ourselves as engaging in fields of study (think: Bourdieu’s field of cultural production) – and many of us do so out in a field site (think: gathering data as fieldwork). To mix all the metaphors, an agricultural ethnographer might routinely study her field in the field at a field.

We also use these spatial metaphors to discuss how we engage with art: we might dig into a band’s discography, we might describe a vibrant music scene as an oasis, and we might talk about the peaks and valleys in a singer’s career – if they don’t spend too much time in a rut or on a plateau. Travel, again, has also been implicated in this discourse of “cultural criticism recently: nomadic criticism, traveling theory, critic-as tourist (and vice versa), maps, billboards, hotels and motels” (Wolff 1993, 224). As

---

4 “What marginality? Marginal in relation to whom? to where? to what? […] Our identities appear to defy logic, for ‘who we are’ is in at least two places at once: outside and within, margin and center. Learning to think from this ‘outsider within’ social location has generated startling and valuable understandings. Finally bell hooks…writes of marginality ‘as much more than a site of deprivation. it is also the site of radical possibility, a space of resistance…It is a space I choose.’”
referenced at the outset of this literature review, the concepts I’m working with (place, culture, imaginaries) are inextricably and constitutively related. And just as geographic metaphors can help us think through culture, cultural metaphors can help us think through place.

A Cultural Sensibility

Geographers have routinely and explicitly reviewed their own proclivity for using cultural metaphor to describe spaces, places, and landscapes. Early (nineteenth century) professional geographers relied upon rich, evocative description full of poetic literary devices. But by the middle of the twentieth century through the height of quantitative spatial analysis, such language had fallen out of favor:

The importance of visual techniques for teaching geography and presenting the results of geographical research is widely stressed, especially in the United States. The geographer assumes that a good photograph or map evokes a sharper image of places than words. Verbal descriptions have become suspect; they are regarded as ineffective or merely ornamental. The art of manipulating words for purpose of vivid description appears to have declined. Simile and metaphor, as devices in evoking imagery, are inimical to the modern style of geographical writing, which strives hard to attain a similitude of scientific rigor. (Tuan 1957, 8)

Throughout the 1980s however, we can trace a return to graphic, imaginative description and much of this can be traced to the influence of cultural studies within the discipline (Cosgrove 1989). As noted, the cultural turn in geography gave human geographers a means to integrate many of their political, economic, and social research concerns (Cosgrove 1989, 567; Barnett 1998). Studies of landscape in geography, though, are inherently and explicitly cultural and cultural metaphors have always been in the toolkit for practitioners of that method (Sauer 1925; Cosgrove 1998). But the “appeal of new landscape metaphors [in the 1980s] is bound up with a critique of Sauer’s methodological
discussions of landscape. Sauer, it is commonly argued, overemphasized mere description of artifacts on the landscape and ignored the processes that give these objects meaning” (Demeritt 1994, 163-164).

Human geographers wove together the descriptive texts of nineteenth century vivid description, landscape studies vocabularies, and cultural imaginaries and “rather than using natural-science analogies such as system, organism or machine as the preferred spatial metaphors” they began to rely upon “text, theatre, carnival and spectacle…all of them self-consciously representational metaphors” (Cosgrove 1998, 567. See also Cosgrove and Jackson 1987, 96-97). These “new metaphors of cultural production emphasize the active social construction, representation, and interpretation of absolutely cultural landscapes and their contested meanings” (Demeritt 1994, 167). The process of placemaking has been referred to as setting the stage and geographers have attempted to conceptualize spatial planning as dance in “the understanding of the spaces of choreography and performance, and the performativities and choreographies of space” (Borrup 2020, 275). Indeed, these cultural metaphors have even been employed in the attempts to represent the discipline itself – academics more comfortable with discrete research on territory and region have discussed mosaics of geographical studies while scholars who investigate indiscrete, interrelational, and critical phenomena tend to refer to the tapestry of geographical thought (Nelson 2019). Reading landscapes as text, becoming more reflexive, turning towards interpretive analysis, and attempting to represent meanings that are produced in space all required a cultural sensibility (Cosgrove 1998, 567-568).
The ways we use metaphorical language in both cases (spatial metaphor for cultural phenomenon and cultural metaphor for geographic phenomenon) have critical implications. Scholars have problematized the way communicating ideas about culture and place in this manner can have sexist, racist, and classist effects in the world, can assume unidirectionality in these relationships in a manner that obscures agency, and can perpetuate dichotomous thinking. More nuanced thinking about these relationships has argued that the margins often drive and re-make the center as “a process of restructuring in which activities previously deemed peripheral to the ‘productive’ city have now moved centre stage,” and “a process whereby previously marginal groups and their activities have been made central to the city and have made the city centre central to themselves” (O’Connor and Wynne 1996). However, although the ideas being communicated are critical and intend to throw light upon exclusion, domination, and power disparities, uncareful writing about groups of people being “displaced, marginalized, peripheral, and outside” can speak about “disempowerment in politically negative spatial terms” that obscure acts of resistance and essentialize marginalization (Price-Chalita 1994, 238). And those terms each have “a dominant oppositional corollary that is situated, centralized, and inside. These negative spatial terms thus constitute subordinate halves of categories which rely on their very negativity for the dominant half’s unity and superiority” (ibid.).

Others have pointed out that in all these subordinate halves “there is a centre” and it is not the negative terms that should criticized but rather “what is to be criticized is (to retain the geographic metaphor) the dominant centre; and secondly, that the criticism, the destabilizing tactics, originate too from a place – the margins, the edges, the less visible
spaces” (Wolff 1993, 235). There is something to this argument – if these social and cultural places people are trying to point to are indeed the sites of protest and the foundations for societal change, then they can never truly be subordinate. However, the argument itself can perpetuate false dichotomy.

There is also a concern about the loss of vitality of the words involved in these processes of analogic thinking. “The naturalization of metaphors leads to them all but losing their metaphorical value. Metaphors such as system, market, machine, organism, body, field, boundary, text, centre, margin, and development, for example, have all become naturalized to the point of invisibility as metaphors” (Howitt 1998, 50. See also T. Barnes and Duncan 2006, 10-11). When spatial and cultural metaphors are overused – when the pictures they paint become too routine and indispensable – they can begin to sound natural and to lose any analytical or critical force. “The very proliferation of spatial ideas and images, along with the rejection of certain key distinctions, makes it difficult to identify what is metaphorical and what is not” (Malpas 2012, 232. See also A. Barnes 2019, 10-11). Finally, attempts to write about space and place in terms of culture in a way that makes room for reflexivity and interpretation have been accused of nearing a crisis of representation (Cosgrove 1998). Studies of space and place – and of culture – have never been completely discrete or tidy in a disciplinary sense (Walker 2020, 1). They often share common approaches and assumptions. On occasion, though, they do “speak different languages and use incommensurable metaphors. Some translation is required” (Demeritt 1994, 163).
Understanding Place Relationally

Much of the literature that I’m engaging with here – or at least the way in which I find this literature most useful to engage with – is best understood through geographic thinking on place and culture as inherently and necessarily relational. Throughout this review on cultural production and placemaking I have pointed out how scholars have struggled to overcome conceptual tensions and contradictions. First, that social, cultural, and geographic thinking on these concepts has tended to offer false dichotomies of high/low, inside/outside, authentic/manufactured, space/place, white/black, male/female, center/margin, core/periphery, structuralist/culturalist, placed/displaced, and mainstream/counterculture. Far too much of the scholarship produced through this dichotomous thinking has assumed that the essence of each of these relationships involves unidirectional causality in which the former phenomena are independent variables that shape (dominate) the latter. Secondly, theorists have argued with each other in the attempt to pin down the lowest common analytical denominator between signs and symbols, text and image, content and discourse (Cresswell 2013, 227-229). And they have argued over the attempt to define their ideas of culture itself in an “infinite regress” (Mitchell 1995, 107-108). Finally, cultural metaphors of space – like theater and carnival – are “self-consciously representational metaphors” that human geographers have worried may cause a (discrete and independent) field of cultural geography to fall victim to a “crisis of representation” (Cosgrove 1989 567. See also Thomas 2013; Flaherty 2002; Demeritt 1993; H. Scott 2004, 26). Yet geographers engaging in nonrepresentational theory have attempted to avert or to race past that very crisis while using cultural metaphors of dance to illustrate imagined geographies of cultural contexts.
in specific places (Cresswell 2012, 230-232. See also Thomas 2013). I think that thinking in terms of relational geographies can be fruitfully employed to help us overcome some of these concerns. From a relational perspective, it takes two to tango.

Relational thinking assumes co-constituted identities. Space is made into place in our attempt to relate to our environment – the way we relate to other people, structures, and temporalities (Massey 1999; Massey 2004). Space and place are themselves relational and should never be seen as distinct or discrete (Malpas 2012, 228-229. See also Massey 1993, 148). Our thinking about space directly affects our sense of place (Massey 2005). “Rather than thinking about the inhabited world as a set of discrete things with their own essences (this place, different from that place), we can think about the world as formed through the ways in which things relate to each other” (Cresswell 2013, 218). In this manner, what we’ve long discussed as binary systems are not discrete but are interdependent. There is no inside to point to if there’s not simultaneously an outside. “Place, in this work, is part of the process by which insiders are differentiated from outsiders – ‘us’ from ‘them.’ Place is not simply endowed with meaning by people who are in it in a positive way. Place, here, is constructed through relations to an outside that is always simultaneously part of it” (ibid., 221). Relationships like high/low culture and marginalized/centered groups are not false binaries, per se, as they can still be oppositional in nature. The point is that each must exist for either to exist, and that any opposition runs along a spectrum – nothing is ever essentially, completely, or stably at one end or the other.

Relational thinking assumes recursivity. If inside/outside and high/low are created entirely by their relationships with one another, then there are no “subordinate halves”
Their gravitational push and pull are proportionate. Relational geographies have “depended on the recognition of how the outside of place was every bit as important as the inside – that in some ways the inside included the outside within it” (Cresswell 2013, 221). The margins control the center just as much as the center controls the margins – in some ways, more so (Cresswell 1996; O’Connor and Wynne 1996; Massey 2006). The two are inextricable. Similarly, privilege can only attach itself to groups of people through the artificial creation of difference and while there is no essential white culture or black culture, there is nonetheless a socially constructed relationship between the two that can be analyzed. This is not meant to elide power disparities or the material effects of differentiation. “Links with other places are really relations of interdependence and, moreover, of an interdependence which is rarely equal. What need to be analyzed are the aspects of domination, subordination, influence, and power which these links embody” (Massey 1993, 145). Relational social networks “may involve both the exclusion of some entities as well as the forcible enrollment of others. In short, relational space is a ‘power-filled’ space in which some alignments come to dominate, at least for a period of time, while others come to be dominated” (Murdoch 2006. Quoted in Cresswell 2013, 218). Indeed, seeing space as a product of relationships has been implicated in progressive political projects of strategic anti-essentialism that focus on the politics of identity formation rather than antiquated identity politics (Massey 2005, 10-13; Massey 1993, 145; Massey 1999, 3. See also Massey 2004). With the rise of relational thinking in geography, “the focus on place began to shift and geographers began to take notions of power, exclusion, and difference seriously. They asked what ‘other’ was being constructed to create places where ‘we’ belong” (Creswell 2013, 220).
Seeing differentiated identities as relational makes better room for the agency of the othered in the analysis of these relationships.

Relational thinking also assumes iteration. “The identities of places are constantly changing as new products of history” and are always in a process of becoming – they are never settled (Massey 1993, 145). These relationships are co-dependent but are never harmonious: “while multiple sets of relations may well co-exist, there is likely to be some competition between these relations over the composition of particular spaces and places” (Murdoch 2006. Quoted in Cresswell 2013, 218). In a closed system in which relationships were fixed and established, difference could not be addressed, and normative considerations would not make a difference. Without iteration there are no imaginaries – just descriptive images. Understanding space and place as relational in an ongoing sense avoids “the claustrophobia of the closed system, the closed coherence where there is no opening for anything new” and makes room for the political alongside the philosophical (Massey 1993, 9. See also Massey 2004).

Understanding cultural classification as relational allows us to engage with people’s everyday binary understanding of cultural classes without reifying snobbish assumptions about elite culture and popular culture. Understanding cultural categories as relational supports the contention that cultural appropriation is normatively problematic even if cultural forms are never essentially or authentically associated with a particular group. And understanding places as relational leads us to the conclusion that the city itself does not exist except that it exists as a product of these never-settled processes. “A product of historical processes, any creative intervention or practice in a place context exists in an interrelational matrix ecology of interdependent actors and organisations – its
culture…People live, create, and recreate culture in cities on a daily basis. The city does not ‘create culture,’ nor is culture in its service. The city is more than ‘of’ culture. The city is culture” (Courage 2020, 219). With this in mind, I turn toward Clyde Woods’s analyses of marginalized cultural production in cities.
SECTION III. FIRST ARTICLE

I Got a Song I Can Sing: A Thematic Analysis of Blues Epistemologies

Abstract: Clyde Woods’s work is positioned at the nexus of critical, urban, and cultural studies and his blues epistemology offers a guide to reading cultural production of marginalized groups as maps containing alternative visions of the past, present, and future. Woods has been recognized for his service to peers and students, his research, and his blues epistemologies. However, research that extends the blues epistemology has been limited, and tends to approach his multifaceted blues in a piecemeal fashion. Moreover, such research has rarely been conducted within the field of urban studies – despite Woods having been an urban planner and urban geographer whose research centered upon New Orleans, New York City, Los Angeles, and Baltimore. In this article, I analyze both Woods’s work and the work of those who have attempted to apply, extend, reframe, and leverage his writing in their own work. I find and explicate five major themes that are critical to research and writing in a blues episteme: (1) vernacular epistemologies & organic intellectualism, (2) cultural studies & activist art/istry, (3) environmental catastrophe & ecological crisis, (4) uneven development & spatial imaginaries, and (5) political praxis & better futures. I argue that these are his key contributions, representing the theoretical toolkit he has offered those who aspire to write with a blues methodology, and I highlight them for that purpose. This paper provides a partial foundation for using the blues epistemology as a method of research.
I Got a Song I Can Sing
A Thematic Analysis of Blues Epistemologies

1. Introduction

   well, now i got a song i can sing
   i got a song i can sing
   if i fail to sing it, and my soul be lost
   ain’t nobody’s fault but mine

   –blind boys of alabama.

   It’s been twenty-five years since the first edition of Clyde Woods’s (1998)
   Development Arrested: The Blues and Plantation Power in the Mississippi Delta was
   published. His well-regarded theory of the blues epistemology, explicated in that
   monograph and further developed in every subsequent publication through his (2017)
   posthumously published monograph Development Drowned and Reborn: The Blues and
   Bourbon Restorations of Post-Katrina New Orleans, is a theoretical, empirical,
   methodological contribution that has had a significant impact upon the academy and upon
   social and cultural knowledge: “a research vision that allows us to see the connections
   between culture and political economy – rather than separating them into isolated strands
   of history” (Brahinsky 2012). His commitment to scholarship, as well as engaging with
   and supporting those he loved, has been remarked upon frequently, warmly, and in great
   depth (See for example Banet-Weiser 2011; Brahinsky 2012; Campbell 2012; Costa
   Vargas 2012; McKittrick 2012; Ruddick 2012; Soja 2012; Wilson 2012; Lipsitz 2014;
   Mahtani 2014; Hawthorne 2019; Wright 2019; Osuna 2021). And scholars who have
taken up his blues epistemology in their own writing represent a diverse array of personal backgrounds, disciplinary training, fields of study, and methodological approaches.\(^1\)

At the same time, the amount of research that has leveraged the blues epistemology in a substantial fashion has been somewhat limited. Moreover, resulting publications have tended to approach his multifaceted blues in a piecemeal fashion. While Woods’s writing consistently sought to unite cultural studies with activist praxis, he tended to reframe his blues to fit given projects, never settling on the best terminology with which to capture his multifaceted understanding of the blues as both a body of explanation and an engine of change. This lack of consistency is reflected in a bifurcated secondary literature on the blues epistemology that tends to center on either the former or the latter. Additionally, such research has rarely been conducted within the field of urban studies – despite Woods having been an urban planner and urban geographer whose research centered upon New Orleans, New York City, Los Angeles, and Baltimore. As we reflect on the passing of a quarter century since \textit{Development Arrested} began to influence the academy, a review of the work of those scholars who have explored, leveraged, extended, or repositioned the writings of Clyde Woods – a thematic analysis of the secondary literature of the blues epistemology – provides a partial roadmap for using the blues epistemology as a method of research that comes closer to his own.

Growing directly out of his doctoral dissertation (1993), \textit{Development Arrested} (1998) uses a political economy of culture perspective to focus on the dialectical

\(^1\) Authors represented in table 1 (in conclusion) have obtained degrees within the disciplines of Environmental Sciences, Political Science, Geography, Sociology, Theology, Philosophy, History, English, and Education and hold professorships in those disciplines as well as in fields of study like literature & language studies, cultural studies, critical studies, black studies, diaspora studies, African studies, ethnic studies, women & gender studies, queer studies, and environmental studies.
relationship between the racial capitalism and black counterculture of the Mississippi Delta – and Development Drowned (2017) could be summarized in much the same way. They are both analyses of relational geographies that focus on the dynamically recursive co-constitution of region and locality. The former focuses on how the local was shaped by the regional and examines how regional blocs of corporate interests, and regional commissions operated in the Delta. The latter focused on how the regional (and often larger scales) were shaped by and are tied to the local by examining the role of New Orleans in the collective black psyche before, during, and after Hurricane Katrina. They examine dialectical relationship between racial capitalism and racialized groups but the former shows how black cultural production responds to formations of capitalism while the latter shows how new modes of black cultural production cause capitalist structures to reform (Wright 2019, 2). His final work benefited from the inclusion of all the approaches he developed across his career – eight article-length works in the form of two introductions and a conclusion from anthologies he edited, two body chapters to an anthology, and three journal articles. These themes were all refined, especially after Katrina became a catalyst for most of his subsequent work.

Based on these works as well as the body of literature that has drawn upon it, I highlight five major themes that are methodologically critical to research and writing in a blues episteme: (1) vernacular epistemologies & organic intellectualism, (2) cultural studies & activist art/istry, (3) environmental catastrophe & ecological crisis, (4) uneven development & spatial imaginaries, and (5) political praxis & better futures. I argue that they are his key contributions: they represent the theoretical toolkit he has offered those who aspire to write with a blues methodology, and I highlight them for that purpose: this
paper provides a partial foundation for using the blues epistemology as a method of
research. In the sections below, I explicate these themes while grounding them in
Woods’s writing and tracking them in the research of those who write with Woods.
Woods’s impact is wide-reaching: anyone who works with black geographies, for
example, may cite Woods’s foundational anthology with McKittrick and both are also
considered in the context of a broader Black Radical Tradition.² And it would be difficult
to consider asset stripping and trap economics as they occurred in New Orleans without
referencing his work.³ The publications I reference in this paper explore the blues
epistemology substantially. As I analyze the secondary literature, I focus on how each
author leverages respective themes in their research. Following this, I summarize the
incidence and usage of these themes in the secondary literature and conclude by pointing
to aspects of the blues epistemology that can be explored or developed further, with the
goal of provoking more research into the blues epistemology.

² “The Black radical tradition is a rich and vibrant tapestry woven by the blood, sweat, and tears of
so many Black people. The term was first introduced to us by Cedric Robinson; archivists, historians, and
ordinary people have since sought to uncover who its protagonists actually were. Beyond highlighting the
stories of individual Black radicals – such as a non-gender conforming women from Angola standing up to
the Portuguese inquisition or a Black a communist woman playwright standing up to the FBI – this
intellectual tradition seeks not to atomize these individuals as lone heroes defending themselves from an
amorphous and transhistorical force, such as anti-Blackness or racism. It seeks instead to situate these
individuals within a tradition which first determined them as being “Black,” a word that ultimately was a
pejorative, but which became a clarion call for liberation” (Elnaiem 2021).

³ “Throughout history, social-spatial enclosures have been used by dominant social movements to
establish stable control over specific territories and their populations. This process typically involves the
reorganization of property relations through the destruction of collectively held property, the commons.
Enclosures are maintained by a system of militarized regulation, physical boundaries, and social, political,
and economic traps, referred to here as trap economics. These boundaries are also defended by a
representational system that provides intellectual justification for, and naturalizes, this form of social
conflict. Capitalist societies in particular have developed though the establishment of multiple forms of
social-spatial enclosures: colonization, slavery, reservations, ghettos, company towns, redlining, benign
neglect, suburbs, gated communities, and prison complexes. Each capitalist society has its own regionally
specific version of trap economic and representational grids. Wealth is extracted from these enclosures
through multiple mechanisms. One of the most widely used practices is asset stripping.” (Woods 2009c,
774-775)
2. Vernacular Epistemologies & Organic Intellectualism

The blues epistemology is Woods’s most well-known and frequently cited contribution. He explores how black people “have constructed a system of explanation that informs their daily life, organizational activity, culture, religion, and social movements” (1998b, 16). The blues are a well-known form and genre of African American music – one that drew upon previous forms of African and African American music and united them as a foundation upon which all subsequent forms have built upon (Tolson 2021). To Woods (1998b, 17), the blues operate “to instill pride, channel folk wisdom, and critique of individuals and institutions with humor and resolution rather than world-weariness or resignation.” He uses ‘the blues’ as a signifier for the social, political, intellectual, and geographic experience of all forms of African American music and, extending his analysis, uses ‘the blues’ as a signifier for all forms of African American cultural production. Doing so allows him to make several theoretical arguments.

Woods (2007a with McKittrick) gives united voice to diasporic populations across the globe. He positions himself to study the societal contexts in which cultural texts are produced and consumed without being artificially limited by genre, form, location, nationality, or ethnicity. And he (1998b) guides us through a textual analysis that examines the dominant culture vs. counterculture dialectic of contestation at play in the cultural forms of marginalized groups and how those cultural forms are informed by a unique epistemological sensibility in the production stage and then cultivate that sensibility for future generations in the consumption stage. They’re a “central institution” of blackness which have been employed by “multiple generations” to organize

---

4 I make this argument, based in Woods’s work, in Section IV.3.a of this dissertation.
5 I make this argument, based in Woods’s work, in Section IV.3 of this dissertation.
“communities of consciousness” (2007b with McKittrick, 54). He (2005, 1008) concludes that the blues began as a unique intellectual movement that emerged among desperate African American communities in the midst of the ashes of the Civil War, Emancipation, and the overthrow of Reconstruction. It was used to confront the daily efforts of plantation powers to erase African American leadership and the memory of social progress. It produced a new type of African American intellectual through a system of teachers, professors, apprentices, and schools. The blues and its extensions are actively engaged in providing intellectually brutal confrontations with the ‘truths’ of working-class African American life. It draws on African American musical practices, folklore, and spirituality to reorganize and give a new voice to working-class communities facing severe fragmentation. This tradition has been engaged in the production and teaching of African American history from its inception.

Blues epistemologies are an alternative form of seeing, understanding, and shaping the world that can be read in the music, dance, painting, and so forth of marginalized groups.

Most of the publications that leveraged Woods’s scholarship attempt to apply the blues epistemology and/or organic intellectualism in their analysis (see table 1 in summary). This recurring thread is often combined with other elements of analytical package but sometimes stands on its own. Shapiro (2002) leverages the blues epistemology as a toolkit for exploring novels about the immigrant experience, especially in territories of political borderlands. The blues epistemology, with its emphasis on liminality, diasporic groundedness and the embodied experience of politico-cultural marginalization is a better lens to view ‘the migrant's unease’ than are the more typical lens of state (de)formation, partition, borders. These are the dominant systems of explanation of political intellectuals – and all of Woods's work is an attempt to denaturalize such systems of explanation with those of organic intellectuals.

Several scholars have sought to enrich the blues epistemology through further perspectives. Robinson (2014), for example, puts forward a blues women’s epistemology
– a “distinct worldview of black women at the margins, to contextualize the work of…black women intellectuals who challenge the intersections of race, class, gender, and sexuality oppression.” She notes that this alternative epistemology is ‘for itself’: it may provide context for the preferences and actions of black women but does not exist to make them legible to hegemonic epistemological perspectives. Richardson (2013) offers queer blues epistemologies, positioning them directly as an extension of Woods’s vernacular epistemologies (his framing, and one borrowed for my section title). Remarking on Woods’s “theorization of the epistemological potential of the blues to comment on and resist racial violence, [Richardson goes] further to recognize how the vernacular also enables queer gender identities and sexual orientations (2013, 171). By doing so, he hopes to make visible the invisible, grappling with how to ensure representation of all black bodies in our collective memory of the past – not simply heteronormative black bodies. In a project that relies upon McKittrick, Woods, and a blues epistemology as part of a more general project of more accurately understanding the South, Eaves (2017) specifically explores its potential for examining queer Black Southern life. And Byrd (2011, 122) brings together the blues epistemology with the worldviews of her southeastern Native American ancestors, for what they “might teach us in order to transform the participatory democracy that Woods evokes into a radical reimagining of how peoples exist relationally within the place-worlds located in the stories we tell and the songs we sing” (cited in Heynen and Ybarra 2020, 22). Brickler (2018) positions a Transpacific blues epistemology that may serve as grounds for cross-cultural study that pushes past the typical aesthetic exchanges of Afro-Asian studies (blues and jazz in one direction, kung-fu and manga in the other, for example) through to
connections more abstract and meaningful. Elements of both Japanese and African expressions of folk mysticism like devils, demons, and trickster gods point to similar approaches to ontological and epistemological worldviews.

The idea of ‘alternative epistemologies’ is not novel. In an early survey of the literature on the subject(s), Mills (1998) pointed a large body of contemporarily extent literature on feminine and feminist ways of knowing, which in turn served as a foundation for scholarship on black ways of knowing and a reexamination of Marxist worldview as championing a proletarian way of knowing. But Woods advocated for examining these ways of knowing in the art of marginalized peoples and to position artists as organic intellectuals: if the blues epistemology is folk philosophy, then blues singers, musicians, poets, and painters are the philosophers, and their lack of residence in the ivory tower only makes these radical philosophers more relevant (and vital) to on-the-ground protest and praxis. And, while his first works (1998, 2002) focus on black ways of knowing, in later writing (2005, 2007, 2009b, 2010, 2012, 2017) he examines how the epistemological perspectives embedded in cultural forms often draw from and inform other alternative forms of knowledge in a collective effort. Woods’s unique contribution has been to champion cultural production as the single best site in which to study the collective organic impact of alternative epistemologies on intellectualism and activism. And while Woods’s oeuvre explores cultural production across a widely diverse variety of forms, his consistent and primary focus on art is the second theme I will examine.

3. Cultural Studies & Activist Art/istry

Most explicitly, the blues epistemology is a consideration of the blues itself. Woods uses the blues as an umbrella signifier for forms of African American music
traditions. Jigs, reels, hollers, chanties, spirituals, and ragtime preceded what we most
often think of as the blues, and jazz, R&B, rock & roll, soul, gospel, disco, ska, reggae,
funk, and hip hop all grew out of the blues (Tolson 2021). Across his professional oeuvre,
Woods uses the blues epistemology to analyze each of those genres (1998a; 1998b; 2005;
2007; 2009b; 2010; 2012; 2017) as well as brass bands, bounce, calinda, and reggae
(1998b; 2009b; 2017). They are, Woods’s argues, the most representative form of black
music. And following the fundamental impulse of the cultural studies field to look at the
means and media of communicating cultural production as well as its message – from the
Frankfurt School to the Birmingham Centre and into contemporary studies in the field –
Woods examines the blues in their many forms as communicated through mass media
from instruments, turntables, radio, CDs, cassettes, boomboxes, and mixtapes (2007, 55).

Having made the argument that the blues are the most representative form of
black music, he further posits that black music is the most significant form of black art,
and that black art is the best loved form of black cultural production in general. And
Woods consistently champions cultural artifacts as texts in which to study these epistemic
understandings of political economic contexts. Throughout his work, Woods calls for an
examination of black art to understand the “philosophical complexity of various ethnic
ontologies” and “the traditions of geographical thought implicit within them” which
continue “to transform the definition of scholarship and the academy” using “among
other approaches, a thorough examination of literature, music, the visual arts” (2002, 63-
66). In this section, I explore the theme of cultural studies by focusing on the many forms
of black art that have been taken up routinely by those who write with a blues
epistemology.
Neal (2012), for example, works with the bounce aesthetic style of several forms of African American music to focus on how Mahalia Jackson’s singing serves as a blues epistemic that serves as a throughline from jazz to hip hop, from New Orleans to Chicago, from tragedy to celebration, and from respectability politics to radical rejections. Robinson’s (2014) exploration of a blues women’s epistemology is founded upon a through thematic analysis of the music and lyrics of Erykah Badu, and Siener (2022) uses the lyrics of rappers active in New York City – as well as their oral histories – to show how activist artists are grappling with shelters, the unhoused, housing, and housing policy as a way of contesting spatialized oppression in the neoliberal city. Brahinsky (2017, 374) examines a made-for-TV documentary created by James Baldwin in 1963 as a sociopolitical text containing lessons about “racial capitalism’s urban consequences years” after its filming. Beckford (2022, 1) uses the blues epistemology to examine “white hegemonic masculinity and its effect on tyrannized black male figures in Toni Morrison’s Beloved.” And Foster (2020) takes up the call in an ethnographic work that examines the current story of the blues in one of its most historically important cities through three registers: development based upon blues industry and blues tourism, blues culture and the way it produces and is produced by broader black culture, and a blues social epistemology based upon Woods’s research.

Barlow (2016) contends that there exists a rhetorical and pedagogical element to blues story-telling that exists not exclusively in the types of stories told but in the form in which they are told. Additionally, he argues that examining discourse, rather than story, allows us to see the blues more clearly, pushing researchers to look at the music of the blues from a cultural studies perspective without sacrificing its potential for sociopolitical
change to pure aesthetics in the application of literary criticism. Richardson’s (2013) exploration of queer blues epistemologies leverages an analysis of black lesbian fiction. Brickler (2018) argues that manga is a medium well positioned to explore and represent the “fantastic and bizarre” worlds of folk culture, but that narratively centering a black American protagonist is rare (10). Examining a Japanese manga comic that fictionalizes the life of famous Delta blues musician, Brickler suggests that it can serve as a point of entry to a more philosophically inclined conversations between the two cultures.

Simon’s (2022) article on “Performance Practice, Politics, and History” re-casts Woods’s blues epistemology as a blues aesthetic in attempt to re-center cultural texts themselves in research that privileges musicality of non-musical performance, and Quiray Tagle (2017), examines the way Al Robles, a Filipino American poet and ‘organic intellectual,’ used his poetry to protest urban dispossession & displacement (demolition of a single-occupancy residential hotel in San Francisco). But Robles’s poetry, Quiray Tagle argues, is a glimpse of blues epistemology in motion that offers a poetic politics of space that both rearranged the world and rearranged lives. Heatherton (2020) works with Woods’s methodology in creating poetry that examines the ordinary, everyday suffering of marginalized persons living in cities. Woods has previously supported Heatherton – in an edited volume of essays on carceral structures in Los Angeles and a second on the racialization of housing in Los Angeles. In a short article for City, she asks us “how can we understand the ineffable condition of cities now? How do we teach and learn under such brutal conditions? How might we find a way out together? How will we make our home in this ongoing maelstrom?” and writes three short poems that attempt to cope with these questions (ibid., 141). Heatherton does not write blues music or even music, per se,
but she uses art as a way of seeing and knowing the struggle against racial capitalism and its many effects. Finally, Krieg (2020) uses life writings and memoirs of three famous blues musicians to explore the way environmental catastrophe has been imagined in the black psyche and spatial sensibility and how it has been represented to critique the intersection of racial injustice and environmental injustice without merely relaying oppression. While Heatherton explores the way racial capitalism effects black and brown bodies through environment and climate, this theme looms much larger in Krieg’s work: marginalized peoples are the most vulnerable to the effects of environmental degradation and the least resilient to sudden shocks to the environment. Indeed, analyzing the relationship between marginalized groups and their environment is a vital method of researching blues epistemologies.

4. Environmental Catastrophe & Ecological Crisis

Accordingly, analysis of intersectionality and environmental injustice is a consistent theme in Woods’s research. In a section of Development Arrested entitled “High Water Everywhere,” Woods (Woods 1998b, 117-120) details the deadly consequences of the Mississippi River Flood of 1927 for lives, livelihoods, and racial relations of the Delta. In that same monograph, he illustrates the deadly relevancy of boll weevil infestations, sustainability, environmental policies (ibid., 117). “Miss New Orleans” (2005) makes a case for seeing the fatally underwhelming relief response to Hurricane Katrina as a moment in which the veil of post-racial politics was blown back and the garb of ‘American Humanism’ stripped away and following this work Woods (2009a) edited a special issue that same topic entitled In the Wake. If “Miss New Orleans” asked us to understand what was lost in the wake of Katrina while exploring the
hegemonic impact of racial capitalism upon the region years prior to the tragedy, then “Katrina World” introduction illustrates how racial capitalism had shaped the region centuries prior to it. Woods’s own entry in that special edition, “Les Misérables,” (2009c) discusses asset stripping as a throughline of wealth hoarding across all forms of racial capitalism and neoliberalism and he analyzes asset stripping in New Orleans in terms of destruction of public commons, degradation of social welfare, elimination of work, food insecurity, demolition of affordable housing, loss of health care, the theft of civil rights, and mass imprisonment before noting that he could also have examined “education, gender, tourism, finance, infrastructure, political redistricting, the nonprofit industrial complex, the elderly cultural appropriation, and so on” as part of a “fuller portrait” of asset stripping (ibid., 772). As these communal assets are stripped away systematically by the forces of racial capitalism, the communities living in New Orleans become increasingly vulnerable to any environmental disaster. The hurricane may be ‘natural,’ but environmental injustice is artificial.

This is a consistent theme is that these crises are never sudden, unpredictable, or natural. They are the result of artificial, long-term capitalist projects of community degradation and marginalization. What we perceive as sudden disasters are merely ‘blues moments’ – moments in which the façade falls away and the inner-workings of the artifice are briefly visible. Shocks to environmental systems are felt most keenly and disproportionately by the most vulnerable inhabitants of cities and regions and the impact of environmental disasters have had ongoing impact on how the past has been imagined through blues music. Thus, Woods’s work has been leveraged by scholars wrestling with
the socio-cultural causes (racial capitalism) and inequitable effects (environmental injustice) of ecological degradation.

Davis et al (2019) offers both an extension and critique of the ‘plantationocene.’ plantationocene is a term with currency in environment studies to highlight how humanity has re-shaped our planet (the anthropocene) without placing blame for planetary crisis on all of humanity. They focus instead on the relationship between neo-plantation capitalism and environmental crises. Woods (1993) dissertated on the temporally and spatially specific incarnation of capitalism led by the interplay of regional blocs, regional governmental commissions, NGOs operating in the Mississippi Delta between the Great Depression and the Clinton era, and always imbued with the contextually specific forms of racism entrenched in that region as residue of reconstruction era politics. Davis et al present it as the model par excellence of the forms of capitalism that most specifically inflict environmental degradation. They argue that black geographies (generally) and blues epistemologies (particularly) may offer a remedy to problems they see with the way a critique they appreciate had been operationalized thus far. Krieg (2020) cites relational examination of environment, economy, and culture in Arrested Development as one of several pillars under a bridge he builds of the blues with which to connect plantationocene criticism with the life writings of the dual victims of racial injustice and environmental injustice. Specifically, Krieg examines the memoirs of three famous blues musicians – examining the role of place, space, the environment, and environmental crisis therein – to ground the quasi-sci-fi nature of anthropocene in the folk blues of marginalized peoples: to humanize life in the anthropocene. He harnesses
blues epistemology towards an intentional conflation of genre, spatiality, temporality, and identity (ibid., 137).

Two of Davis’s (2019) co-authors, Williams (2017) uses demographic data to show how racism was intentionally built into the system of agricultural industry from the beginning, and Moulton (here with Salo, 2022) further leverages both Woods’s solo work as well as his work with McKittrick as critical agents of the Black Radical Tradition that he uses to bring black geographies into conversation with black ecologies in an ecocriticism project of understanding black movements and black lives. Ruffin (2010, 137) outlines blues epistemology’s “understanding of places where the blues joined people with their environment,” relying upon the blues epistemology to read the poetry of Jayne Cortez for themes of eco-crisis, arguing both that eco-crisis makes the blues continue to be relevant in a landscape of newer forms of black music and that the blues epistemology can make eco-protest legible (ibid.). Ludwig (2021, 231) uses Woods to explore questions about environmental justice by putting forward blues epistemology “as a means of establishing the critical historical consciousness crucial for determining more just futures” centered in the historic blues town of Natchez, Mississippi. Mizelle (2014) uses a blues epistemology to examine the significance of the 1927 Mississippi Delta flood within African American memory culture and historical imagination. And Roane (2020) uses blues music to explore the “phenomenological perspectives of working-class Black witnesses and victims of the” St. Louis cyclone in the same year.

Environmental crises are not all climate related – and as Woods points out, none of them are entirely natural. Recalling Woods’s argument that dominant incarnations of capitalism attempt un成功fully to squash countercultural resistance through the
cooptation of cultural forms, the Delta (as geographic region) looms in the popular imagination of rural blues music and therefore is also a privileged site of the cultural tourism industrial complex. Truman (2021) argues that this tourism industry, exploiting the region’s historical blues aesthetic, in turn both supports contemporary local blues music and feeds on it. “The blues-based cultural economy of the Delta figures into the livelihoods of local musicians, restaurants, hotels, gift shops, record stores, museums, and many more businesses in this region” (ibid., 4-5). The systemic inequalities perpetuated under this system make the region particularly vulnerable to environmental and health crises – including Covid-19. And when disaster strikes – particularly global pandemic – tourism shuts down. At the same time, the music is a thread of local community awareness and resilience that fosters collective agency, mobilizing against such artificial crises. The blues epistemology, then, is “simultaneously a mediator of anti-racist struggles and a ground of these struggles” (ibid., 7). The specific groundedness of these struggles – the grounds it makes, takes, and battles against the loss of – is a constant theme of Truman’s work. Moreover, it is a recurring analytical emphasis in Woods’s work that one must contend with to perform blues epistemological research.

5. Uneven Development & Spatial Imaginaries

An urban planner with a deep interest in the relationship between falsely dichotomized dualities like urban & rural, city & region, peonage farmer and slum dweller, southern and national, Woods emphasizes the connections between how capitalism participates in the creation of space – and how a blues epistemology can help recreate it. One of the many ways he (re)positions the blues epistemology is as a ‘blues development agenda’ (1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2017). “Regional Blocs”
(1998a), for example, relays the role of the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission in the production of space on a local and regional scale. The LMDDC was also a primary focus of his dissertation (1993) and first monograph (1998b) as well, but this article-length rearticulation distills his empirical evidence and his theoretical contributions for a more professional, rather than academic, audience, offering his blues epistemology for urban planners wrestling with (in)equitable development. Much of Woods’s article on “Life After Death” (2002) highlights uneven development, urban renewal & revitalization, and the destruction of black neighborhoods and communities.

If these two articles address the problem of uneven development from a more professional, practice-oriented perspective, “Sittin’ on Top of the World” (2007) does so from a more theoretical perspective by using Harvey’s understanding of critical geography’s toolkit to cast ‘blues geography’ as blues epistemology’s antidote to neoliberal spatial fix. “Blues geography places regional schools of working-class organic intellectuals at the centre of the production of geographical knowledge. Therefore, families, events, work sites, travel, neighborhoods, households, and prisons become critical sites in the construction and revision of theory, method, and praxis” (ibid., 60). Working with Harvey’s four pillars of geographic thought, Woods makes a thorough and persuasive case for blues culture as a systematic body of knowledge encapsulating cartography, space & time, place & region, and personal relationships to space and place.

More empirically, his posthumous conclusion to the Black California Dreamin’ anthology (2012), investigates how corporations and government agencies have worked in tandem to trap black bodies in place in the central city, have hollowed the welfare state that slightly supported them, have gentrified their neighborhoods, and have hyper-policing
them once they’re unhoused. His methodological approach here is to show with the way uneven urban development leaves black communities vulnerable to incarceration and homelessness in the same fashion he had previously (2009c) worked with the way environmental injustice leaves black communities vulnerable to hurricane and housing destruction — via an analysis of systematic community asset stripping. In both cases, he notes that asset stripping is the method of employing a particular (and particularly racial) form of spatial fix he refers to — with his usual double entendre of music & social critique — as ‘trap economics’: holding black bodies in place through the systematic destruction of a community’s social, political, and cultural assets. At the same time, it’s important to note that he also shows how asset stripping has been met by those who fight this uneven development. “Not all assets are visible and not all assets can be stripped. New Orleans is the birthplace of many tragedies. It is also home to many miracles. Despite the worst of intentions, asset stripping policies of the past have often brought forth miraculous transformations.” (ibid., 792). And in California, the black communities of L.A. are not only the most marginalized but also, consistently, the most active in contesting this spatial marginalization (2012, 196).

Wood’s emphasis on uneven development and production of space has been taken up less explicitly in the secondary literature on blues epistemology. But Camp (2012, 654) uses Woods’s concepts of blues geographies and trap economics to examine the way space is produced, reproduced, and contested in L.A.’s Skid Row under neoliberal revanchist urbanism through a nexus of “poverty, policing, and policies designed to punish the poor” (654) as well as to look for “prospects for alternative futures” in the cultural production of local grassroots artists and activists (657). Also examining Skid
Row, Dozier (2019) leverages Woods’s concept of blues development – itself in opposition to plantation development (both rural and urban) as she conducts a case study of protest-led homeless policy and policy reform. “Woods shows how, over centuries, Black working-class people have challenged spatial difference [providing] planning, producing visions of and reshaping geographies at a variety of scales,” she explains (ibid., 183). In her formulation of the argument, “contested development shows how elite and grassroots planning provokes the push-and-pull contradictions present in the development of space. In so doing, the tenuous politics of development can challenge or reproduce difference” (ibid.). She relies most pointedly on Woods’s posthumously published article on Skid Row development as she analyzes the reproduction of spatial difference as the production of urban space.

Also relevant, here, is Moulton and Salo’s (2022 157) aforementioned work on uniting black geographies & ecologies towards a form of locally grounded eco-criticism that attends to “black spaces, spatial knowledges, and instantiations of Black agency” in a way that “provides a way to understand the historical and contemporary imperatives of Black social, environmental, and racial justice movements, as well as Black geographical movements and mobilities” towards a better and more just production of space. And, examining how the construction of blue infrastructures like urban “water retention ponds, bioswales, and canals” are often planned for historically black neighborhoods, Gaber (2012) offers the concept of ‘bluelining’ to the way watershed planning – like redlining – is imbricated in the production of racialized space. In an ethnographic study of how community activists unite to contest this inequitable production of space, she uses ‘blues infrastructures’ to point to “alternative, often underground, assemblages within the Black
community...in order to situate them within the blues tradition – not only a genre of music, but as Woods suggests, a cultural genre of critique, resistance, and care” (2021, 1077).

I am not arguing that questions of space and spatiality do not help determine the questions the scholars discussed in this paper ask and the course of the research they perform. All their work is enriched by questions of place and space, and many of them are geographers by profession. Rather, the production of space and uneven development is less often explicit in their work – and neglecting to attend to the relationship between the social and the spatial represents a fundamental failure to appreciate Woods’s blues epistemologies. There are two notable exceptions to this discrepancy between Woods’s work and those who rely upon it. First, space and spatiality are often a primary emphasis of scholars who reference Clyde Woods in his work with McKittrick in black geographies. Edited by Woods and McKittrick, Black Geographies and the Politics of Place (2007a) is routinely cited as launching the subdiscipline field of black geographies in a formal fashion, both spatializing the Black Radical Tradition and extending radical critique to geographers and to the discipline of geography. The authors call for attending to a specific – and specifically black – sense of space and spatiality that had been casually ignored or intentionally excluded by the white discipline. In an introduction to a special issue of Antipode honoring Woods after his death, McKittrick (2012, 1) recalled the drafting of the introductory chapter:

my portion of the introductory remarks were bleakly drafted and Clyde – while not disagreeable to my thinking – interwove a series of statements throughout that reoriented our discussion. While eyeing and drawing attention to the underside, Clyde also brought into focus geographic acts that preserve sacred spaces, reimagine the stakes of emancipation, and rewrite narratives of social justice. Keenly aware of my preoccupation with the history of racial violence and
alternative black ontologies, Clyde gave me a different future – one that does not abandon my preoccupations but rather situates and interweaves this research alongside a blues epistemology and blues life.

While a uniquely and specifically black spatial sensibility would remain a theme throughout all his writing, so too does a commitment to contextualizing the embodied experience of racialization by connecting it to both the temporally and spatially located characteristics of racial capitalism and the empirical narrative of contesting racism in place. For writers who cite Woods in the context of black spatial sensibilities, emphasis on the uneven production of space is typically explicit. For those who cite him in the context of blues epistemologies, this is less often so. A second and crucial exception is the work of those who champion the blues epistemology as black critical praxis.

6. Political Praxis & Better Futures

Woods consistently pushes us to consider not only how the cultural production of marginalized groups reflects but also protests inequity and provides a toolkit for dismantling it. If his first writings (1993; 1998a; 1998b), produced from his dissertation, was a more Hegelian project of historicizing the blues epistemology, his first publication after that project was a more reflexive critique of academia for its repeated failure to covert critical research into actual, emancipatory change. He indicts academics for their morbid fascination with examining the corpses of marginalized populations while turning a deaf ear to the cries of the dying, offering a ‘travelogue’ of racialized marginalization and devastation in regions all over the globe, encompassing spaces both urban and rural, leaving behind countless victims of the “whipsaw of social, cultural, and physical destruction seems invisible to all but the amputees” (2002, 62). Extending the metaphor, he notes (ibid.) that
the same tools that symbolize hope in the hands of the surgeon symbolize necrophilia in the hands of the coroner. Have we become academic coroners? Have the tools of theory, method, instruction, and social responsibility become so rusted that they can only be used for autopsies? Does our research in any way reflect the experience, viewpoints, and needs of the residents of these communities? On the other hand, is the patient really dead? What role are scholars playing in this social triage?

While such portrayals of racism and its effects as a life-or-death struggle may be an excellent method for communicating significance, Woods notes that it is a manifestly poor method for highlighting how marginalized communities strive to survive. Another approach is necessary.

In “Do you Know What it Means” (2005), he explains that alongside mere critique “it is necessary to choose an ontological and epistemological approach […] that does not further marginalize working-class African American vices or blind their boundless social vision” (1008) and “the endless definitions of freedom” provided by the blues tradition” (1016). And “the New Orleans region became a national and international center for social schism and social vision” not due to the pain inflicted on its citizens but “due to the historic movements launched by its people” (2017, 1). The blues epistemology provides as a toolkit not only the blues tradition of social investigation, interpretation, & explanation (1998a; 1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2010) but also and perhaps more crucially, a blues agenda (1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2017) and a blues ethic/ethos of social justice (2005; 2007; 2010; 2017). Those tools have been leveraged by activist-scholars interested in leveraging either counter-cultural production or alternative geographic sensibilities towards creating real, material change in the world and striving for better futures – from using a blues epistemology to examine successful
historical protests, to leveraging it towards future decolonial projects, and to illustrating how it may be used to create intersectional solidarities of revolution.

Using a successful protest, strike, unionization, and litigious effort led by Filipino American and black workers against discrimination as a case study, Schulze-Oechtering (2016) argues that these two groups of marginalized workers were able to unite with each other not only because of their currently shared economic status or their shared histories of differentiated racialization and political protest of racialized inequity. More importantly, the two groups were able to unite over similar epistemic structures. Blues epistemology and Manong knowledge (the author’s conceptual term), both providing theoretical tools to investigate hegemonic structures, are analogous in ways that allow different marginalized groups to become legible to each other enabling conversations that imagine and enact better futures. Quiray Tagle’s (2017) article on Filipino American community poetry and Davis’s (2019) article on plantationocene criticism similarly leverage Woods in an analysis of protest-in-motion – the former a descriptive look at another successful protest past and the latter a prescriptive framework for imagining better futures.

Siener (2022, 373) cites Woods in his conceptual move towards ‘blues geography’ – in conversation with Angela Woods – towards an examination of homeless shelters, homeless policy, infrastructural changes, and rap music in bankruptcy era New York City:

A blues conception of space is therefore the antithesis of shelter individualization because it socializes hardship and reckons with how partial, dialectical knowledge moves through and produces space. Its spatial ontology is historical and relational. As a result, the blues represent potential and are empowering: they circulate and collectivize already existing critiques of—and everyday resistances to—the material conditions experienced by the working class. The blues then can
uniquely offer insight into the political consciousness of those living in homeless shelters, how the spaces of shelter are produced, and how the blues itself has changed given novel historical and institutional circumstances.

His work considers economic class as much as (or at least as inseparable from) racial class as part of the blues epistemology. Similarly, Datcher (2019) uses the blues epistemology as a method of reading creative fiction that unites and animates both “Black and Brown” liberation projects, asking how cultural production can impact material conditions and mobilize collective action. Showing exactly how cultural production borne out of those multi-racial solidarities can issue calls for mobilization, Osuna (2019) uses the blues epistemology’s call for understanding music as social investigation and criticism, as he performs a content analysis of rap lyrics that positions Chicana hip-hop musicians as street reporters broadcasting a radical critique of the way the institution of policing was intimately imbricated in the process of the “ongoing neoliberal restructuring” of 1990s Los Angeles. Their critique “not only attempts to explain the problems of the grieved communities – it offers a solution to their problems” (ibid., 78).

In the field of educational policy, Vaughn (2016, abstract) combines Woods’s blues epistemology with Sylvia Wynter’s concept of alterity to create a working methodology that “investigates how a historically marginalized Black community conceives, practices and theorizes about citizenship in community-based pedagogical spaces.” An active community organizer and an advocate for liberation pedagogies, Vaughn hopes to harness black knowledge and ways of knowing educational systems that truly enable black lives. King (2008) harnesses the blues epistemology towards evaluating teacher education programs toward liberatory and racial-social justice practice. Also exploring the pedagogical potential of Woods’s work, Lewis (2002) looks at the
contemporary project of decolonizing education, curricula, and the academy and offers diaspora epistemologies and blues epistemologies – and the collected work of the Black Radical Tradition – as a theoretical toolkit both for diagnosing the problems of current academic knowledge production and consumption and for offering an antidote to them. Among the many scholars surveyed, Lewis values Woods for the ability of his blues epistemology to decolonize knowledge production through, specifically, “recognizing intellectual forms that can be read across genres, and ultimately across disciplines, enabling a formula for gleaning insight that skips easily between epistemological frames” (ibid., 30).

Also relying upon the potential of a blues epistemology to decolonize knowledge, Burnett (2016, abstract) uses the blues epistemology to help him demonstrate “that the cultural phenomenon of the blues is an indigenous way of knowing that offsets the hidden logic of racialized dominance within modern Christian understandings of revelation.” Burnett argues that, while a religious lens tends to understand music through racialization, Woods can help us focus on the role of spaces of marginalization in producing the blues. “By attending to space,” he notes, we can show “how critical consideration of geography and region can reveal nuances that are often veiled behind racialized and theologized ways of understanding the people of the Delta Region” (ibid., iv). Serrano (2015) notes that the blues (musically and epistemically) are foundationally a move to take formal European thought (music scales and racial capitalism) and impose upon them informal African thought (blue notes and blues communalism). Therefore, he argues that the blues epistemology “may provide a way to reconceptualize Christianity in the service of developing post-colonial ministerial practices” that can leverage theology
towards praxis and societal good (ibid., 30). Moving away from theology but keeping with decolonization efforts, Robinson (2014) hopes to decolonize academia by making the work of black feminist intellectuals ‘on the margins’ (that is, from outside the academy) legible within the academy. Across this literature, the renovative power of the blues epistemology is as important as its explanatory potential.

7. Conclusion

While I have described much of the work that borrows from Woods, I have only reviewed one such publication from any individual author. Moreover, I have (mainly) looked at each piece with an eye towards the theme(s) it most heavily and explicitly leverages. However, the blues tradition does not examine crises without imagining better futures, it does not examine art without trying to understand the artist’s perspective, and it does not examine social or cultural dimensions as isolated from spatial dimensions. The work of Clyde Woods emphasizes a multi-faceted approach to social, cultural, and political research. Researching blues epistemologies without considering the multifaceted nature of the blues represents a failure to understand or apply Woods’s work.

Accordingly, most (all but one) of the publications reviewed worked with some combination of these five themes (See Table 1, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental Catastrophe &amp; Ecological Crisis</th>
<th>Uneven Development &amp; Spatial Imaginaries</th>
<th>Political Praxis &amp; Better Futures</th>
<th>Vernacular Epistemologies &amp; Organic Intellectualism</th>
<th>Cultural Studies &amp; Activist Art/istry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barlow</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahinsky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The blues epistemology is Woods’s most well-known contribution, it is leveraged in all his writings throughout his career, and often stands in as synecdoche for all his contributions. It comes as no surprise, then, that the blues epistemology – in its specific and original sense as a unique worldview and system of knowledge – is the theme referenced more than any others by these authors – and is referenced by all but one of
them. They use the lens of either vernacular epistemologies or organic intellectualism in their pursuit of exploring how a second or third theme of his work may help them better to explain or understand their research. Eight publications worked with four of these five themes: Davis (et al), Gaber, Heatherton, Ludwig, Moulton and Salo, Osuna, Quiray Tagle, and Truman. Moulton and Salo consider the revolutionary potential of blues epistemology, black ecologies, and a black sense of space as ecocriticism that does not explicitly look at art or cultural artifacts, and Davis and Gaber leverage the blues epistemology towards an examination of the effects uneven development on the environment in a change-oriented manifesto that also does not look at artistry. Ludwig and Truman are doing similar work to Davis and Gaber that does consider art while examining cultural production as texts in which to read environmental epistemic perspectives, but Ludwig does so without an explicit emphasis on space while Truman’s work is a critique of recent events but without explicit emphasis on future praxis. Finally, Quiray Tagle and Osuna each use the blues epistemology to analyze activist poetry that challenged uneven development without having an explicit emphasis on ecology or the environment – and Heatherton’s own poetry does similar work.

I have not seen any work citing Woods that has woven together all five of these themes. Only about a seventh of them wrestle with environmental injustice while also working with artistic production. Only an eighth work explicitly with artistic production as the wrestle with uneven development. About the same seek to combine environmental analysis with spatial & development analysis. Worse still, from a blues epistemological perspective, only about half of the authors who do explicitly examine artistic production do so with a critique that centers praxis, and only about half of those who center praxis
conduct explicitly cultural analysis. This is an absence that Woods refused to allow for. I am not suggesting that a publication should be evaluated by that standard, of course – Woods’s work is generative, not limiting, and every publication has its own purpose and ambitions. But taken as a body of literature, there are gaps in which aspects of his work they tend to interact with. To those ends, I will conclude by pointing to projects I am pursuing that examine aspects of the blues epistemology – or the way in which it has been considered thus far – that can be explored or developed further, with the goal of provoking more research into the blues epistemology that leverages all the tools Clyde Woods provides us. If much of the literature here has approached Woods’s multifaceted blues from a piecemeal fashion, especially egregious is the tendency to center either cultural studies or activism, but inconsistently both – an error that Woods consistently cautioned against. Woods did grapple with the best way to position the blues as both intuitively understandable for academics and politically leverageable for activists, tending to reframe his blues to fit various projects. I am interested in finding a way to reframe the blues in a fashion that centers cultural studies while still inspiring activist research. Woods’s elegant weaving of radiantly different strands of study is precisely what makes his own writing so valuable, and he sets a high bar for those who follow his lead. Still, “Clyde left us with much to think and ponder about as we work to enable learning, participation, and self-determination for those reading in ‘development-arrested’ places. He blazed a trail for us to follow. It is now up to us to follow this path; but we could never fill the footprints he left behind in the sands of time” (Wilson 2012, 5). It is truly rare to see research as thematically vibrant and multifaceted as his – and there are still elements of his work that are waiting to be explored.
SECTION IV. SECOND ARTICLE

What I Have on My Mind: A Transformative Reframing of the Blues Epistemology

Abstract: Clyde Woods’s work is positioned at the nexus of critical, urban, and cultural studies and his blues epistemology offers a guide to reading cultural production of marginalized groups as maps containing alternative visions of the past, present, and future. Woods has been recognized for his service to peers and students, his research, and his blues epistemologies. However, research that extends the blues epistemology has been limited, and tends to approach his multifaceted blues in a piecemeal fashion. While his writing consistently sought to unite cultural studies with activist praxis, he never settled on the best terminology with which to capture his multifaceted understanding of the blues as both a body of explanation and an engine of change. Rather, he tended to reframe his blues to fit given projects. Moreover, this lack of consistency is reflected in a secondary literature on the blues epistemology that tends to center either the former or the latter. I argue that Woods’s theoretical contributions are most accurately and productively understood as blues imaginaries. I do so by tracing connections between literature on imaginaries, cultural studies, black geographies, and blues epistemologies. I conclude that remapping urban imaginaries through the lens of blues epistemologies reshapes our understanding of urban imaginaries by highlighting the voices of the marginalized, focuses our understanding of the blues by recentering praxis, and creates spaces for diverse groups of people with radical epistemologies to reimagine radical futures.
What I Have on My Mind
A Transformative Reframing of the Blues Epistemology

1. Introduction

The life of cities and our affective experience of living in them is mediated and shaped by ordinary interactions with informal forms of cultural production. Culture – while notoriously difficult to define – can be taken as our entire way of being in the world, and cultural production refers to the continuously unfolding practices of everyday life from “relatively banal habits” to “self-consciously artistic work of professional artists” (Buchanan 2018, 312-313).¹ Our relationships with music, food, and shopping generate powerful images of the city and, in return, our images of ourselves as people who live in them. The types of cultural production we choose to interact with serve as essential elements in the construction of our identities, as a primary method for claiming a right to the city, and as vital representations of marginalized and oppressed groups and individuals continually contesting the denial of that right. Analyzing the way these processes take shape and make place in our cities is an inter-disciplinary project and draws upon diverse fields like urban studies, critical studies, cultural studies, and race & gender studies (Jayne and Ward 2017). Few scholars have succeeded in the project of weaving together these diverse strands as thoroughly yet elegantly as Clyde Woods with his research into the blues epistemology.

¹ This concept of culture draws upon Raymond Williams (1998 [1961], 48-56).
The theory of blues epistemology is Woods’s most well-known and cited contribution to academic thought. The blues epistemology explores how marginalized peoples “have constructed a system of explanation that informs their daily life, organizational activity, culture, religion, and social movements” (1998b, 16): it is both a way of thinking and a grammar with which to communicate it (2010, 35). Blues epistemology represents a way of life that draws on – both pulls from and inscribes upon – the dynamic nexus of diasporic groups of people that identify with each other, the places they inhabit, and the cultural forms that mediate these relationships. It helps us read the cultural production of marginalized populations as radical critical texts to better understand the political-economic contexts in which they are produced – uniting cultural studies and activist praxis (See Banet-Weiser 2011; Brahinsky 2012; Campbell 2012; Costa Vargas 2012; McKittrick 2012; Ruddick 2012; Soja 2012; Wilson 2012; Lipsitz 2014; Mahtani 2014; Hawthorne 2019; W.J. Wright 2019; Osuna 2021). However, Woods tended to reframe his blues to fit given projects, and never settled on the best terminology with which to capture his multifaceted understanding of the blues as both a body of explanation and an engine of change. Moreover, this lack of consistency is reflected in a bifurcated secondary literature on the blues epistemology that tends to center either the former or the latter. I argue for framing them as blues imaginaries. We can come to know cultural production as praxis by extending and revisiting Woods’s blues epistemology to encompass imaginaries, and remapping urban imaginaries through the lens of blues epistemologies reshapes our understanding of imaginaries by highlighting the voices of the marginalized and opening up spaces for diverse groups to reimagine radical futures.
Initially, Woods wrestled with framing the blues as an exploration of existential truth and our entire way of being. During the initial meeting to pitch his dissertation concept, Woods disagreed with his advisor on the question of whether to dissertate on a blues ontology or a blues epistemology – Woods had conceived it as the former, while his advisor convinced him to reposition it as the latter (Gilmore 2017). He would occasionally return to an ontological framing later in his career (Soja 2012, 3). The distinction between these categories influences how we employ them. Ontology is our understanding of the nature of our world: what the truth is, and whether any objective truth may exist in the first place. It is “the theory of the existence of things – at its most basic, or fundamental, it seeks to answer the question why there is something rather than nothing. It does not examine the existence of particular things; its focus is the more general level of the possibility and actuality of anything existing at all” (Buchanan 2018, 339). And epistemology is concerned with how we investigate the questions of ontology and the nature of any knowledge formed during the investigations. It is the “study or inquiry into the origin, possibility, and constitution of knowledge. Its central questions are: what does it mean to know something and by what means are we able to have knowledge?” (Buchanan 2018, 170). In framing the blues this narrowly, they are delimited to mere description – which is not how he employed them – he sought so much more from them. This gap was bridged by means of framing the blues in different ways to address different situations: if blues epistemology, ontology, worldview, and philosophy were employed to gesture towards the more theoretical aspects of projects,

---

2 Fittingly, this inflection of the blues as social theory also calls to mind Raymond Williams’s understanding of culture.
then blues agenda, development tradition, and social vision were employed to gesture
towards the praxis he found in the blues.

Besides ontology and epistemology, his most thoroughly explicated conceptual
re-framing was as blues geography (2007). Working with David Harvey’s four pillars of
geographic thought, Woods made a persuasive case for the blues as a systematic body of
knowledge encapsulating cartography, space & time, place & region, and personal
relationships to place (ibid.). “Blues geography places regional schools of working-class
organic intellectuals at the centre of the production of geographical knowledge.
Therefore, families, events, work sites, travel, neighborhoods, households, and prisons
become critical sites in the construction and revision of theory, method, and praxis”
(ibid., 60). In this light, the blues are a system for studying the way we relate to our
environment and to ourselves. Across his body of work, he harnessed his blues analytic
on a variety of vehicles towards a wide array of theoretical and empirical ends. He wrote
2007; 2009b; 2017), blues geographies (2007), and blues historiographies (2010), and he
explored the analytic potential of a blues tradition of social investigation, interpretation,
& explanation (1998a; 1998b; 2005; 2007; 2010; 2009b), a blues school & blues
pedagogy (2007; 2010), a blues philosophical system, blues social vision, & blues system
of organic scholarship (2017), a blues agenda/sustainable development
agenda/development tradition (1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2017), a blues
knowledge system (1998b; 2007; 2010; 2009b), a blues ethic/ethos of social justice
blues cultural movements (1998b; 2010; 2017), and blues grids of (re)articulated histories
Writers who have borrowed from his ideas have taken up a blues conversion, a blues narrative form, a blues aesthetic, a blues methodology, and blues infrastructures (Serrano 2015; Barlow 2016; Neal 2012; Vaughn 2016 and Mahtani 2014; Gaber 2021). Typically, they have done so not as a critique of the way Woods positioned the blues but as a strategic move to make the blues legible to their field of study. That seems also to have been Woods’s own motivation in discussing blues geographies (2007) and historiographies (2010).

Woods’s ever-shifting terminology does not indicate forgetfulness or confusion: he was strategic about how he presented his blues-based social theory & cultural analytic, employing specific signifiers to fit specific projects. But his use of either ontology or epistemology as a signifier is too limiting, and the huge variety of secondary and tertiary signifiers he employed to capture other aspects of his analytic waters down its meaning—the blues can be sapped of their analytic strength through semantic vacillation. He did grapple with the best way to position the blues as both intuitively understandable for academics and politically leverageable for activists. As Woods so bitingly argued, he had no interest in solely performing autopsies, and he would not be satisfied with addressing symptoms of social ills nor even ‘curing’ the disease in one place or time. The point, however, is (famously) to change it: to violently eradicate the conditions of the cancer that is racial capitalism from existence. I argue that Woods’s theoretical contributions are most accurately and productively understood as an exposition of imaginaries. Imaginaries—geographic, social, historical, political—have significant potential to unite critical explanation with critical activism in a manner that ontology and epistemology fail to do. Imaginaries concern “sensory and emotional experience and practices, on the print of
collective memory on imagining how the city could be, on the different, often conflicting, social constructions of the city’s future” (Bloomfield 2006, 46). If ontology concerns the nature of truth and epistemology concerns a method for forming, finding, and articulating truth, then imaginaries concern the collective (re)creation of truth. Blues imaginaries are an analytic lens that unites all the projects Woods tasked them with and one that is prescriptive as well as descriptive.

In this paper, I bring blues epistemology into conversation with urban imaginaries. I do so by drawing connections across several literatures. Anderson’s (1983) work on imagined nations is useful in its examination of the role of mass media/communications in the social construction of community formation. However, there is room for elaboration on the role played by cultural texts themselves, rather than merely their transmission, and his work is underdeveloped in its examination of geographically disparate communities. The field of cultural studies more explicitly connects societal contexts with artistic texts and their transmission but their analysis, too, tends to tie given genres of cultural production to specific times, places, and groups of people. The field of black geographies is not typically concerned with cultural studies specifically but explores the way marginalized peoples imagine society radically differently – and is attentive to how those imaginaries are deterritorialized through diasporic imagination. Thought together, these bodies of theory form a throughline between imaginaries and Woods’s blues – which weave together all these threads of social, cultural, & spatial investigation, yet are themselves limited by the how they have been framed. After considering each of these in turn, with an eye toward how they build upon each other, I briefly consider factors that limit the application of blues
epistemologies, I argue that their potential application is widespread with few borders, and I make a case for re-framing them as blues imaginaries. We can come to know cultural production as praxis by extending and revisiting Woods’s blues epistemology to encompass imaginaries. And remapping urban imaginaries through the lens of blues epistemologies reshapes our understanding of imaginaries by highlighting the voices of the marginalized and opening up spaces for diverse groups to reimagine radical futures.

2. Urban Imaginaries

There are no places without imaginaries. Imaginaries are the communal theater-in-the-round in which we come together to produce and to consume cultural forms and to harness them in the collective project of creating and contesting space and of transforming space into place. Academic scholarship on imaginaries has proceeded from several directions (See Castoriadis 1997 [1975]; Said 1994). The concept of imaginaries seeks to capture capacity to interpret textual images in the form of culture and expressing meaning with them. Imagination has historically been inflected with specific perspectives – whether ontological, epistemological, or disciplinary – e.g., a geographic imagination, a sociological imagination, or a historical imagination (Zusman 2013; Vandevoordt and Verschraegen 2018). A geographer might interpret images in terms of locations, territories, and regions. A sociologist might interpret images in terms of groups, communities, and societies. And a historian might interpret images in terms of eras, paradigms, and generations. The entities that we create with and through our imagination are imagined objects of some sort – imagined nations, imagined landscapes, imagined borders, and so on (Howie and Lewis 2014; Çinar and Bender 2007; Bottici 2019; Zusman 2013; Mason and Riding 2021).
When theorists engage in a conversation about how these imagined objects are inflected with expressions of value – how imagination is perpetually intertwined with culture in our conception, perception, and activity in our environment – this conversation concerns imaginaries. They concern “the symbolic sphere in which space and places are contested. They project unconscious social desires and construct imaginary social alternatives which form part of a long, utopian tradition” (Bloomfield 2006, 45).

Imaginaries are collective sets of imagination both as analytical frames and as social forces to be reckoned with. Imaginaries are both “structures and signs, minds and bodies, facts and subjectivities, actualities and virtualities, economies and ecologies or urban space” (Lindner and Meissner 2019, 6). Thought poured to concrete, and the immaterial made material, imaginaries are “symbolic, psychic indicators of unconscious desires and social constructions impacting on urban reality” (Bloomfield 2006, 45). There are no cities without imaginaries. The city is constituted by the interplay between its spaces and its imaginations. The brick and mortar do not exist apart from representation, nor are our ideas without material consequences or take shape outside the hard city of maps, statistics, and architecture. The city is both the actual physical environment and the space we experience in novels, films, poetry, music, architectural design, political government, and ideology. (Prakash 2008, 7)

While neither imagination nor imagined entities are ever static (spatially, socially, temporally), academics often speak of imaginaries in terms that leave even more room for dynamic, contested nature – perhaps due to our intuitive understanding of imaginaries as being a collective project rather than an individual capacity (Bloomfield 2006, 49; Appadurai 1996, 5; Huyssen 2008, 3; Çinar and Bender 2007). These projects are never-ending – imaginaries are always in the process of becoming realized; the imagination is never a closed system in which all interrelations are established or settled (Massey 1999).
We must always see “the city as a field of experience as well as the way social and physical space is imagined and thus made into urban culture” (Çinar and Bender 2007, xi).

Imaginaries have been taken up by scholars of widely different perspectives. With reference to the various linguistic inflections of these studies (image, imagined, imagination, imaginative, imaginary, imaginaries), I have sorted through some distinctions in the preceding paragraphs because the way the general concept has been harnessed points to completely different perspectives and intentions in using them. These inflections imply normative prescriptions and have a critical impact on social practice (Appadurai 1996, 31). They also have epistemological implications that should not be ignored if they are to be effectively leveraged as theoretical heuristics. Social constructionism is fundamental to the study of urban imaginaries. This may or may not contrast with studies of imagined objects, for instance – most famously studied by Benedict Anderson. While Anderson does not work specifically with urban imaginaries, his theory is relevant to bringing urban imaginaries into conversation with cultural studies – and thus with blues epistemologies.

*Imagined Nations*

Anderson is frequently cited in literature on imaginaries and is concerned with imagined nations, communities, and publics. I find his conception of the imagination to be a fruitful starting point for exploring how we imagine communities and how cultural production may be imbricated in the process. Anderson (1983, 5-6) defines a nation as an imagined political community and explains that “it is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or
even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” While much of the scholarship that references Anderson considers him to be more focused on material reality than on the abstract, his insights are not anathema to a conception of place as being socially constructed through urban imaginaries. Attempting to make a “distinction between a realm of consciousness or culture and some purely material or physical realm is a socially and historically developed dualism that furthers the effectiveness of modern forms of domination” implicated in these hegemonic projects (Mitchell 1995, 104). And by defining imagined nations in the above manner, he sheds light on these processes.

First, if we form communities by imagining them without ever knowing, meeting, or seeing most of our fellow community members, then the connection between objective, empirical evidence and the object of our imagination is not absolute. The objects of our imagination are socially constructed and reconstructed. Second, if we assume that he views nations, nationality, and nationalism as real, we must come away from his work understanding that the objects of our imaginations are real, even if they are produced entirely in our heads.³ Reality is both socially constructed in its creation and real in its effects. Third, this reality is individually conceived yet collectively enacted, which privileges the medium (the media) of communication: cultural production is the method of making social construction into reality. And fourth, if reality is maintained collectively, then it can be altered or even destroyed collectively. The world is only what we imagine it to be, and while those images have material effects, we can always imagine

---
³ And such an assumption seems fair since he spends the rest of the monograph engaging with empirical evidence that is legitimately impressive in its geographic breadth and temporal depth. From my reading, Anderson is primarily focused on materialities and “real effects.”
better places. I’m not suggesting that Anderson is this optimistic, but the conclusion follows – imaginaries can be active rather than passive, and thus may have normative purchase.

Anderson’s thesis, though, is that the advent (or at least the ascendancy) of nations and consequently nationalism was both enabled and necessitated by print capitalism and mass media. Cultural texts – in the form of books, almanacs, and newspapers – were pushed by producers rather than pulled by consumers, and our broadening and deepening relationship with cultural production began to create public communities. The process of modernized mass communication only expanded and quickened with radio, television, and the internet. His analysis of mass media and its effects – of how changes in the manner culture both is produced and consumed can be read in social and political imaginaries – is a bridge between imaginaries and the field of cultural studies. While perspectives, theories, and methods have changed quite a bit between the Frankfurt School’s pioneering cultural studies to the Birmingham Centre’s critical updates to the field and through to today, emphasis on the role of mass media/communication in modern cultural production remains crucial (Kellner 1997; Kellner 2007; Storey 2009). Mass media is the means by which images of cultural values are transmitted. If Anderson argued that imagined communities are effectively created by the production and consumption of cultural texts, then our ability to choose and create the cultural forms we interact with becomes our primary method of enacting a resistant and subversive process of imagining better futures. Cultural production – through music, through literature, through film – can be intentionally wielded as resistance and can be read for insight into how resistance and subversion take shape in marginalized
communities (Kellner 1997; Turner 2002; Edgar and Sedgwick 2008; Storey 2009; Shobe and Banis 2010; Hsu 2017; Rowe 2017; Ibe 2019).

Cultural Imagination

Anderson is not concerned primarily with urban studies, nor especially in cultural studies: he uses some lyrics and poetry to discuss how people sing about nationalism – and he describes the emotional and political power of singing together as a group – but the focus of the former is on nationalistic discourse and the latter on the community forming power of language as it is read, spoken, or sung together (1983, 141-145).

Across the literature, though, putting imaginaries into conversation with cultural production or analyzing how either process takes space and makes place is not a novel approach (Lindner and Meissner 2019; Courage et al 2021; Oakley and O’Connor, 2015). And culture has always been a means for us to connect with place – and the reverse is always true, as well. The way we envision our city and attempt to represent it to each other in cultural forms creates the city as we know it. These processes are iterative and recursive – culture shapes environment, environment shapes culture, and the work of creating community through the production and consumption of culture across time and space is maintained through repeated practice. Imagination is transformed into imaginaries through the lived experience and ordinary practice of cultural production (Appadurai 1996, 9). How we interact with our city daily both informs our images of it as well as enables us to take place in it. In other words, “a physical space only becomes a cultural place when symbolic meanings are attached to it which derive from the practices and interpretations of the socially diverse groups of people who inhabit it. Space is contested when diverse groups conflict over history, memory, and entitlement – What
kind of place is it or should it be? And whose place is it?” (Bianchini 2006, 51). The building blocks of each are meanings, memory, media, and mental constructs – “by a process of continuous inter-textual cross-reference the cultural codings have a cumulative effect which forms the urban imagination” (Bianchini 2006, 7 & 15). Indeed, imaginaries may simply be a new name for an old field: “in geography,” at least, “the idea of geographical imaginaries would seem to have replaced other terms that, in other contexts, made it possible to relate the cultural with the spatial” (Zusman 2013, 51. See also Vandevoordt and Verschraegen 2018). Both cultural production and imaginaries are theaters of the symbolic in which people living in the city create opportunities for transforming their worlds through placemaking. The work of relating the cultural with the spatial is still a vital and ongoing project both in and outside the study of imaginaries – especially for those who contest hegemonic constellations of both culture and space.

While urban imaginaries are a vital lens for understanding how cultural production is imbricated in the production of given urban places, often missing is a more nuanced understanding of how these processes take shape across deterritorialized global spaces and mass-mediated cultural production. Such an understanding of imagined communities as multi-sited is not incongruent to Anderson’s work. He offers lengthy analysis of what allows far-flung nationals to continue to identify with their nations through the age of colonialization and concludes that media sustains nationality – but he argues that this sustenance requires the routine reinforcement of pilgrimage to a central geographic location (1983). Imagined nations are never truly deterritorialized as they require periodic reterritorialized without which the imagination fails. But putting Anderson’s work into conversation with more contemporary analysis of the spatial
construction of cultural imaginaries allows us to conclude that these pilgrimages can be completely virtual, since space and place flow through networks which ensure that the local and the global are constantly connected, everywhere, “from roots to routes” (Massey 1998, 123). And examining the imaginative potential of communities that have always and explicitly identified as globally networked can help us understand these processes. “The interconnections which bind together and internally differentiate a diaspora culture, for instance, cut across regions, nation states, and continents, linking local areas” (ibid., 124). Moreover, the children of “diaspora societies wrestle constantly to find an enabling interlocking of the different ‘cultures’ in which they find themselves” (ibid., 122). As a diasporic community whose cultural production fundamentally shaped global music, the cultural imaginaries of black spatial sensibilities can provide a unique perspective.

Diasporic Imaginaries

Cultural forms can be harnessed as protest or socio-political tools to shape racial imaginaries and the changing nature of racial relations can be glimpsed in the set of texts constituted by cultural production emanating from the city. People who are acutely aware of the role of racialization in the formation of their sense of identity tend to choose which forms of culture to engage with, taking space and making place, and imagining better futures in a more intentional fashion than people who are not forced to do so. Within contemporary academy, black imaginaries are studied most actively and explicitly as black geographies (Woods 1998; Wilson 2000; Gilmore 2002; McKittrick 2006; McKittrick and Woods 2007; Shabazz 2015; Bledsoe, Eaves, and Williams 2017; Allen, Lawhon, and Pierce 2019; Hawthorne 2019; Bledsoe and Wright 2019). Black
geographies are an interdisciplinary project of scholarship arguing that black matters are inherently spatial matters – and that the “spatial imaginaries, space-making practices, and senses of place rooted in Black communities” necessarily serve as critical interventions and forms of resistance against the power structures that intend to marginalize lives (Hawthorne 2019, 5). Black geographies have critical and normative implications for the study of urban politics. Indeed, “they possess creative possibilities for remapping time and space, for renegotiating the links between past and present as well as between the local and the global. They can clear up confusion about the relations between people and property, independence and interdependence, materialism and morality, race and place” (Lipsitz 2011, 255). Black spatial imaginaries have healing and liberating properties (ibid., 245). Attending to them serves to center a “Black sense of place and disrupt the normative conceptualization and mere geographic containment of Black subjects by focusing on the ways that Black subjects and places invoke agency and create space” (Eaves 2017, 80). It asks us to be mindful in our refusal to see any essence of race, in favor of seeing race as socially and discursively constructed and invite us to dispose of the question of what blackness is and focus instead on where and when blackness is, arguing that blackness is fundamentally created in space and in time (M.M. Wright 2015). But it does so without dismissing the specificity of embodied experience of racialized bodies for the sake of reaffirming the artificiality of racialization (Woods 2002). McKittrick (2006, 17) argues that engaging with the unique geographic sensibilities of black persons sheds light upon the invisible, the displaced, and the ungeographic “through taking notice of the ways in which space and place are fundamentally tied to the material landscape and daily social processes. Black
geographies, imaginative and material, are critical of spatial inequalities, evidence of
geopolitical struggles, and demonstrative of real and possible geographic alternatives.”
Although the roots of black geographies stretch out across many disciplines, there has
been an explosion of scholarship within the field in the last half-decade or so and
McKittrick is important to discuss in this context. Her work is concerned explicitly and
passim with imaginaries.4

Across Demonic Grounds, McKittrick works to show us how racialized
perspectives are mobilized to contest the politics of place through black cultural
production. She is credited for initiating – or at least heralding – the field of black
geographies through the act of co-editing the anthology Black Geographies and the
Politics of Place with Clyde Woods. The interdisciplinary set of essays collected in Black
Geographies focus on the sense of placelessness that stems from a history of racialized
diasporic uprootedness. The middle passage – materially and immaterially – has
dispersed black persons across the globe and thus sheared intuitive connections between a
black sense of spatiality and a black sense of place. The diasporic sense of placelessness
has made placemaking more explicitly imaginative in the collective black consciousness
as well as more multi-sited and wide-ranging in its processes of contestation. The
diasporic imagination uses exile “as a source of strength” rather than of deprivation and
harnesses it towards envisioning and enacting coalitions that transcend borders (Lipsitz
2011, 215). These kinds of transnational imaginaries of placemaking create new forms of
collective, public culture (Low 2009, 32-34). The process of placemaking is completely
dependent upon the collective creation and deployment of geographic and cultural

4 See McKittrick, Demonic Grounds: There are only five out of thirty-three introductory pages in
which she doesn’t employ some inflection of imagine.
imaginaries, but while we all make place from space through imaginaries, a black geographical imagination does so intentionally and actively. Indeed, “Clyde Woods and Katherine McKittrick highlight the radical possibilities of black geographies, specifically the oppositional placemaking imaginaries and practices employed by subaltern actors” (Neely and Samura 2011, 1942). McKittrick offers her demonic grounds as schema with which to analyze the potential of diasporic imaginaries for explicating these social processes of struggle and resistance— and Woods shows how blues music can provide an effective tool kit for leveraging such schemas.

3. Imagining the Blues

Before asking how best to analyze the oppositional placemaking imaginaries and practices of subaltern actors through the blues, we must investigate what the blues are and what people and places may be made legible by the blues. Woods offered his theory of blues epistemology as a lens through which to view the dynamics of contestation through cultural production, showing how black people “have constructed a system of explanation that informs their daily life, organizational activity, culture, religion, and social movements” (Woods 1998b, 16). They are an umbrella signifier, referring to a hugely varied set of aesthetic musical genres, local, regional, and national scenes, lyrical composition, and social epiphenomena (Woods 2007, 50 & 55). They are an artistic response to chaos, expressing a black perspective on the incongruity of life and an attempt to achieve meaning in a situation fraught with contradictions. They symbolize the solidarity, the attitudes, and the identity of the black community and thus create an emotional frame of reference for endurance and aesthetic appreciation. The blues represents a wide spectrum of expression spanning proverbial wisdom, folk philosophy, political commentary, ribald humor, sorrowful lament, satire, social phenomena, and romantic relationship. The lyrics of the blues often describe problems and offer possible solutions. (ibid., 54)
To Woods, the blues operate “to instill pride, channel folk wisdom, and critique of individuals and institutions with humor and resolution rather than world-weariness or resignation” (1998b, 17). They engage in a social struggle with the understanding that the contest against power can never be definitively won or lost but is perpetually fought over the balance of power (ibid., 19). Woods offers the blues as reflecting knowledge, as producing knowledge, and as teaching knowledge. He sees the information embedded in the blues as historical, anthropological, sociological, geographical, and political in addition to simply musicological. The blues “use several forms of reasoning simultaneously: analogic, symbolic, dialectic, materialist, surrealist, asymmetric, and utopian. Schools within the blues tradition have been concerned with crossing physical, national, cultural, and intellectual boundaries for over a century” (2007, 75). They’re both a body of knowledge and a method for accessing knowledge. The blues epistemology is the missing link between urban studies and cultural studies — fields that revolve around each other but are typically (mis)treated as independent of one another. They allow us to gain insight into how space is socially produced, reproduced, and contested through every day, embodied experiences.

In this section, I consider which forms of knowledge may be better understood or described through the blues, whether there is any inherent limitation to their application, and how they may be applied. Woods (ibid., 66) asks us, “how deep are the roots of the blues and where, if any, are its borders?” – especially in a world in which oppressive structures are unbounded. “Although there are hundreds of dialectics and dozens of regional, religious, ethnic, and gender identities embedded in the blues pantheon and its extensions,” he (2017, 35–36) argued, “the central ethical core is the creation of a socially
just and sustainable society in the bosom of a social structure dedicated to economic monopoly and the exploitation of black working-class communities, families, individuals, and traditions.” He was uninterested in placing limits upon the explanatory potential of his blues epistemology and maintained that the blues epistemology was equally crucial for understanding the specificity of the black experience and for looking for productive alliances between oppressed peoples across time and space. First, I argue that the blues are not limited to the study and explanation of any particular genre, time, place, or group of people but are vital to critically inflected cultural production and can help us understand the everyday experience of a wide array of marginalized individuals and communities. Finally, I conclude that putting the blues into conversation with imaginaries – extending Woods’s theory as blues imaginaries – is the most generative way of framing his body of work, both in terms of intellectual theory and political activism.

**Genre**

The blues are not limited to a particular music form. Spirituals and even minstrelsy were put to political ends and it’s hard to think of soul music and the civil rights era apart from one another, or of the birth of hip hop music without bankruptcy era New York City (Woods 2007; Woods 2010; Rose 1994). “Rappers proclaim their affiliation with the Blues in their statements, lyrics and music, and historians and musicologists draw parallels between the sociopolitical backgrounds and narrative approaches of the two genres” (Exarchos 2020). Woods’s contribution to the anthology on *Black Geographies* applied his theory to a discussion of the social politics present in hip hop and in rap – noting that “like the blues, the concern for global justice was embedded in hip hop early on,” he (67) traces a through-line from blues to soul and into
rap genealogically, lyrically, sonically, emotionally, socially, politically, and geographically.


Location

The blues are not limited to a particular time or place. They draw from earlier forms of African culture, were combined and recombined during the Great Migration, and were drawn upon in the creation of international forms of blues culture “partly determined by their inheritances but…also critically determined by the diasporic conditions” (Hall 1993, 109). Cultural production (generally) and music (particularly) grow out of times & spaces without remaining essentially locked in them. Woods followed blues epistemologies as they took root and flourished in adversity during The Bourbon Dynasty of 1594-1792 (2009b; 2017), slavery, the Civil War, & reconstruction (1998a; 1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2010; 2017), Great Depression and New Deal (1998a; 1998b; 2002; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2010; 2017), WWII (1998a; 1998b; 2007; 2009b; 2010; 2017), civil rights era (1998a; 1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2010; 2017), age of neoliberalism & 1970s recession era (2002; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2010; 2017), and the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina (2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2017). Indeed, illustrating the influence blues culture has upon popular and mainstream culture, he (2007, 70) notes that “another aspect of the social-spatial dynamic in blues geography is the remarkable
persistence of naming of periods in U.S. history according to the blues-based intellectual movements: Ragtime, the Jazz Age, the Swing Era, Bebop, post-Bob, the Rock and Roll era, and the Hip Hop Era.” The blues, as it were, are simultaneously in time, timeless, and timely.

While cultural diffusion has always ensured some degree of dispersion, the influence of given forms of cultural production is widespread in our contemporary, mass mediated global soundscape. The blues are geographically unbounded; rags and hollers are not confined to the Delta, nor is hip hop anathema to the Delta. Blackness was not essentially rural (historically) and is not essentially urban (presently). Woods (1998, 20) argues that “the reification of urban street culture detached explanation from its blues-folk roots; the analysis of African American social life as urban became definitive and the rural South became derivative.” As he researched them and taught them, blues epistemologies have been used to better understand New Orleans, Louisiana, the Gulf Coast, the broader Delta region, the Piedmont, and the Deep South (1998a; 1998b; 2002; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2010; 2012; 2017) as well as Chicago (1998b; 2002; 2017), NYC & LA (2002; 2007; 2010; 2012) and Baltimore (2002) along with other communities on national scales both urban and rural (1998b; 2002; 2007; 2009c; 2010; 2017), and on a truly global scale (1998b; 2002; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2010; 2017) as mediated and communicated across the diaspora (1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2010; 2017) – most notably, in the Caribbean (1998b; 2007; 2009b; 2010). As he (2007) noted, the blues may have grown from and been imbued with locally situated knowledges but all that they know may be taught everywhere. “The blues tradition has consistently served to unite working-class communities across different spatial scales: blocks, neighborhoods,
towns, cities, regions, ethnicities, and nations.” (Woods 2007, 53). The blues need not know its place or stay in its space.

*Ethnicity*

The blues are not limited to a particular group of people. Woods consistently tracks the relationship between black people and the blues and enriches that origin story with precursors and dispersion. Blues music is the music of people who have been oppressed but not silenced. The blues are an inherently African American musical form and they have long and most famously been played by black musicians. And the legitimacy of ‘blue-eyed blues,’ the vitality of British blues, and ethical questions of middle-class white kids becoming even more prosperous by appropriating the blues has been questioned often (Oliver 1976; 1983). But this is less a question of racialization, than of marginalization. While Woods was disinterested in analyzing the music of the privileged in any form – including the blues on those terms – the blues epistemology is a productive lens with which to view the cultural production of those who are marginalized along any and every axis. The cultural forms Woods analyzed with his blues epistemology were those of peoples who have been oppressed by, and who stood in unwavering protest of, racism and racial capitalism (1998a; 1998b; 2002; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2010; 2012; 2017) in all its forms – most notably (neo)plantation power & neo-Bourbonism (1998a; 1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2010; 2017) in which public institutions/policy concerning education, housing, labor, healthcare, food security, labor, policing, incarceration, disenfranchisement, corruption & neglect (1998a; 1998b; 2002; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2010; 2012; 2017) combined with corporate interests such as those of the cotton, tobacco, sugar, rice, oil, chemical, mining, tourism, & gaming

Woods noted that “those who are marginalized based on their culture, ethnic, race, class, gender, and regional position find this epistemology and its analogic reasoning empowering” (2007, 74). In an article remembering Woods shortly after his death, Costa Vargas (2012) represented debates he used to have with Woods about whether an outsized focus on blackness and the black experience enables or precludes productive alliances with non-black people of color. By the time he wrote “Sittin’ on Top
of the World,” at least, he was interested in the diasporic epistemologies of black folks across the world – and as he began to focus on New Orleans after Katrina, he was considering how indigenous epistemologies have informed and been informed by blues epistemologies as each have co-evolved. Shortly after, he (2010, 42) notes that “the African American identity itself is the product of hundreds of African identities and dozens of African American identities and...movements built upon multiculturalism and diversity are not new.” And Serrano (2015, 39) makes a broad claim for application and generalizability, arguing that Woods’s blues epistemology and ontology are rooted in a particular shared experience but is open to all. Although the blues spring from the black experience of theft, slavery, and apartheid in the context of US state-building, blues people can be Black, indigenous, Asian, Latino, and/or white. The subject category of blues person is not ascribed, it is assumed by someone seeking an alternative to the epistemological, ontological, and teleological limits of coloniality/modernity institutionalized in the state...The requirement for affiliation is solidarity with oppressed peoples and opposition to institutions and structures that create and introduce the conditions for oppression.

Certainly – and without losing sight of the importance of listening to and learning from the specificity of the black experience – Woods was not interested in artificially limiting the explanatory potential of the blues epistemology.

knowledges (1998b; 2007) and he leveraged them to study the cultural production of farmers (1998b; 2002), subaltern groups, the unhoused (1998b; 2007; 2010; 2012; 2017), and impoverished and working-class Americans (1998a; 1998b; 2002; 2005; 2007; 2009c; 2010; 2012; 2017). Blues epistemology seeks to account for multiple perspectives and experiences. The concept of ‘theory’ itself can be defined as the perspective from which one interprets the world – “postcolonial theory sees the world in terms of empire, colonialism, and their legacies, much in the same way that Marxist theory sees the world in terms of capitalism, feminist theory in terms of gender, or queer theory in terms of sexuality (Go 2018, 2).” Uniting these theoretical images of the world, Woods (2007, 50-51 & 58-59) frames blues epistemologies as being grounded in the feminist imagination of the female blues singers who launched the genre’s first popular recordings, the postcolonial perspectives of diasporic imaginaries, the anti-capitalist politics of imagined nations of the working classes, and the imaginative potential of queer studies for radically anti-normative thought and action. The blues are empowering, not delimiting.

4. Towards Blues Imaginaries

While Woods’s blues analytic is not limited by race, place, era, or musical form, the way in which it is employed has an impact on what we can see while using its lens. And Woods is pushing us to glimpse so much more with his analytic than what little we can see by studying or researching blues ontologies or blues epistemologies. Woods does suggest that we seek knowledge by researching cultural forms, but this seems more of a methodological instruction than a claim about the nature of any knowledge to be gleaned from such research. He’s not making a claim about the nature of the world but a claim about how we can change the world. Woods describes his blues epistemology as an
“embedded, necessary, and reflective” attempt to “create a new reality based on cultural freedom and economic and social justice” (1998b, 25). It seeks to build upon “kin, work, and community networks” as “the foundations of thousands of conscious mobilizations designed to transform society” (ibid., 27). He tells us that his blues epistemology presumes the “constant reestablishment of collective sensibility,” and he wrestles with Edward Said’s *Orientalism* when he notes that it is the “desires, repressions, investments, and projections circulating within a culture that weigh upon the imagination and logic of the individual” (ibid., 28). *Orientalism* itself relies upon a relational concept of placemaking unfolding though the collective cultural and political imaginaries of western society (Jackson 1989, 149-151. See also, Said 1994). And Woods also draws from Benedict Anderson and Raymond Williams – both of whom are frequently cited in imaginaries literature.

Woods’s theory is that the social construction of the blues is both active and transformative. The textual images available to read both in sound and in lyrics reside in the collective imaginations of those who produce them and those who consume them, and these imaginative expressions have material effects upon both individuals and on environments. These transformations are political as much as cultural (Appadurai 1996, 10). Woods is not claiming that the blues are the truth, but that the blues can *transform* the truth. Through them, we may re-envision our world. The blues are normative projection of collective transformational action: this is the realm of the imagination (Mehrotra 2008, 207; Appadurai 1996, 7-8).

Woods conceived of his theoretical contribution as a framework for examining the transformative interplay between spatial, social, and temporal imaginaries and the
ongoing processes of contestation and placemaking that are always both reflected in and reflective of a wide variety of cultural forms. The blues revel in joy without ignoring harsh reality. They provide an expression of justified grief over the diasporic sense of uprootedness and placelessness, but they do not crumble into depression or acquiescence. The blues offer a method for registering protest to personal and societal evils without giving way to pessimism. Critical without being cynical, eschewing the flâneur and the blasé and disdaining the stoic, Woods’s blues people provide a fuller and more human perspective than the stock characters of classic social imaginaries. They offer mature yet affable defiance in the face of struggle. Understanding that Clyde Woods’s social theory of the blues is engaged in perpetual conversation with the theory of urban imaginaries provides us with the best possible theoretical perspective from which to explore all forms of countercultural production to understand how marginalized people create and recreate their environment in cities and regions across the globe.

He argues that popular musical forms exploded in a rebirth during the last decades of the previous century and illustrated “a multiethnic working-class vision of a flawed United States haunted by its own practices of ethnic oppression and enforced poverty” and this music offered “an unapologetic celebration of life, resistance, spiritual affirmation, community, social and humanity, and the highest levels, the ‘upper rooms,’ of African American culture and philosophy” (1998b, 20). Woods wanted to “bridge the gap between” music’s “aesthetic tradition” and music’s “theory of social and economic development and change” (ibid.). This is neither cultural studies nor the study of culture in a discrete sense. It is a method with which to truly refuse the imposition of this false dichotomy – one that enables us to see the imaginaries created by the interplay between
art and society and to see them in an explicitly political light. And the urban imaginaries expressed in this music “began to influence both popular and academic, literature and criticism” after “achieving mass distribution nationally and internationally through recordings” (ibid., 18). That argument connects us, necessarily, to the role of mass media capitalism in contributing to group identity formation through the ongoing process of communicating cultural values that serves as a through line between imagined nations, cultural studies, black geographies, and blues epistemologies. For as “new technologies of communication have generated a global perspective from the history of slavery of the African diaspora and allowed the international export of new world black cultures,” we have spent decades witnessing the resistant potential of urban imaginaries that are expressed through music (Valentine, Skelton, and Chambers 1998, 20. See also Hall 1993; Gilroy 1984). This is important in the context of this essay – it leads to a simple set of conclusions.

The marginalized subject relates uniquely to space as connected to multiple places yet belonging to none, resulting in an affective experience of being perpetually out of place. This sense of placelessness floats aloft imaginaries which weave a complex transnational web of contestation that is consciously aware of the need to intentionally shape space, make place, and claim a right to the city. These urban imaginaries are community-forming and are mediated through culture, and such cultural forms wield transformative potential against existing power relations of the environment. Cultural production mediates the relationship between placemaking and urban imaginaries, countercultural production can be radically transformative, and these processes of spatial imagination are always unfolding. Black imaginaries provide an effective analytical
window to this relationship, as well as a unique set of normative implications. The musical forms emanating from any city are both reflective of and imbricated in these processes that recursively and iteratively constitute quotidian urban experience. As we continue to critically reimagine our past and the longue durée of racial capitalism while striving to collectively imagine better futures, we may remember that “the blues are the cries of a new society being born” (Woods 1998b, 39).
SECTION V. THIRD ARTICLE

Trouble in Mind: Clyde Woods, Herbert Marcuse, and the Frankfurt Blues

Abstract: The Frankfurt School is credited with pioneering both critical studies and cultural studies and has been criticized in its approach to each. The Black Radical Tradition and the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies have served as two powerful post-Frankfurt interventions, and the work of Clyde Woods is informed by both. Woods’s work is positioned at the nexus of critical, urban, and cultural studies and his blues epistemology offers us a guide to reading the cultural production of marginalized groups as maps containing alternative visions of the past, the present, and the future. However, the secondary literature on the blues epistemology has approached these projects in a piecemeal fashion, tending to position the blues as either a body of explanation or an engine of change. In this paper, I explore how we can refocus the blues by pairing Woods’s socio-spatial sensibilities with Herbert Marcuse’s utopic thinking. I extend recent work to spatialize Marcuse’s emancipatory politics as well as work repositioning the blues epistemology in order to revitalize Marcuse’s theory and operationalize Woods’s methods. I draw connections between Woods and Marcuse across (1) the Black Radical Tradition, (2) multiracial working-class solidarities, (3) self-reflexive critique, and (4) praxis, before forging a fifth site of convergence in the body of Walker’s (2022) Marcusean triadic topology. I conclude that, together, Woods and Marcuse offer a fuller, richer perspective from which to think through a truly critical, cultural theory.
Trouble in Mind
Clyde Woods, Herbert Marcuse, and the Frankfurt Blues

1. Introduction

trouble in mind, babe i’m blue
but i won’t be blue always
yes, the sun gonna shine
in my back door someday

–big bill bronzy.

The collective scholarship of the Frankfurt School offered societal analysis that opposed capitalism and other oppressive structures and sought key sites and practices of emancipation (Kellner 1997; Cobb 2004, 163; Kellner 2007; Benhabib 2018; Freyenhagen 2018). Its name is nearly synonymous with Critical Theory and studies, foundational to Cultural Theory and studies, and a key influence in many fields and disciplines (Kellner 1997; Kellner 2007). While the Frankfurt School is well-regarded by many engaging in ‘critical’ research, there are limitations in how their work is relied upon by contemporary academics. Critical Theory and Cultural Theory has itself been critiqued, and some academics posit “even if [Frankfurt] still has something relevant to say, there are now better ways of saying it” (Ibe 20, 465). Additionally, the questions they raised and the methods they used to address those questions are more readily adapted by some disciplines than others, and Frankfurt is respected across the humanities and the social sciences even as their scholarship is unevenly utilized by contemporary scholars within those disciplines (Ibe 20, 465. See also Feenberg 1981; Kellner 1997; Kellner 2007; Westphal 2020; Walker 2022). This is particularly accurate across the
disciplinary landscape of geography, where geographers are often ‘critical’ by default yet seldom wrestle with early Critical Theorists.¹

Membership in the Frankfurt School has always been loosely defined and its members disagreed with each other substantively, methodologically, and politically (Freyenhagen 2018). Efforts to undertake integrating the Frankfurt School into geography and excavating the geographical implications of the Frankfurt School have begun, and the “time is right for staging Marcuse’s comeback” (Walker 2022, 1). Moreover, the field of Cultural Studies has always embraced the language of the Frankfurt School and of geographical knowledges, and the discipline of geography long ago faced its cultural turn. Cultural Theory, therefore, serves as fertile ground upon which to build bridges between prior theory and current research to further spatialize the Frankfurt School. The work of Clyde Woods is positioned at the nexus of critical, urban, and cultural studies and his blues epistemology offers a guide to reading the cultural production of marginalized groups as maps containing alternative visions of the past, present, and future.

Building upon recent impetus to import Frankfurt more explicitly into geography, this paper leverages the post-Frankfurt legacy of Critical Studies and Cultural Studies as an entry point to put Herbert Marcuse into conversation with Clyde Woods. Thus, it extends recent work to spatialize Marcuse’s critical theory, oppositional politics, and emancipatory praxis and further, repositions Woods’s blues epistemology to a broader academic audience – revitalizing the former and operationalizing the latter. I draw connections between Woods and Marcuse across (1) the Black Radical Tradition (BRT),

¹ See, for example, the call for papers for this volume: Walker et al 2022.
(2) multiracial working-class solidarities, (3) self-reflexive critique, and (4) praxis and better futures. Following this comparative analysis, I propose a fifth site of theoretical and political convergence in the body of Walker’s (2022) Marcusean triadic topology. First, I open by examining critiques of the Frankfurt School and the work of both Marcuse and Woods in more detail and make a case for combining their theory.

2. The Frankfurt Blues

The Frankfurt School has been credited with pioneering both critical studies and cultural studies and has been criticized in its approach to each: for lacking a consistent focus on space and spatiality and not attending to racialization as a guiding principle of capitalism in the first case, and for tending toward elitism and failing to recognize how culture can be grounds for contestation and resistance ‘from below’ in the second case. In both cases, their scholarship has been criticized for lacking a robust perspective on space and spatiality.

Critical Theory

Critical Studies are a multi-disciplinary field of study founded upon Critical Theory – and “Critical Theory” is associated with the ideas of the University of Frankfurt’s Institute for Social Research (Durham 2017. See also Barker 2002, 36-37). “The critical theory of the Frankfurt School was a blend of philosophical reflection and social scientific inquiry [and] at the center of this political and theoretical project was the transformation of the concept of critique” (Benhabib 2018). This spirit unites much of the scholars and scholarship of the Frankfurt School, creating research guided by an impulse to critique hegemonic structures, the mediums (media) of their communication and
perpetuation, and those who would ignore or rationalize these processes, towards radical and emancipatory praxis. It is a body of research which engages in a neo-Marxist project of analyzing the effects of capitalistic domination upon political, social, and cultural reproduction as well as the role of modern media and mass communication in the changes driven by these dynamic processes of reproduction (Kellner 2007, 49. See also Storey 2009, chapter four).

However, the Frankfurt School’s Marxist emphasis on economic classification structures produced less sophisticated analysis of identity structures: “the Frankfurt School’s indifference to race and gender is a conspicuous flaw” (Ross 2014) but nationality, sexuality, and language tumble through similar cracks (Benhabib 2018). Much of the scholarship emanating from writers engaging in critical studies over the last half century seek to address gaps in the treatment of identities and subjectivities (Benhabib 2018; Corradetti 2012; Ross 2014) and the treatment of race is an illustrative case. Said (1994, 278) argued that the Frankfurt School “is stunningly silent on racist theory” (cited in Baum 2015, 420). Critical Race Theory (see Ansell 2008), Black Geographies (see Hawthorne 2019), and the collective insight of the Black Radical Tradition (C. Robinson 1983) have addressed this gap.

Cultural Theory

Cultural Studies are a multi-disciplinary field that examines linkages between power and culture – specifically, how mass media is involved in the reification of capitalistic hegemony (Kellner 1997; Barker 2002, 145-146). Seeking exile from Hitler’s Germany in the United States, Frankfurt scholars saw continuity in the way communication media influenced and was influenced by those respective societies: Nazi
government controlled German media produced submission to fascism while American media was controlled by corporations and produced apathy through the sedative effect of leisure time pervaded by commercial entertainment (Kellner 2007, 49). In both cases, the “industrialization and commercialization of culture under capitalist relations of production” was the feature that cut through socio-political differences (ibid.). Horkheimer and Adorno pointed to this feature as a specific object of analysis in their cultural industries critique (ibid.). In culture, they argued, “technology produced mass culture that habituated individuals to conform to the dominant patterns of thought and behaviour, and thus provided powerful instruments of social control and domination” (Kellner 1997, 14).

However, the scholarship of the Frankfurt School has been critiqued as “elitist and reductionist” (Kellner 1997, 12) for reifying distinctions between high and low culture. They thought that only under-educated people were vulnerable to the hegemonic effects of the cultural industries, and that low culture functioned only as a tool of the cultural industries (Barker 2002, 115-117). Their predictions for the “end of the individual” were exaggerated and blinded them to the agency of people producing and consuming culture-from-below to their own ends (Kellner 2007, 62). While the influence of mass culture upon working class leisure time is significant, “where there is consumption there is pleasure, and where there is pleasure, there is agency” (Kellner 1997, 19-20). Frankfurt School scholarship “never presented a united front; it was, after all, a gaggle of intellectuals” and some of their cultural critique could be more sophisticated along these lines (Ross 2014. See also Kellner 2007, 71; Kellner 1997, 14-15 on Benjamin). The field of cultural studies has significantly progressed in the area, from early British cultural theorists like Hoggart, Williams, and Thompson who saw value in the everyday cultural
production of working class peoples (Turner 2002, 33-57) to Hall and the Birmingham School of cultural studies who championed popular culture, and culture-from-below as sites of subversion and resistance to hegemonic cultural value systems (Turner 2002; Kellner, 1997; Barker 2002; Edwards 2007, chapter four; Edgar and Sedgwick 2008; Ibe 2016; Rowe 2017).

Social-Spatial Theory

Finally, while “the Frankfurt School’s Critical Theory has been informed and enriched by questions of space and place [and] the spatial dimension is central to the philosophical tradition of Critical Theory” (ibid.), these questions were more often implicit than explicit in the work of scholars who placed more emphasis on historicizing their critique rather than spatializing it (See Feenberg 1981; Westphal 2020; Walker 2022, 4-6). In their work and the work of those who have engaged with it, “explicitly spatial questions have been sidelined by dimensions of time and temporality, encapsulated by a seemingly nostalgic clinging to better, pre-capitalist times and a preoccupation with a utopian future of redeemed humankind” (Walker et al 2022). In return, geographers rarely seek to leverage Frankfurt scholarship in their research or to apply the topographical tools of their trade (space, place, region, bordering) to analysis of Frankfurt scholarship and a “robust spatial perspective” on the Frankfurt School “is yet to be solidified” (ibid.). Spatial matters “have not been at the forefront of scholarly inquiry so far” even though “the spatial dimension is central to the philosophical tradition of Critical Theory” (ibid.). Addressing that deficit is the intent of this special issue – and every article herein contributes to solidifying such a perspective by articulating the oft elided spatial dimension of Critical Theory. Recent efforts have begun to undertake that
project of integrating the Frankfurt School into geography as well as excavating the geographical implications of the Frankfurt School, and the “time is right for staging Marcuse’s comeback” (Walker 2022, 1).

Along with Horkheimer, Adorno, and Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse was a key philosopher of the first generation of the Frankfurt School (Buchanan, 2018, 825; Freyenhagen 2018). Initially studying under Heidegger, Marcuse rejected Heidegger’s politics and later updated his own philosophy after reading Marx (ibid.). He fled Nazi Germany – settling in the United States, where he developed a body of theory on social critique, the cultural industries, repressive tolerance, Freudo-Marxism, and emancipatory liberation and revolution (ibid.). Where many of those scholars failed to update their personal politics with increasingly radical times, Marcuse kept his finger on the pulse of emancipatory movements and became a well-respected figure within activist circles through to the 1960s/1970s as the father of the new left (ibid.). “Marcuse’s sudden rise to prominence during this period was one of the most unexpected developments in his long and distinguished life. At the age of almost 70…Marcuse became a worldwide intellectual phenomenon [and his] critical theory was much discussed in both the mainstream and underground or alternative media” (Cobb 2004, 163). The radical emancipatory currents that flow through his writings remain relevant today, and “Marcuse deserves to be freed from his critics and the idea that he has little to say to present-day society” (Walker 2022, 8).

Walker (2022, 57) argues that Marcuse more consistently and explicitly emphasized the methods of overcoming oppressive society than did other Frankfurt scholars, rather than simply identifying and calling for its eradication. In her monograph
on *Spatializing Marcuse*, Walker (ibid.) takes on two projects. She excavates evidence of a geographic sensibility in his work, arguing that space, place, location, and topology are always present, enriching his questions and the answers he provides, if typically implicitly. She appropriates Marcuse’s ideas for contemporary geographic analysis, arguing that his contributions shed light on challenges that human geographers are still wrestling with. His “lifelong struggle to adapt Marxism to changing contexts,” she contends, “continues to have a remarkable degree of currency” and her reframing of his work in a geographical light “deliberately unmoors Marcuse’s theories from their original space of engagement” to examine and champion “the salience of his animating ideas – solidarity, resistance, and freedom” as appropriated in our own research as “we extend, stretch out, extract, convert, and emplace his work” (ibid., 1, 3, 95, 96). Marcuse’s consistency in leveraging philosophy towards practice, “exhibited in his unwavering commitment to the possibility of a better future, sets him apart from other Frankfurt School thinkers” (ibid., 57).

This consistent emphasis on praxis and utopic vision creates a throughline between Marcuse’s oppositional thought and that of Clyde Woods. And where The BRT and the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies have served as two powerful post-Frankfurt interventions, Woods was well-informed by both. Woods wrote at the intersections of critical, cultural, and urban geographies and is known for his blues epistemology and that is “one of the central institutions of African American life” (Woods 2005, 1008). It is an “indigenous knowledge system” that “draws on African American musical practices, folklore, and spirituality to reorganize and give new voice to working-class communities facing severe fragmentation” (ibid.). It leverages
marginalized folk culture as maps of meaning containing collective diasporic travelogues of embodied experience of suffering from and fighting against capitalism across space and time that harnesses collective knowledges toward better futures. The “blues, blues pedagogy, and music-making use several forms of reasoning simultaneously: analogic, symbolic, dialectic, materialist, surrealist, asymmetric, and utopian and in addition to being intertextual and polyphonal, the blues has a highly developed geographic critique embedded within it” (Woods 2007, 75). Woods reads cultural texts for description of societal contexts and takes seriously cultural forms previously championed as culture-from-below without consigning it to that ‘lower’ status. He observes the way culture is communicated/mediated by forms of technology like “turntables, radio, CDs, cassettes, boomboxes, and mixtapes” (ibid.) and shows how blues culture has impacted mainstream culture over centuries of racial capitalism without romanticizing prior struggles or eras (2005; 2017). He finds an organic intellectualism whose effects can be traced but whose knowledges are not legible to dominant ideologies, while also taking seriously the multiplicity of identities forming and formed by the blues (2017, 35-36). It is a sophisticated, nuanced method for critical and cultural studies.

But the secondary literature on the blues epistemology approached these projects in a piecemeal fashion. Those who have researched the blues epistemology have seldom combined analysis of environmental injustice with cultural studies, or of uneven development with uneven spatial development, or of environmental analysis with spatial development analysis. They combine cultural studies with political praxis inconsistently, an oversight that Woods repeatedly cautioned against. Previously, I have argued for reframing Woods’s theoretical contribution as blues imaginaries as an effective method
of combining his projects of employing the blues as a body of explanation and an engine of change – projects that tend to be bifurcated in the secondary literature.\textsuperscript{2}

Recontextualizing Woods’s scholarship in both the critical and cultural studies traditions – putting Frankfurt School into conversation with the blues – clarifies a methodological approach better incorporating each whilst retaining Woods’s nuanced approach.

Specifically, I want to put Clyde Woods into conversation with Herbert Marcuse.

While the social is always spatial and the spatial always social – and mutually perpetually political – spatialization is typically implicit in both Marcuse’s writings and in the writings of those who have committed to his perspective. “The spatial vocabularies of Marcuse’s theories, along with their material and metaphorical contours, have remained underdeveloped” and “his name is rarely among the philosophers quoted by geographers interested in the spatial dimensions of social life” (Walker 2022, 4 & 6). In contrast, the blues epistemology is quite explicitly a “place-based ethical position that develops in particular conditions of containment” (Wright 2019, 3). Walker (2022, 3) notes that Marxist geographers have been instrumental as geography works through socio-spatial relationships. In that vein, Woods (2007, 3) references Harvey who (2001, 211) notes that failure to understand these relationships has led to easy and uncritical geographical analysis of neoliberalism and asks how geographical knowledges can be reconstituted to better serve that project. Answering, Woods argues that blues geography offers “construction and revision of theory, method, and praxis” (2007, 60) that weaves together the pillars of geographical knowledge into a system of geographic wisdom (ibid., 74) and that “the social-spatial dynamic in blues geography enables us to understand how

\textsuperscript{2} I make this argument, based in Woods’s work, in Section IV of this dissertation.
marginalized people in marginalized places…are central to an understanding of the origins of neoliberalism” (ibid., 69-70). Whereas “Marcuse’s diagnoses of society are said to be overly general, lacking firm empirical grounding” (Walker 2022, 10), Woods employs a critically inflected longue durée of capitalism tracking fluidly between empirical analysis of the past and of the past-in-the-present. ³ Finally, Woods’s analyses of the dialectic between the universality of capitalism in its oppressive nature and the temporal and spatial specificity of capitalism in its various incarnations (Bourbonism, plantationism, neoliberalism, etc.) lends a consistent emphasis on consequence of space and place that enrichen Marcuse’s analyses. This paper asks how reimagining the Frankfurt School through the lens of the blues epistemology reshapes our understanding of each by further grounding and spatializing the former and recentering utopian praxis in the latter. In the next section, I draw connections between Woods and Marcuse.

3. Connective Tissue

*The Black Radical Tradition*

“The Black radical tradition is a rich and vibrant tapestry woven by the blood, sweat, and tears of so many Black people” (Elnaiem 2021), with no singular foundation in a person or a publication. Contemporary analysis on scholarship and activism of BRT argues that our understanding of it can be challenged and enriched by complicating each of those words in turn: we must ask what do we mean by black? what do we mean by radical? and what do we mean by tradition? (Elnaiem 2021; Scott 2013; Walker 2022). Putting the words in that order and capitalizing them is typically a reference to *Black*

³ His 2002 critique of the academy being, possibly, the only exception.
Marxism (C.J. Robinson 1983). Even then, Robinson’s (ibid., 167) work gave name to extant phenomenon: “the ideological, philosophical, and epistemological natures of the Black movement whose dialectical matrix...was capitalist slavery and imperialism” (quoted in Pulido and De Lara 2018, 5) and positions it as a collective consciousness and ontological mode of existence formed in the perpetual fight against racial capitalism (Elnaiem 2021). If capitalism is never not racial then critique may never neglect race and emancipatory praxis must be led by black leaders. And Marcuse was sensitive to that argument. While making a case for retaining all that is hopeful and vital in Marcuse’s oppositional politics by diversifying his critical theory though exposure to contemporary feminist and racial critique, Walker (2022, 95-116) shows that Marcuse benefited from this sort of exposure personally, as well. “His former student, Angela Davis, who was a member of the Black Panthers and joined an all-Black branch of the Communist party as a young woman, was part of Marcuse’s own education around Black liberation” (ibid., 99-100). And Farr et al (2013, 413) note, Marcuse had an “attitude toward theory and practice…that made it possible for Angela Davis and other student activists to impact his critical theory and for him to support and participate in student and other radical movements.” Walker (2022) notes that he “considered Black liberation struggles a vanguard of social change” (108), his credibility was well-regarded “among political activists and intellectuals of the late 1960s” (ibid.), and in 1967 he was “invited to participate at the Congress on the Dialectics of Liberation” along with Stokely Carmichael, a leader in the Black Panther Party (ibid.). Marcuse respected the liberatory potential of Black Radicalism’s perpetual confrontation, black radicals respected the
potential of Marcuse’s oppositional politics, and the blues epistemology has room to incorporate both.

Woods (2002, 1013) notes that “attaining human rights is a fundamental category in the blues epistemology, particularly the fate of the incarcerated and the abused, since upon these pillars African American identity was born.” Where Hall (1993) famously asked “what is this ‘black’ in black popular culture?” and the Birmingham School’s scholarship reflected this explicitly anti-essentialist push against the concept of black culture, Woods argued (2002) for strategic essentialism and the blues epistemology champions black culture as evidence of both the collective ontological mode of existence and perpetual struggle Robinson (C.J. Robinson 1983) points to as the BRT. “Although there are hundreds of dialectics and dozens of regional, religious, ethnic, and gender identities embedded in the blues pantheon and its extensions, the central ethical core is the creation of a socially just and sustainable society in the bosom of a social structure dedicated to economic monopoly and the exploitation of black working-class communities, families, individuals, and traditions” (Woods 2017, 35-36). The blues epistemology offers a crucial method for performing critical and cultural theory that draws upon the theory of the BRT.

Schulze-Oechtering (2016, 25) uses the blues epistemology to investigate working-class epistemic perspectives in a successful unionization and class-action lawsuit effort, noting that Woods’s “scholarship placed those who toiled at the bottom of the plantation social hierarchy in the same political lineage as radical intellectuals more commonly associated with” BRT. Robinson (Z.F. Robinson 2014, 53) examines R&B lyrics for insight into blues women’s epistemologies, “bringing political economy and
materialist realities more squarely into Davis’s work and gender into Woods’s work.”
Lewis (2002) argues that “it is essential that methodologies be established for the reproduction and circulation” of BRT (ibid., 32). He notes that blues epistemology “opens up seemingly endless possible arrangements for scholarly intervention. It releases a tradition of recognizing intellectual forms that can be read across genres, and ultimately across disciplines” (ibid., 30). Finally, Davis et al (2019) and Moulton and Salo (2022) use blues epistemologies, black geographies, and black ecologies to perform ecocriticism sensitive to BRT.

Multiracial Working-Class Solidarities

Class consciousness, struggle, and solidarity are concepts that highlight common roots. Just as Black Marxism is frequently cited in definition gestures to BRT, the Frankfurt School grew out of contemporary extant forms of Marxism Class consciousness, “the collective awareness of both a common material situation and a common set of interests arising out of that situation …entails the perception of a common enemy and is in this regard a cornerstone of what Karl Marx referred to as class struggle” (Buchanan 2018). Frankfurt overlooked the importance of race, gender, sexuality, language, and nationality as these sorts of identity classifications were thought to weaken solidarities among the oppressed. Marcuse’s critique is based on Marxism, and recognized class consciousness as a foundational to radical projects of emancipatory revolution. He also understood that Marxism needs to be updated to maintain relevance (Farr et al 2013, 413). His theory and his politics were more nuanced in their understanding that other marginalized identity structures are vital avenues towards revolutionary alliances. Farr et al (ibid.) insist that “although Marcuse was a revered
scholar and teacher, he never ceased being a student and activist. He was a student of the times and as such paid careful attention to unfolding events and their social, political, economic, and environmental implications...while supporting radical New Left, feminist, civil rights, ecology, and other movements of the 1960s and 1970s.” Rather than seeing other forms of oppression as merely derivative of or incidental to economic class struggle, a Marcusean approach might emphasize the comingling of different intersections of oppression. Regarding racial capitalism, for example, BRT does not distract from class consciousness or preclude multiracial and multinational solidarities but rather generates exactly the kinds of encounters and solidarities Marcuse advocated for (Walker 2022, 111).

Clyde Woods refuses to lose sight of the specificity of the black experience as lived in and through the blues (2002), while also making room for the way that blues culture has always imbued itself with empowering elements of a wide array of cultural production and in turn has been drawn upon by a wide array of radical social critique across the last century (2002; 2010; 2017). He notes that “The African American identity itself is the product of hundreds of African identities and dozens of African American identities and...movements built upon multiculturalism and diversity are not new” (2010, 42) and that the unique “dilemma posed by the end of slavery times fused these traditions together – multiculturalism and internationalism – to find its very existence. Consequently, the blues became constitutional, transformative, and perpetually expansive” (2017, 35-36). He positions the blues epistemology as the vibrant and politically powerful knowledge system and organic intellectualism of a working-class consciousness and notes that “the very existence of any sort of inequity and inequality
anywhere in a society must be understood as human rights violations…and the cultural production that registers anguish or protest of inequity of any sort must be studied as the same” (ibid.). He studied cultural production in that light and employed the blues epistemology to analyze impoverished and working-class alliances, noting that “those who are marginalized based on their culture, ethnic, race, class, gender, and regional position find this epistemology and its analogic reasoning empowering” (2007, 74). In his analysis, this came to include the perspectives of black people, creoles, indigenous peoples, Latinx, Asian Americans, and queer folks. And those who have extended his analysis have often focused on working-class solidarities across ethnicity, language, and nationality.

Dozier (2019, 183) “utilizes Clyde Woods’s theory and methodology of ‘Blues development’, which describes how Black working-class creative critiques and resistance are a form of development which counters dominant regional planning” in the fight for rights for the homeless and those whose homes are threatened by gentrification. Siener (2022, 372) confirms that the blues “circulate and collectivize already existing critiques of – and everyday resistances to – the material conditions experienced by the working class [and] can uniquely offer insight into the political consciousness of those living in homeless shelters.” And Moulton (2022, 165) cites Woods (along with Roane and Hosbey 2019) in noting that “the critiques by the Black community both challenge dominant representations of historical land-use patterns and memorialize the struggles of working-class Black communities.” Costas Vargas (2012, 5) noted that “Clyde moved with ease from a focus on black culture and life to a multiracial and multiethnic set of

4 I make this argument, based in Woods’s work, in Section IV.3.c of this dissertation.
perspectives” and Serrano (2015, 39) argues that while “the blues spring from the black experience of theft, slavery, and apartheid in the context of US state-building…the subject category of blues person is not ascribed, it is assumed by someone seeking an alternative to the epistemological, ontological, and teleological limits of coloniality/modernity institutionalized in the state…The requirement for affiliation is solidarity with oppressed peoples and opposition to institutions and structures that create and introduce the conditions for oppression.” Osuna (2019) examines such solidarities as they mobilize black and Chicano residents of Los Angeles against police violence, Shapiro (2002) finds them in the shared experiences of immigrants in political borderlands regions, and Schulze-Oechtering (2016) uses the blues epistemology to investigate a unionization and class-action lawsuit effort uniting African Americans and Filipino Americans, finding a “a political culture that viewed self-determination and multiracial solidarity as mutually reinforcing” which “prove that racial boundaries can be crossed, but that they must be crossed” (ibid., 36 & 44). Quiray Tagle (2017) examines a protest movement maintained by solidarities between African Americans, Filipino Americans, and Chinese Americans in the case of a fight against the destruction of a residential hotel in San Francisco. She argues that the poetry of Filipino American activist and artist Al Robles and his blues “imagine nascent and emergent solidarities across differences, based upon a shared disidentification with the spatial logics of late commodity capitalism” (ibid., 101).

Self-Reflexive Critique

In attempting to define critical theory itself, Buchanan (2018, 128-129) notes that it is “a highly reflexive enterprise – it is never satisfied with asking what something
means or how it works, it also has to ask what is at stake in asking such questions in the first place” and it “takes self-reflexivity a step further and asks whether or not its objects of research are not artefacts of the theory.” Likewise, Benhabib (2018) locates the novelty of the Frankfurt’s critical theory (initially via Horkheimer) in “disclosing that the world of social facts is not governed by natural laws but is instead the historical residue of the work of human beings themselves [enabling them] to end the alienation from and enslavement to a social reality that dominates humans.” It is the development of a self-reflexive of the academy itself, arguing that those who research social and cultural phenomena are not merely objective observers of phenomena but are subjects of the system they observe. The Frankfurt School “understood its goal as the transformation of society for the better and the vigilant application of ideological critique to everything, including their own theories” (Felluga 2015, 240-241) and such self-reflexive critique of the role of the academy itself in reifying ideologies – indeed its culpability in suppressing the voices of the oppressed – is a consistent theme running through critical and cultural studies. In One-Dimensional Man, for example, Marcuse evaluates the sort of critique practiced by academic critics imbricated in a one-dimensional society, arguing that “because traditional social science fails to see the socioeconomic system as a totality in which it participates, under the guise of ‘value-free’ science, the approach will necessarily retain ideological biases or assumptions of the given order and subvert the speculative possibilities of an alternative society” (Broner 1982, 146). Indeed, Bronner (ibid., 147) argues that the “emphasis upon the need for reflexivity in the speculative moment of emancipation” places Marcuse’s work in a newer take on Marxist critique and that Marcuse made a “distinction between modalities in the realm of necessity and
reflexivity in the realm of praxis” (ibid.). For Marcuse, it is precisely this self-reflection and self-criticism that leads to a speculative moment which allows us to anticipate conditions for the overthrow of oppression. And “inherent in much of the blues is the self-critical author speaking for a self-critical audience” (Woods 1993, 83).

Woods employed such reflexive critique of academia in his (2002) article on (social) life after (social) death. He indicts geographers (specifically) and academics (generally) for their fascination with examining the corpses of marginalized populations while disregarding the cries of the dying, allowing systematic research into both the causes & effects of societal disease without offering prevention or cure. “The same tools that symbolize hope in the hands of the surgeon symbolize necrophilia in the hands of the coroner. Have we become academic coroners,” he asks us (ibid., 62). “Have the tools of theory, method, instruction, and social responsibility become so rusted that they can only be used for autopsies? Does our research in any way reflect the experience, viewpoints, and needs of the residents of these communities? What role are scholars playing in this social triage” (ibid.)? While such portrayals of racism may be an excellent method for communicating significance, Woods notes that it is a poor method for highlighting the agency of marginalized peoples. His articles connecting the blues to hip hop were critiques of the disciplines of geography as well as history, offering blues geographies (2007) and blues historiographies (2010) as a potential remedies to the problems he pointed to. “It is necessary to choose an ontological and epistemological approach […] that does not further marginalize working-class African American vices or blind their boundless social vision” and Woods (2005, 1008) gestures towards his blues epistemology as an approach to avoiding that pitfall.
The blues epistemology has been employed in the process of reflexive critique most frequently in the context of decolonizing education – professors hired, courses taught, readings assigned, and publications cited. Vaughn (2019, 3), for instance, relies on a blues poetic narrative to “recount [her] struggles and lessons learned in research with blues epistemology and alterity,” using her personal experience of journey through primary, secondary, and collegiate education to voice critique of the way the academia fails so many of its students of color. She cites the concepts of liminality, alterity, and the blues epistemology as foundations for voicing her critique for developing a personal blues methodology with which to overcome. Lewis (2018) offers a similar critique of education and academia. Working through that critique, he notes that “for Woods, the blues necessarily extends beyond its position as a widely recognized musical tradition to a social and economic form of theorization […] by appropriately locating the blues as a tradition of criticism through artistic production” (ibid., 30). He offers the blues epistemology and the BRT as an effective method of decolonizing the curriculum and cautions that “the aim is that this epistemology produces a means of enacting scholarship that is not simply a response to colonial circumstances, but a genuine process of transcending them” (ibid., 31).

**Praxis and Better Futures**

Putting theory into practice to make reality bend to normative philosophy rather than bending political philosophy to supposed reality (Benhabib 2018), praxis is often used as a synonym for resistance and action intentionally undertaken to interrupt the operations of hegemonic value communication and reproduction (Buchanan 2018, 365). “That is, critical theorists seek not only to theorize aspects of a given society but also to
effect practical, political change” (Felluga 2015, 240). The point of critique is to initiate structural change. Without praxis, there is no point to critical theory and “if the value of Critical Theory is how it helps us to change the world, then there is no better time to resuscitate and re-invigorate the emancipatory thinking of Herbert Marcuse” (Walker 2022, 13). While other Frankfurt scholars wrote about praxis, their combination of radical theory and radical practice was, itself, rather theoretical (Farr et al 2013, 407) in comparison to Marcuse. “For Marcuse, oppressive practices and forces must be met with refusal and the production of liberating practices and forces. The deep connection between thinking and acting for Marcuse involves envisioning engagement in emancipatory projects while recognizing the necessary relationship between theory and practice and their mutual dependency” (ibid., 406). Marcuse’s personal politics were guided by his focus on the need for radical activism – a focus that continually updated his sensibilities and established his credibility with younger activists (Walker 2022, 95-111). This a major pillar of Walker’s (ibid.) monograph: to look for the spatial in Marcuse’s theories and to ask how Marcuse’s theories can help us wrestle with spatial concerns – as well as ask how contemporary social theory can help update his theories and look for seeds of sympathy to contemporary theory already planted in his writings and his politics. That project is relevant because there was always something valuable in his work, worthy of updating: “one of the distinguishing features of praxis (as opposed to mere action) is that praxis,” Walker (ibid., 4) argues, “is informed by theoretical considerations. The merger of theory and practice holds the potential to overcome the contradictions of the social order and is thus a keystone of revolutionary activity.” And “Marcuse was exceptional for his political militancy and his commitment to the production of
alternative subjectivities through praxis” (ibid., 5). Woods also takes up that cause and is my reasoning for discussing this point of connection last in this section, before forging a new point of connection through Walker’s own heuristic.

The oppositional politics rooted in reflexive critique and oriented towards liberation and better futures has always been at the root of the blues, and these themes run through all of Woods’s work, positioning him as a spiritual successor of the Frankfurt School without being weighed down with the aspects of their scholarship that we find less resonant today. He famously told us that “the blues are the cries of a new society being born (Woods 1998, 39). That the blues are a “profound working-class knowledge system that became the lifeblood of the people imprisoned on the plantations outside the city – the new ontology, epistemology, and praxis” (2017, 35) and that, with the blues, “we stand at the dawn of a new era of ethnic and social justice” (2002, 66). In an earlier paper I argue that reframing Woods’s theoretical contribution as blues imaginaries are an effective method of employing the blues as both a body of explanation and an engine of change – projects that he framed in a variety of different inflections (ontology, epistemology, agenda, geography, development tradition and many more) and ones that tend to be bifurcated in the secondary literature on the blues epistemology. A critical theme throughout his work, he never engaged in the story of pain without the story of joy, nor without the need to secure the latter and minimize the former by imagining better futures. Contemporary writers still find productive the “endless definitions of freedom” given by his blues tradition (Woods 2005, 1016).

Praxis is a recurring theme in much of the literature that draws upon the blues epistemology – most notably in research that combines the blues epistemology with
analysis of environmental injustice. For example, Moulton and Salo (2022, 166) explore blues epistemologies, black geographies, and black ecologies as a method of performing ecocriticism that is sensitive to BRT and, therefore, “hold the promise of abolitionist futures, ecological justice, and repair at multiple levels.” Moulton previously applied this theoretical perspective empirically in an article (Davis et al 2010) that offers both an extension and critique of the “plantationocene,” a term with currency in environment studies to point to the way humanity has re-shaped our planet (the anthropocene) without placing blame for planetary crisis on all of humanity. They argue that black ecological practices based in black geographies and blues epistemologies “are founded upon a basic understanding that ecological care, multispecies kinship, and social justice are fundamental to the development of a human praxis that promotes well-being. As such, they go beyond theorization and provide some of the “how-to” for realizing this vision” (2019, 10). Gaber (2022) combines the theory of blues epistemology with the empirical research on redlining to offer ‘bluelining’ “to think through the contested assemblages of water, race, and space at the margins of urban life” (ibid., 1073) in a praxis oriented approach which draws upon the blues “not only a genre of music, but as Woods suggests, a cultural genre of critique, resistance, and care” (ibid., 1077). And Ludwig (2021) uses Woods to explore questions about environmental justice by putting forward blues epistemology “as a means of establishing the critical historical consciousness crucial for determining more just futures” (ibid., 231).

The blues are a form of social explanation “that continues to inform daily life, social institutions, and movements” and an ontology and epistemology used to interpret both continuous crises and “attempts to create a new reality that places economic, social,
and cultural justice at its center” while remaining “socially embedded, necessary, and reflective” (Woods 1993, 82-85). They “use several forms of reasoning simultaneously: analogic, symbolic, dialectic, materialist, surrealistic, asymmetric, and utopian.” (Woods 2007, 75). They’ve “fostered utopian and prophetic traditions whose statements on oppression, social justice, love, life, and destiny circulated widely” (Woods 2017, 92). They offer organic intellectuals and students “a constantly evolving language to discuss their freedom dreams, agendas, and plans” (2007, 59). Blues epistemologies have consistently maintained focus on putting theory into the hands of practice to visualize utopic imaginaries and develop better futures. And the fluid dimensions of blues utopic imaginaries constitute the final area I want to explore.

4. A Blues Utopia?

In the fourth chapter of Spatializing Marcuse, Walker (2022) offers a grounded, topological path forward through which to harness Marcuse’s oppositional politics towards better futures through a methodological understanding that utopia is at all times an end point, a beginning point, and everything in between. “Topology,” she argues, “with its language of folding and openness, jolts us out of the ‘is’ into multiple planes of plenitude” (ibid., 57) and her triadic topology frames Marcuse’s utopia in terms of ‘right here, not yet, and over’ – in order to refocus praxis while resisting analysis of utopia as being a process neither settled nor unobtainable. This allows us to see utopia as “at once a powerful instrument of indictment, an antidote to rationality, and an onto-epistemology that explodes spatio-temporal boundaries” (ibid., 58). Her emphasis on the concept of topology in the explication of these aspects of utopian thinking and practice is intended to
imbue them with a geographical thinking that relates, troubles and tears asunder
dichotomous thinking of past/present, distance/proximity, and hierarchized conceptions
of linearity and scale (ibid., 66). In these modes of thinking, both reality and utopia can
never be settled or stable but are always related, overlapping, and in transition. In this
section, I briefly explain the three aspects of this triadic topology and, in turn, excavate
them in the body of the blues epistemology.

_Right Here_

Right Here is the aspect of Walker’s take on Marcuse’s triad used to point to the
fact that the seeds of utopia are always also extent in the fields of oppression. “A linchpin
of the alternative society [Marcuse] envisaged was the stubborn negation of facts billed
as immutable truths” (ibid., 67). These artificially constructed truths are pointed to by
Marcuse as so-called ‘reality’ and are imbricated in our typical, even ontological inability
to see reality outside of what is right here in front of us in which imagining things
otherwise is mere fantasy. Tracing Marcuse’s elaboration of (1) the pleasure principle
(unconscious desires and need for satisfaction), (2) the reality principle (the conscious yet
traumatic repression of such desires for the sake of more ‘practical’ restraint to conform
to societal pressures), and (3) his own performance principle (in which members of a
society are evaluated by their ability to succeed under ‘reality’s’ terms), Walker (ibid.,
59-61) notes that “Marcuse uses one mode of thought in particular, that of phantasy
(imagination), to illustrate the potential for overturning” reality (ibid., 61). It is the reality
principle that makes our daily existences seem not only reasonable/rational but
impossible to see otherwise. And it is in our radical imaginations that we can abandon
dependence on ‘reality,’ see alternative realities and glimpse better futures of pleasure
and gratification (ibid., 62). As Marcuse (1970) noted, “the abstract philosophical
concept of a freedom which can never be taken away suddenly comes to life and reveals
its very concrete truth: freedom is not only the goal of liberation, it begins with liberation;
it is there to be practiced” (published in Kellner 2005, 49 quoted in Farr et al 2013, 414).
Utopia need not be perpetually delayed and relegated to some abstract point in time but
instead is planted in our present in the many possibilities which may emerge in the
negation of reality as intrinsic to our world and the affirmation, rather, that reality is
historically constructed and located, and that utopia is urgent, imminent, and emergent.
Practically, then, right here “signifies the impulse to rupture by pointing to the cracks and
fissures of the limited perspective of the present and disrupting the fallacy of the
inevitability of the status quo” (Walker 2022, 68).

The ruptures Marcuse points to serve as a throughline between the Frankfurt
School more generally, Marcuse’s ideas, and the writing of Clyde Woods. Benhabib
(2018) argues that the “one crucial legacy of a critical social theory that Horkheimer
identified [is that] critical theory of society develops, he said, an existential judgment of a
period which is approaching its end. Critical theory must also be a theory of crises.”
Crisis moments are brief, wherein threats to the status quo expose weaknesses that may
be exploited by a critically infected opposition to change society for the better. Often,
these moments – recession, police violence, environmental disaster – are presented as
temporary abnormalities. As Benjamin (2007, 257) cautioned us, though: “the tradition of
the oppressed teaches us that the state of emergency in which we live is not the
exception, but the rule. we must attain to a conception of history that is in keeping with
this insight” (quoted in Osuna 2019, 78). A longue durée of capitalism reveals these
crises, ruptures, and disjunctions to be the result of deliberate machinations of systematic oppression and inequity.

Woods (2005) appropriated the critical theory of crisis moments into the blues epistemology as ‘blues moments’ to encapsulate the recurring instances in which time and place align to provide a window exposing the innerworkings of intentionally maintained structural inequities. Woods examined bankruptcy era N.Y.C as one such blues moment (2007) and a posthumous anthology chapter examined the housing and policing crisis in Skid Row L.A as another (2017).5 New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina loomed large as the artificial crisis and radical disjuncture – the blues moment – par excellence (2005; 2009a, 2009b, 2009c; 2017) with which Woods showed that Katrina was no ‘natural’ disaster but the result of intentional racist policy over centuries of abuse. “The Katrina crisis provides new epistemologies, theories, methods, policies, programs, and plans for communities confronted by the ‘let them eat cake’ ethic of the neo-Bourbon/neoliberal agenda” (2009b, 448). If unpredictable in their exact form and function, these moments are perfectly predictable in the inevitability of their recurrence, and they disrupt “the molecular structure of a wide array of carefully constructed social relations” (2005, 1005). These ruptures in maintaining the status quo are moments of tragedy that may build bridges to better futures and are always embodied in blues epistemologies.

5 See also Camp, who cites Woods’s blues geographies and blues moments in a paper that precurses Wood’s application of those concepts in the context of housing policy and policing in Skid Row. Camp (2012, 655) notes that “the Blues moment represented by the crisis has compelled artists and activists to struggle over the definition of material conditions” while also connecting Woods’s blues moments to Hall’s (2015 [2010]) conjunctures – itself drawing from Marxism & Critical Theory.
Not Yet

Not Yet is the aspect of Walker’s Marcusean triad that insists upon the emancipatory power of a future glimpsed through refusal to accept the confines of dominant conceptions of reality. “The commitment to hope beyond what appears right before us primes us for the unexpectedly new” and “enfolds the anticipatory strains contained within reality itself into an imaginative ontology” that harnesses hope towards confidence for an unknowable-yet-awaited future (Walker 2022, 64). Walker (ibid., 65) traces, as a partial foundation, this aspect of Marcuse’s ideas to Bloch’s utopian thought, noting that for him, art can serve as not only as a means of describing our world but of explaining it. Fittingly, the second case study (ibid., 70-73) in her topological framing of Marcuse’s utopia looks towards radical, revolutionary art as an explanatory method for revealing different modes of being. A central facet of the organizational goals of a conference serving to construct and solidify Chicano identity consciousness through cultural nationalism “was the explicit inclusion of artists, writers, and musicians who were deemed integral to political activism” (ibid., 71). Walker points out that the 1960s saw a revitalization of art and activism that embraced a politics of difference and found oppositional consciousness within art – a rejection of the reality-based performance of artistry that made space for pleasure-in-freedom and freedom-in-pleasure. Refusal to live life within the dominant conceptions of reality “enacts a new sensibility, perceiving that which is not yet by displacing what is” and the “concrete acting out of the utopian impulse uproots domination in favour of visions of popular sovereignty” (ibid., 72). Enabled by new sensibilities, a transformation occurs in which the distance between right here and not yet collapses across time and space.
“With this in mind, and taking seriously Clyde’s regional geographies and what they teach us about how blues epistemologies develop, consider the following: what do the blues look like in your place and time, or as the Zapatistas might say, your calendar and geography?” (Wright 2019, 3-4). In his explication of racial capitalism and resistance against it over centuries, Woods (See 1998b & 2017) makes three important points. First, capitalist epistemology is reformed and reincarnated across place in time but is the same beast under different names. Bourbonism, feudalism, racial capitalism, plantation capitalism, reconstruction politics, neoplantation capitalism, regional bloc capitalism, industrial capitalism trap economics, asset stripping, debt peonage, mass incarceration, and neoliberalism as aspects of the same, continuously operating system (2017). Second, the blues epistemologies that arise to contest capitalist ideologies leverage crisis moments to inflict systemic harm upon the structures of capitalism. Blues moments and disruptions in which we can peak behind the curtain and see the true artificiality of the reality principle are moments in which we can do real harm to capitalist epistemologies. While we have yet to effect complete overthrow of capitalism or reached utopia, we have consistently struck blows that have reshaped it – and this is the cause of reincarnation. Third, different forms of capitalist epistemologies and different forms of blues epistemologies co-evolve with each other in a “dialectic of Bourbonism and Blues” (2009b, 445. It is a dialectal relationship of contestation and cooptation – the latter is never simply a reaction to the former, and counterculture affects mainstream culture as much if not more so (2017, 62).

Effective resistance exploits crisis and disjunction as a wedge with which to broaden cracks enough to glimpse utopia. “The Black community responded [to neo-
Bourbonism] by using cultural movements to construct distributive networks that were also designed to develop leadership and to support community planning and social movements: societies and benevolent associations; churches, second lines, pleasure and social clubs; brass bands, the Mardi Gras Indians, etc.” as cultural forms through which to develop different ways of being in the world that were illegible to racial capitalism and intuitive to the radical, organic intellectuals of the black working-class (2009b, 436). The blues and its own offers insight into different modes of seeing, knowing, and being in the world that can cut across your calendar and your geography.

*Over*

Over is used to emphasize the idea that utopia – while completely grounded in concrete socio-spatial contexts, achievable within them, and strived for against them – is a completely new set of contexts that are not immediately imaginable. It is an unknowable formation characterized by its negation of the status quo, rather than by an articulable affirmative project. “The lure of utopic thinking” Walker (2022, 73) reminds us, “lies in the possibility of emancipation from the status quo but not in the sense of some forward-pushing motion propelling political beings from here to there – this is precisely the type of onto-epistemological thinking [the triadic topology] intends to disrupt.” Marcuse’s emancipatory oppositional politics refuse to conceive of utopia as the distant-future culmination of linear liberal progress but rather the immediately obtainable product of radical revolution that eschews linearity for simultaneity. Utopia – or utopian thinking – is everywhere, anywhere, and nowhere – as its achievement serves also as its own negation. Just as our ‘reality’ is historically constructed by the residue of the power relations that constructed it, so too is utopia itself constructed within and against specific
power relations – and thus, if utopia is the negation of those power relations, then the
death of those underlying power structures is inherently the death of utopia. “Utopia is a
slippery construct that is difficult to illuminate in advance of its creation – once it has
found its voice, it disappears” (ibid., 75). It is, always, a beginning and never an end.

Woods would frame that beginning as a ‘blues development agenda’ (1998b; 2005; 2007; 2009b; 2009c; 2010; 2017). Concluding a discussion of asset stripping and
political economic immiseration that left the people of New Orleans vulnerable to the
effects of Katrina, Woods (2009c, 791) points out that “challenging the neo-
Bourbon/neoliberal path has proven exceedingly difficult…controlling asset stripping
requires a comprehensive approach to policy reform that ensures the sustainability of
working-class communities and social justice – a blues agenda.” While describing what
the more policy-based initiatives to a redemptive blues agenda might look like, he notes
that these political aspects of the right to the city are not as powerful – do not lead to the
transformation – in the same way as a “socio-spatial and political delinking” that
reframes these rights as a right to return: a right residents have granted themselves (ibid.,
792). “Not all assets are visible and not all assets can be stripped,” and the asset that
exists in the form of revolutionary, utopian thinking is that which brings about truly
“miraculous transformation” (ibid.). He notes that “the growing power of the blues
tradition results from the evolution of the neoplanation development tradition [and]
among the central concerns of the blues tradition of social investigation is the breaking of
the bonds of dependency in all their economic, political, social, cultural, gender, class,
and racial manifestations” (2005, 1009) and that “the blues can be viewed as a permanent
countermobilization against constantly re-emerging” racial capitalism (2007, 58). Again, blue epistemology unfolds in dialectical contestation with racial capitalism.

We don’t know what forms utopia will take, when it will take them, or where it will take them. It is not a linear march of gradual progress but a radical project of emancipation from oppression – a recentering of pleasure over reality or performance. And its realization is its own negation – as utopia is always constructed within and against specific power relations. But just as we cannot know the form of our utopian projects, we cannot know the exact forms racial capitalism will take – we do not know the exact outline of the reality, the status quo, or the bond of dependency our future holds– nor have we ever. But we can know that a miraculous transformation into a blues utopia is one in which the pleasure of music, of dance, and of poetry will always exist for the sake of breaking those bonds, should they exist in any form – because we can know that they will always exist primarily for their own sake.

5. Conclusion

Woods (2007) draws a throughline between lyrics of the blues music produced in the Mississippi Delta during the 1930s and the hip-hop lyrics produced in New York during the 1970s (See also Woods 2010). In both places and times, musicians were able to present a boisterous, happy-go-lucky image of African Americans during times of incredible economic hardship. Referencing a classic song in the blues canon that details a narrator trapped in a web of social destruction amidst the Great Depression, but which nevertheless repeatedly reclaims that the narrator is still ‘sittin’ on top of the world,’ he (ibid., 46) asks “was the author gripped by madness? Or was he rooted in an intellectual
tradition that inherently enabled destitute African Americans to traverse multiple scales of consciousness and space?” He argues, then, that the blues have always been fueled by their “unique combination of tragedy, realism, sensuality, and faith” (ibid. 53, referencing Wright 1960, xii-xv). Throughout his theoretical explications, methodological instruction, and empirical analysis of the blues epistemology, Woods consistently attends to the way the worldview and perspective of those enmeshed in the blues epistemic are illegible to those trapped within hegemonic onto-epistemological thinking. The blues revel in joy without ignoring harsh reality. They provide an expression of justified grief over the diasporic sense of uprootedness and placelessness, but do not crumble into depression or acquiescence. They offer a method for registering protest to personal and societal evils without giving way to pessimism. Critical without being cynical, eschewing the flâneur and the blasé and completely disdaining the stoic, Woods’s blues people provide a fuller and more human perspective than the stock characters of classic social imaginaries. They offer mature yet affable defiance in the face of struggle – defiance that comes from a simultaneous understanding of the possibilities, limitations, doubts, and vitality that must attend truly utopian thinking. And the blues will always be available to offer “its endless definitions of freedom” (2005, 1016).

Clyde Woods positions the blues epistemology as being a contextualized, embodied way of seeing, knowing, representing, and transforming the world that is shared across the diasporic imagination of marginalized groups. These imaginaries are communicated through cultural media in every sense – they are written, read, reproduced, and enacted through cultural production. The blues epistemology is inherently black, but also draws upon different forms of sympathetic ontological perspectives and social-
spatial sensibilities and, in turn, has much to teach those who are willing to find, approach, and learn from the cultural production of the blues tradition – in song, in dance, in poetry, in the visual arts, and in community traditions. Most important, blues imaginaries do not accept the status quo but seek always to change it, accepting setbacks without ever acquiescing. In this, especially, Woods describes a social-spatial sensibility that particularly dovetails with Herbert Marcuse’s own oppositional, emancipatory praxis. And Marcuse’s personal, constantly evolving political sensibilities consistently made room for the radical lessons offered by newer voices – including the transformative solidarities to be found within the Black Radical Tradition. While Marcuse was one of the pioneers of a revolutionary project of critical and cultural theory that Woods is rarely placed directly in the context of, his scholarship is clearly part of that project. Therefore, the philosophy of both Woods and Marcuse is made richer through co-thinking them and putting them into conversation. Woods’s writing revitalizes much of Marcuse’s early works with a greater attention to the production of space and the role of spatialized thinking in both oppression and resistance and his consistently historical and observational analysis ground revolutionary thought in the realm of empirical study. And Marcuse’s thinking centers both theory and politics into an emancipatory praxis that is reviewed in Woods’s historical analysis and always called for yet less developed as future-oriented practice and inconsistently focused upon in the writing of those who perform research grounded in the blues epistemology. Together, they form a fuller, richer perspective from which to think through a truly critical, cultural theory.
SECTION VI. CONCLUSION

I conclude this dissertation by offering a vignette intended to open avenues of study that connect Louisville’s contemporary political and cultural landscape with racial relations and the cultural production of marginalized groups across its history – arguing that the former can be traced to aspects of the latter. Specifically, I trace connections between the racist production of urban spaces in Louisville, public-private development interests in the city, the murder of Breonna Taylor, the protests of that murder that erupted in the city and across the nation in 2020, and the #DefundThePolice movement that was briefly held up as an alternative vision of the future during that year. This vignette is not intended to stand as a thorough analysis of blues epistemologies, but rather is an entry point to future work – what I explicate below envisions possibilities of enacting the theoretical contexts I have discussed conceptually in more explicitly concrete terms. With the three articles explicated across this dissertation as a foundation, I can analyze Louisville’s cultural history and current cultural climate as both counternarrative explanation and alternative visions of the future over the course of a career in blues utopic imaginaries.
In a 2019 essay on the legacy of the Frankfurt School and of critical theory, Seyla Benhabib argues that the “one crucial legacy of a critical social theory that Horkheimer identified is that critical theory of society develops, he said, an existential judgment of a period which is approaching its end. Critical theory must also be a theory of crises.” Crisis moments are brief, wherein threats to the status quo lay bare its artificiality, exposing weaknesses that may be exploited by a critically infected opposition to change society for the better. Often, these moments – recession, police violence, environmental disaster – are presented as temporary abnormalities. As Benjamin (2007, 257) cautioned us, though: “the tradition of the oppressed teaches us that the state of emergency in which we live is not the exception, but the rule. we must attain to a conception of history that is in keeping with this insight” (quoted in Osuna 2019, 78). A longue durée of capitalism reveals these crises, ruptures, and disjunctions to be the result of deliberate machinations of systematic oppression and inequity.

In his exploration of a critical and cultural theory anchored in a black socio-spatial sensibility, Clyde Woods (2005) appropriated the critical theory of crisis moments into his work, reframed as ‘blues moments’ to encapsulate the recurring instances in which time and place align to provide a window exposing the innerworkings of intentionally maintained structural inequities in a racial capitalist system. If unpredictable in their exact form and function, these moments are perfectly predictable in the inevitability of their recurrence, and they disrupt “the molecular structure of a wide array of carefully constructed social relations” (ibid., 1005). These ruptures in maintaining the status quo are moments of tragedy that may build bridges to better futures and are always
embodied in blues epistemologies. Early in his career, Woods examined bankruptcy era N.Y.C as one such blues moment (2007) and a posthumous anthology chapter examined the housing and policing crisis in Skid Row L.A as another (2017). For the bulk of his professional academic career, New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina loomed large as the artificial crisis and radical disjuncture – the blues moment – par excellence (2005; 2009a, 2009b, 2009c; 2017) with which Woods showed that Katrina was no ‘natural’ disaster but the result of intentional racist policy over centuries of abuse. “The Katrina crisis provides new epistemologies, theories, methods, policies, programs, and plans for communities confronted by the ‘let them eat cake’ ethic of the neo-Bourbon/neoliberal agenda” (2009b, 448).

Across late spring and the summer of 2020, Louisville was feeling the weight of two blues moments. Both were felt nationally and globally to varying extents: one which arose acutely which we are still navigating as of 2023, and one that smoldered slowly before flashing brightly but had burnt out in the public discourse by the end of the year. Both, of course, were no sudden or unpredictable crisis: the seeds of their devastation were already present, and there has been no true structural change that would prevent their recurrence. The Covid-19 pandemic of 2020 was a global phenomenon that exposed systematic inequality and uneven vulnerabilities in capitalist systems from the global to the local. And the murder of Breonna Taylor by state-sanctioned violence led to waves of protests against racist policing in downtown Louisville as well as in cities across the region, nation, and globe. As 2020 unfolded, Highsmith (2020) observed that

Local governments are struggling to respond to multiple urgent crises unfolding concurrently. A global pandemic has threatened to overwhelm our public-health infrastructure and necessitated disruptive changes to our daily lives. Those safety measures, combined with the absence of adequate federal support, have displaced
tens of millions from their jobs and created an economic contraction that is already causing unprecedented revenue shortfalls. Masses have taken to the streets to protest the lawless violence routinely inflicted upon black people by unaccountable police.

Banai (2020) notes that the pandemic exposed vulnerabilities of urban systems expansively, but also served as a change agent for many systems. So too does police violence both expose inequities and serve as catalyst for meaningful change – but for true change to happen, violence must be deconstructed in the context of the structures that sustain it. And we must attain to a conception of history that refuses to see Taylor’s death as an exception to otherwise functional institutions. Across the essay that follows, I contextualize Taylor’s death into Louisville’s specific forms of racial capitalism, relying upon Poe and Bellamy’s (2020) journal article as well as local and national news articles published through that year, and I discuss one of the loudest calls for change in the months following her death.

Poe and Bellamy (2020) trace currents of housing injustice, health disparities, environmental injustice, and development directly to the murder of Breonna Taylor. Working with the concept of plantation capitalism they argue that, from the Civil War through to today, economic impetus tied most specifically to housing conflict has more consistently been the cause of racial violence than social, political, criminal, or interpersonal causes in the city. Additionally, they note that Louisville can be contrasted with other cities throughout the South in that Louisville had a much stronger tendency to perform racial violence within legal, state-sanctioned contexts. And rather than fostering within public discourse an image of black people as an irredeemable social class best kept permanently segregated or incarcerated, public discourse shaped by governmental, legal, journalistic, religious, and philanthropic structures promoted an image of black citizens
capable of making steady progress if supported by white society – but who needed occasional policing. Planning and development interests were presented as forces of progress for both the local economy and for black residents that were repeatedly displaced. They (2020, 145) connect that historic perspective to “present day Louisville, where over the past decade the city’s owning class launched multiple real estate and urban greening projects in Louisville’s urban core, culminating in an interest in urban redevelopment and gentrification led by a coalition of philanthropy, private capital and local government” on Louisville’s West End.

The Ninth Street Divide looms large in Louisville’s urban imaginary. A collection of neighborhoods in the city’s urban core immediately to the west of the downtown/central business district, the West End is separately from the East End by the Ninth Street Divide – a street running from north to south, across which even the names of intersecting east-west streets change to reflect the tenor of the divide. “Any Louisvillian who has lived here for more than a few years knows, almost instinctively, the boundary line between west Louisville and the rest of Louisville,” Crutcher et al (2013, 25) explains:

Most white Louisvillians know it because they’ve heard some variation of the warning, “don’t go west of Ninth Street.” They might have heard it when they were moving for town and were looking for a place to live, or from parents or friends concerned about their safety…Although the notion that west Louisville is a dangerous and even foreign place is embedded in the mental map that many of us…carry around in our heads, it is rarely talked about in public. Or rather, one aspect – the regular drumbeat of news about the latest murder that occurred there – are constantly broadcast, but its underlying causes are seldom broadcast.

Louisville is one of the most racially segregated cities in the nation and the West End is the most racially segregated area of Louisville (Wilson 2017; Kent and Frolich 2018). Wright (2004) shows the historical foundation for the entrenched residential segregation
in Louisville – especially in the West End. In many cities, the process of black people moving into white neighborhoods in the inner city spanned years and was fraught with violence. Wright (2004, 106) argues that Louisville largely welcomed Black residents: “black housing was interspersed with white businesses,” they lived on the same blocks, and white people frequently moved into homes previously occupied by black residents. This was not due to some deep-seated antiracist animus, of course: from the perspective of white Louisville, it simply made sense for domestic servants to live near the homes in which they labored (ibid.). To be sure, black Louisvillians were more likely to live in basements, homes facing alleys, and small servant’s quarters within these neighborhoods, but they were never barred from the neighborhoods altogether (ibid., 106-110).

However, segregation increased every decade between the Great Depression and the recessions of the 1970s and only seven other cities encountered worse rates (Cummings and Price 1997, 619). Housing on the West End was often completely dilapidated (ibid.) and “neighborhoods were becoming overcrowded, predominantly black, and relatively powerless compared to other areas” (K’Meyer 2010, 151). While ‘black flight’ took place to some extent in the 1990s, this did not lead to increased integration anywhere, and race is still the primary characteristic distinguishing all neighborhoods in the city (Cumming and Price 1997, 620). All of this continued as the city met with postindustrial decline worse than most in the nation – a transformation that had disproportionate effects upon the city’s black population (ibid., 624-626). The West End is the group of neighborhoods that for two centuries had constituted most of Louisville’s urban core, but which were hollowed out by white flight and demarcated by an enlarged, multi-lane Ninth Street and the renaming of its cross streets (Hudson 2004).
This was a method of psychologically ‘othering’ the West End against the East Louisville that wealthy and white citizens still wished to picture as the city’s downtown (ibid.) and Louisville has come to be characterized by a black core and a white fringe (Cumming and Price, 620). This is the dual racialization of space and spatialization of race: black people are kept out of places seen as valuable and they’re removed from places that are becoming valuable – black people are held in deteriorating places, and places that are predominantly black are allowed to deteriorate (Lipsitz 2007). And Louisville’s West End has deteriorated by most indicators (Hudson 2004; Gilderbloom, Meares, and Riggs 2014; Meares et al 2015; Hanchette, Lee, and Aldrich 2011; Carter 2022). “Viewed altogether,” (Hudson 2004, 27) notes, “the combined effects of mediocre education, economic change…have resulted in the rapid and dramatic growth of one-parent households, usually female headed, usually with children, and usually poor or economically marginal. While poverty has the same relationship to delinquency and crime among young African Americans as among any other group – being black dramatically increases the likelihood of close and adverse encounters with police and the criminal justice system.” And Poe and Bellamy tie hyper policing in the Russel neighborhood directly to development on the West End.

Focusing primarily on the West End’s Russel neighborhood, Poe and Bellamy (2020) track the neighborhood’s history over a century of racial zoning, redlining, institutionalized housing, demolition of black homes and businesses, urban renewal, regeneration, & revitalization, slum clearance, and policing that led to disparities on the West End and within Russell, specifically, across health, education, incarceration, family composition, income, and housing. Next, establishing multiple-generational family links
between current development interests (both corporate and philanthropic) and antebellum fortunes made on tobacco, whiskey, and horses, Poe and Bellamy (2020, 149-151) create a throughline between plantation capitalism and neo-plantation urbanism. Moreover, as these old-monied institutions seek to re-develop Louisville, its West End, and the Russel neighborhood towards their image of a revitalized city – and one they may continue to profit off – they (ibid., 152-153) argue that local government (and especially the Louisville Metro Housing Authority) has been a consistent partner in this project, in the form of loans, grants, and zoning amendments as well as in the form of aiding in the displacement of (largely black) residents of areas ripe for ‘development.’ Specifically, Louisville Metro aided in the enforcement of dispossession through three mechanisms.

First, courts aided in dispossession through eviction judgements, wherein records show that “eviction judgements increased drastically from 2016 to 2017 (138 to 223) despite eviction filings decreasing (401 to 391), suggesting that LMHA pursued a more aggressive eviction policy of targeting lease violations once the relocation process began” (ibid., 154). Second, its local legislative apparatus expanded the grounds upon which a local nuisance ordinance could be enforced in 2018, with a new “list of reasons a property could be considered a public nuisance, including misdemeanor crimes, possession of drug paraphernalia, theft or domestic violence” (ibid., 157). And third, its police department was granted funding to increase surveillance to enforce such ordinances, whereby “expanded police power in surveillance and nuisance abatement resulted in a sharp increase in public nuisance cases, with 84% of those in Louisville’s predominantly Black western half” (ibid.). “However, as interracial social distance narrowed, intra-racial social distance widened—as class divisions grew more pronounced
between the black middle class (and above), on one hand, and the black poor and working poor on the other” (Hudson 2004, 21). This shaped an atmosphere of hyper policing on the West End, full of public video surveillance, patrolling, and no-knock warrants.

Against this backdrop, Poe and Bellamy (2020, 158) note that Louisville Metro Government purchased 22 properties on a three block of stretch of Elliot Avenue in Russell between 2017 and 2020 – a street that included the residence of Jamarcus Glover. Louisville Metro acquired “these properties through foreclosure and outright purchase and using a combination of police terrorism and code enforcement to take properties in key areas of the West End,” it “entered a grant agreement for project management of Elliot Ave” in November of 2019, and in March of 2020 Glover “was placed under surveillance and targeted for the no-knock search warrant that ultimately led to Breonna Taylor’s murder” (ibid.). Public-private development interests operating Louisville under the same plantation capital logics in place for two centuries continue to profit from dispossession of black bodies as it always has and continue to do so through the state-sanctioned mechanisms as it has typically relied in Louisville.

Louisville Metro Police Department (LMPD) officers had already pressured Glover into moving out of his home on Elliot but were still surveilling and investigating him (Bailey, Costello, and Duvall 2020). Taylor had previously dated Glover and based upon continued (but not criminal) ties, they also began to investigate Taylor (ibid.), and commissioned a no-knock warrant to break into her apartment in the St. Andrews neighborhood (Duvall 2020). Taylor’s current partner, Kenneth Walker was sleeping beside Taylor when LMPD executed the warrant – and while LMPD maintained that they
announced themselves on that no-knock warrant, Walker and neighbors denied ever hearing any such notification (ibid.). On 13 March 2020, shortly after midnight, officers broke into Glover’s home with a battering ram – waking up Taylor along with Walker, who fired a gunshot in the direction of what he took to be illegal intruders, striking one officer in the leg (ibid.). Following this, three of the seven officers present fired their weapons a total of thirty-two times, striking Taylor six times, and killing her in her hallway (ibid.). No illegal substances, packages, or money were found in the home (ibid.). And none of the officers who were present on the raid were fired, suspended, or charged in the aftermath (ibid.).

Although the event occurred in March, and the murder of Breonna Taylor typically associated in the public memory with waves of protests that broadened in impact and scope, the first two rallies unfolding in pursuit of justice for her murder did not occur until late in May of that year (Ratterman and Shanahan 2020). Taylor’s family had already been pushing for justice for two months – but it took a national outcry over the death of George Floyd to bring about more widespread public anger over Taylor (Eligon and Wright 2020; Taylor 2020). Floyd was murdered by Minneapolis police officers on 25 May of 2020, and his death caused an international fervor that would envelop the anger over other events of police brutality, be swept up in a larger Black Lives Matter (#BLM) movement and amplify the voices of Taylor’s family (ibid.). There are differences between the two events, of course - but the two murders eventually became co-linked for a brief, emotional moment in history as protests, calls for justice, and calls for police reform were sustained across the summer and fall of 2020.
One difference was that Floyd’s murder was recorded, and that video swiftly went viral. Another is that Taylor was a woman: “the Louisville protests on her behalf after Floyd’s death were belated attempts to rectify and recognize the ways that Black women are rarely the first thought in our outrage over police shootings” (Cooper 2020). In Louisville, fittingly, black women led those protests:

They've been arrested. They've paid to bail others out of jail. They've led marches through Louisville's streets and distributed food to people in need. They've drafted policy changes, disrupted news conferences and, through seven weeks of protests, stayed on message. They want justice for Breonna Taylor. They're Black women who've had enough. Across Louisville, dozens of Black women are stepping into leadership positions. (Loosemore 2020)

On May 28th, 500-600 protesters rallied in downtown Louisville (Sylvestri and Wise 2020). They continued across June (Green 2020), July (Freiman 2020), August (Wolfson), and September (Callimachi et al 2020) – by which point LMPD had arrested over 500 protestors (Wolfson 2020). The three officers who fired their weapons were eventually placed on administrative leave pending a local investigation (Read 2020). They were all charged related to endangering nearby apartment residents, not for shooting Taylor, and only one was indicted – he was also fired (along with one other officer), but later acquitted on the endangerment charges (ibid.). Four officers were accused of civil rights violations (still pending) by the federal Department of Justice for the way they handled both obtaining and seeking the warrant (Oppel, Taylor, and Bogel-Burroughs 2022). The chief of police for Louisville Metro lost his job in the aftermath of the protests (Read 2020), Taylor’s family reached a settlement in a wrongful-death lawsuit against the city (ibid.), and the use of no-knock warrants has been eliminated by Louisville Metro, along with other minor ‘accountability measures’ for LMPD (Oppel, Taylor, and Bogel-Burroughs 2022; Eligon and Wright 2020). In July of 2020, “the legal
team in Breonna Taylor’s case filed court documents alleging that the search warrant that was issued for her house originated as part of an LMPD effort to aid in the gentrification of Louisville’s West End neighborhoods” (Poe and Bellamy 2020, 157). And in December of 2022 Mayor Greg Fischer – the same mayor presiding over the same administration that battled and arrested protesters for over five months two years previously (Eligon and Wright 2020) – unveiled “a new historical marker recognizing the 2020 protests that followed the police killing of Breonna Taylor…at Jefferson Square Park, a central location for the demonstrations” (Stultz 2020).

But the protestors at Jefferson Square Park and across the nation had a different vision for urban policing. One that was positioned in radical opposition to the liberal project of reform. A vision that centered the specificity of black vulnerability to state-sanctioned violence while crafting an alternative future that would better serve all marginalized peoples. Their vision was not simply the investigation of a few individual police offers, the mild reorganizing of one police department, or the simple, gradual reform of police policy like the suspension of no-knock warrants or a greater focus on body cameras in the use of police patrolling. Their vision was not linear reform, but a fundamental break from the status quo.

During those protests, ‘defund the police’ became a rallying cry of anger over the police killings of black Americans (Balsamo 2020). It was a “more radical option, one scrawled on cardboard signs and tagged on buildings and flooding social media” (Lowrey 2020). As Wortham (2020) explains, the cry first came from the Black Visions Collective, a “political and community base for Black people in Minneapolis [that] regularly orchestrates rallies…focusing on police violence in particular and taking care to
contextualize it within a broader system of racism.” After Floyd’s death put Minneapolis
onto the national stage,

the immediate priority for Black Visions members became to publicly pressure
city officials on defunding the local Police Department. They had been working
on it privately for years, and Floyd’s death only accelerated the urgency. Offline,
they were holding nightly calls with City Council representatives, sending them
research materials and enlisting allies to do the same, all in an attempt to persuade
them that reforms were no longer adequate — an entirely new system needed to
be imagined. (ibid.)

In public meetings, the Collective would play rap protest songs like 33 by noname, a
song released in 2020 denouncing racial injustices, and they partnered with the Million
Artists Movement as well as local activists and artists (ibid.). Within a week of Floyd’s
death, ‘defund the police’ was taken up by the organizational webpage for Black Lives
Matter, as a memo on the page gave notice that “We call for an end to the systemic
racism that allows this culture of corruption to go unchecked and our lives to be taken.
We call for a national defunding of police. We demand investment in our communities
and the resources to ensure Black people not only survive but thrive (Black Lives Matter
2020). From there, the call was taken up by a wide array of organizations and cities
(Balsamo 2020; Wortham 2020; Sadon 2020; Yglesias 2020; Villas 2020; Lowrey 2020).
And the “rallying cry spread across American cities” (Villa 2020). At the height of the
protests, a majority of the members of the Minneapolis City Council supported
disbanding their police department – the department involved in the murder of George
Floyd (Balsamo 2020; Wortham 2020; Slater 2020). And the movement was one that
leaders of America’s largest urban centers had to grapple with – as did prominent
politicians on the national stage during the 2020 elections and in the time since (Balsamo
2020).
The demonstrations in 2020 were sparked by incidents “of police misconduct so egregious that most everyone in American politics has denounced it” (Yglesias 2020). Blues moments are easy to denounce – crises serve as disruptions of the status quo that are incredibly visible, even to those who typically fail to pay attention. Using Google.com’s trends statistics as a rough gauge for global search interest, interest in Breonna Taylor peaked twice, in the first week of June and second week of September of 2020, and has been flatlined ever since, while ‘defund the police’ peaked in the second week of June, trailed off through to the first week of February of 2021, and has flatlined ever since. Using Newspapers.com’s archival tool to examine local journalism, one finds that Breonna Taylor was mentioned in 923 articles in the Courier-Journal during 2020. This fell by half to 483 articles in 2021, by half again to 227 in 2022, and was reduced down to just 8 articles in 2023 – as of my search, in mid-March. Discussed in the Courier-Journal less than in national news, mentions of ‘defund the police’ also fell precipitously over that period. This blues moment and the coincident surge for structural change held sway in the public discourse for less than a year. When events like the death of Breonna Taylor capture our attention through new outlets, social media, and protests, they are impossible to ignore and leave us with two general options. We can pretend that they are abnormalities – exceptional, singular cases that we can adjust for by issuing mild reform measures in hopes that they don’t reoccur. Or we can think through new futures in which recipes for disaster no longer exist because we have eliminated the toxic ingredients. “Abolitionist organizers that have long urged jurisdictions to unwind their punishment infrastructure are not simply shouting empty slogans; they have proposed specific steps—and alternative systems—that we could adopt today” (Highsmith 2020).
The death of Breonna Taylor was not an aberration. It was part and parcel of the status quo – the result of two centuries of racial capitalism that allowed profiting through racialization and resulted in uneven development, police violence, and premature death.

As the words ‘defund the police’ permeated public discourse, many protestors, pundits, politicians, policy experts, and journalists would argue about exactly what they meant – some claiming that ‘defund’ means simply to reallocate police funding to different aspects of policing, or to reallocate city budgets to strengthen other public health projects that may serve to reduce the need for policing (Balsamo 2020; Yglesias 2020; Highsmith 2020; Brooks 2020). As Yglesias (2020) noted, “a three-word slogan is not a detailed policy agenda, and not everyone using the slogan agrees on the details.” And Slater (2020) asks us, “how do we parse out the difference between a movement for, say, the abolishment of stop-and-frisk policies, versus a movement to dismantle police forces altogether?” But the Black Visions Collective – and Black Lives Matter along with them – have always maintained that the words are quite literal and mean an abolishment of police departments (Wortham 2020; Highsmith 2020). Moreover, and to be clear, activists have been calling for the abolishment of police departments before the summer of 2020, and they are still calling for it. We don’t know what that future will look like. But we do know that the change necessary to bring about that future exists right here, at hand – and we need to collectively demand it. “When you talk to activists who are pushing to defund police departments, there’s a specific word that comes up often: Reimagine” (Villa 2020). This is not a new call – and it is as vital as ever.
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