

# Relevance, Gentrification and the Development of a New Hegemony on Urban Policies in Antwerp, Belgium

Maarten Loopmans

[Paper first received, August 2007; in final form, July 2008]

## Abstract

This paper applies a state-theoretical perspective to a historical analysis of gentrification and urban policies in Antwerp, Belgium. Before 1970, the city experienced a period of modernist hegemony, with urban development policies characterised by slum clearing, peripheral high-rise social housing construction and inner-city office development. After moving through a period of non-hegemony with intense debate and struggle about urban development, the city now appears to be experiencing another period of hegemony in urban policy of which state support for gentrification has become the centrepiece. A historical state-theoretical approach shows how this move has been the consequence of local institutionalisation and political conflicts following the collapse of modernism, and provides insight into the opportunities available for critical observers of gentrification to enhance policy relevance.

## Introduction: Gentrification and the Policy Relevance Debate

In recent years, a revived interest from policy-makers in the gentrification of central-city neighbourhoods has been documented in the gentrification literature (Badcock, 2001; Hackworth and Smith, 2001; Smith, 2002; Wyly and Hammel, 1999, 2001; Lees, 2003; Slater, 2004; Uitermark *et al.*, 2007). As policy-makers throughout cities of the West are now promoting gentrification as the key to urban regeneration and have developed

policies in favour of gentrification, the question arises as to how the mass of academic literature critical of the negative social effects of gentrification has come to be ignored (Lees, 2003). Recognising the opportunities for policy relevance attached to this growing interest in gentrification among policy-makers, Lees (2003) calls for an increased dialogue between academic researchers of gentrification and policy-makers. While other commentators fear that just such a dialogue with pro-gentrification policy-makers would remove critical perspectives from gentrification

Maarten Loopmans is in STeR—Urban Design and Spatial Planning, University College Brussels, Nijverheidskaai 170, Brussels, B-1070, Belgium. E-mail: maarten.loopmans@gmail.com.

research altogether (Slater, 2006, p. 751), Lees asks us

What is the point of a substantial, critical, and vigorous academic literature on gentrification if it is not actually disseminated to those in a position to influence and make the policies we seek to inform? (Lees, 2003, p. 573).

The resurfacing debate on relevance in geography in general (for example, Pacione, 1999; Massey, 2000, 2001, 2002; Martin, 2001, 2002; Dorling and Shaw, 2002; Imrie, 2004; Beaumont *et al.* 2005; Ward, 2005; Pain, 2006) has equally struggled with the dilemma of either having to sell one's critical soul to the devil and get access to government and its allied institutions, or remain distant from the state but at the same time without impact. However, in recent contributions, the debate has moved to a more nuanced level of reasoning (Blanc, 2000; Massey, 2002; Imrie, 2004; Beaumont *et al.*, 2005; Ward, 2005; Pain, 2006). These latter contributors argue that producing policy-relevant research goes well beyond working with or for policy-makers. Questioning whether getting the minister's ear is always the most effective route to affect policy-making, they set out to analyse how more diverse 'spaces of relevance' (Beaumont *et al.*, 2005) can be deployed. The question, Imrie (2004) argues, is not so much *whether or not* geographers (or, in our present case, gentrification researchers) should strive for policy relevance, but *how* and by which strategies they can do so. Imrie (2004), Beaumont *et al.* (2005) as well as Pain (2006) emphasise the importance of an analysis of the political and social context in which policy research takes place, to be able to exploit fully the spaces of relevance at hand. This presupposes an active engagement of the researcher that goes far beyond the delivery of research reports to authorities and writing academic journal articles. To enhance relevance, Beaumont *et al.* argue that

interstices must be sought by researchers to mobilize support, establish a firm institutional basis and advance critical claims that may or may not tally with those of the authorities (Beaumont *et al.*, 2005, p. 124).

Repeatedly, gentrification researchers have been called to arms to take policy seriously in understanding the form, scale and scope of gentrification (van Weesep, 1994; Lees, 2000) but so far there have been only few explicit attempts in this direction (for example, Wylie and Hammel, 1999, 2001; Hackworth and Smith, 2001; Slater, 2004; Uitermark *et al.*, 2007) and, with some notable exceptions (in particular Uitermark *et al.*, 2007, who strongly emphasise the governmental and institutional dimension to explain state-led gentrification), the (local) state continues to be treated as a Black box whose internal processes deserve little or no investigation.

In this paper, I will take up Lees' (2000) challenge to take a closer look at particular urban regeneration policies and the representations and discourses on gentrification that figure in it. I argue that, to understand the spaces of relevance available to gentrification researchers in a context of state-led gentrification in a particular city, it is first of all necessary to analyse how and why the state has come to take an interest in gentrification as public policy.

Using a neo-Gramscian state-theoretical framework, I analyse how in Antwerp (Belgium) gentrification has become a core element for the establishment of a new hegemony in urban policy. Seen from this perspective, it is clear that gentrification policy does not appear out of the blue, on the demand of particular actors external to the local state. Instead, it reveals itself as the historical and contingent outcome of a series of attempts to match the interests and goals of various local actors and groups and develop a common rationale for urban development both inside and outside the local

state. This process started after the crumbling of modernist hegemony in the 1970s, when a counter-hegemonic discourse appeared revolving around the concept of liveability, to which gentrification appears as the—belated and probably still provisional—answer.

The paper begins with a discussion of how neo-Gramscian political theory might enhance our understanding of the historical and geographical particularities of the interplay between urban policy and gentrification. The analytical framework developed is then applied to the case of Antwerp, Belgium. In the conclusion, I explore what this analysis teaches us in relation to the possible strategies and tactics for enhancing policy relevance in critical gentrification research.

### Hegemony and Strategic Selectivity

One of the most innovative and influential ideas in Gramsci's political theory is his concept of *hegemony*. Hegemony, in Gramsci's writings, has come to mean various things, but for the purpose of our analysis, two dimensions of it appear crucially important. First of all, Gramsci introduced the concept of hegemony to capture the ideological predominance of bourgeois values and norms over the subordinate classes (Carnoy, 1984). Hegemony allows dominant social groups to rule by consent rather than coercion. It is the situation whereby rule in the interest of a dominant social group is seen as legitimate by subordinate classes or groups because this particular interest is presented (and accepted) as equal to or at least supportive of the 'general interest'.

Ives (2004) points to the role of ideology in hegemony when explaining how the concept of hegemony expands the definition of politics from the direct activities of government and operations of state power to questions of how people come to understand the world. Hegemony exists because those social groups

whose interests are not furthered by the ruling constellation, lack their own coherent framework to understand the world and their position in the world, and necessarily fall back upon ideas and concepts offered to them by the hegemonic social group.

Secondly, Gramsci uses the concept of historical bloc to emphasise the functionality of hegemony as a means of co-ordination. A historical bloc refers to an alliance of different forces, organisations and actors—of both structure and superstructure—at various scales (Jessop, 2005, p. 425) organised around a hegemonic set of ideas that give strategic direction and coherence to their collaborative efforts. For a historical bloc to emerge, its core organisation must engage in a hegemonic project, a "conscious planned struggle for hegemony" (Gill, 2003, p. 58; Jessop, 1997, p. 62) which involves both the active search for compromises, shared interests, common goals, and institutional links among the organisations and groups of the historical bloc (Gramsci, 1975/2001, pp. 1612–1613) and the development of a common, congruent discourse to win the hearts and minds of the general public.

However, in a diverse society with a variety of different and opposing interests, a historical bloc cannot achieve full closure and hegemony is always potentially unstable. There is always the risk that counter-hegemonic discourses are produced by social groups whose interests are not furthered by the operations of the members of the historical bloc, or that co-ordination of the historical bloc fails as members no longer believe its co-ordinating set of ideas appropriately furthers their interests. When the historical bloc comes under duress or when counter-hegemonic discourses gain influence in civil society, consent is no longer the prevailing feature of rule and a phase of hegemony is alternated with non-hegemony (Cox, 1983, p. 135), as Gramsci observed in most European countries after the First World War (Gramsci, 1975/2001, p. 1638).

Jessop (1990, 2002a) adds that the struggle over hegemony is fought on a strategically selective terrain of existing discourses, organisational and structural relations resulting from earlier struggles. This terrain makes some strategies and discourses more viable than others and lends to the sequence of hegemonic and non-hegemonic phases a path-dependent and place-specific character (Jessop, 2002a, p. 34). A crucial factor of selectivity, according to Gramsci, is the state of hegemony or non-hegemony: Gramsci argues how countervailing forces seeking to take over state power or reorient state policies should not engage in a head-on attack against the hegemony of a historical bloc, deploying a military metaphor a 'war of manoeuvre', but require, first, a 'war of position' to develop a coherent alternative world-view, to forge alliances and networks among different groups in civil society and to undermine existing hegemony (Ives, 2004, pp. 107–109). Only if hegemony falls apart, and a period of non-hegemony starts, do opportunities appear for alternative projects to influence state policies.

In the following section, I will analyse how gentrification became the ideological focus of a local hegemonic project for urban development in Antwerp. The above theoretical discussion provides us with a framework for this analysis. It suggests how alternating periods of hegemony and non-hegemony can be detected, and suggests that these develop in a path-dependent manner. It suggests that the establishment of hegemony requires a project that secures both legitimacy with the wider public and co-ordination of relevant actors within and without the state apparatus, whereas non-hegemony can result from problems of either legitimacy or co-ordination, or both at the same time.

Central elements to the analysis of this history of urban development are the discursive and organisational actions of organisations attempting to occupy a central and

steering role in the development of a hegemonic project. Which discourses are produced and which alliances are formed are key questions to establish a periodisation of hegemonic projects (not necessarily all successful in establishing hegemony) leading to the current phase of gentrification policies (Jessop, 2002b).

This framework of analysis is then applied to the involvement of local government in Antwerp in a hegemonic project focusing on gentrification, which can be traced back to the contradictions of modernism which surfaced in the 1960s, and is the temporary end-phase of a four-stage local search for answers to these problems (see Table 1).

In a first phase, we witness the collapse of modernist hegemony as it faces both legitimacy and co-ordination crises, leading to a period of non-hegemony. In a first phase of non-hegemony, a shattered historical bloc is not able to provide any answers and counter-hegemonic discourses gain more prominence; but practical experiments by various organisations do not succeed in reconciling the problems of legitimacy and co-ordination. In a second phase of non-hegemony, the local and regional state take a stronger lead, having developed an internal consensus over the direction to take, but they do not succeed in convincing civil society. From this follows a last phase of state-supported gentrification that, I contend, is thus far the most successful hegemonic project in that it responds to both the issues of legitimacy and co-ordination, which had troubled the modernist project.

## **Urban Policy Programmes and Hegemony in Antwerp**

### **The Last Convulsions of Modernism: Cataclysmic Phase, 1971–83**

Antwerp, a medium-sized city with a population of 460 000 and home to one of Europe's largest ports, lies in the highly urbanised north-west European core area between

London, Paris and the Ruhr. It has a particularly large medieval core of about 10 square km and an inner ring of densely built up, 19th-century working-class neighbourhoods (Figure 1). Its early 20th-century inner suburbs are largely contained within the administrative border of the city, but the city is in a highly competitive position with the wealthy autonomous municipalities of its post-war suburbs, where another half a million commuters to the city reside.

As a major port city, Antwerp has long had a strong working-class character and ever since 1933—with the exception of the war years—Antwerp has been governed by a socialist mayor. Profiting from the flourishing of its port, socialist mayors Huysmans (1933–39) and Craeybeckx (1946–76), under the ideological influence of local modernist architects Renaat Braem, Leon Stynen and Henry van de Velde would give Antwerp, compared with other Belgian cities, an impressive modernist make-over (Toubhans and Lombaerde, 1993). After the Second World War in particular, slums were cleared at unprecedented rates. In the medieval inner city, 3500 houses, or about 35 per cent of the existing housing stock, were demolished and replaced by offices, thoroughfares, public spaces or social housing. At the same time, high-rise social housing was created in the periphery, between 1953 and 1973 at a rate of about 1000 units per year (Ceuppens, 1981). The modernist ideology served to co-ordinate the collaborative effort of construction firms, landowners (in the periphery) and the local state—operating as a collective consumer—while the national state and private service companies also invested in replacing the dilapidated inner-city housing stock with offices for a growing service economy.

The depressing housing situation in the inner city and the post-war housing shortage, as well as the economic optimism of the time, also stimulated widespread popular support for the modernist ideas of functional

separation and the promise of light, air and space (see the collection of papers in van Herck and Avermaete, 2006; in particular de Meulder, 2006). The old, often medieval townhouses, were relegated—literally—to a folkloric museum. Modernist renewal was the pride of the city. In one of its promotional publications of the time, the city heralded that

Antwerp is growing in a really American rhythm. In its centre the old houses are being pulled down by hundreds, in order to make place for high flat buildings. To the South (Kiel) and to the North (Luchtbal) there are still vast and fallow lying areas enabling a bolder town-planning on a larger scale. More and more new modern residential quarters are silhouetted against the sky (Publiservice, 1957, p. 31).

For quite some time, modernism as an ideology of urban development succeeded in providing both a degree of co-ordination between the main actors involved and strong legitimacy among the Antwerp citizenry.

However, this hegemony eroded—as in many Western cities—by the end of the 1960s when previously silenced subaltern voices joined in a counter-hegemonic attack. Conservationists bemoaned the rapid destruction of historical monuments; progressive intellectuals and artists wanted to revamp the underground spirit of the city; feminist activists reclaimed city streets and public spaces, monopolized by traffic, for their children; and local shopkeeper organisations who annually lost clients through the undermining of the housing function in the centre mobilised for inner-city living. All these social forces heavily contested the modernist renewal processes (de Smit, 2003; Verschuere, 2003, p. 165; Buyck, 1988). Under the common flag of ‘liveability’ they reclaimed the city for its inhabitants; they firmly advanced their claims for a maximisation of the city’s ‘use value’ against the exchange value realised for



**Figure 1.** The districts of Antwerp

capitalist investors. To this end these social groups urged for civil participation in urban development.

Their concerns were taken up first by a local non-governmental planning organ 'Schelde-Dijle vzw' in a report on the inner city (Schelde-Dijle vzw, 1971). When in 1971 one of its members (Bob Cools) was appointed alderman for spatial planning in Antwerp (the first ever in Belgium), these ideas also entered the official urban planning discourse (see Stad Antwerpen, 1973). However, they did not spread widely: spatial planning was still a marginal practice in Belgium at the time (see Dutt and Costa, 1992), which had little influence on wider politics. In his memoirs, Cools (1994) describes how the department of public works, which followed an entirely different logic than the urban planners, took the decisions on construction permits. When in the 1970s real estate investors discovered the newly emerging rental office market in Antwerp, they had few difficulties in obtaining new construction permits, even if monuments or residential quarters needed to be razed. Under fierce protest from the population, and against the ideas propagated by the planning department, high-rise office development experienced a golden age in the central city and further increased the growth of the CBD (Sanders, 1986).

On the other hand, the city experienced, particularly at the end of the 1970s, a period of financial hardship due to the continuation of the economic crisis. Although the planning department created several plans for the revitalisation of inner-city neighbourhoods (Stad Antwerpen, 1973, 1978, 1980), experimenting with citizen participation and new concepts, little was realised in practice: it became increasingly difficult to find public funding for the execution of the plans. In 1983, after a particularly difficult amalgamation process with surrounding municipalities, central government imposed rigorous financial constraints upon the city. Antwerp

modernism received its final blow: the city was not even allowed to make any major investments anymore until all its debts had been discharged (expected, at best, for 2012). The close alliance between construction companies and the city that had made possible the rapid modernisation of large parts of the city was shattered. All the while, a decade of fierce popular protests against an unwilling local government had ruined the relations between the city and its activist citizens, which, according to the then mayor Cools (1994, p. 141) resembled a regular trench war.

From this, it is clear how modernist hegemony came into trouble first because the modernist discourse stopped finding legitimacy for its practices among the wider public. The main focus of critique was that it failed to guarantee the liveability of the city for its residents. The claims for a liveable inner city then also troubled co-ordination practices as, at the time, they ran counter to the strategies of construction firms seeking profit. This placed the local state in an ever more difficult position, first expressed in an internal conflict between a newly introduced planning department stressing the legitimacy issue and a department of public works trying to maintain co-ordination. Finally, it was also externalised to the rest of the historical bloc when Antwerp lost its financial autonomy and thus all its leverage to reconcile the claims of the citizenry and its private partners.

### **Exploring Counter-discourses: Experimental Phase, 1983–90**

In the same year (1983), the new 'Flemish regional government' that developed from Belgian decentralisation set up an 'urban renewal' programme under pressure from a European-wide campaign led by the then Dutch presidency. Money was provided from the regional level for the—mainly physical—renewal of deprived urban areas. Antwerp grabbed the chance for a new

start (Stad Antwerpen, 1989). The Flemish programme had drawn much of its inspiration from the 1970s experiments of the Antwerp planning department, which took the opportunity finally to realise its ideas. The Antwerp urban planning discourse had remained marginal in the 1970s but now gained prominence in Antwerp urban development circles—not just because of Flemish funding, but also because former alderman for spatial planning Bob Cools was elected mayor in 1983. This new official discourse drew from the popular critique of modernism, but it retained the modernists' main social considerations (the eradication of slum housing). Key elements of the now-official problem definition were:

—First of all, there was the 'urban flight' of higher-income groups to the suburbs, which had contributed to the near bankruptcy of the city, but also to a growing segregation between rich and poor.

—Secondly, there was the dilapidated housing stock in which predominantly poor people were still residing; about 10% of the housing stock was below the standards of that time.

—On top of that came a neglect of the living environment in urban cities, which had been under pressure of road building, industry and office development. There was a lack of public transport, public space and green areas and too much traffic, pollution and waste in the streets.

—Finally, the participation of the population in the development of planning has become an important consideration (Stad Antwerpen, 1985).

The urban renewal programme, co-ordinated by the city's planning department, succeeded in providing ambitious redevelopment plans for 15 areas in the 19th century city. It promised to increase the 'liveability' of these areas for its residents through small measures. It involved the renewal—and often pedestrianisation- of the public domain and

the renovation of dilapidated housing. Most of the reconstructed housing consisted of either self-renovation by owner-occupiers or turning private residual rental housing into social rental housing. Citizen participation in the development of plans became a central feature of the programme. The planning service worked together with the local university's sociology department to gain an overview of the city's social and housing situation, and engaged the Regional Institute for Community Development (Regionaal Instituut voor Samenlevingsopbouw, hereafter RISO) to organise citizen participation.

The actual execution of the plans was carried out by the department for public works and the social housing companies, under the co-ordination of the urban planning department and the residents, who had to organise themselves as a 'steering committee'. While internal co-ordination was enhanced, there was little or no interaction with organisations and actors outside the formal state apparatus. The private real-estate sector was intentionally excluded. 'Liveability' had to be stimulated for the original residents and therefore displacement was to be avoided. Bearing in mind the major *tabula rasa* operations in earlier decades, real-estate companies were suspected of disregarding this consideration. Not that they were that interested in participating: after demand in the office sector had gone down in the early 1980s, they had just discovered the potentials of upmarket housing development, notably on the Antwerp waterfront alongside the River Scheldt, with its abandoned 19th century warehouses, and in 'Zuid', the late 19th-century bourgeois area south of the centre. Development started slowly in Zuid after new museums and cultural infrastructure had been established there in the late 1980s and gradually expanded northwards along the waterfront. Individual gentrification pioneers had already settled in the area in previous years and profit rates there were



much higher than in the slum areas designated for the renewal programme. In the medieval centre, 1970s individual pioneers were increasingly replaced by a rapidly expanding tourism and leisure infrastructure, turning the area into a theme park full of cafés, restaurants, fashion boutiques and antique shops (Verhetsel and Ceulemans, 1994; Timmerman, 1994).

With the advent of a new government in Flanders six years later, the urban renewal programme was phased out. Considering the virtual absence of private investors as one of the programme's greatest flaws, the Flemish government sought to promote urban development through public-private partnerships instead (de Decker, 1994a).

In Antwerp, this renewed focus on the co-ordination problem equally failed. Inspired by a growing activity at the Antwerp waterfront, a group of urban planners, architects and private investors tried to re-establish a common and unifying approach to waterfront development. In 1989, 'Stad-aan-de-Stroom' (SAS or City at the Stream) was set up as a quango, supported by the municipal and the Flemish government. It drew a budget from both public and private sources in order to develop 'visions' for qualitative urban development. SAS departed from a 'harmonious vision' on urban development (Timmerman, 1994). It believed that 'qualitative environments' would convince both investors and the local population. Soon SAS would experience the utopianism of this hope. Project developers—at the time, mainly construction companies looking for quick gains<sup>1</sup>—were unwilling to let their investment decisions be co-ordinated by the SAS vision, choosing quick profit instead of the promised sustainable collective benefits. Moreover, citizen participation was not very high on the agenda. It was limited to a series of 'preliminary hearings' at the beginning of the project and no solutions were offered to the 19th-century

working-class areas where needs were more pressing, making SAS a somewhat élite endeavour (Stad aan de Stroom, 1990). Consequently, SAS quickly lost legitimacy both with the wider public and with local government. Internal and external frictions over concrete projects caused the group to dismantle in 1994 (de Decker, 1994b). Capital would continue its own path of urban regeneration in the most profitable areas, separate and divergent from state or bottom-up initiatives.

In this first, experimental phase of non-hegemony, it is interesting how counter-hegemonic discourses and previously marginal organisations like the planning department gain more prominence. With the former hegemony scattered, the local state starts a frenetic search for a new hegemonic discourse, which opened up opportunities for these more alternative voices. The urban renewal programme is an attempt by the local state to seek renewed legitimacy by incorporating counter-hegemonic discourses, but it neglected the co-ordination issue and was unable to enforce a coherent, city-wide urban development coalition. SAS, on the other hand, did show awareness of the co-ordination problem, but it did not succeed in orienting investments in a direction which might also take into account the issue of livability in deprived urban neighbourhoods. Nonetheless, the failed experiences of SAS and urban renewal inspired the establishment of a more coherent and sustained hegemonic project in the next phase.

### **A Hegemonic Project Gaining Ground: Social Urban Policy Phase, 1990–2003**

In the year 1988, Antwerp politics experienced a shock. A large part of the Antwerp populace turned away from the governing parties and voted for, among other 'protest parties', the

extreme-right racist party Vlaams Blok. Analyses showed how the Vlaams Blok electorate at the time was dominated by less educated, White, poor and working-class urbanites from deprived 19th-century neighbourhoods and most political analysts sustained the view that the White urban poor had grabbed the Vlaams Blok as a lever to ask for attention to the problems they experienced with the influx of foreign immigrants in their neighbourhoods and to express their more general political alienation. As the party's electoral basis continued to grow, the questions the Vlaams Blok had been putting up at that time (immigration and unsafety) became strong factors in the discourse on cities and prompted a new interpretation of 'liveability' in 19th-century inner-city neighbourhoods (see Loopmans *et al.*, 2003; de Decker *et al.*, 2005). The predominantly 'physical' approach to urban renewal in the 1980s was now deemed too restricted to establish 'liveability' in general. Indeed, similar signals had already been received in the hearings during the urban renewal participation process and earlier (Stad Antwerpen, 1978). Citizens had voiced their discontent over both the growing ethnic diversity in their neighbourhoods for disrupting established patterns of social cohesion and over the individuality and incivility in contemporary urban life. However, as these were considered 'social problems', they had not been 'upgraded' to urgent needs within an urban planning logic (Stad Antwerpen, 1978, 1985). The continued neglect of this 'social' pillar of urban renewal by the planning department suggested the need for a new approach and necessitated another recentring of the institutional focus within urban policy.

In a direct response to the political situation in Antwerp (de Decker, 1999; Loopmans *et al.*, 2003), the Flemish government set up a programme for local actions against poverty and social exclusion (Flemish Fund for the

integration of deprived people—VFIK) next to and apart from the urban renewal programme which petered out.

In Antwerp, the birth of this fund has been taken as a chance to redirect urban development from physical to more social aspects. In 1990, a new public-private body was set up (neighbourhood development company or BOM), a collaboration among the planning and social policy departments of the city of Antwerp, the city's Public Centre for Social Welfare (Openbaar Centrum voor Maatschappelijk Welzijn, hereafter OCMW), the sociology department of the University of Antwerp and the community development NGO RISO. The BOM drew funding from various sources (among them, the EU's Third Poverty Programme and URBAN Pilot projects) and focused on highly visual, 'strategic impulse' projects. It included physical renewal, but integrated with economic development projects (attracting new firms to deprived inner-city areas) and social development in one integrated area development project (Moulaert, 2000, pp. 97–101).

At the federal level, a 'safety fund' had been developed in 1992 in order to tackle unsafety in city neighbourhoods (de Decker *et al.*, 2005). The safety funds considerably increased the means for local policing, but would later on move more into the sphere of urban development. However, so far, safety remained beyond the limit of the BOM and urban development initiatives in Antwerp and there was little co-ordination between safety contracts and urban development. The Flemish social exclusion fund VFIK evolved, under the influence of the BOM example, into the social impulse fund (SIF) (van Hove 2001; de Coninck and Vandenberghe, 1996). The SIF wanted to broaden the exclusive focus on poverty of the previous funds and reconnect it to the physical approach of the urban renewal programme and to questions of economic development in an integrated approach.

Nonetheless, the SIF retained a strong social focus, through a mandatory priority for the most deprived areas and a focus on social exclusion; in Antwerp, the economic and physical development element even diminished compared with the period when the BOM received EU funding. Since 1995, a new organisation, the Urban Development Corporation Antwerp (Stads Ontwikkelings Maatschappij Antwerpen, hereafter SOMA) has co-ordinated the means for urban development derived from higher-level authorities. SOMA, another quango, is firmly under control of the Alderman for Social Affairs (Christiaens *et al.*, 2007). The planning department became even more peripheral in this phase, as was the social housing sector. Again, the aim was enhancing 'liveability', but now, liveability focuses more strongly on social aspects instead of physical. Liveability would be pursued more through 'teaching people how to live together in diversity' and to decrease the social exclusion of the poor. One very successful programme within the sphere of 'social liveability' was 'Opsinjoren' (Loopmans, 2006b), which aimed at deploying willingly active residents in the struggle for 'liveability' in streets and neighbourhoods (for instance, by planting flowers, keeping the streets clean and organising street parties) in tight collaboration with the municipal services.

After the failure of the urban renewal programme, Opsinjoren and its spin-off activities gave a new boost to citizen participation. It successfully established firm links between local politicians, specific local service departments (especially the sanitation department and the local police) and (mostly White, native Belgian, upper working or middle class) resident organisations (Loopmans, 2007). As politicians were eager to close 'the gap' between citizens and politics that had been revealed by the success of protest votes, the development of these relations increased

the voice and legitimacy of 'active' residents in particular (Loopmans, 2006b).

The SIF approach, like the urban renewal policy before it, focused in the first instance on the legitimacy issue. Although increasingly recognising the need to co-ordinate public and private investments in the urban environment, neither BOM nor SIF succeeded in providing adequate leverage for luring in the private real-estate sector. Leading policy-makers in Antwerp claimed that the priority for social policies in the most deprived—and thus high (investment) risk areas—deterred private investment by property developers (Boudry *et al.*, 1999). Instead, after a short dip in the early 1990s, residential gentrification boosted again in the second half of the 1990s and the sector regained attention for housing development in the more marketable areas around the waterfront and the medieval core. Instead of individual gentrification pioneers and construction companies, more integrated property developers who specialised in waterfront development were now taking the lead, turning derelict warehouses and bourgeois mansions into large loft projects which attracted mainly older, but wealthy, residents. In the medieval centre, commercial gentrification expanded further, mainly driven by the boom in the fashion industries; various streets were turned into new shopping districts dominated by fashion stores.

Zuid in particular experienced rapid development in the 1990s, moving from a position in the top 10 of Antwerp neighbourhoods with the lowest taxable income in 1991 to one of the highest taxable incomes in 2001. The area has become the home of many galleries, architectural firms, designer studios and advertising agencies (Hoefnagels, 2004). The small amount of interaction between SIF and gentrification areas consisted of displacement of lower-income groups from gentrifying areas—enjoying private investment—to the most deprived areas—enjoying public

investment via SIF (de Maesschalck and Loopmans, 2002; Lauwers, 2008).

### **Longing for the Middle Classes: Gentrification Policy Phase, 2003–present**

The present phase of urban development discourse started after yet another, even more overwhelming, electoral victory by the extreme right. Although the public debate has moved on from the original caricature of the bitter urban poor voting for the Vlaams Blok, the Vlaams Blok electorate is still dominated by White less educated working-class voters. The party's electoral rise can be explained primarily by geographical expansion, spreading first to the inner ring of early 20th-century working-class suburbs and then also to the more wealthy suburban districts, even beyond the city borders (de Maesschalck and Loopmans, 2003; Billiet and de Witte, 2001). Schuermans and de Maesschalck (2007) show how, since 1999, support for the party has been growing much faster in suburban and rural municipalities than in inner-city districts. A 'coalition of the last chance' was set up in 2000, incorporating all parties of the political spectrum apart from the extreme right. Its governing has been marked by an acute sense of urgency as the extreme right came very close to holding an absolute majority of votes. Hence pressure was even higher to take new initiatives.

Before these elections, autochthonous upper-working and middle-class active residents groups that gained more legitimacy under SIF had already been bringing up—with ever more assertiveness—'safety questions', such as street prostitution, drug dealing, rack-renting, illegal dumping and the presence of illegal immigrants, which the social approach of the SIF had not been able to tackle (Bewonersgroepencongres, 1997; Stad Antwerpen and *Gazet van Antwerpen*,

1998). The political situation after 2000 made it hard to neglect further these claims and yet another approach to urban development had to be invented. Simultaneously, private real-estate investors started to lobby for more state support. As the redevelopment of the waterfront and the medieval core reached its conclusion, they began to explore areas where profit was less guaranteed, such as Antwerp-North, the Haussmannised zone along the former medieval city walls linking the 19th-century working-class areas in the north-east to the city centre or the severely rundown red-light district Schipperskwartier on the Scheldt river to the north of the medieval core (Lauwers, 2008).

The political sense of urgency provided the background to address both claims at the same time, as again, a round of discursive reinvention and intense institutional re-organisation at both the Flemish and the local levels was deemed necessary to curb the electoral crisis (Stad Antwerpen, 2001). Under local pressure, a new, more entrepreneurial City Fund replaced the SIF in 2003. The SIF was criticised for its social focus, not providing any leverage for collaboration with economic actors and focusing too much on the poor. It had largely neglected the middle classes and the potential for urban renewal that lies enclosed in their aspirations for gentrification. Moreover, the SIF had failed in its underlying rationale: to undermine the electoral base of the extreme right. With the new City Fund, a new urban policy discourse could be constructed, focusing on 'opportunities' instead of 'problems'. 'Liveability'—which remained the core concept—was now equated with "a safe, attractive and vibrant urban environment" to be measured by its "attractiveness to higher-income groups" (Loopmans, 2007).

In Antwerp, supervision of the urban development budget was taken away from the Social Affairs Alderman and returned to the Alderman for Urban Development

and Planning. The city's 'planning cell' was reinforced with young and creative professionals (Christiaens *et al.*, 2007) and two new institutions were established. On the one hand, there is the semi-autonomous Real Estate and Urban Development Company Antwerp (Vastgoed- En Stadsontwikkelings bedrijf Antwerpen, hereafter VESPA), which took over the task of co-ordinating urban development programmes from SOMA in an explicit attempt to obtain closer collaboration with private real-estate agents operating in the city (for instance, by drawing some of its employees directly from private real-estate companies). On the other hand, there is a new cell for 'Integral Security', under the equally new Alderman for Integral Security, which should work on the social aspects of urban development, but from a more 'policing' instead of 'caring' perspective and largely funded by the federal safety funds.

These new structures, under the pressure of an ever more tilting electoral power balance, succeed in responding to both local resident groups' claims for 'liveability' and the quest of private investors for 'profitable opportunities' for housing investment. Uncivil behaviour lying at the basis of 'liveability' in its current sense, is now tackled more with repression instead of care. The Integral Security cell, together with a more community-oriented local police and sanitation department, take on an increasingly proactive approach towards street and window prostitutes, drug addicts and illegal immigrants subject to rack-renting in slum housing (Stad Antwerpen, 2005). Where deemed necessary, they are driven off the streets and eliminated from the neighbourhood, to be "replaced by better people", as the Alderman for Integral Security bluntly stated in a public hearing in Antwerp-North, if necessary by force

the municipality is willing to provide for more security measures where real estate actors demand this as a condition before investing in

Antwerp North ... It must be possible to send out more police forces in the neighbourhood to meet the demands of security from project developers (*Gazet van Antwerpen*, 2005).

Very little protest was pitched against these statements; instead, the dominant network of (White, mostly middle-class) active local residents in Antwerp North proclaimed that they were eagerly waiting for a more 'liveable' neighbourhood. Citing Zuid as the desirable neighbourhood type, they made no secret of their wishes to replace more marginalised groups by middle-class gentrifiers (de Bilzen, 2002; 2006)<sup>2</sup>. A kind of liveability now prevails which market parties, according to the Alderman, were merely waiting to provide—in collaboration with the city. Liveability, in a somewhat revanchist guise, finally succeeds in providing a coherent framework for all actors involved in urban development. Moreover, through VESPA, the city of Antwerp has finally found a vehicle to re-establish itself as an active and leading investor, combining the co-ordination of major supralocal urban policy funds with the tasks of valorising the city's own unused patrimony (more than 900 buildings in the portfolio, often at strategic locations, for an estimated value of 113 million euro; in addition VESPA lets out about 1400 units in 2006), of developing its own building and renovation projects (155 buildings in its 2006 portfolio, 62 more being realised), and of organising major public-private partnership projects (30 major projects, affecting a whole building block, in 2006) (AG VESPA, 2007).

The power to co-ordinate is revealed by the increasing number of building projects with which the city is willing and able to identify itself; again, as in the modernist period, public and private sectors are investing in the same areas, if not in the same projects: one of the main instruments the city uses today for urban development is the 'building block project' where a whole building

block is being readjusted and revalorised in collaboration with the various public and private landowners (Pittillion *et al.*, 2005). The renewed focus on construction in urban policy has not gone unnoticed by the wider public, as is revealed by the current mayor Patrick Janssens' local nickname 'the brick mayor'.

His approach is successfully legitimised with the promise of more liveable neighbourhoods born with the arrival of 'better' residents. In his electoral campaign for the municipal elections of 2006, mayor Janssens put a lot of emphasis on his '*grands travaux*' for the city and how these have made Antwerp a more pleasant place to live in—in addition to several complimentary articles through the more regular channels of newspapers and lifestyle magazines, both mayor and vice-mayor have published a series of books about their 'realisations' (Janssens, 2005, 2006; van Campenhout, 2006)—and the local 'new urban' jet-set of pop icons, artists and media-characters overtly supported him in a poster campaign. It turned out to be a good strategy: previously, the Vlaams Belang had been able to set the terms of the campaign. In 2006, the party's leader Filip Dewinter tried to incorporate Janssens' major urban development projects as 'urban diamonds' into his own electoral strategy and explicitly supported the mayor's policy of attracting (White) middle-class residents, proclaiming it not just a socioeconomic, but also an ethnic reconquest of the central city (Dewinter, 2006). It was mainly Janssens who profited electorally from this new discourse: for the first time in 30 years, the main opposition party Vlaams Belang did not make any electoral progress in the city (a rising percentage of votes in the peripheral districts of the pre- and post-war suburbs was offset by a loss in the 19th-century belt), whereas mayor Janssens' own social-democrats increased their share of the votes by more than 15 per cent to over

35 per cent, a result which his party had not been able to reach since 1976. So far, few studies have been published on the 2006 local elections, but preliminary research notes have pointed out two important phenomena. First, easier access to Belgian nationality and access to municipal elections for non-nationals have increased the electorate of foreign origin, which, obviously, has negatively affected the results of the Vlaams Blok in the 19th-century districts where residents of foreign origin are well represented (Hertogen, 2006). Secondly, Janssens' personal campaign has had a strong positive impact on the social-democrat party results. Focusing on the young urban professionals he has been so keen to attract to the city and who also predominantly settled in the 19th-century area (replacing an older working-class population), Janssens succeeded in drawing voters away from other more traditional 'gentrifier parties' like the greens (Groen!) and the liberals (VLD) (van Aelst *et al.*, 2006).

While it may be too early to speak of an established hegemony, it is clear that the latest hegemonic project deploying the concept of state-supported gentrification has the best chances of developing into hegemony since the modernist project. This project is furthered now by strongly professionalised real-estate developers (mostly local companies which have been merged or integrated with multinational real-estate actors), a polity focused on and experienced in physical urban development (headed by VESPA and mayor Janssens) and the activist part of the population—i.e. the hundreds of upper-working-class and middle-class resident committees—mobilised for a more liveable city. Gentrification has become the key word to co-ordinate both public and private investment activities in the city and is strongly supported by the wider public, as is revealed not only by the relative lack of organised protest (even Vlaams Belang supports the

road taken), but equally by the spectacularly strong electoral support for the mayor and his party in the latest elections.

## Conclusion

Analysing the development of state-supported gentrification in Antwerp from a neo-Gramscian perspective reveals how these policies are intensely connected to local political and social struggles and shows how the sequence of policy shifts culminating in the present gentrification policies can be regarded as reactions to problems of legitimacy and co-ordination in the field of urban policies. In Antwerp, the history of gentrification as a hegemonic project can be traced back to the crisis of modernist hegemony in urban development (Table 1). This crisis revealed itself first in a decreasing legitimacy for the major urban renewal projects that it spawned, in particular in the inner cities. Instead, activists from various stances (conservationists protesting against the destruction of historical monuments, feminists reclaiming public space for children instead of cars, inner-city shopkeepers bemoaning the loss of local residents as clients and progressive intellectuals and artists aiming to revamp the creative underground spirit of the city) came up with a new alternative discourse focusing on the 'liveability' of the city and reclaiming the city for the residential function. Whereas it troubled the coalition between state and private-sector construction companies (which was given the final blow by the 1970s economic crisis), a true counter-hegemony was not established.

Instead, parts of the 'liveability' discourse have been incorporated in ensuing attempts to re-establish hegemony. Almost immediately, new organisations on the fringes of the city's bureaucracy set themselves up as the central brokers of a new hegemonic project. In an experimental phase, the newly developed

planning department was the first to come up with a renewed approach to urban policy. However, the incorporation of grassroots claims in their discourse prevented a renewed collaboration with the private sector and, as they largely neglected the social dimensions of the liveability problem, legitimacy was soon lost as well. In their wake, new organisations developed equally aspiring for a more central position. SAS, which focused on the co-ordination issue, did not live long. However, the BOM-SOMA approach, under the auspices of the Social Affairs Alderman succeeded in taking up a more established position. Liveability is now interpreted in a more integrated manner, focusing on the social dimensions too, and this approach lives up more to the demands of the participating residents. Yet focusing on the most deprived areas and populations, it fails to lure in the private sector and obtain a co-ordinating role. Consequently, visible results are meagre. As the growing safety concerns voiced by active residents and the Vlaams Blok are equally ignored, the programme steadily loses its legitimacy as well.

In a final phase, VESPA appears as a new key organisation. Focusing on gentrification (framed as the attraction of 'better' residents to the city) as a more durable solution to the multidimensional problem of liveability and concentrating purposively on the more opportunity-rich areas with depreciated, but valuable 19th-century bourgeois mansions and warehouses, such as the Haussmannised zone bordering the more deprived, homogeneous working-class areas, it succeeds in re-establishing a common ground with the private real-estate sector and acts as the co-ordinating organisation for all urban development activities. With safety now also taken serious as a policy issue, connected to the goal of gentrification, and with the enhanced liveability of already-gentrified areas acting as a lure for aspiring residents in other

**Table 1.** Hegemonic phases in Antwerp, 1970–2007

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Core organisations</i>	<i>Discourse</i>	<i>Legitimation</i>	<i>Co-ordination</i>
Cataclystic phase (1971–83)	Public works department	Welfare for all through a rational modernisation of the city	Problematic, various social groups protesting as promise of welfare for all is perverted by a decrease of liveability for those living in the inner city	Problematic, the local state is divided and collaboration with real estate sector problematic
Experimental phase (1983–90)	Planning department	Re-establish liveable inner cities for residents alone	Successful at first, then problematic as problems of immigration and social cohesion become ignored	Problematic as the local state attempts to keep out the professional real-estate sector, which turns to other areas
Social urban policy (1990–2003)	SAS BOM-SOMA	Combine architectural quality and profitability through collaboration Focus on social, economic and physical problems in particular neighbourhoods	Problematic from the start OK at first, then problematised because lack of attention to safety and problems in addressing bad state of private housing market	Promising but problematic as a result of a lack of trust in the profitability of the endeavour Problematic as the focus was very much on social welfare and public investment was concentrated in the most problematic neighbourhoods; private sector saw no opportunity for profit
Gentrification policy phase (2003–present)	VESPA	Focus on safety and opportunities for residential urban development	OK so far, strong support for it in gentrifying neighbourhoods (as revealed in electoral results) and hope in others	OK, very effective collaboration between VESPA and real-estate sector, and focusing on same areas



neighbourhoods, the gentrification policies of VESPA also succeed in securing legitimacy from the local electorate.

A neo-Gramscian analysis of this kind does not only help us to reach a better understanding of the current relation between public policy and gentrification in Antwerp, it also provides valuable strategic insights for scholars seeking to deploy spaces of relevance. In particular, Gramsci's writings on the strategic dimensions of hegemonic struggles can be of interest. First of all, this approach suggests not to look for generic strategies to enhance policy relevance, but to take into account the local social and political context; even though studies suggest that gentrification policies are on the rise world-wide, this does not mean that they all occur under similar social and political conditions. Rotterdam, for instance, reveals a similar path towards gentrification policies. However, the impetus in Antwerp for hegemonic struggle has been much more the legitimacy issue, whereas in Rotterdam, with a stronger bureaucracy, co-ordination problems have played a stronger role in driving the search for a new hegemony (Uitermark *et al.*, 2007; Beaumont and Loopmans, 2008). Hence other fields will need to be explored to increase relevance.

In particular, it has been suggested taking into account whether or not a hegemonic situation exists; it is not a given that gentrification policies will underpin a local hegemony everywhere. It is likely that these strategies will not find such strong legitimacy amongst the population or that they will not always enhance co-ordination within the governance network. If indeed a local hegemony is the condition we are working in, as it appears to be in Antwerp, we might take Gramsci's warning seriously that a head-on war of manoeuvres, approaching key policy-makers with highly critical ideas about the policy choices they have made, is not the proper approach for the moment. The story presented here has revealed how, at certain moments in

non-hegemonic times, critical scholars have been able directly to 'whisper in the mayor's ear': desperately seeking for a new hegemonic project, policy-makers were indeed relatively receptive to the advice of the highly critical planning department or to the analyses of the BOM-partners in the non-hegemonic 1980s and 1990s. However, the operational success of and the widespread electoral support for the current gentrification approach puts policy-makers in a more comfortable position with little pressure to seek out new policy formulas and hence such openness to criticism cannot be expected today.

Therefore, Gramsci's writings suggest, it might be more wise to engage in a 'war of position', trying to strengthen those social groups that are disaffected by the policies. Indeed, in Antwerp, signals exist that very diverse social groups are negatively affected, in different ways, by these policies, but their protests remain highly fragmented and go largely unnoticed. These are not confined to the most evident victims, those who are being displaced or see their choice in the housing market further restricted to ever-lower-quality housing for an ever-increasing price. They might for instance be linked to conservationist groups, who are increasingly critical of the fact that gentrification often entails new-built development in valuable historical parts of the city. There is a lot of work to do for gentrification researchers in empowering various groups. Today, few of these groups produce a coherent story within which to frame their discontent and gentrification students can do a lot here by providing well-developed analyses of the interrelations between their disparate experiences and the process of state-supported gentrification; such analyses might strengthen their claims and help them to build—perhaps unexpected—coalitions which might severely undercut the legitimacy of gentrification policies as they are today. Of course, this is not just a matter of dissemination of results but equally

involves strategically choosing subjects of study which might provide powerful discursive weapons for those groups rejecting gentrification as a solution to their problems.

Yet critical students of gentrification need not stop there. Apart from unsettling the legitimacy of gentrification, there is a lot of work to do on the co-ordination side as well. Today, the co-ordination power of the gentrification discourse rests with the belief that gentrification policies could bring profitable and liveable neighbourhoods everywhere, for everyone. Critical analyses of this belief might increase insight into who benefits from the policies and who does not and will possibly reveal unfounded optimism from the side of some of the partners involved and decrease their willingness to collaborate.

Finally, apart from undermining the legitimacy and co-ordinating power of current gentrification policies, the even more important job of constructing a more viable alternative remains: to imagine and develop new vibrant urban policy scenarios which might draw the necessary public support and enable the sufficiently strong enough co-ordination of core organisations to constitute an alternative hegemony, without producing the negative social externalities and inequalities so often caused by gentrification. This might well prove the most challenging task lying ahead of us.

## Notes

1. Remark made by Jef van den Broeck, spatial planner and former SAS member.
2. A sole exception was Basta!, a committee dominated by working-class political activists pleading against all forms of nuisance but rejecting the gentrification road as they feared displacement (see Loopmans, 2006).

## Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper by

Justus Uitermark, Ben de Rudder, Jef van den Broeck, Pascal de Decker and Justin Beaumont and three anonymous reviewers.

## References

- Aelst, P. van, Nuytemans, M. and Walgraeve, S. (2006) *De verkiezingscampagne van 2006: onderzoeksnota* [The electoral campaign of 2006: a research note]. University of Antwerp.
- AG VESPA (2007) *Jaarverslag 2006*. AG VESPA, Antwerp.
- Badcock, B. (2001) Thirty years on: gentrification and class change-over in Adelaide's inner suburbs, 1966–1996, *Urban Studies*, 38, pp. 1559–1572.
- Beaumont, J. and Loopmans, M. (2008) Towards radicalized communicative rationality: resident involvement and urban democracy in Rotterdam and Antwerp, *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*, 32(1), pp. 95–113.
- Beaumont, J., Loopmans, M. and Uitermark, J. (2005) Politicization of research and the relevance of geography: some experiences and reflections for an ongoing debate, *Area*, 37(1), pp. 118–126.
- Bewonersgroepencongres (1997) *Wijk in de kering, bewonersgroepencongres* [Changing neighbourhood, resident group congress] 18 April, unpublished document, Antwerp.
- Billiet, J. and Witte, H. de (2001) Wie stemde in Juni 1999 voor het Vlaams Blok en waarom? [Who voted Vlaams Blok in June 1999 and why?], *Tijdschrift voor Sociologie*, 22(1), pp. 5–36.
- Blanc, M. (2000) La recherche et l'action: un couple heureux?, *Espaces et Sociétés*, 30(101/102), pp. 17–34.
- Boudry, L., Coninck, M. de, Fret, L. *et al.* (1999) Sociale, stedelijke en bestuurlijke ontwikkeling? Een tussentijdse SIF-Balans [Social, urban and governmental development? An intermediate evaluation of SIF], *Alert*, 25, pp. 21–48.
- Buyck, J. (1988) De jaren '60 van zero tot VAGA [The sixties from zero to VAGA], in: J. Weverbergh (Ed.) *Antwerpen: De Jaren 60* [Antwerp: the sixties], pp. 181–202. Schoten: Hadewijch.

- Campenhout, L. van (2006) *Dromen is Durven* [To dream is to dare]. Antwerpen: BMP.
- Carnoy, M. (1984) Gramsci and the state, in: M. Carnoy (Ed.) *The State and Political Theory*, pp. 65–88. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ceuppens, A. (1981) *Evolutie van de Sociale Woningbouw te Antwerpen* [The evolution of social housing in Antwerp]. Gent: RUG.
- Christiaens, E., Moulaert, F. and Bosmans, B. (2007) The end of social innovation in urban development strategies? The case of Antwerp and the neighbourhood development association BOM, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(3), pp. 238–251.
- Coninck, M. de and Vandenberghe, J. (1996) *Het sociaal impulsfonds: een instrument voor het stedelijk beleid* [The social impulse fund: an instrument for urban policy]. Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap, Brussels.
- Cools, B. (1994) *In Naam van de Stad* [In the name of the city]. Antwerp-Baarn: Hadewijch.
- Cox, R. (1983) Gramsci, hegemony, and international relations: an essay in method, in: R. Cox and T. Sinclair (Eds) *Approaches to World Order*, pp. 124–143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Bilzen (2002) *Marshallplan voor Antwerpen-Noord* [Marshall plan for Antwerp-North]. Unpublished document, Antwerp.
- De Bilzen (2006) *Marshallplan voor Antwerpen-Noord* [Marshall plan for Antwerp-North]. Unpublished document, Antwerp.
- Decker, P. de (1994a) Het herwaarderingsbesluit geherwaardeerd? [Renewing the renewal decree?], *Ruimtelijke Planning*, 2, pp. 85–93.
- Decker, P. de (1994b) Plangroep stad aan de stroom stopt [Plan group the city and the stream stops], *Planologisch Nieuws*, 14, pp. 74–77.
- Decker, P. de (1999) On the genesis of an urban policy in Flanders, Belgium, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 14, pp. 183–190.
- Decker, P. de, Kesteloot, C., Maesschalck, F. de and Vranken, J. (2005) Revitalising the city in an anti-urban context: extreme right and the rise of urban policies in Flanders, Belgium, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29, pp. 152–171.
- Dewinter, F. (2006) *Antwerpen Troef!* [Antwerp first!]. Antwerpen: Uitgeverij Egmont.
- Dorling, D. and Shaw, M. (2002) Geographies of the agenda: public policy, the discipline and its (re)turns, *Progress in Human Geography*, 26, pp. 627–646.
- Dutt, A. and Costa, F. (Eds) (1992) *Perspectives on Planning and Urban Development in Belgium*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gazet van Antwerpen (2005) Grootjans gaat in op vraag projectontwikkelaars [Grootjans responds to project developers' demands], 10 November (<http://antwerpen.gva.be/nieuws-antwerpen/2005/11/10/grootjans-gaat-in-op-vraag-projectontwikkelaars-antwerpen.html>; accessed 23 March 2007).
- Gill, S. (2003) *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gramsci, A. (1975/2001) *Quaderni del Carcere* [Prison notebooks]. Turin: Einaudi.
- Hackworth, J. and Smith, N. (2001) The changing state of gentrification, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 92(4), pp. 464–477.
- Herck, K. van and Avermaete, T. (2006) *Wonen in Welvaart, 1945–1973* [Good living, 1945–1973]. Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010.
- Hertogen, J. (2006) Allochtonen redden democratie in Antwerpen [Allochtoneous save democracy in Antwerp], *BuG 36*, NPData, Brussels.
- Hoefnagels, C. (2004) Theoretisch en empirisch onderzoek naar gentrification in Antwerpen [Theoretical and empirical study on gentrification in Antwerp]. Unpublished MA thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Hove, E. van (2001) *Networking Neighbourhoods*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Imrie, R. (2004) Urban geography, relevance and resistance to the 'policy turn', *Urban Geography*, 25(8), pp. 697–708.
- Ives, P. (2004) *Language and Hegemony in Gramsci*. London: Pluto Press.
- Janssens, P. (2005) *De Stad wor Azzek zen Gebore* [The city where I was born]. Antwerp: BMP.
- Janssens, P. (2006) *Het Beste Moet Nog Komen* [The Best is Yet to Come]. Antwerp: BMP.
- Jessop, B. (1990) *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place*. Pennsylvania, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Jessop, B. (1997) A neo-Gramscian approach to the regulation of urban regimes: accumulation

- strategies, hegemonic projects and governance, in: M. Lauria (Ed.) *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, pp. 51–73. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jessop, B. (2002a) *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, B. (2002b) The political scene and the politics of representation: periodising class struggle and the state in the eighteenth Brumaire, in: M. Cowling and J. Martin (Eds) *Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire: (Post-)modern Interpretations*, pp. 179–194. London: Pluto Press.
- Jessop, B. (2005) Gramsci as a spatial theorist, *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 8, pp. 421–437.
- Lauwers, L. (2008) *Verhuiseffecten van stadsontwikkeling in Antwerpen: een kwantitatief onderzoek naar intrastedelijke migratiepatronen* [Displacement through urban development in Antwerp: a quantitative analysis of intra-urban migration patterns]. Unpublished MA thesis, Free University of Brussels.
- Lees, L. (2000) A reappraisal of gentrification: towards a 'geography of gentrification', *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), pp. 389–408.
- Lees, L. (2003) Policy (re-)turn: gentrification research and urban policy—urban policy and gentrification research, *Environment and Planning A*, 35, pp. 571–574.
- Loopmans, M. (2006a) From residents to neighbours: the making of active citizens in Antwerp, Belgium, in: J. W. Duyvendak, T. Knijn and M. Kremer (Eds) *Policy, People, and the New Professional: De-professionalisation and Re-professionalisation in Care and Welfare*, pp. 109–121. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Loopmans, M. (2006b) Ondernemende burgers in ondernemende steden [Entrepreneurial citizens in entrepreneurial cities], *Agora*, 22(4), pp. 19–22.
- Loopmans, M. (2007) From SIF to city fund: a new direction for urban policy in Flanders, Belgium, *Journal for Housing and the Built Environment*, 22(2), pp. 215–225.
- Loopmans, M., Uitermark, J. and Maesschalck, F. de (2003) Against all odds: poor people jumping scales and the development of an urban policy in Flanders, Belgium, *Belgeo*, 2(3), pp. 243–258.
- Maesschalck, F. de and Loopmans, M. (2002) Hervreiding van middelen en mensen [Redistributing money and people], *Rooilijn*, 35(3), pp. 120–125.
- Maesschalck, F. de and Loopmans, M. (2003) Electoral geography and manifestos of new urban parties from 1977–1999: how urban are they really?, *Belgeo*, 3, pp. 329–342.
- Martin, R. (2001) Geography and public policy: the case of the missing agenda, *Progress in Human Geography*, 25, pp. 189–210.
- Martin, R. (2002) Response to Dorling and Shaw, *Progress in Human Geography*, 26, pp. 627–646.
- Massey, D. (2000) Editorial: practising political relevance, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 25, pp. 131–133.
- Massey, D. (2001) The Progress in Human Geography lecture: geography on the agenda, *Progress in Human Geography*, 25, pp. 5–17.
- Massey, D. (2002) Response to Dorling and Shaw, *Progress in Human Geography*, 26, pp. 627–646.
- Meulder, B. de (2006) De Belgische stedenbouw en de belofte van welvaart 1945–1975: 10 punten over de veranderende productie van het wonen [Belgian urban development and the promise of welfare 1945–1975: 10 remarks on the changing production of housing], in: K. van Herck and T. Avermaete (Eds) *Wonen in Welvaart, 1945–1973*, pp. 128–145. Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010.
- Moulaert, F. (2000) *Globalisation and Integrated Area Development in European Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pacione, M. (1999) Relevance in human geography—special collection of invited papers: guest editorial, *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 115, pp. v–xiv.
- Pain, R. (2006) Social geography: seven deadly myths in policy research, *Progress in Human Geography*, 30, pp. 250–259.
- Pittillion, F., Wuyts, T. and Acker, M. van (2005) *Bouwblokprojecten in Antwerpen* [Building block projects in Antwerp]. Stad Antwerpen and Henri van de Velde Institute, Antwerp.
- Publiservice (1957) *Antwerp today*. Publiservice S.C., Antwerp.
- Sanders, C. (1986) *Recente ontwikkelingen in de kantoorsector toegepast op Antwerpen* [Recent developments in the office sector in Antwerp]. Unpublished MA thesis, Catholic University of Leuven.

- Schelde-Dijle vzw (1971) *Leidraad voor de ontwikkeling van de kernstad Antwerpen*. Schelde-Dijle vzw, Antwerp.
- Schuermans, N. and Maesschalck, F. de (2007) Extreem-rechts, ethnocentrisme en onveiligheidsgevoelens op het Vlaamse platteland [The extreme right, ethnocentrism and feelings of insecurity in the Flemish countryside], *Ruimte en Planning*, 27(2), pp. 10–27.
- Slater, T. (2004) Municipally managed gentrification in South Parkdale, Toronto, *The Canadian Geographer*, 48(3), pp. 303–325.
- Slater, T. (2006) The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30, pp. 737–757.
- Smit, K. de (2003) Hoe dol was Dolle Mina? De geschiedenis van de Dolle Mina's in Vlaanderen [How crazy were the Crazy Minas? The history of the Crazy Minas in Flanders]. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Ghent.
- Smith, N. (2002) New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as a global urban strategy, *Antipode*, 34, pp. 427–450.
- Stad aan de Stroom (1990) *Een opening in de stad: bewonersverhalen voor de toekomst* [Openings to the city: residents' stories for the future]. Stad aan de Stroom vzw, Antwerp.
- Stad Antwerpen (1973) *Binnenstad Antwerpen: structuurschets* [Structure plan for the Antwerp inner city]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen (1978) *Structuurschets zuid* [Structure plan for the south]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen (1980) *Structuurschets Stuivenberg* [Structure plan for Stuivenberg]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen (1985) *Activiteitenverslag 1983–1984–1985: planologie, huisvesting, milieu* [Activity report 1983–1984–1984: planning, housing and environment]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen (1989) *Zes jaar stadsvernieuwing: de nieuwe kleren van mijn buurt* [Six years of urban renewal: new clothes for the neighbourhood]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen (2001) *Bestuursakkoord 2001–2006* [Government agreement 2001–2006]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen (2005) *Stadsplan veilig* [Municipal security plan]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Stad Antwerpen and *Gazet Van Antwerpen* (1998) *Antwerpen: verhalen over buurten* [Antwerp: stories about neighbourhoods]. Stad Antwerpen.
- Timmerman, G. (1994) *De Uitverkoop van Antwerpen* [Selling off Antwerp]. Berchem: EPO.
- Toubhans, W. and Lombaerde, P. (1993) Antwerpen, een moderne stad [Antwerp, a modern city], in: E. Taverne and I. Visser (Eds) *Stedebouw, de Geschiedenis van de Stad in de Nederlanden van 1500 tot Heden* [Urbanism, the history of the city in the Low Countries since 1500], pp. 314–327. Nijmegen: SUN.
- Uitermark, J., Duyvendak, J. W. and Kleinhan, R. (2007) Gentrification as a governmental strategy: social control and social cohesion in Hoogvliet, Rotterdam, *Environment and Planning A*, 39, pp. 1125–1141.
- Verhetsel, A. and Ceulemans, S. (1994) Stadsvernieuwing en speculatie op vastgoed: een gevalstudie: Sint-Andrieskwartier-Antwerpen [Urban renewal and real estate speculation: a case study in the Antwerp Sint-Andries quarter], *Planologisch Nieuws*, 14(3), pp. 111–126.
- Verschueren, J. (2003) *Plaats voor de homo ludens! Vlaamse provo's als nieuwe sociale beweging in een ruimtelijk wereld-systeem-analytisch perspectief* [Make way for the homo ludens! Flemish provo's as a new social movement in a spatial world-system perspective]. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Ghent.
- Ward, K. (2005) Geography and public policy: a recent history of 'policy relevance', *Progress in Human Geography*, 29, pp. 310–319.
- Ward, K. (2006) Geography and public policy: towards public geographies, *Progress in Human Geography*, 30, pp. 495–503.
- Weesep, J. van (1994) Gentrification as a research frontier, *Progress in Human Geography*, 18, pp. 74–83.
- Wyly, L. and Hammel, D. (1999) Islands of decay in seas of renewal: urban policy and the resurgence of gentrification, *Housing Policy Debate*, 10, pp. 711–771.
- Wyly, L. and Hammel, D. (2001) Gentrification, housing policy, and the new context of urban redevelopment, in: K. Fox-Gotham (Ed.) *Critical Perspectives on Urban Redevelopment*, pp. 211–276. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

