

A Discussion of the Explanations of Gentrification — Focusing on Ley's and Smith's Works in the 1980s

Pillsung Byun*

Abstract : Gentrification, the revitalization of inner city areas, encompasses both the changes in social and demographic composition and the alterations in the physical and economic nature of built environment. This urban phenomenon has received the bulk of attention since the 1970s, and simultaneously provided one prominent stage for the theoretical or ideological debates in the field of urban geography. Given this context, this paper deals with the consumption-based and production-based approaches to gentrification, both of which are involved in such debates. Specifically, this paper critically reviews and evaluates David Ley's and Neil Smith's explanations representing the two approaches, respectively. On the basis of the two urban geographers' seminal works published in the 1980s, this paper discusses the limitations of each explanation as a partial explanation.

Key Words : Gentrification, Inner city, Consumer preference, Rent-gap

1. Introduction

Since the 1970s, the revitalization of declining inner city areas in the major cities of North America has been strengthened. In this process, urban poor neighborhoods of inner city areas have been transformed into middle-class neighborhoods, socially, economically, and physically. This new urban spatial

change amid a long-standing suburbanization is called 'gentrification'.

The definition of gentrification usually has two aspects. It encompasses both the changes in social and demographic composition (i.e., immigration of new middle-class households into an inner city) and the alterations in the physical and economic nature of built environment (i.e., physical redevelopment and

* Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Geography and Regional Development, University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

rehabilitation as capital investment; rise in land prices and changes in housing ownership) occurring in deteriorating inner city areas. The question of which aspect is underlined, the social and demographic changes or the physical and economic alterations in built environment, differentiates between two competing approaches to gentrification — the consumption-dominant explanation vs. the structural Marxist or production-dominant explanation.

Based on these two approaches, there have been many studies since the 1970s. As Hamnett (1991) points out, although gentrification is smaller and narrower than post-war suburbanization in scale and range, gentrification has received the bulk of academic attention for the following reasons (Hamnett, 1991):

First, gentrification has opened a new epoch in the urban history of advanced countries. It has been considered a key feature of metropolitan restructuring after the 1970s. Second, gentrification has a significant implication for urban politics. It has caused the political issues (e.g., displacement of urban working class) which mainly concern the struggle for control over urban neighborhoods — the conflicts between the neighborhoods' use and exchange values. Third, gentrification symbolizes a big challenge to the traditional theories of residential location and urban spatial structure. Specifically, the urban phenomenon contradicts the account of downward filtering process, the evolutionary explanation that suburbanization is the final stage of

transition from the pre-industrial city to the industrial city. And, gentrification conflicts with Alonso's urban land market theory emphasizing the preference for space and low densities over the accessibility to a central city. Fourth, in urban geography, gentrification has also occupied one prominent stage for the theoretical or ideological debates between the consumption-dominant and the production-dominant approaches. The former underscores consumer demand, preference, culture, and human agency, and the latter emphasizes capital accumulation logic and capitalist social structure.

This paper concerns the fourth point. I critically review and evaluate David Ley's studies epitomizing the consumption-based approach and Neil Smith's works representing the structural Marxist or production-based approach. Especially, this paper focuses on the two scholars' seminal works published in the 1980s. The reason is that most of Ley's and Smith's influential works on gentrification appeared in that period. Significantly, there was the debate between Ley and Smith in *Annals of the American Geographers Association* published in 1987. The debate shows critical elements of the two competing approaches, on the basis of the two scholars' 1980s works. My critical review and evaluation targets the limitations that each approach has as a partial explanation of gentrification. For a comprehensive explanation, this paper addresses the need to focus on the agents directly involved

in built environment production, along with social relations and local conditions.

2. Post-Industrial Society and the Consumption and Culture of New Middle-Class

1) Inner City Revitalization in Vancouver — Ley's Works in 1980 and 1981

Ley (1981) discusses the inner city gentrification in Vancouver, Canada, using census data of the 1970s. He identifies that new middle-class — the university-educated residents engaging in the quaternary sector and having relatively high income and small household size — continued to immigrate into the inner city neighborhoods with good amenities (Ley, 1980; Ley, 1981). Simultaneously, he finds the physical redevelopment in the form of condominium development occurring in the neighborhoods.

Ley (1981) concludes that the gentrification in Vancouver was attributable to the new middle-class's demand for the amenities of the Vancouver inner city neighborhoods within the context of post-industrialization. According to Ley, the amenities include recreational and retail facilities allowing for differentiated consumption, and ethnic and architectural diversity. With respect to the gentrification in Vancouver, Ley attaches secondary importance to roles of built environment sector. Clearly,

Ley (1981) considers the investment and development activities by real estate businesses in the transformation of some inner city neighborhoods. Furthermore, he points out the flow of international and domestic capital into the real estate development in the Vancouver inner city during the early 1970s. However, he asserts that such activities of real estate industry were stimulated by post-industrialization and the resulting expansion of new middle-class (Ley, 1981).

Significantly, Ley does not discuss the issue of why the new middle-class expanding in Vancouver had preferences for the inner city amenities. Regarding this issue, Ley (1980) only suggests that professional, technical, or managerial workers with relatively high income and market power show cultural orientation toward individual consumption, aesthetics, and the amenities supporting such consumption. From his argument, it is inferred that many new middle-class people immigrated into the Vancouver inner city because their needs for the amenities were satisfied by inner city living. Nonetheless, origins of such needs for the amenities have to be explained. With respect to this, Bourassa (1993) criticizes the demand-sided approach to gentrification for not explaining where the preferences underlying consumer demand for gentrification comes from. In addition, how new middle-class's needs for the amenities are satisfied in inner city areas should be explained. But, Ley assumes that such needs are automatically satisfied,

without any consideration of housing (re) development in inner city neighborhoods.

2) "Alternative Explanation for Inner City Gentrification" — Ley's Work in 1986

For a generalized explanation of gentrification, Ley (1986) performs statistical analyses on gentrification by using census-tract-level data of the 22 Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) of Canada in the period, 1971-1981. He condenses a wide variety of accounts on gentrification into four hypotheses, and defines gentrification operationally.

Ley's 'gentrification index' operationalizes gentrification only as the rise in average household status within an inner city, irrespective of the physical and economic features of an inner city housing market.¹⁾ Specifically, the gentrification index is confined to the change in social status index for the period of 1971-1981. This social status index is calculated by the percentages of the employees engaging in the quaternary sector (occupation indicator) and of the population who attained university education (education indicator) in each census tract.²⁾ Certainly, Ley insists that such information on housing market activities as housing price changes, building permits, and renovations was considered for his study. However, he admits this information was not available for all the census tracts of an inner city within each CMA. In response to Ley's narrow definition of gentrification, Smith (1987a) argues

that gentrification is the combination of changes in social composition of residents, existing housing stock, and housing and land markets. According to Smith (1987a, 462), "... upper-middle-class immigrants to a run-down neighborhood do not move into slums; they fix them up, or they move into buildings fixed up or newly built. This involves capital investment in neighborhoods."

The four hypotheses which Ley presents are about demographic changes, housing market dynamics, urban amenities, and shifts in urban economic base. All of them are operationalized by 35 variables. Some problems are inherent in the operationalization processes of the variables.

First, Ley evidently misunderstands the implications of the rent-gap. He argues he has made use of Smith's rent-gap by employing such variables as the house value ratio and the rental cost ratio of an inner city to the CMA for the housing market hypothesis. Regarding the rent-gap, Ley (1987) insists that his unique rent-gap between an inner city and suburbs is reasonable, and assert that Smith has treated an inner city and suburbs as part of a systemic whole. However, according to Smith (1979), the rent-gap is the disparity between capitalized ground rent actually appropriated by landowner under the current land use and potential capitalized ground rent from the best use of the land. Stated otherwise, it does not represent a geographical disparity in rent level or housing value. More importantly,

Ley's operationalization of rent-gap has omitted the nature and historical pattern of capital accumulation in built environment — investment, disinvestment, and reinvestment in urban areas — on which Smith bases the rent-gap.

Second, as Ley admits, since the indicators for urban amenities of an inner city were not available, the variables representing a whole CMAs' amenities were used in his research. It may be only a minor problem related to data availability but may lower the reliability of Ley's research because of his emphasis on new middle-class's preference for inner city amenities.

Finally, the economic hypothesis is about the changes in urban economies — post-industrialization — of the 22 CMAs. But the variables representing the hypothesis are insufficient. Four of the variables are related to household income, and the other three variables are related to the general economic performance in each CMA like GDP growth rate.

Ley (1986) has performed a simple correlation analysis on each of the 35 variables (operationalizing the four gentrification hypotheses) with the gentrification index. Then, he has undertaken principal component and regression analyses. Based on the results of statistical analyses, Ley concludes as follows: the economic transition toward office-based service economy in the Canadian cities, post-industrialization, has drawn professional and managerial employees of the quaternary sector, new middle-class, into urban cores.

Some segments of this group have predilection and political articulation for inner city amenities. Accordingly, inner city areas have been revitalized and restructured by these potential gentrifiers.

Yet, Ley's conclusion has some limitations. First of all, as mentioned earlier, some variables employed to draw his conclusion are not sufficient. For example, variables on urban amenities fail to reflect amenities of inner city neighborhoods. Second, the key question of where new middle-class people's preferences for inner city amenities enabling differentiated consumption originally come from has yet to be answered. Third, how such needs for inner city amenities are gratified has to be discussed. If housing (re)development that targets the potential gentrifiers' preferences for urban amenities and related lifestyle did not unfold in inner city neighborhoods, the people could not immigrate into the neighborhoods, and more demand for inner city living would not be stimulated.

3. Rent-Gap Thesis and Capital Accumulation in Built Environment Production

- 1) "A Back to the City Movement by Capital, not People" — Smith's Work in 1979

Smith (1979) doubts that consumer preference

emphasized in the existing neo-classical or consumption-based approach³⁾ explains gentrification. Clearly, he warns that consumption, preference, or demand should not be automatic effects generated by production. And he accepts that Ley's post-industrial thesis is broad enough to deal with gentrification in international terms. Nevertheless, he points out that the consumption-based explanations are self-contradictory because individual consumer preferences have to be changed in unison for a general explanation on gentrification.⁴⁾ Instead of individual consumer preferences, he presents a collective social preference. More significantly, he emphasizes the symbiosis between production and consumption, where the former dominates. He argues that only the final forms of gentrified areas depend on consumer preference and demand. Simply put, no matter how significant consumer preference and demand are, gentrification cannot be realized without capital investment in inner city housing stock and profitability for the investment.

Presenting the rent-gap thesis, Smith contends that the structural logic of capital accumulation in built environment production explains gentrification. The structural logic creates the objective economic condition for gentrification, i.e., the physical deterioration and economic devaluation in inner city areas, by accelerating suburbanization since the 1950s. Under the condition, the rent-gap becomes wide, and it can ensure developers satisfactory profits for

investment in inner city areas. In short, though not explicitly, Smith connects the rent-gap to uneven development over urban space and locational switching of capital investment, both of which reflect the nature and history of capital accumulation in built environment production.

Additionally, Smith (1979) states that developers and financial institutions as significant players initiate gentrification collectively. This means that he considers production-side agents. However, Smith describes such agents only as transmitters of signals from structural forces to concrete urban space. This is evident in Smith's argument that gentrification occurs when the rent-gap becomes large enough to guarantee sufficient profits to developers by the structural logic and historical pattern of capital accumulation. Given this context, the possibility that developers will not initiate gentrification despite the wide rent-gap is excluded.

To sum up, in his 1979 work, Smith uses the rent-gap thesis to explain gentrification. He argues that the structural logic and historical pattern of capital accumulation in built environment and the resulting operations of urban housing and land sub-markets generate gentrification. Concurrently, he dismisses importance of consumption-sided factors.

However, Smith shows some confusion in the 1979 study. First, he asserts that occupier developers, actors who buy and redevelop property and inhabit it after completion, are

more significant for gentrification because of the fragmented structure of property ownership in inner city neighborhoods. Occupier developers differ from landlord or professional developers in that occupier developers do not seek profits but pursue their own lifestyle and increases in asset values. This could mean that Smith accepts indirectly the active roles of possible gentrifiers with respect to gentrification, which he continues to dismiss. In addition, this confusion presents that gentrification can be performed by occupier developers even if the rent-gap is not widened.

Second, he also treats a government as a significant actor to create the conditions (e.g., assembly of many fragmented pieces of land) where developers could reap high profits for redevelopment and rehabilitation in an inner city. Given this, even if the rent-gap is not sufficiently broadened for professional or landlord developers to perform investment activities, gentrification can occur with the help of a local government. This possibility is inconsistent with Smith's emphasis on the structural logic of capital accumulation in built environment production.

2) "Gentrification and Uneven Development" — Smith's Work in 1982

Smith formulates a structural Marxist theoretical framework for gentrification in his 1982 work. Specifically, he relates gentrification to uneven development over urban space under

capitalism. He argues that gentrification is the leading edge of uneven development which provides momentum for various factors — demographic, economic, social, and cultural — encouraging gentrification. More importantly, he underlines three aspects of uneven development — 'equalization and differentiation,' 'valorization and devalorization,' and 'capital switching.'

With respect to equalization and differentiation, Smith asserts that equalization (e.g., suburban development) and differentiation (e.g., inner city decline) of ground rent level by capital investment in built environment represents uneven development over urban space. Moreover, equalization and differentiation are simultaneous with valorization and devalorization. The discussion of valorization and devalorization more directly elaborates on uneven development between inner city areas and suburbs. Since capital invested in built environment is structurally tied up in a specific form for a long period, such capital investment poses a big barrier to new development like redevelopment and rehabilitation, and as a result, continuous devalorization occurs. Such restless devalorization in one area has engendered the condition for valorization in other areas. For example, suburbanization has unfolded on a large scale while inner city built environment has been devalued to the extent that the rent-gap opens up. In this process, unevenness of development over urban space is manifested. Third, Smith presents capital switching as an

underlying process behind 'equalization and differentiation,' and 'valorization and devalorization.' Capital switching unfolds between sectors (e.g., property boom due to influx of capital into built environment sector) or between geographical areas (e.g., inner city revitalization, whose substantial part is gentrification) for profits, and leads to urban spatial restructuring. Such restructuring is embodied in gentrification. In other words, gentrification is part of a larger redevelopment process dedicated to the revitalization of profit rate (Smith, 1982: 151). In short, gentrification represents the restructuring of urban space by capital switching.

In summary, Smith (1982) attempts to develop a structural Marxist theoretical framework of gentrification. Concretely, he attributes gentrification (and suburbanization) to uneven development over urban space and capital switching, which represent the structural logic of capital accumulation in built environment. For this reason, the agents involved in production of urban built environment fail to be considered in his framework.

3) Recognition of an Integrated Explanation — Smith's Works in 1986 and 1987

Smith (1986; 1987b) attempts to make an integrated explanation of gentrification by acknowledging the values of key factors that are stressed in the consumption-based approach. But, he dismisses the factors as secondary.

Smith (1986) recognizes that an integrated explanation is needed in order to elucidate causes of gentrification. He presents factors for gentrification: (1) suburbanization and the emergence of rent-gap; (2) the deindustrialization of advanced capitalist economies and the growth of white-collar employment; (3) the spatial centralization and simultaneous decentralization of capital; (4) the falling rate of profit and the cyclical movement of capital, and; (5) the demographic transition and the changes in consumption pattern. Here, it should be noted that Smith attempts to encompass key factors of the consumption-sided approach, such as post-industrialization, the demographic transition, and the changes in consumption pattern, for an integrated explanation. The problem is how much importance he attaches to them, however. Post-industrialization and the resulting concentration of white-collar managerial and professional activities at urban cores, the demographic changes, and the new urban lifestyle are recognized only as explanatory factors of the specific form that gentrification takes, not causes of gentrification. He just ends up with making a list of factors, although he says that the explanation should be a consideration of each factor's relative significance and relations to other factors, not a simple enumeration of factors. Thus, Smith's attempt for an integrated explanation is meaningful only in the sense that his list includes some key factors of the consumption-based approach. Nevertheless, Smith

(1987b, 163) feels it necessary to integrate the production-based and the consumption-based approaches “in the notion that production and consumption are mutually implicated.” Smith (1987b) focuses on a critical issue of why the inner city areas that failed to meet middle-class's needs and were abandoned for a long time attract the people. Regarding this question, Smith examines the significance that social restructuring could occupy with respect to gentrification. He summarizes social restructuring as the centralization of managerial and professional employment into urban cores, new middle-class's high income and spending power, and the increase of women in labor power and in upper-level income group. These changes are considered as ‘enabling conditions’ for gentrification (Smith 1987b). However, he argues social restructuring cannot answer the question of why gentrification occurs. Instead, he asserts that the rent-gap reflecting the nature and historical pattern of capital accumulation in built environment production makes social restructuring implicated in gentrification (Smith 1987b). Although Smith defends the rent-gap thesis as “a necessary centerpiece -at theory of gentrification” (Smith, 1987b: 165), the rent-gap is also only another enabling condition like social restructuring. In this regard, he acknowledges that the rent-gap presents only an opportunity for gentrification. Given this, Smith addresses shifts in mode of consumption under capitalism. He recognizes the influence of the shifts in consumption mode

on production of urban space, which is well illustrated in ‘demand-sided urbanization,’ i.e., post-war suburbanization. But, he attributes the influence of consumption on urban spatial restructuring (e.g., gentrification) to the transition in regime of accumulation (Smith, 1987b). Particularly, the restructuring of production, as a response to the over-accumulation crisis faced by the Fordist regime, has reshaped and reorganized consumption mode. For example, the mass-consumption under the Fordism which loosened social differentiation notably, working-class's ownership of housing and automobiles. Equally, given the reorganization of consumption mode generated by the shift from the Fordism to the new regime of capital accumulation, gentrification has emerged as a part of the spatial configuration of such reorganization, i.e., a socially polarized city. This process signifies “the re-differentiation of the cultural, social, and economic landscape” where “new middle-class individuals can differentiate themselves from capitalists above and working class below” (Smith, 1987b: 168).

Certainly, Smith relates gentrification to the shift in accumulation regime which is considered a solution to the over-accumulation crisis. Therefore, he consistently tries to explain gentrification on the basis of the structure of capital accumulation in built environment production, although he attaches more importance to social restructuring and consumption than in his previous works.

4. Critical Evaluation and Summary

1) Consumption-based Explanation of Gentrification — Ley's Works

Ley attempts to base his explanation of gentrification on post-industrialization and new middle-class as potential gentrifiers who are characterized by peculiar cultural preferences. In more detail, post-industrialization creates the growth of white-collar professional and managerial workers⁵⁾ who engage in the quaternary sector at urban cores. This group is also oriented toward the lifestyle where individuality, aesthetics, and urban amenities are underscored, and has formed market demand for the gentrification of inner city areas.

But, Ley's explanation is not sufficient. First, Ley does not deal with either where new middle-class's needs for the lifestyle based on differentiated consumption and the urban amenities supporting such consumption comes from or how their needs are gratified in an inner city. Instead, he continues to stay only at the broad-level societal change post-industrializing trends and the rise of new middle-class with a new consumption culture. In this regard, what Mullins (1982, 53; cited in Hamnett, 1991: 182) points out should be noted. He says, "[t]he development of office employment cannot wholly explain the residential increase of inner city educated labor

simply because the bulk of these workers reside in the suburbs and commute." Knox (1991) traces new middle-class group's cultural orientation toward differentiated consumption and related urban amenities to the background of the group's maturation and to postmodernism as a socio-cultural change. They, as members of the baby boom generation, were grown under the "forced democratization and egalitarianism of taste" (Harvey, 1989: 80; cited in Knox, 1991: 184) by modernist culture. For this reason, they were in favor of the anti-modernist cultural movement where self-actualization was underscored. Given this, their needs for individuality and diversity have been created. And, they have had demand for the amenities allowing for individuality and diversity. These needs have also been promoted by postmodernist culture where the mode of differentiated consumption symbolizes and maintains social differentiation. Moreover, Knox asserts that new middle-class has been targeted by real estate industry, and the group has pursued their differentiated consumption and related amenities through the new residential setting provided by such industry, notably, inner city upscale housing and privately master-planned suburban communities. But, Ley does not focus on roles of real estate businesses with respect to the potential gentrifiers' pursuits of their lifestyles and underlying preferences.

Second, the area to be gentrified is only given as a premise, and gentrification is narrowly defined as the change in social and

demographic composition of inner city neighborhoods. Due to this limitation, Ley's explanation fails to consider role of real estate industry and dynamics of inner-city housing and land markets.

In summary, regarding gentrification, Ley concentrates only on the broad-level social, economic, and cultural processes in urban areas — post-industrialization and the emergence of new middle-class with unique lifestyle and cultural preferences. For this reason, he pays little attention to agents involved with gentrification, especially, roles of production-side agents. Additionally, he confines his discussion of gentrification to its social and demographic aspect. It follows that Ley's analyses provide a consumption-based but partial explanation of gentrification.

2) Production-based Explanation of Gentrification — Smith's Works

Smith stresses the structural logic of capital accumulation in built environment production.⁶⁾ Significantly, he presents the rent-gap as an integral part of his production-dominant approach in order to explain which neighborhood within an urban area has been or is likely to be redeveloped. He bases the concept on the structural logic and historical pattern of capital accumulation, focusing on the post-war suburbanization since the 1950s and associated decline of inner city areas. Capital has flown out of inner city areas into suburbs, and

simultaneously, devaluation of property in inner city neighborhoods has restlessly been deepened. As a result, the rent-gap is widened in inner city areas. This gap signals more attractive investment opportunities to capital flowing into suburban areas. Consequently, these opportunities have caused capital to return to inner city areas. In short, the rent-gap epitomizes uneven development over urban space and capital switching, which structural Marxists regard as the structural processes for urban spatial restructuring under capitalist economies.

To be sure, Smith (1986; 1987b) attempts to integrate the consumption-sided approach into his explanation. But, fundamentally, he sticks to his production-dominant approach which predicates on the rent-gap thesis and the structural logic of capital accumulation in built environment production. He regards key factors of the consumption-based approach only as the determinants explaining the surface forms of gentrification (Smith, 1986). Moreover, based on Aglietta's regulationist approach, he describes gentrification as the consumption and product differentiation by the sector of built environment production, given the post-Fordist regime of accumulation (Hamnett, 1991; Smith, 1987b).

However, Smith's explanation of gentrification has some limitations. First, his rent-gap thesis seems economically deterministic. Thus, it ignores the voluntary aspect of human agency within structural constraints. Clearly, Smith

(1987a) acknowledges that local institutions of inner-city housing and land market, local specific conditions, and possible consumers' views complicate timing and place in which gentrification occurs. But, specific agents' actions, which are relatively independent of structural constraints and can influence the possibilities of gentrification generated by structural forces, are reduced to an ambiguous collective social action.

Second, the rent-gap can talk about only the possibility of a certain neighborhood's being under redevelopment and rehabilitation. For this reason, the rent-gap is only the necessary condition for gentrification, not the sufficient condition (Hamnett, 1991).⁷⁾

In summary, Smith's production-dominant explanation of gentrification focuses only on the structure and history of capital accumulation in the making of built environment, which the rent-gap thesis represents. However, the rent-gap only provides possibility of gentrification and overlooks roles of agents within social relations under local conditions. In this respect, Smith's work is a production-based but partial explanation.

5. Concluding Remark: Towards a Comprehensive Explanation

As discussed above, the consumption-based and the production-based approaches provide partial explanations of gentrification. The supply of gentrifiable property by the struc-

tural logic and historical pattern of capital accumulation in built environment production, and the growth of possible gentrifiers given the macro-level processes of post-industrialization and related social, cultural, and demographic changes are not more than the necessary conditions for gentrification.

The key to a comprehensive explanation should be a consideration of the roles and interests of agents involved in urban spatial change, especially production-side agents participating in production of gentrifiable housing and inner city redevelopment. The consideration of production-side agents like property development businesses should encompass not just local conditions which mediate, filter, and even refract macro-level structural process but also social relations where the agents are placed.

It cannot be denied that consumers' demand, preference, and related political articulation may have important effects on gentrification. Yet, no matter how significant roles consumers play, gentrification cannot be realized without any concrete investment activities of the agents directly active in built environment production. In reality, urban spatial restructuring is embodied in real estate development and related various decision-making processes. It should be noted that production-side agents like developers and growth coalitions have secured leading roles in the redevelopment of the North American inner city areas during the past two decades. Additionally, production

(or supply) not only follows consumption (or demand) but also generates it.

More importantly, such production-side agents' roles in urban development are influenced by locally specific conditions, and can be performed only within social relations among various agents. Here, social relations mean social interplay of production-side agents with other agents, including consumption-side agents. Since such agents are not atomistic, they can pursue their interests involved in built environment production only within the social relations. Local conditions can encompass local culture and value system, together with local political structure and processes. They influence all the agents' interests and actions by mediating, filtering, and refracting structural forces of capitalist society. And they are used and even transformed by local agents. In relation to this point, Wilson's discussion (1991) of local filters in urban spatial change is worth noting in order to complement the partial explanations of gentrification. According to him, at the local level, social norms, political practices, and key individuals' interpretation of landscape filter the structural influence of macro-level processes to be transmitted to the agents involved in neighborhood changes.⁸⁾

In conclusion, production-side agents implicated in social relations with other agents under a locally specific condition should be a starting point for a comprehensive explanation. Either Smith's or Ley's explanation does not cover agents, social relations, and local con-

ditions. Without consideration of production-side agents, Ley focuses on post-industrialization and the associated growth of new middle-class as broader processes. Even Smith who emphasizes the production-dominant approach only concentrates on the structure of capital accumulation in built environment production, and only mentions the role of the capital as an abstract concept. A comprehensive explanation has to be the basis for explaining the realities articulated in urban specific areas with which local agents within social relations given local conditions are involved.

Notes

- 1) However, in his previous research, Ley recognizes that "gentrification implies both social up-filtering and physical renovation" (see footnote 1 in Ley, 1981: 145).
- 2) In more detail, social status index of every census tract within an inner city was calculated for both 1971 and 1981 and then the index was weighted by population size of each tract. By aggregating index values of all the tracts, the social status index for the inner city of each CMA was computed.
- 3) Smith (1979) summarizes two types of neo-classical or consumption-dominant explanations of gentrification 'cultural' and 'economic.' The former includes the young, professional, and middle-class people's unique lifestyle, which differs from that of their parent's generation, and their search for individual self-expression. The economic accounts stresses as main factors

the rise in commuting cost due to fuel price increase, the rise in cost of newly constructed housing, and the economic benefits of proximity to work.

- 4) To be sure, Smith's criticism is logically valid. However, it seems that he deals with the meaning of 'individual' narrowly. The word implies the focus on human agency, in neo-classical or consumption-based works on gentrification.
- 5) Bourdieu (1984; cited in Knox, 1991: 183) classifies this class into two groups "new bourgeoisie" and "new petite bourgeoisie." The former consists of public administrators, scientists, private sector executives (e.g., financial analysts, management consultants, personnel experts, designers, marketing experts). The latter includes junior commercial executives, engineers, medical and social service employees, and those who engage in cultural production (e.g., TV and radio producers, magazine journalists, authors, and editors).
- 6) For example, Smith (1979, 540) says, "[i]n the decision to rehabilitate inner city structures, one consumer preference tends to stand out above the others — the preference for profit" and "[t]he relationship between production and consumption is symbiotic, but it is a symbiosis in which production dominates."
- 7) Smith accepts this limitation. He notes, "[n]ot all neighborhoods experiencing the rent-gap may experience gentrification or redevelopment" (Smith, 1987a: 464).
- 8) According to Wilson (1991), in a locality, social norms endow basic imperative of built environment production with values, and political practices determine the distribution of resources to legitimate the social norms in relation to

urban spatial changes. Additionally, key agents in urban development performs individually unique interpretations of place, value, and experiences under the influence of structural forces and local contexts, and then convey the interpretations to production of urban built environment.

References

- Bourassa, S. C., 1993, "The Rent Gap Debunked," *Urban Studies* 30(10), pp.1731-1744.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984, *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hamnett, C., 1991, "The blind men and the elephant: the explanation of gentrification," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 16(2), pp.173-189.
- Harvey, D. W., 1989, *The condition of post-modernity*, Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Knox, P. L., 1991, "The Restless Urban Landscape: Economic and Sociocultural Change and the Transformation of Metropolitan Washington, DC," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81, pp.181-209.
- Ley, D., 1980, "Liberal ideology and post-industrial city," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70, pp.238-258.
- Ley, D., 1981, "Inner city revitalization in Canada: a Vancouver case study," *Canadian Geographer* 25, pp.124-148.
- Ley, D., 1986, "Alternative explanations for inner city gentrification: A Canadian assessment," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 76, pp.521-35.
- Ley, D., 1987, "Reply: the rent gap revisited,"

- Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 77, pp.465-468.
- Mullins, P. 1982, "The middle-class and the inner city," *Journal of Australian Political Economy* 11, pp.44-58.
- Smith, N., 1979, "Toward a theory of gentrification: back to the city movement by capital, not people," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45, pp.538-548.
- Smith, N., 1982, "Gentrification and uneven development," *Economic Geography* 58, pp.139-155.
- Smith, N., 1986, "Gentrification, the frontier, and the restructuring of urban space," in N. Smith and P. Williams (eds), *Gentrification of the City*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp.15-34.
- Smith, N. 1987a, "Gentrification and the rent gap," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 77, pp.462-465.
- Smith, N., 1987b, "Of yuppies and housing: gentrification, social restructuring and the urban dream," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 5, pp.151-172.
- Wilson, D., 1991, "Urban Change, Circuits of Capital, and Urban Development," *Professional Geographer* 43(4), pp.403-415.

젠트리피케이션에 관한 일고찰: 레이와 스미쓰의 1980년대 연구를 중심으로

변 필 성*

* 미국 애리조나 주립 대학교 지리학 및 지역개발학과 박사과정수로
(pillsung@email.arizona.edu)

요약 : 도심 부흥 및 재개발로서 나타나는 젠트리피케이션은 도심 및 이너시티에서 일어나는 인구 및 사회적 구성의 변화와 부동산의 물리적·경제적 특성 변화를 포괄한다. 1970년대 이후 젠트리피케이션은 학문적으로 많은 조명을 받아왔고 동시에 도시지리학 분야내 이론 및 이념 논쟁의 장을 제공하였다. 이러한 맥락에서 본고는 그러한 논쟁에 참여해온, 젠트리피케이션에 대한 두 가지 접근, 즉 소비중심 접근과 생산중심 접근을 논의하였다. 구체적으로 각각의 접근을 대표하는 데이비드 레이와 닐 스미쓰의 젠트리피케이션에 관한 연구를 재고찰하고 비판적으로 평가하였다. 특히 1980년대에 출간된 레이와 스미쓰의 연구를 중심으로 하여, 각각의 접근방법론이 젠트리피케이션에 대한 부분적 설명에 그치고 있음을 중점적으로 논의하였다.

주요어 : 젠트리피케이션, 이너시티, 소비자선호, 지대격차