

## **Acknowledgements**

The process of writing this thesis could not have been done without the help and support of many people. To all of my friends and family that have supported me through these two years: I owe you a debt of gratitude. You know who you are. To Camilla, Morten and Vegard I want to say thanks for reading my text and the feedback you gave me.

First, I must express my gratitude to my informants Esteban, Jason, Johnny, Isabel and Sarah that you let me take part of your life. This could never been done without you. Without me showing the openness and honesty this thesis would never seen the light of day. I want to send a special thanks to Jamestown Community Centre that opened their doors for me, and gave me a lot of fruitful information.

I also want to utter my appreciation to May and Dan who let me into your home, and my time in San Francisco would never have been the same without Jan, Marise, Nicole and Jen. The memories will never fade.

I want to thank my friends and fellow students at Dragvoll for helping me keeping the spirit up, even when the horizon seemed dark to me. Our lunches and good times made this last year way more fun that I anticipated.

Finally, I want to thank Stein Erik Johansen for all his feedback and guidance.



## **Contents:**

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Contents:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction: the More the Merrier</b>	<b>5</b>
Some last comments	7
<i>Reader's guide</i>	7
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Theory and Methodological Reflections</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Methodological reflections</i>	10
The new population	12
The long-term residents	13
The process of positioning	15
<i>Pierre Bourdieu</i>	18
Capital	18
Social capital	20
Habitus	21
Critiques of Bourdieu	23
<i>Fredrik Barth and process analysis</i>	23
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Mission District</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>The Latino Community</i>	29
Jamestown Community Centre	30
A neighbourhood mom - Isabel	31
"The grimier the better" – Esteban	33
<i>Hipsters, young professionals and students</i>	36
"This is underground"	37
Johnny – an entrepreneur	40
Seeking equality – Sarah	41
Jason – the American life	43
<i>Commitment</i>	44
<i>Art and expression</i>	47
Murals	48
Carnival – colours and culture	53
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Groups and categorization</b>	<b>55</b>
<i>Prototype and cognitive categorization</i>	55
<i>The American way</i>	58
Ethnicity	59
The silenced separation of class	63
The new middle class	63
The working class	64
Separation of class	67
Ethnicity and class	68
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Gentrification</b>	<b>73</b>
<i>Mission District – one neighbourhood?</i>	74

<i>Objective structures and social realities</i>	77
<i>The gentrification in the Mission</i>	83
Personal reflections on the gentrification in the Mission	85
<i>Economy</i>	89
The rent marked	91
<i>The conflict between the residents</i>	91
Different values	92
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>References:</b>	<b>97</b>

## Chapter 1

### Introduction: the More the Merrier

Walking up the street with a suitcase in my hand. Everything is exciting and new. People are everywhere and there are all kinds of people, and the colours, the colours are everywhere! Is this San Francisco for sure? It seems like I'm in Mexico or somewhere... My brand new anthropological eyes and ears are taking in every impression, and I can't believe this marvellous place I've arrived at. It is a huge mix of people from different social classes, ethnicities and genders (and by genders I mean more than two). And the best part, everybody seems to get along well together! How wrong could I be?

The inhabitants of Mission District, a neighbourhood in San Francisco, USA, are very diverse. Mission District is often referred to simply as "the Mission". The inhabitants of the Mission were not living in such harmony as I intentionally supposed, as the differences between the residents was a major source of conflict. The issue I have focused on in this thesis is how different values amongst the inhabitants of the Mission are made visible, and how the inhabitants various values affect the interaction between them. The question becomes on of how these values influence the gentrification process, and how the gentrification process affects the resident of the Mission District. A value is a defined purpose of an action, or a standard of estimating an action (Eriksen and Frøshaug 1998: 110).

When I first arrived in Mission District, my impression was that this was a stable society. I soon discovered that this was not the case, as the Mission was going through a process of gentrification. Gentrification is a change in an area within a city due to the wealthier people buying housing properties in a less affluent neighbourhood. This is an urban phenomenon, which results in changes in the social life and environment. The people living in these areas have fewer resources at their disposal than the people buying the properties. Over a time period as a result of the changes, the average income increases and the residents are more affluent than earlier, and often the family structure for the inhabitants' changes. It often results in fewer families of smaller size.

It affects the composition of social classes, the economy and often the character of a neighbourhood. Consequences of the gentrification process are that the lower income residents have a harder time to pull through economically because of rising rent and generally higher living expenses in the neighbourhood. There are different comprehensions of what is valuable amongst the dwellers in a gentrified area. Residents in this area, such as the Mission, don't have much in common, and this creates a dispute of boundaries when residents use the same facilities. The gentrification process therefore creates tensions between the inhabitants in the Mission, but at the same time keeps them separate, creating two categories of people inhabiting the district.

The two main population categories in this district are the long-term residents on one hand, and the new population on the other. The former of these, the long-term residents, have roots in the Mission, although they need not necessarily have lived there for many years, but never less have a rooted connection with the community around them. Many of these residents have connections to Central- or Latin American and the Caribbean's. The new population have another way of connecting to their environments than the long-term residents. They have are more individualistic lifestyle, and independent relationships. The new population, however, started to move into the Mission around the years 1995-2000, which started the process of gentrification. The new population are for the most part American citizens. I use this division of categories, because it is a distinction expressed by the residents themselves, i.e. and emic distinction. This separation is not only one that the residents of the neighbourhood told me, but also one I experienced myself. The emic term of the long-term residents are the Latinos, the Latino community or just the community. The hipsters, young professionals and students are the emic term of the new population. The perspective of Latinos on one hand, and hipsters, young professionals and students on the other, are at the informants level. Another perspective is connected to class. With this viewpoint, the long-term residents belong to the lower or working classes. The other category of people, the new population, belongs to what we might term "the new middle class". When I draw up these distinctions, I use Pierre Bourdieu's notion of class. I distinguish between these two categories according to habitus and cultural capital. These concepts are thoroughly explained in chapter 2 (Bourdieu 1984; Broady 1991; Bourdieu, Østerberg et al. 1995; Bourdieu 2006). The

new middle class is a flowing category of individuals, and the Mission is just a short stop on their way towards more set frames of their lives.

### **Some last comments**

English is not my native tongue, but I wrote this thesis in English because my informants asked me if they could read it when it was done. After all the time and effort they spent on me, I said I would try, and this was the result. In some way it made it a little easier for me since I didn't had to translate the words and expressions of my informants. The pictures I added in chapter 3 are only from Balmy alley, because unfortunately my pictures from Clarion alley weren't good enough to be published. The interpretations of the murals and what they express, are mine own.

### **Reader's guide**

The foundation of this thesis is the dynamics of how different people are defined according to similarity and difference, although there are several ways in which people are defined when they are a part of something bigger. Let's start with the notion of collectivity. People need to share something or have something in common with each other before we can talk about a collectivity, but at the same time, while collectivity creates nearness internally, it also creates distance to that which lies outside it. It transforms that which falls outside it into an idea about something else, something different. It is an internal-external identification process, identifying them and us. Collectivity is "similarity among and between a plurality of persons" (Jenkins 2008: 103). The use of the term "collectivity" means that these people share something, although whatever this may be and how it is shared, is of little consequence. Another way of classifying the relationships will be the two other terms: groups and categories. The difference between a group and a category is how they relate to each other within the domain of collectivity. A group has an internal acceptance of itself as such, while a category is externally directed, entailing an acceptance for something held in common with others (Jenkins 2008: 104). These various perspectives on a collectivity are needed because the collectivities have different internal or external opinions of each other.

To understand the relationship between the two categories, it is necessary to discuss how the societies in the USA experience themselves and how they classify each other. To understand what happened in the Mission it is necessary to establish what is classified and how it is classified. Ethnicity and race are related discourses with which Americans often classify themselves (Banks 1996; Ortnner 2006). A discourse is a set of concepts that are given within the existing culture. The concept has certain expectations to it, and it often is connected to the relations between power and language. Although race and ethnicity are two different terms, there is much overlap between them. Race refers to the a biological characteristic of an individual, while ethnicity is the cultural characteristic of an individual as a member of a group (Blu 1980). Karen Blu's (1980) definition of ethnicity is comparable to Richard Schermerhorn's (1996) definition that is used in chapter 4, and both of them define ethnicity of something cultural that is shared by members of the collectivity. I will have a discussion of how race and ethnicity is connected to class even if the concept of class is almost non-existent by the citizens of USA.

Pierre Bourdieu's models of social life and his explanations of cultural capital and habitus are the foundation of this thesis. His notion of the social life establish a link between normative and instrumental systems, and show how humans may have free will despite of rules and norms (Bourdieu 1984; Broady 1991; Bourdieu, Østerberg et al. 1995; Bourdieu 2006). Many of the theories in this thesis are based on process and the ability to make choices, which Fredrik Barth instrumental focus may be used to illuminate. Bourdieu's concept of capital and habitus describes an embodied understanding of values and structures, which I suggest are needed to identify and understand change and process. Barth (1996) argues that choices come from the compulsion to maximise ones own profits. David Hollinger (1995) debates how choice might influence the structures. Even if there is a possibility of a choice, the agent might choose to remain passive because of the habitus inherent in their status of class and ethnicity.

In the last chapter I discuss gentrification with a view towards the different classes and how they experience each other. There are different angles I explore and one of them is how the residents of the Mission experience and understand the social structures. By using Arjun Appadurai (1996) theories about the anticipation and



perception of the Other through various scapes, I will argue that the image or idea of the self is not necessarily the image and idea held by one group about another and vice versa. By discussing Appadurai's scapes and cosmopolitanism I argue that the intention behind people's understanding of each other might be good, but outcome of the understanding may be different of the intention. The intention is to have an understanding that is as precise as possible, but because of distinction of normative and instrumental systems, this doesn't occur. In an area undergoing the gentrification process this may lead to conflicts especially when there is not much communication between the residents. The values of the residents of the Mission are different and this influences the relationship between them. This relationship is thoroughly explained in chapter 5.

## Chapter 2

### Theory and Methodological Reflections

In this chapter I will use my methodological reflections to clarify two important issues I experienced when I was in the field. First I need to explain why I changed the focus and locus of my fieldwork after I arrived in San Francisco. This was of significant for me, because it shows the importance for an anthropologist to be flexible and expectant to the field. Another issue that was important for me was objectivity. The discussion is large, so I will limit it to mentioning one side of the discussion because of limitation of pages. In the next part I will give an overview of the theories I will build my thesis at. How values are experienced, negotiated, and how values are connected to social identities are topics I will explore through these theories. The main models I will use are Bourdieu's model (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu, Østerberg et al. 1995; Bourdieu 2006), and Barth's (1994, 1996) generative model to make Bourdieu's model more dynamic. By using Bourdieu's structures to understand the resident's values and describing them, I will be able to give an image of how the different categories share the residential area of Mission District. I will be able to give an image of the neighbourhood, and why the communication and interaction between the residents function as it does. These are the two main theoretical approaches, but as a supplement I will use Erving Goffman (1968, 1992) that shows how roles and statuses are connected to social identities.

#### Methodological reflections

Originally, my project was about how gay men in the Castro District in San Francisco made groups within themselves. When I came to San Francisco, I couldn't afford the high level of rent in the Castro. One of the closest neighbourhood to the Castro was Mission District, so I decided to get a room in an apartment, and stay in the Mission and commute to the Castro since it was just a 10-15 minutes walk. When I got to see and experience the Mission, I was a little worried because I didn't know much about the area except for what the Lonely Planet (Bing 2008) said, which was that the neighbourhood was exciting, artistic and for people moving into the neighbourhood; moderately safe. The reason why the Lonely Planet guide said it was moderately safe

was because it used to be a gang related neighbourhood, but at the time of my fieldwork the gang activity was reduced. After a couple of days of exploring the neighbourhood I found something really exciting: there were many ethnicities amongst the residents, and different social categories in one area, and it seemed that everybody got along great. My initial impression was that there was a mix of people living in the same area, all using the same infrastructure, and that there is some sort of equality between them all. Because of all these different people living in the district, there had to be something more going on than just what I could observe on the surface. The fact that many different people living in one area, with such a distinct Latino character as in the Mission, caught my attention and triggered my curiosity. This was the reason why I decided to stay in the Mission and do my fieldwork there, instead of going all the way up to the Castro. I decided to change my entire focus of my thesis, because of the new location. I had to adjust to the new situations. Allaine Cerwonka argues that “ we stress that ethnography demands a certain sensibility, as well as improvised strategies and ethical judgements made within a shifting landscape in which the ethnographer has limited control “(Cerwonka 2007: 20). The situation turned into something else than planned, in the beginning of my fieldwork. I went with the flow, and adjusted my fieldwork to the new location. I estimated at the time that my new focus were going to be more fruitful than my focus in the Castro, because I lived in the same area as my subjects, I would not only be closer to my subjects physically, but also mentally, and above all, there was something exciting going on that I couldn't put my finger on. My interest was drawn from the categorization in the gay communities in the Castro, to some sort of equality between people that I didn't expect from the dwellers in the Mission. Since I started from scratch again, I stumbled around some time before I found my theme. First I wanted to write about how different ethnicities lived together in one neighbourhood, and the challenges this brought. Soon I discovered that there had been changes in the neighbourhood the last 10-15 years, and new people were moving into the neighbourhood. The flow of people was causing problems for the original population. The issue that often was brought up by all of my informants, and people living in the neighbourhood was gentrification. This was the repeating topic in many of my conversation, both interviews and other conversations. I decided to do my thesis on the topic of gentrification.

When I arrived in the Mission, I needed to settle down, and find where I was according to the already exciting categories. Since there were large differences between the collectivities I needed to anticipate my own category and attributes within the collectivities in the Mission. There was an obviously difference between the long-term residents and the new population. There were other categories in the Mission, but the largest and the most obvious were the long-term residents and the new population. The separation was between different ethnicities, and another obvious one: class.

### **The new population**

I blended well in with the new population because of my background and my own lifestyle. In the Mission, I lived in a shared house with mostly young adults, and I lived on the same terms as large parts of the new population in the area. My friends and informants went out to dinner and drinks, both during the week and weekend. Almost every weekend there were parties to attend and fairs to visit. All of them had work or studies, but the spare time was concerned about enjoying life. This lifestyle was easy to maintain in San Francisco because everything were available if he or she has the resources to live the life he or she wanted. I had 3 official informants from this category, but I met many people that shared parts of their life with me.

During the middle of the 1990s that the wave of new people started to move to the Mission and some of these who moved to the Mission at that time live there still and this group of people are in their 40s. I had one official informant from this category. I met him often at a coffee bar for interviews. I would define him as a good example of the new population because at the time he has no kids, but were in a relationship, and lived in an apartment on the west side of the Mission (also called Mission Dolores). It was a little harder to connect with him, than my other informants from the new population, even if we had almost the same lifestyles. The relationship I had with Johnny was a researcher-informant relationship. I wanted to see more of his personal life, but I didn't want to be rude, and invite myself back to him and his wife's home. We always met at a café or a coffee bar of his choice. His favourite place to meet was at a coffee bar called "Coffee Bar", and this was on the other side of the neighbourhood compared to where he lived. This was a modern coffee bar and most

of the clientele were from the new population. I didn't get a proper look at his private life because I assume that he felt this had no relevance for my research.

My two other informants from this category were at the same age as me. We got a more personal relationship, and much of the information I got from them was through participant observation. Jason was my housemate, and rented the room next to mine almost my entire stay. A month before I moved back home to Trondheim, he moved out and went to Indonesia to surf with his girlfriend at the time. He kind of took the role as my big brother, because if there were something I didn't understand, I could just knock on his door and ask him. No matter what it was, he would help me the best he could. I teased him about his girlfriends coming over, and he could tease me back for something I did. I sometimes went out with him and his friends, and they often took me places outside the neighbourhood. My other informant Sarah, I met in a bar in the Mission while her friend flirted with my friend on Valentines Day. She introduces me to several of her friends, and they all showed me how young people from the new population lived their lives. She invited me over to their apartment on the west side of the Mission some times, and other times we went out for drinks, or went to fairs in the city. I became friends with Sarah and her friends, and Lauren even stayed with me and comforted me when I needed some support (such as when I got homesick or got a tattoo). Both with Jason and Sarah I got good connections with on a personal level.

### **The long-term residents**

Finding a way to get to know somebody from the long-term residents community was hard. I had to try something than finding friends at bars, since I obviously was an outsider. I went online to see if I could find some organizations to work with. After I sent a couple of emails to some of the neighbourhood community centres, and I got in touch with Esteban. He in turn, introduced me with Isabel. Along with the long-term residents I felt like an outsider who just asked questions. I tried a role as a photographer, but that did not work out very well. I didn't have the right equipment I needed to get the pictures I wanted, and it was hard being both an anthropologist and a photographer. As an anthropologist it was not a very good solution, because I could not focus both on taking pictures and make out what happened around me. Doing both

participant observation, and focusing on what happened through a camera lens was hard to combine. As a photographer I needed to sort out what the story told me through the lens, and focus on that. As an anthropologist I needed to be aware of everything around, and to pick up on different sorts of communication, not only the direct communication that a photographer would focus on. When I tried to be both a photographer and an anthropologist at the same time I felt that I only did both jobs halfway, and I was not happy with the result.

Another problem I had in the long-term residents was the language barrier. At Jamestown Community Centre they had bilingual interpreters, since not all of the users spoke both English and Spanish, and for my self I can only speak English. In my everyday life I could not understand what everybody was saying around me, because people often speak Spanish amongst themselves in stores and at the streets. Normally I used the local facilities for my shopping, laundry and other necessities, and at these places they spoke English to me, but Spanish amongst themselves. Because of the language barrier I know I may have lost some information. Of all my informants two of them spoke Spanish fluently, one from the new population, and one of the long-term residents. The rest of them understood and spoke some Spanish on different levels. All of them spoke English fluently since all they were born and raised in the USA.

It was frustrating trying to fit in to a world where I didn't expect I would fit in. It is possible that I was a little tentative since this was a new environment for me, and I was not sure of how to behave respectfully. It is possible that I became a little shy. The result was that I didn't get the connection I wanted with the Latino community. I felt like an outsider, and had a different relationship with the long-term residents than with the new population. To understand the long-term residents community I had to rely on my informants. Because of this, I had problems getting "backstage" information, which we know from Goffman's (1992) theories. My informants could withhold information or lie if they wanted to, and if they did, I would not be able to notice. I trusted my informants because they seemed like they were honestly trying to help me, and give me a peek inside the community. I took the easy way out when I distanced myself from the long-term residents, but at the same time it gave me information on how the communication between the two categories worked. The way

that the long-term residents treated me indicated that they saw me as an outsider, and they protected themselves. They saw me as someone from the new population. There will be more about this aspect of communication between the two main groups in chapter 4 and 5.

### **The process of positioning**

I relied on participant observation and interviews for collecting information during my fieldwork. Participant observation means that the researcher has to be an insider, and participate at the same time as the researcher has to be able to see the situation from the outside and analyse what is going on (Eriksen and Frøshaug 1998: 33).

Amongst the new population it was easier to do participant observation since I blended well in with this category. Members from this category could identify themselves with me, just as I could identify myself with them. I could easily identify with Sarah and the group of people in their 20s, who were working with a program that seeks to eliminate educational inequity by providing teachers for all schools called “Teach for America” (TeachForAmerica 2010) It was easy to blend in with them, and they were open and friendly towards me. I didn’t stand out in the crowd when I was with them. I was able to establish more personal relationships with them. They allowed me to collect backstage information (Goffman 1992) of their lives, and it was comfortable because it was very similar to my own lifestyle and values. With this category I had interviews so I could put their words of how they experience the Mission, and at the same time I participated in their lives. They showed me so much of their lives that it sometimes got complicated separating the role as a researcher from the friend. It went that far that I was on the risk of “going native”. I felt like one of them, and the risk was that I forgot that I was there to work and study them as an anthropologist. But question strikes me: where do the limit between being a good researcher and a human go? It’s a huge discussion, but it applied to my fieldwork as well as others. Nancy Scheper-Hughes (2006) argues for a more moralistic anthropology. She claims that the researcher hides behind anthropology, and separates the researchers from the objects he or she is going to study (Scheper-Hughes 2006). The anthropologist has a responsibility towards the people who are studied, and should not view its subjects as the Other. The anthropologist has a moralistic and

ethical responsibility to the subjects, and should not just be “witnesses” to the actions and lives. Ethnography should be personally engaged and politically committed (Scheper-Hughes 2006: 511). Scheper-Hughes writes about anthropologists in extreme situations, where humans are in risk of their life, but the question of how personal an anthropologist should be is important. How objective can an anthropologist be? It was hard separating the friend and the researcher, because when did my friends and informants tell me something that was told in confidentiality? During the fieldwork I actually forgot to be the researcher sometimes. It was very easy to fall in the character as just a friend. An example is when Sarah supported me when I got my tattoo. She was there to support me as a friend, not because I was studying them. I wouldn't have been able to manage the painful experience of the constantly puncturing of my skin if she hadn't been there to support me. The writing and analysing process made me realise that the separation between the researcher and the private person became blurred during my fieldwork. My objectivity got blurred, and it was harder than expected to keep a distance towards my subjects. Sometimes there were no distance, and I think that's just fine. It is through the process of letting people cross the intimacy border one really gets to know someone, and become able to understand their situation. One needs to try to hold an objective perspective of course. The objectivity makes the anthropologist able to say something about others, not one self (D'Andrade 2006) but there is a fine line between being completely objective, and being personally involved. The blend of objectivity and being able to use my own understanding and empathy was what did to understand the new population in the Mission

Because of my position as an outsider with the long-term residents, I had to rely on my interviews and observation, but not so much participant observation as I wanted. After a while I understood more and more of Spanish words in sentences, and I could interpret words people used, but I could never understand sentences and the coherence. I had to rely on my own interpreting of body language and read the situation based on my own gut feeling, and I trusted my own instincts. The danger about this was that it was another culture, and other rules than what I am used to, but it was still western culture and some of the same cultural and social norms and rules were valid there, so I could use some of my basic knowledge to interpreter situations in the Mission. I didn't know this when I first arrived there, but I realised during my



stay that my interpretation was often the correct one. If I couldn't trust my own feelings and my instinct, I had lost an important tool. The new place and the new setting I was in, made me trust my instinct. I knew if I made mistakes that didn't were unanimous the norms and rules that already were established there, I could read it if I made mistakes in the behaviour to my respondents. I had to rely on trial and error when it came to what was allowed and what's not. It was hard getting personally involved with the long-term residents the same way as I did with the new population, because I was an outsider. Amongst my informants with the long-term residents I had to rely on mostly interviews, and less on participant observation. Because of my role as a researcher in the society, it was harder doing participant observation the same way I did with the new population. I did more interviews and observation with the long-term residents than the participant observation that I got to do with the group I blended in with. My informants from the long-term residents were very willing to answer all my questions honestly and elaborate the answers so I got a lot of information from them. They did not push or distance me out me from their lives, but I felt that I didn't belong there, so I might also have distanced myself from them as well. It was kind of a business relationship between them and me. It was easier to separate between myself as the anthropologist, and my personal life when I was winking with them. I could observe the long-term residents from a distance, and without understanding every conversation. I used my informants from the long-term residents to try to fill inn the gaps of information I had. I call them my informants, and not my friends because of the lack of a personal intimate relationship. This had not only to do with that I was lacking the same background as them, but also a difference in age and lifestyle. One of my informants had a child, and worked many hours a day and she tried to spend her spare time with family and friends. The other one was committed to local community, and he didn't like the influence the new population had on the neighbourhood. When it came to myself I used these new facilities and enjoyed them. Both of these informants had an everyday life in the neighbourhood, and they had their circle and friends and family around them and wanted to use their spear time on them.

## **Pierre Bourdieu**

The French sociologist, philosopher and anthropologist, Pierre Bourdieu's most important works are connected to culture, knowledge and power. He was inspired of structuralism, but at the same time is aware of the agent. As a result of his inspirations, some of his key concepts are capital and habitus. These concepts will be describes and explained in the following text. To be able to understand the enormous work of Bourdieu and his perspective of capital and habitus, I found backing in Donald Broady's "Sociologi och Epistemologi: Om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologin" (Broady 1991). I've used Broady's understanding and discussion of Bourdieu to get a good comprehension of what capital and habitus is, and how they are connected to each other. The following text will be inspired of that.

### **Capital**

Symbolic capital is a relational term that is used about something that is perceived as valuable by recipients. Someone has to recognize, evaluate and understand the action or title, for it to make sense in the social world. For an individual to make an action without a recipient or someone to evaluate or judge the action, it will be is meaningless. For a recipient to be able to evaluate or judge the action, one also needs the same objective structures and dispositions to be able to make the judgement. Dispositions are where the agents taste comes from, and the background of how people interact. The dispositions are beyond what is directly learned by an agent. Dispositions generates meaningful practices and perceptions, and are strongly connected to habitus (Bourdieu 1984), which is explained later in this chapter. Dispositions are a result from social skills, and a collective memory that are embodied by the social human. The system of dispositions are what decides how humans act, think, experience and values in certain social conditions. The dispositions often are products of the same or similar characteristics or accesses. This mean that people with the same have the same opinion of what is valuable and how valuable it is. They have the same understanding of the objective structures.

Cultural capital is a subgroup of symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is everywhere, but cultural capital referrers to the dominant relation in the society as a whole. Bourdieu's research show that agents "culture needs are a product of upbringing and education"

(Bourdieu 1984: 1). What cultural practice the agent prefers, depends on educational levels and social origin, and this influences the taste of the agent. This turns the school system into a socially recognized hierarchy of the art, and in turn, creates a similar social hierarchy of consumers. This creates difference in taste, and functions as a separation of class (Bourdieu 1984). Art has meaning for someone who is culturally competent to understand the cultural code. An agent who doesn't have this cultural code might not understand the use of colours, the lines and the meaning of the piece of art. He or she doesn't have the dispositions to decode the work of art. Cultural capital is also about the relation of power between people. Some have higher education than others, and it's this group of people that often are considered the dominant part. They are the ones that define what good and bad taste is. The difference between classes derives from the overall volume of capital, which is understood as the useful resources and power – economic capital, cultural capital and social capital. The division of various classes runs from those who are best provided with economical and cultural capital, to those who are deprived of the types of capital mentioned above (Bourdieu 1984). People from higher classes have often higher education and a more economical capital. It doesn't necessarily have to be a symmetric correlation between a higher education, large economical capital and cultural capital. There are higher educations that pay less for instance a teacher, but they often have the dominant form of cultural capital. Bourdieu has another example of that some artists have the cultural capital, but lack economical capital. The avant-garde artists that reject both the ordinary taste connected to the shopkeepers that indicate the lower middle classes. Next the artist rejects the middle classes taste, and the scholastically acquired taste. The avant-garde sees this taste as a variant to the middle classes taste, and despises it for being passive, taking it too seriously and above all too prudent and *late* (Bourdieu, Østerberg et al. 1995: 116). Cultural capital is not symmetrical with education and economical capital, but it needs to be understood in connection with habitus.

Symbolic capital in a non-writing society is maintained and storied through incorporated habits, dispositions, traditions and the social memory of the past among interaction between people. In the modern society the symbolic capital may be changed and transformed, and because of this, Bourdieu also uses cultural capital. Powerful agents, such as a university professor, an editor or another leading role in

the society in virtue of themselves, their authority or their institutions may change and transform what is right and what is wrong according to tastes in the social world. If one has the right kind of symbolic capital, and are articulate one will be able to dominate culture knowledge, and focus on what is good and bad taste. The ones that dominate cultural knowledge will hold the authoritative cultural capital. Bourdieu used his theories on the French educational and school system, and he used the educational system as empirical examples for his theories. He claims (1984) that teachers have the ability to tell which pupils that are talented. These students have the specific accesses of hereditary of cultural knowledge. They master the form of knowledge and language that the school premiere. When the pupils have the same understanding and value assessment as the teacher based on the teachers dispositions, the pupils are awarded. In the western world the consumption of food is another example. It is a huge focus on food, and what's "good" for you (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu, Østerberg et al. 1995; James 1997). In the American society food is a class issue. Fast food and food that is categorized as unhealthy are often connected with the lower classes. Healthy or "good food" are connected with the higher classes. When I went to McDonalds and Burger King in the Mission, most of the people there were families, and often from the long-term residents. The Whole Foods store had natural and organic food as their focus, and they had mostly customers from the new middle class. In this example the divide is present because of the economy, but the classes need to separate themselves from each other. The separation is often based on what the other classes don't have accessible (Bourdieu, Østerberg et al. 1995). When the working class get hold of what the middle class has accessible, the middle classes will find something else that separate themselves from the working class. It is possible to convert from one class to another. By converting capital, individuals tries to acquire as many values and symbols of good taste, i.e. the dominant cultural capital, as possible (Eriksen and Frøshaug 1998). By getting access to the assets of the higher classes they might try to change classes. It's not enough to just have access to a higher economical capital, but one also has to consume the other class's cultural capital.

### **Social capital**

Another form of capital is social capital, which is the connections between people. The connection can be family relations, contact in between individuals, or a tie

between collages or co-students (Broady 1991: 177). It should not be considered a subgroup of symbolic capital. The reason why are because social capital doesn't have the same kind of symbolism as cultural capital. While cultural capital is more about institutional capital and the value of educational measurement. Social capital doesn't store itself in material resources, institutions or titles. Social capital is about social network. It's not the accesses itself that is important, but the peoples practises and conceptions. The accesses that social capital translates from, for instance a family name, or the relationship between old students from a school, is valuable. The classification of these accesses is not enough for Bourdieu's method, but one need to include the conception and practise amongst the agents. When it comes to social capital, the focus is at the relationship between individuals, and the conception of themselves and others in interaction that is important. Social capital concerns the value assessment of the social network, and the expectation of others in comparison to oneself.

The different types of capital need to be seen as part of a whole. One can see different types of capital in empirical material, and the different types of capital coexist. While social capital is used to understand the accesses between individuals and different types of collectivist, cultural capital has different levels and conditions. The conditions are the incorporated, which often is referred to as habitus, objective conditions as measurement, books and tools and the institutional condition such as educational degrees and titles (Bridge 2006). An empirical situation often has several conditions and forms of capital. The different types of capital are used to identify and explore the relationship between various aspects of capital. It is not the identification of capital and the role agents or titles possess, but how they function together that is interesting. It is the relationship between these factors, and how they come to life that gives the most interesting information of how the social world operates. The relationship between the types of capital give information of how individuals and groups act and manoeuvre in the social reality they find themselves in. To understand the concept of capital it need to be view together with incorporated behaviour.

### **Habitus**

An aspect closely connected with the different types of capital is habitus. Habitus is large part of how people relate to each other, and how they orientate themselves in the

social world. Habitus is the incorporated knowledge that humans obtain from their experiences

The habitus is both the generative principle of objectively classifiable judgements and the system of classification (*principle of division*) of these practices. It is in the relationship between the two capacities which define the habitus, the capacity to produce classifiable practices and products (taste), that represent the social world (Bourdieu 1984: 170).

The theory of habitus is based on structures of the grounds of changeable and consistent dispositions (Bourdieu 2006). These dispositions are grounded in the individual agent. The social structure and habitus can manage the individual because of

...as principle of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively “regulated” and “regular” without in any way being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their goals without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary to attain them, and being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating action of a conductor (Bourdieu 2006: 407)

Habitus is about incorporated behaviour that recreates the future based on patterns from the past. The pattern from the past come from the understanding of objective structures that constitutive from a particular type of environment (Bourdieu 2006). The human mind can't make conscious decisions about everything that needs to be decided. Some decisions are made unconsciously. Eleanor Rosch (1978) developed prototype theories in the 1970s that describes cognitive processes of categorization in the human mind, and how the human mind unconsciously remembers the world as a whole, and not a list of features (D'Andrade 1995). Rosch's prototypes explain how the unconscious mind remembers, but Bourdieu's focus of habitus explains the dynamic of conscious and unconscious actions of the individual.

Habitus, (...), operates neither consciously nor unconsciously, neither deliberately, nor automatically (...) habitus is simultaneously collective and individual, and definitely embodied (Jenkins 2008: 42)

Habitus is the relation that is established between practice and a situation. The meaning is produced by the habitus through perception and appreciation that is produced by an observable social condition (Bourdieu 1984). The incorporated habitus has an influence on the acting agent. In situations where the agent would find him or her self, habitus and cultural capital is part of how he or she acts. Habitus is closely connected to the concept of symbolic and social capital. Habitus is part of this capital, but habitus is not always capital (Broady 1991). Every human is equipped with habitus, but it is the market of the cultural capital that decides what ingredients, and what sort of effect habitus has on cultural capital. An example of how habitus and capital are connected can be explained with a person that is raised in an intellectual

family where the cultural capital weighs more than the economical capital, compared with the children of an industrial leader inherits the opposite distribution. One may separate between inherited and acquired capital (Broady 1991: 227). Capital and habitus are connected through the social systems, and by recreating the past these systems are maintained. The agents are not entirely subjects of the environment, but there is a freedom within limits. An individual or a group can make choices within the limitations of the social system. The higher classes will control the values and symbols of cultural capital. By controlling these values they also controls whose habitus that is most consistent with the dominant cultural capital. In other words: the higher classes will be the category that decides the ranking of values and symbols.

### **Critiques of Bourdieu**

There are several authors that criticise Bourdieu and his models of systems. Both Kristeen Paton (2010) and Gary Bridge (2006) discuss Bourdieu's terms of capital and habitus in correlation to gentrification. Bridge claims that cultural capital doesn't exist in social vacuum, and the different cultural capitals may be in conflict with each other, and he argues that the new knowledge and taste are often reproduction of the local taste (Bridge 2006). By this he mean that the new population coming to an area, often adjust the local cultural capital to it's own. Paton (2010) argues that capital is a too static to understand gentrification by. The types of capital can't explain change in an additional discussion. Bourdieu's model show how the gentrification process happened, but because of the static nature of capital and habitus, it can't explain how it happened. (Barth (1994) critiques amongst other theorists, Bourdieu, for the use of static models and structures. By concentrating on the structures there is little room for process and change. Barth's critiques Bourdieu's social systems will be made clear, and generative model of process and change will be described thoroughly in the next section.

### **Fredrik Barth and process analysis**

Barth critiques the structural functionalism, and instead focuses on process and change. He has taken another approach towards understanding the social world than Bourdieu. However, Barth take on the interactions of the individuals and argues for that it is not the rules and framework of the structures that creates the social form, but

the individuals interacting with other individuals. His argument is that our theoretical models should be formulated with the intention to explain how observable frequency patterns or regularities are generated (Barth 1994). This is an approach that focuses on process, and how process is explained. Many models are too static and can only describe the pattern, but Barth need a deeper explanation of how the processes work, and why they work.

Barth's (1994) use of form in a social reference is series of regularities that we observe in individuals behaviour within a population. He use the simplest model of a society, it implies that the society is like an aggregate, and humans make choices while they are under certain limitations and incentives (Barth 1994). In these situations there will be produced static regularities. There is no force or mechanic necessities that make human decide over the choices they do, but the human capability to predict and evaluate (Barth 1994). The future can't be predicted, but according to more static models we can assume what's going to happen is based on the actions of the past and the present day. Some models are static, and don't have room for change. Bourdieu's and his models of capital and habitus are useful to describe difference, but his models have little room to describe change and process. To understand change and process we need to admit that what we observes, are not "customs" but an occurrence of human behaviour (Barth 1994). Still the problem with personal choice is there, and the question need to be how limitations and incentives do channel the decisions of behaviour (Barth 1994). Personal choices lead to no alterations or changes, but the question is where do these choices come from? In Barth's (1994) opinion, the structuralisms answers the question with the limitations and incentives comes from moral, and that the society is a normative system. The regularities in behavioural patterns are connected to moralistic limitations and incentives that determine the regularities, and the regularity is summed up to a status position (Barth 1994). The statuses of an individual come from a moralistic perspective that determines the regularities, which mean that the choices are taken from the moralistic perspective of the status. With statuses there comes rights and obligations that belongs with it. These rights and obligations are determined by the moral. People make their choices because of what the moral impose on the action, based on what the status require. Through the transformation the form become generated into a congruent form, that consist of moral norms and command that this is



the logical cause of behavioural regularities (Barth 1994). The reason why Barth claims that the models that use regularities are not good enough is because the models use moral as the cause of limitations. They make moral the limitation, and because of moral the society is stable. Morals make the society stable because moral doesn't change according to Bourdieu's model. When the reason for decisions doesn't change, the society stay stable. Barth's argument is that we should be able to explain how observable frequency patterns or regularities are generated, is not satisfied by the answer that moral is that cause of behavioural patterns.

To make use of a process analysis we need to refer to something that control and affect activity (Barth 1994). These control mechanisms should go longer than just reeling off the different parties commitment to each other. The study of process needs to be a study of necessary, or likely mutual dependency that controls the happening. The study of process is the explanation on various, complex forms that are produced in interactions (Barth 1994). The difference of Barth's explanation, and other more static models, are what creates the pattern we need to make *visible*, not just describe the pattern of social form. The pattern of social forms is generated through interaction, and through their form they reflect the incentives and limitations that are present in the society (Barth 1994). The pattern in the interaction reflects why agents make their choices.

Barth's assertions are that transformations *from* the limitations and incentives *too* the frequency patterns of behaviour in a population are complex. It has it's own structure, and through the structure we will be able to explain a great deal of characteristics of social life (Barth 1994). A possibility for a tool to analyse fundamental processes where rights and obligations are relevant in certain social situation, is to use both status and role. Goffman (1992) use status and role, and show how each interaction establishes and sustains an agreement around the definition of the situation, and separates the agents different statues and negotiates the ground for their interaction. This process is kind of a selective communication: they are over communicating what confirms the relevant status positions, and under communicating the aspects that diminish the status positions (Goffman 1992; Barth 1994). This will lead to stereotype forms for behaviour; the behaviour that doesn't have the rights and obligations of the status, but seems like regularity characteristic of the role because of the definition of

the situations demands of over- and under-communicating. This is impression management according to Goffman's definition (Goffman 1992; Barth 1994). To use an example from the Mission, I will use the hipsters. A hipster is stereotyped as a subject who only cares about him or her self, partying and give the impression as someone "unique". As a result of the situational over- and under communicated status positions, the hipster's regularity behaviour is expected to be as one mentioned above. It is the role of the hipsters, but still it is just an occurrence of behaviour.

How a variety of decisions under the influence of channelizing factors might have the cumulative effect of producing clear patterns and convention. Nearly all the same problems with impression management rise for all that hold a status. The costs and rewards of the interactions accomplishment leads most people to a change in the execution of the role in the direction of a optimum; the more a certain type of behaviour is static connected to a status, the more it will be intensified by serving as a idiom for identification, a expression of the status (Barth 1994). The agent will constantly try to execute their role and maximise their rewards through how others interact with him or her. Since an agent intensifies some aspect of the behaviour connected to the role, these aspects will be seen as identification of the status. Based on this perspective, a model of how complex and comprehensive behavioural patterns (role) might be generated from specifications of rights (status) seen together with transformation rules (impression management) (Barth 1994)

The limitations that defines each social situation is connected with the rights and obligations that follows the set of relevant statuses; we need to understand how statuses are combined in sets, in such a way that we are able to construct rules that controls different possibilities of combination of status in a generative model (Barth 1994). We find the foundation of these rules in most interpersonal relationships transactional character, in other words the obligation of reciprocity (Barth 1994). Each social relation involves a stream and counter stream of performance. Our own and others idea of peculiarity and value influence our relation in two different ways: first of all, the agents decide which statuses that are complimentary in the social relation, and then they influence the progress of the interaction in the relation (Barth 1994). Nothing is accidental, and both parties adjust the statuses according to who is interacting. The interaction is based on the set of relevant statuses and it is a

reciprocal progress through the other agents presence and performance. Barth (1994) specifies that in this connecting transaction as an analytical term are connected to reciprocity; the interaction sequences are systematic controlled by reciprocity in many cases.

Transactions may be seen as a structure that leads into a notion of maximising value. By looking at transaction as a structure that maximises values, we can analyse the transactions as sequences of reciprocity that follows certain steps of a strategic game. There are an account of wins and losses of values. Every action, or each step, influences the account, changes the strategic situation and channelizing later choices (Barth 1994). In comparison to the more static models where moral is the foundation of interaction is Barth's model is more dynamic. The actions of the participants is based on the individuals wish to maximise their values. The maximizing of values is the incentive for different choices that are made in an interaction situation. In Barth's (1994) model the choices incentives and limitations is active by deciding what values could be won, and what could be lost. Each social actors adjustment to the other part in the transaction can be made out from the others possible steps, and how these steps next will influence the egos possibility of profit of values. The structure of this model is expiration of time – a model of process (Barth 1994).

## Chapter 3

### Mission District

Mission District is a neighbourhood in San Francisco, California, often just called the Mission. One of the things the Mission is recognized for is its Latin American influence. This is one of the oldest areas in the city and the oldest church and structure in San Francisco is the «Mission San Francisco de Asís» which was founded 29<sup>th</sup> of June 1776 (Albano 2011). The settlers came to this area to christian the Yelamu Indians, and to settle down. The church still lies in the Mission and is open for public. The Californian gold rush in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century brought new activities to the Mission District and it turned out as an entertainment area. When Europeans came to settle in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, many Irish and German immigrants moved to the neighbourhood, and there are still traces in the Mission from this period of time. There are restaurants and bars in the Mission with a distinct European style like Schmidt's, Walzwerk and even ChaChaCha, a tapas restaurant and bar, that promotes themselves as "ChaChaCha at Original McCarthy's". The European influence on the neighbourhood today, is not as substantial the Central and Latin American ones. After the 1906 earthquake most of the city north of the Mission burned down, and as a result of that the population in the Mission grew even more, and more businesses moved into the neighbourhood.

During the 1940s to 1960s many Mexican immigrants moved into the neighbourhood, which started the European immigrants flight from the district. These Mexican immigrants are the reason why the Mission has its Latin American character that it is known for today. During the 1980s many immigrants came from Central America because of political and economical instability, and many of these immigrants settled down in the Mission because it already was a Latino community there. They brought Central American banks and companies there and these companies would set up regional headquarters on Mission Street. The flow of immigrants from the 1940s and forward have set the standards for how the Mission has been earlier and what it was during my fieldwork

During the 1990s a phenomenon started to expand in San Francisco. This was the dot com bubble. This phenomenon is based on how the stock market in different countries grew because of how internet based companies were established, and a lot of economical capital went into these companies with an unrealistic expectation that the stock price would continue to rise. The stock price dropped after a big high. An example of a successfully internet based company is amazon.com. The dot com bubble in San Francisco led to a change in the Mission. Young, artistic and liberal people started to move into the neighbourhood, and with this resulted in that another culture started to get hold of the neighbourhood. The new population started moving into a lower class neighbourhood, and this was the beginning of the gentrification process in the Mission. Landlords bought houses, which they rented out to whomever that could pay. The largest visible difference of the gentrification process is between Mission Street and Valencia Street, and it's described in the chapter about gentrification. There are two larger categories of dwellers in the Mission, and it's the new population that brought the gentrification process to the neighbourhood, but as a consequence, the process affects the long-term residents also.

### **The Latino Community**

In the Mission there is a community amongst Latinos. To explain community I will use Jenkins definitions:

...community do not belong to intellectuals. It is a powerful everyday notion in terms of which people organise their lives and understand the places and settlements in which they live and the quality of their relationships. (Jenkins 2008: 133)

The community is one of the most important foundations in the Latino culture. There are several subgroups within the Latino community, but I will not focus on these. My focus is on the relationship between the Latino community as a whole and the hipsters, young professionals and students. People who belong to the Latino community are not only Latinos, but also other residents with a rooted connection to Mission District, and the new immigrants from various parts of Central and Latin America and the Caribbean's. This might include other ethnicities, different ages, various work and family situations, and different lifestyles. My informants called it the Latino community themselves even if it is not only people with a connection with Central and Latin America and the Caribbean's. They might have different backgrounds and roots, but they are connected by the idea of a distant past and the

present situation. The gentrification process makes the daily life harder for large parts of the Latino community during my fieldwork.

### **Jamestown Community Centre**

Jamestown Community Centre is an after school program for kids and teenagers in the neighbourhood. The centre is a safe place for the parents to send their kids off to, instead of sending them home alone after school every day of the week. There are other centres in the neighbourhood that focus on different aspects of the Latinos and the lower classes in the Mission. Jamestown Community Centre tries to give the residents an alternative to after school activities, instead of TV or hanging on the streets that might have a bad influence on them. The TV or the street is often the alternative since their parents must work considerable hours to make enough money to keep the house and put food on the table. The community centre is open for kids between 0 and 18 years old. They provide different programs for the neighbourhood's kids and youth, and make sure they have a safe place to stay after school. If the kids and youth use much of their time on the streets they may end up with gangs, substance abuse or make other bad choices. Jamestown Community Centre has a mission about empowering kids and youth and makes them responsible adults. The Jamestown Community Centre webpage says:

Jamestown's mission is to mobilize the resources of families, neighbourhood residents, and other community members to help young people realize their full potential as empowered and productive members of society. (JamestownCommunityCentre 2009)

The Centre is a part of the community, and it is important to keep it going to ensure some of the values connected with the community. They will make sure that the Mission is a safe neighbourhood with a strong community that can empower the residents. With good communication between the residents, and that the resident's care about the neighbourhood, they can make sure that the neighbourhood has good management. At the annual meeting the 25<sup>th</sup> of March 2010 one of the mothers stood up and explained how important Jamestown Community Centre was for both her and her daughter. She was almost in tears because of Jamestown and their work, since she knew her daughter was safe there. Not only was she safe, she also were able to go to dance classes which she loved, and this was important for her as a mom because she was working all the time and didn't have to worry about her daughter. She also mentioned that her son that used to go to Jamestown and he loved it there as well. Most of the participants of the meeting, except for the staff, were women and

mothers, but the meeting took place in Spanish, so I did not understand what the other women said at the meeting. Jamestown is a part of the community in the Mission, and it is important for the people that use the facility. It is also important for the kids because it gives them opportunities when it comes to education, after school activities and the chance to evolve personally. That is something they might not have if they did not participated at the Jamestown Community Centre.

### **A neighbourhood mom - Isabel**

Isabel's grandmother was an immigrant from Durango, Mexico who was raised in Texas and came to San Francisco in the 1940s or 50s. She worked hard every day of her life, and when she died Isabel's family were left with two houses, one in Potrero Hill and one in Bernal Heights. Isabel admires her grandmother's work ethics, and says that one of the reasons why they still live in the Mission is because of her grandmother's work ethic. They don't live in any of the houses owned by her grandmother, but her inheritance gave Isabel's mother and Isabel a chance to start a life of their own. Isabel lives as a single mother with her 15 year old daughter and her mom in one house. She has to work considerable hours to ensure the household stability (and to keep her job). She is a lawyer and because of her job as a corporate lawyer and her daughter's scholarship, she can afford to send her to a private school. One of the reasons why they can still live in Isabel's mothers house is because Isabel has a good job, and makes enough money to help pay the mortgage. Isabel is an ethnical mix between Mexican, Philippine and Native American. She identifies more with the African American experience than the Latin American one, since she for instance can't go back to Mexico and say she is Mexican, because she is not Mexican. She has no direct connection to Mexico, she only knows that her grandmother was from Durango. She said:

I associate more to the African American experience because they don't know exactly where they are from except from Africa and they are detached from it, and I feel more American because that is what I can relate to, but not just American like apple pie, grounded forefathers American, so I am kinda caught in the middle between American and Latin American.

She said for some of them that had the same experience, they take pride in the Mission because that is the closest they have to a country. She doesn't have any nationalistic feeling about Mexico, and she doesn't even know if she has any family left there. Some of the closest relationship she has with a place is her relationships with the Mission. This is where she grew up, and this is where she is raising her

daughter. For both of them the Mission is home. One of the things she could not have been without is the community around her and her daughter. The community helped her, and gave her opportunities to create a future for her and her family. She is a part of the community as a board member at Jamestown Community Centre, helping out local NGOs (non governmental organizations), and other volunteer work even if she is working crazy hours at the law firm. Sometimes up to 16-17 hours a day at the busiest months of the year (usually around tax times).

At the time Isabel's grandmother came as an immigrant to the Mission, it was not very popular to speak Spanish, and her grandmother needed her children to translate from Spanish to English for her. Isabel's mother was the youngest of her sisters, and she spent much time with her older sisters, and they got Americanized and mostly spoke English. Isabel has English as her mother tongue, and might have trouble keeping up with a Spanish conversation if she misses a word or two, but mostly she can understand and participate. Isabel is active in the Latino community, even if she doesn't speak much Spanish. When she went to her daughter's soccer matches the other mothers at first thought Isabel were aloof, but the reason for this was that Isabel could not take part in the conversations on the same level as the rest of the mothers. While the other mother's native language was Spanish, Isabel's native language is English and this limited her some in the conversations. When the rest of the mothers understood that Isabel were not aloof, but didn't quite understand everything that were said, they warmed up to her, and adjusted their speech to Isabel. She was still "one of them" even if she did not speak Spanish fluently.

For Isabel the community represent the people you surround yourself with every day, from the families to the local storeowners. Both Isabel and her daughter have a relation with a bakery on 24<sup>th</sup> street. This bakery was the one that Isabel used to visit when she was young, and she started to bring her daughter when she was just a kid. They both mention that bakery when talking about the community. Other important parts of Isabel's community are her friends, friends from work, and especially some of the NGO's she has been working with, and people she has daily contact with. The Latino community has changed for Isabel because of the increased rent prices and higher living expenses. Many families from the Latino community had to move out of the Mission, and live in the suburbs instead. The fact that people that have lived in the



Mission for years, and are a part of the community have to close their stores or move out of the neighbourhood harms the Latin community. When people are moving from the Mission it is a constant reminder of the economically difficult times it has been for people with lower incomes, and the financial crisis of 2008 made the economical challenge even harder.

**“The grimmer the better” – Esteban**

Esteban is a 35-year-old man and has lived in the Mission almost all his life, except when he was studying or travelling. His parents came from San Salvador in the early 1960s, unlike most Salvadorians that came here in the early 1980s because of the Salvadorian civil war. His parents were looking for new opportunities for themselves, and met each other in the Mission. About 15 years ago he had more family living in the Mission, but now it is only he and an old aunt left, and the rest moved out of the city and settled down in the Bay Area. He is single and live in an apartment with housemates like many other people in the Mission.

For Esteban the Mission is not longer what it used to be. In his childhood his identity was closely linked to the Mission. Not only as a place to live, but it was also a part of him. The Mission always used to be “home” for him, also during his travelling and education. When people asked him where he was from, he didn’t say San Francisco, but always pointed out that he was from the Mission in San Francisco. He was very precise about being from the Mission, and not only San Francisco, because it was here he felt at home and he would not picture himself living anywhere else than the Mission on a long term basis. He took very much pride in being born, raised and lived most of his life in Mission District. During the last couple of years this has changed. He doesn’t feel at home in the Mission like he used to. The Mission used to be a part of his identity, but not anymore. These personal changes are the result of the changes in the community, and the community for him is like an extended family. When parents are going to work they need someone to look after their kids, and they may leave the kids with aunts, uncles, neighbours and other people they can rely on in the neighbourhood. This is some thing he values deeply, and that is also one of the reasons why he works at a community centre as a counsellor for kids, teenagers and families in the Mission. Even if the neighbourhood is safer now, he preferred it like it

used to be 15 years ago. It was grimmer and more dangerous, but sometimes grimmer is also good in his opinion. Back then, there were more gangs, more drugs and in general more crime in the neighbourhood, and most of the crime was Latino on Latino, but still it was home for him. This was his place and his community even if the neighbourhood was considered a bad neighbourhood. Esteban couldn't see any reason why the Mission needed improving when it affected the residents, and forced them to move out to the suburbs. Of course there are many good sides with the improvement such as less violence and less gang related trouble. The neighbourhood became safer for its residents and there were improvement in the public areas, but the consequences were not good enough for the residents who had lived there a long time.

Esteban is conservative when it comes to the gentrification because he thinks that the changes here are too inconsiderate towards the community that have lived here for decades. In the Mission he used to know everybody, and everybody knew him. This has changed, and he sometimes feels like an outsider. There are too many new people that are different from him, and the stores he knows and are used to, are going bankrupt and have to close. The gentrification process has changed what the Mission is to him. The people are not the same, and the connection he used to have with the district are not the same. In his eyes the Mission he used to know doesn't exist anymore. The connection between his identity and the space is not there anymore, he don't feel at home in the Mission the same way he used to when he was younger. This transformation has to do with the fact that there are many new people that have moved into the neighbourhood, and these new people don't have connections with any of the communities that already were in the Mission. The new people have another way of structuring their way of life. The new group is more anonymous and individual, but it has grown so large that you have no choice but to acknowledge that it is present in the neighbourhood. Esteban said that everything that was worth preserving was objects and things that were more than 15 years old. The rest is not worth it.

In the Mission there is an obvious difference between the long-term residents and the new population. These two branches do not share the neighbourhood mentally even if they share it physically. There are some boundaries and some areas where the population do not agree on, and one of them is the categorization of the

neighbourhood. Esteban got really upset when I asked him about the difference between Latino culture and immigrant culture. His whole body language resented the comparison between Latinos and immigrants. He shook his head and twitched in his chair. It was very obvious that the connection between Latinos and immigrants bothered him. The limit between being a Latino and being an immigrant were not closely connected in Esteban's opinion. He reacted to the fact that the people in the neighbourhood still combines the word Latino with immigrant even if some of the Latinos have lived in the neighbourhood for generations. For him an immigrant is someone who adds something exciting to an already existing society. They add their history and their culture to the new society they are moving into. He is aware that for others, the term immigrant might refer to someone who takes something from a society. They take jobs, governmental money and so on, but he argues that the United States is a country built by immigrants, and the immigrants today are just continuing the same history that the pilgrims started 500 years ago. The immigrant culture is only one aspect of Latino culture, and it is frustrating for him that this aspect always is brought up in connection with Latinos. The Latinos are much more than just immigrants. Immigration has to do with the degree of assimilation within a society. The term Latino has to do with heritage and identity, and it has to do with the Latin American culture, and it include other native people such as European ancestry and African ancestry. The term Latino is a word that connects the individuals in the community. Esteban is proud of his Latino heritage, and this heritage has to do with the culture. One of his closest connections to being a Latino is through the Salvadorian culture. These connections has been mostly practiced by speaking the Salvadorian dialect of Spanish, eating the Salvadorian food and socialising with other Salvadorian people living in Mission District. This connects him to the Latino heritage, but that's not necessarily the only way. Other people have other ways of being a Latino. While both an ethnic appearance and being an immigrant has stigmatic issues, the stigmatization is very different. When Erving Goffman (1968) defines stigma he first describe an old definition from the Greeks and their definition of stigma that "refers to bodily signs designated to expose something unusual and bad about the moral status of the signifier" (Goffman 1968: 11). These signs were burned or cut into the body as a sign of the person status, and in Christian times stigma could refer to bodily signs of holy grace or a medical sign on the body that gave a religious allusion (Goffman 1968). The use of stigma today is fairly treated as it used to, but

stigma is applied more towards the disgrace itself than the bodily evidence of stigma (Goffman 1968). According to Goffman (1968) there are three various kinds of stigma: The first one is bodily abominations, the second one is a blemish of the individual character, and the last one is the stigma of race, nation and religion. The last kind of stigma is the one Esteban reacted to. Stigma is connected in this thesis towards ethnicity, and the expectation of ethnicities as different classes. While being an ethnic Latino involves being connected to a cultural arena where people share something in a common past (see Schermerhorn 1996 in chapter 4), and there might be roles and statuses that people just assume and negotiate of being a Latino. An immigrant is a more political status. The Latino is more a stereotyped figure, while the immigrant aspect is a stigmatized feature of the stereotype. Automatically connecting immigrants with Latinos would possess the Latinos an undesirable differentness that they do not anticipated (Goffman 1968). Esteban didn't like that the entire Latino community were just assumed to be an immigrant culture, he said that these two aspects were connected, but not nearly the same. The words immigrant and Latino do not have the same meaning for everybody, and therefore make it hard to find an exact definition of it from Mission District. There will be more about different perception in the gentrification chapter when I discuss objective structures and social realities. The other category of residents has different values than most of the long-term residents, and their lifestyle are a result of that.

### **Hipsters, young professionals and students**

The other categories in the Mission are the hipsters, young professionals and the students. They are the new population that have moved into the neighbourhood. A hipster is the name of a member of this subculture. It is often used about a category of young adults that have an interest in non-mainstream culture and they often live in an urban environment. This non-mainstream culture consists of fashion, music, movies and media channels to mention some aspects. It can be a little hard to describe the hipster culture because it is important for the hipster to find his or hers own style within this group. The individualism is strong in this subculture. There are subcultures within the hipster culture as well. Most of the hipsters will not characterize themselves as hipsters, but you can find hipsters everywhere in the Mission. The labelling of a hipster is complicated because they do not want to be labelled. It is a

cultural category that defines itself through action and being, not through a word. It is what they do and look like that matters, the individual expression is important in the hipster category. People usually ridiculed the word “hipster” in the Mission and it lacked seriousness. Even though there are many different people who are hipsters, the majority of the population do have a stereotype of the hipster as a bit selfish and like to expose their specific self. There are different ways of showing their peculiar personality and one way is through poems.

### **“This is underground”**

An example from the Mission of how hipsters show that they are different is for instance the poetry night. The evening of 29<sup>th</sup> of April 2010 there was a gathering of people for a poetry night on top of the BART station at 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Mission Street. There was a mix of people here, but most of them were from the new population and they seemed to be mostly hipsters and students. The top of the BART station at 16<sup>th</sup> Street was normally a gathering place for homeless people, prostitutes, drug addicts and dealers, and the area had signs of it. It was a little worn down and during my stay I would not walk around there alone in the evening and night because I didn’t feel safe. At this BART station they decided they wanted a poetry night. There were young adults coming to the top of the BART station and when they thought there were enough people (20-30 people) there, they started the event. They had drawn up a circle in colour chalks that represented the stage. First was a Caucasian man doing some freestyle rapping before an African American man got up and read a poem about how his parents were absent when he grew up and how he was practically raised by TV. There were both male and female performers participating. One of the women that read her poems was shushing everybody all the time. She almost started to cry when she was done with her poem. There could be several reasons for why she got she so emotional, for instance it could be that her own poem moved her so, one reason could be that people were talking when she performed her poem and she was frustrated, it could be nerves of performing her poem in public or a combination of the above. During this poetry session there was a highly intoxicated man sitting with the rest of us, and he was putting on a show of himself. There were some girls in their 20s who sat directly behind him and they were laughing of him. He threw his backpack up and down while he made strange buzzing sound, drew on the ground

with a crayon, sharpened a bottom of a tin can or something that looked like one, and he didn't realize that he cut himself at the same time. The people around him were giggling and some were shushing at him. There was one girl who shushed at him and courage him to continue. She shushed him and told him to stop, but at the same time was giggled at him, throwing back his crayon and gave him a lot of attention. He loved the attention and kept up with his show. This man's behaviour was as expected from him when an event like this were held at the BART station at 16<sup>th</sup> Street. During this night there was a lot of various performances by the poets. The poems were often personal and melancholy. After a while a girl with lots of different colours in her hair appeared on stage and read her poem. She talked about flavours. She surprised at the end, and told us that this was the Kool-Aid flavours she liked. That was a relief and the crowd did not mind a laugh. There was one man who came with an attack at the hipsters. He went over and over again with a rap saying, "This is underground". We sat literally on top of the underground and I thought he was talking about all the hipsters in a sarcastic tone. The hipsters want to be "underground" and unique, but really can't because they try too hard to be unique and special, and they all do it the same way. It seemed like this guy was making fun of them and some in the crowd didn't quite understand that this guy was making fun of them and was cheering him on. Some of the people that didn't quite understand that he were being sarcastic and they looked at him with appreciation. Some understood that he was being sarcastic and thought it was fun that he did this. They were laughing and amused by his performance. He looked like he was in his early or middle 30s. He mentioned artists like Beastie Boys and Eminem and said they were underground, even though they in reality are not. He said: "THIS IS UNDERGROUND" very clearly and with a sarcastic tone. By naming both famous artists that most clearly is not underground music, and comparing them to the event at the BART station, he made his point about the hipsters. They want to be underground and singular people, but the irony is that they are a category and not as unique as they want to be. This poetry night were a typically hipster thing to do, and the location was also typical for this subculture. By choosing this location they tried to show how different they are. The choice of the BART station at 16<sup>th</sup> Street is to show off that they are liberal and do things differently than other people. Ironically this location is not a surprise and rebellious at all because this is what one would expect of hipsters. By trying so hard to be different and individual they are making it predictable and they will become a group of

individuals who try to be individual the same way. Many of the hipsters try to be an individual the same way, and this behaviour will turn them into a category.

Young professionals and students do not have the particular styles as the hipsters, but they want to have their own styles as well. A young professional or a student do not mind mainstream culture, and they are not as obvious in the street picture as the hipsters are. Young professionals and students are more mainstream, and it is easier for them to blend in. Hipsters, young professionals and students as a category in the Mission mostly consist of transparent younger people from the middle class who move to the Mission for a time-limited period of their lives. When, and if they move out of the neighbourhood it often has something to do with relocation because of job opportunities, addition to the family and the need for larger space, the independent desire for another local environment or an acceptance to a school somewhere else. The reason why people from this category often move from the neighbourhood may vary, but they have in common that this is a transparent category of people. Another common characteristic is that they often have little connection with the Mission as a home. The hipsters, young professionals and students do not have the same long lasting connection with the Mission as people from the Latino community might have. Their connection with the Mission is that it a place to stay for a limited period of time, and that the Mission offers them what people in their situation need. There are many apartments where they can live together with friends and reasonable cheap rent. It is mostly single persons or couples with maximum one child within this category in this area, and they don't need a lot of space with this kind of living situation. The area provides many activities such as Dolores Park where many people, also people from outside the Mission, come to relax on a day off, there are many cafés, and coffee bars, restaurants, bars and many smaller niche stores. These are places that the new population frequently visit are often businesses that were opened in the last 15 years to satisfy the need of the residents that moved to the neighbourhood. These residents are mostly middle class and they have enough money to spend on these activities since they often have little obligation to other than themselves or their partner.

The individuality is very important to the new population so they can keep on living their lives. Individualism is very important in the American culture. Individualism is that individuals have a right to think and make decisions, to judge and live life as they

want. Because of this individualism that is incorporated in the United States society is it also incorporated in the individuals that are born and raised with American culture. The hipster, young professional and student culture in the Mission is influenced by the individualism in the rest of the United States, and it is visible in several areas. The individual expression is vital amongst the hipsters and it's all about individual styles and fashion. The look of a hipster is like they do not care about what clothes they use, but in reality they have used a lot of time and some times even a lot of money on the casual look. Much of the clothes and outfits are vintage, second hand or bought at stores that specialize on a peculiar style. Hats, glasses and sunglasses, shoes and other accessories are important part of the individual hipster look. It is easy to maintain an individual style in the Mission and San Francisco, because you can find anything there. One of the hidden conflicts in the Mission is between the collectivist and individuality that also can be seen as a conflict between the past and the present. The individuals moving to the Mission threaten the Latino community, and the individuals are little concerned with the long-term residents, and this conflict will be explained in the chapter about gentrification.

### **Johnny – an entrepreneur**

Johnny moved to the neighbourhood about 13 years ago, and 7 years ago he and his wife bought an apartment in the Mission Dolores area. He is originally from Los Angeles, but moved from Los Angeles because he missed the feeling of living in a real city. San Francisco has a more traditional city infrastructure than Los Angeles. He establishes businesses, and helps them make progress on the different markets. He mainly works with trust funds. The reason why he moved to the neighbourhood was because some friends brought him to the Elboroom between 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Street on Valencia, and he just really liked the energy in the neighbourhood and the eclectic atmosphere. He stayed in different apartments with friends for a couple of years before he got his own apartment on 21<sup>th</sup> Street between Valencia and Guerrero. He appreciates the change that has happened here, but he doesn't want any big store chains like Pottery Barn or Starbucks to move to the neighbourhood. He thinks that there is a lot of respect here between the different categories, even if it may be unspoken of. He is polite to other residents nearby and tries to be a part of the neighbourhood. He would not mind more interaction with other people, but for him



this has not been a problem. Johnny is typical dweller for his demographic in the Mission. He feels most at home between Mission Street and Dolores Street and between 16<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Street. These streets are the most commercial streets with all the bars, restaurants and stores. His interaction with the Latino community is mostly based on transactions, and this is a good description of the social system between the two main categories in my own opinion. Johnny has got to know storeowners, and they always have a friendly tone, but there is not a personal relationship. He thinks it is like this because the Latino community is more focused around a strong family structure, and his demographic as Caucasian professional do not have the same strong family connections. They are more single or couple types. He will not call it different values, but more different life paths and choices.

### **Seeking equality – Sarah**

Another informant is Sarah. She is a 22-year-old woman living in the northwest part of the Mission (on Valencia and Dobuce). She works for “Teach for America”. She is originally from Riverside outside Los Angeles, and came to San Francisco to work for the organization. She works at a pre school, and all the children and most of the adults speak Spanish as their primary language. She moved to San Francisco and the Mission in august 2009 and lives in a shared apartment with 3 other friends, most of them also work for “Teach for America”. They ended up in the Mission because a friend of hers, that earlier was a part of the same program, told them that the Mission was one of the cheapest places to stay in the city, and they could get a bigger apartment for the same price they would pay in another neighbourhood. It’s a short ride to the freeway for the daily commute to work and the transportation to downtown are also good. She loves the area and the fact that she can find whatever she want or need in the neighbourhood. She also has also noticed the segregation in the neighbourhood. For her, the Mission is a Latino neighbourhood that is more and more influenced by more white young people who usually have more money. She thinks many of them are looking for the same as herself and her friends. They want to live in a neighbourhood with restaurants, bars and a lot of activities and where it’s easy to get around. These are one of the main reasons why people keep moving to the Mission. It’s a fun neighbourhood for young people that are looking for a cheap place to stay.

The new population visit different places than the long-term residents normally go. It exists an invisible boundary that can explain some of the silent conflict in the neighbourhood. There are some places where everybody is welcome, but also some places where the boundary blurred. Sarah told me she went to a bar called Skylark. The first time she had a blast, and she felt that this was one of the bars where all non-white people went. The second time Sarah and her friends almost got kicked out by some girls who protected “their” bar so it will not turn out to be another “hipster bar”. There are mostly Latinos and African Americans that go to Skylark according to her. After this experience she mostly stick with the bars that doesn’t seek a certain clientele, but Skylark is still one of her favourite bars in the neighbourhood. The first time everything was just fine and they could enjoy themselves. When they arrived the second time and it ended as a conflict, she knew that they had crossed a boundary. At their usual places they feel very welcome, but these places might be called typical “hipster bars”. Sarah doesn’t stand out in a crowd at these places. There are several bars that serve as regular places to different types of people. Some are obviously Latino bars, and some are typically hipster bars. Between these two extreme categories you find most of the bars in the Mission. Skylark is not extreme, but is more a Latino bar. There are bars, which barely have a Caucasian individual inside them. On the other side there are bars that hipsters go to, and often the kind of hipsters that want to be even more special. Some of the bars in the Mission are not only used as a place to meet friends, but also as a place to be with similar people. The boundary between who belong where is not visible, and of course there are no banning of different people by law, but there are some social boundaries that should be recognised and respected. It is resemblance between oneself and others that show where the boundaries are. Where one may find similar people is where one should be going. When you do not stand out in a crowd according to the social rules in the social networks in the Mission, then that’s the right place to be. There are several places where all kinds of people blend together, but they are not like the extreme places I’ve discussed above. In places like these you find much more equality between all different people. In the extremities there are an unequal balance of power, and this power is based on where the boundaries are crossed. When a boundary is crossed the powerful majority will start to socially exclude the minority. How this is

done may vary since it is different people taking the dominant role. Sarah's example may happen, in other ways. The social exclusion may be less loud and obvious.

### **Jason – the American life**

Jason is a 26-year-old man originally from New York State, but he first moved to San Francisco and the Mission District in September 2006 to January 2007. He lived in the same area from September 2009 to June 2010, when he moved away again because of school. The first time he moved to the Mission was after advice by some friends that lived in the East Bay. They told him it was a cool area, and the second time he moved there he knew the ropes, and his boss knew of a vacant room and could arrange so he could move in. His impression of the neighbourhood was that it was exciting because of the ethnic diversity. He think that the Asians are taking over the stores on Mission Street that used to be stores owned by Latinos, and the Latin community are resenting the Asian community because they was taking over. The hipsters, young professionals and the students were rising the rent level and, Jason said that together with the Latino population it was creating a very interesting dynamic. He didn't feel any anger or animosity between the different categories, and he thought that this was unique since there were a lot of hate between different ethnic groups in the United States. He said that the Mission was very special since it seems like everybody was getting along in relatively harmony. He liked the Mission because it was heterogeneous and people went well together. Personally he doesn't have a personal relationship with people from other categories, and he explained this with the expression "birds of a feather flocks together", which means that people who are alike tend to be together. For Sarah it was easier to relate to people in the same situation as himself, he felt more connected to students and young professionals because they were in the same situation as himself. He knew that not everybody had the same resources (as himself) and he tried to be considerate about that. Not everybody with the same background as him acknowledged this. This was for him a way of showing respect for other people in the neighbourhood. Most of his friends lived in other parts of the city, so when he went to meet them he often met them outside the Mission. He had no strong connection to the Mission, and one of the reasons he stayed in the Mission is because of the considerable cheap rent. If he sees a future for himself in San Francisco he doesn't want to stay in the Mission because he want to live in a little

more quiet neighbourhood. For him the Mission is just a stop on the way like it is for many other young people living in the area.

### **Commitment**

The Mission is more than just a place to live. It has a very distinct presence and people of the Mission have made it a home for themselves. The movie “La Mission” (Bratt 2009) with the actor Benjamin Bratt has a quote that is suitable for some of the residents there: “You can take the man out of the Mission, but you can’t take the Mission out of the man” (Bratt 2009). The movie is a realistic representation of a father who is a recovering alcoholic and inmate, and his son who turns out to be gay. They both live in the Mission and their lives illustrate life in the Mission; you as an individual should do what is expected of you. What is expected from the son is that he is a normal youth: he should be athletic, interested in girls, do ok in school and challenge his limits while keeping within certain limits. The father disowns his son because he exceeds these limits, and the son rebellion against his father. The father is a respected man in the neighbourhood because his strength and masculinity. He is a “real” man. He has worked hard to turn his life around and raise his son. When he discovers his son is gay he has a hard time accepting it. In a way this movie shows what is expected from a Latino. A strong man who needs his family to keep being strong. It shows both the violence and masculinity that is stereotypical of the Latin American culture. The movie shows a biased representation of a Latino man in the Mission, but at the same time it breaks with this prejudiced image of the Latino community because of the representation of the son. He is just as strong and masculine as his father, the only difference is that he is gay and wants acceptance for it. It is a complex situation and the conflict between tradition and changing times is portrayed in the movie. The generation gap between the father and his son are one of the subjects of the conflict. The hipsters are moving in the neighbourhood and they bring new impulses and different living conditions to the long-term residents. The new impulses put people in a new situation and they have to adjust to them. All these changes are shown in the movie, and this give a realistic picture of the Mission by the time of my fieldwork.

There are different rights for different people in the Mission, but also different obligations towards people around the agent. A right is what the individual expects from others as an aspect of an identity, and this right has to be collectively recognized as a right expected from an institutional identity. Duties are what the collective expects from the individual, and there has to be a collective call of this duty from an individual and this call has to be recognized by the individual (Jenkins 2008: 165). Institutional identity in this sense are about “the way things are done” and “how things are done” (Jenkins 2008: 157). It is a pattern of behaviour, and it has inter-subjective relevance and meaning in specific situations, and it is all recognised by people as the normative way to do it. In comparison to groups and categories which have identificatory processes about boundary and external identification, rights and obligations concerns internal relationship within these groups and categories. In the long-term residents community in the Mission, some of these rights are changing because of the changes in the neighbourhood. There used to be a strong connection between people from the community that was brought from Latin America to the Mission by the inhabitants. This created a need for someone or something to take care of children in a safe and appropriate way. Here is where places like Jamestown Community Centre found their meaning. There was a mutual agreement that there was a need for a place like this in the Mission. If not for the Jamestown Community Centre, the mothers would have been forced to stay home with the children or they would have to leave them home alone. It is an obligation for them to work, and bring money to the household is what they need to do to be content and create a home. The rights and obligations for people in the working class in Mission District is about earning money, and creating a safe environment for your family. You have an obligation to care for your neighbour within your own capacity, but also that the environment takes care of you and your family within their capacity. The long-term residents community are more influenced by reciprocity, and this has both advantages and disadvantages. It can create complicated relations between families and friends, but on the other side it can protect and help people who has problems. This will only work as a safety net if everybody involved realize this commitment. The reciprocity might be problematized when one of the parts wants out of the relationship, and they want to break the commitment. This can create a huge conflict between the ones involved. In the long-term residents community there is also a much stronger sense of belonging. There is an emotional belonging that the new population lack. This

emotional belonging is about a sense of historical belonging, about family and knowledge, and about the neighbourhood that creates interdependence with the Mission. For the residents that have lived most of their lives in the Mission this emotional connection also leads to a feeling of ownership. The local environment supplies the residents with the needs they have and the resident's gives back by using the facilities. It is not just the Latinos using the facilities, but they are one of the larger consumer groups. It is a give-and-take-situation between local business, and the consumers that also satisfies the needs of the residents, which means that they have everything they need close to home. The rights and obligations are more connected to the social conditions compared to the individual level of the new population. The individual effort among the long-term residents is what maintains the influence of the Latinos in the Mission.

For the new population there are not many obligations concerning responsibility towards your family and the community, but more environmental responsibility. The responsibility for future generations is more important in these circles. There is a greater focus on "living green" i.e. living a eco-friendly life. During the last years a bike lane in Valencia Street and the organic stores in the same street might be an example of the importance of the environmental influence. It is less commitment in this category. One would expect that one's family would be there in one way or another in a difficult situation, but since most of the hipsters, young professionals and students don't have their family in San Francisco they don't have the same support around them. One can depend on friends to take the role as a supportive person, but they do not have the same obligation to you as the family often has. The friendship can in many cases not replace the family tie because of the commitment a family member has towards another member is stronger than a friendship. Because many of the hipsters, young professionals and students in the Mission do not have their family nearby they are also more independent. That is both positive and negative since they lack the closeness and security of a family to depend on, but they have the independence to make the choices they want. They can freely choose a job, where to live, and who to be friends with, and it is easier to hide the parts of their lives they do not want their family to know about. Since the family is far away there is often a family member with great impact, it might be the mom, dad, siblings, grandparents or an aunt or an uncle, and when a younger individual move away it is often to

experience something for them without this impact. When they move away they have the opportunity to live their lives another way that what they would do at home. Some have aspects of their lives they might want to keep away from their families for different reasons, some may think their family will disapprove of their choices and values. It doesn't need to be a bad thing, but just something that isn't talked about in family situations. Not having the family nearby gives more opportunities for a more individual lifestyle. The new population have a less emotional connection to the Mission. Their connection is more based on the individual wishes based on economy, the location of Mission District (transport and getting around) and the activities the Mission can offer (restaurants, bars, environmental profile...). The rights and obligations of the hipsters, young professionals and students are more on an individual base. It is their own personal wishes and choices that keep them in the Mission, and when these wishes and choices change, they move out from the Mission. The long-term residents have little expectations of the new population. Most of these expectations is about partying and enjoying themselves without too much concern about the local environment and the future of the Mission. The new populations concern is about the future, but the future for most of them are not in the Mission, but somewhere else. That is also one of the reasons why they are enjoying life, and is not very concerned about the district. The Mission is just a short stop on their life path.

The different values amongst the dwellers in the Mission are obvious in this setting. The long-term residents have commitments towards the people immediate close to them, while the new population has a commitments that is often more abstract. The difference between these two types of conflicts, grounds on the different cultural and economic capital and habitus. These commitments mentioned above are some of the reasons why the two categories are in conflict. It is an unintentional conflict that comes from the different perspectives of what is important amongst the categories.

### **Art and expression**

The long-term residents and the new population have different connections to the district and their identity. For hipsters, young professionals and students the Mission symbolizes their freedom as individuals and an eclectic space where they can develop themselves and live their life as they wish. For people in the Latino community the

Mission is “home”. This is where many of them live and this is a place they want to call home. The Latino presence is to the greatest extent visible, and still alive in the Mission present even if the neighbourhood has undergone some large changes the last decade. The artistic look of the neighbourhood bear evidence of the substantial Latin influence that is visible in the district.

### **Murals**

Public space is one area where the Missions dwellers have the possibility to express themselves, and one phenomenon that is very obvious is the use of murals. There are many murals in San Francisco, but the biggest concentration is in Mission District. Here you can hardly walk down a street without seeing one or more murals. The murals in Mission District are influenced by the Latino population and are inspired by Latinos art. The murals have often an expressive use of colour, and it’s not realistic or true to natural objects, but some parts may be an exaggeration or an understatement depending on what the artist wants to express. The wall paintings have both a decorative and often a politically meaning. Many of the murals in Balmy alley, which is one of the big alleys for murals, show a large variety of paintings. One of the themes that are used frequently are resistant against the oppression and governmental rule in some Latin and Central American countries where many of the Mission Districts inhabitants either come from or have some kind of personal connection to. All over the Mission there are murals on the house walls, and these murals often have a message. Balmy alley is especially famous for it’s murals and artists in the Mission started painting the murals in the early 1970s, but there are still new murals coming to life in this alley. There are both cartoonish paintings and more serious paintings about memories of the home country, resistance against oppressors and to the memory of people that suffered from HIV and AIDS. The murals are constantly changing. It is not only murals in Balmy alley, but many other places in the Mission also have huge murals. The women’s building at 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Mission Street and Valencia Street has huge murals covering it. These murals show strong and inspirational women, and celebrate women and girls from multicultural backgrounds. Next to the BART station on 24<sup>th</sup> Street there are many murals that are similar in styles and colours to the one mentioned above. Many of the murals in the neighbourhood show the importance of community and belonging somewhere. They are a reference to a



common history, but also a common presence. The murals represent what people from the Mission has in common, it represents that they have a history together, and that they also have a community where their own values are maintained. They share an idea of what is important and how the residents of the Mission should maintain it. The Latino community are a group that are conscious of their legacy and preserve who they are through art. This emphasizes their sense of taste. A prominent leader within an educational institution does not create cultural capital here, but it is formed by commonness and by being a large group. The social capital of this group has influenced the change in the Mission, but lately in correlation with the new population. In other words, the hipsters, young professionals and students are a considerable category, which control what is accepted as the “right” form of capital. Hipsters, young professionals and students are open the Other, but only through their own understanding of the Other and what they accept as being the Other.

The walls of Balmy alley are covered with murals. The one closest to the left is in the making.



The mural to the left is a portrait of Oscar Romero, a Salvadorian martyr, and the one to the right express the memory of a past that still exists with many of the long-term residents.



One alley separates itself from the other streets when it comes to murals in the Mission. That is Clarion alley between Mission Street and Valencia Street. Those streets symbolize the division between the gentrified Mission and the less gentrified Mission as explained in chapter 5. These murals separate themselves from the other murals because these are more cartoonish compared to the others in the neighbourhood. The murals do not have the same kind of style as many of the other big murals. Some of the murals in this alley are more surrealistic than the ones in Balmy alley. The murals are paler in the use of colours, abstract and artsy when you compare it with the ones that have a more political message. Clarion alley also has a political message, but there are more variety, and it looks like it is suppose to be more inclusive towards different people than the Balmy alley murals, which are Latin American and political. It seems like the murals are all about the differences you find in the Mission, both culturally and thematic. The murals in Clarion alley seem to

address the more modern Mission compared to the Mission 20-30 years ago. The Clarion murals are newer compared to the ones in Balmy alley, and there is some changes every year made by local artists. The murals in the Mission show the development in the Mission and expresses the changes that have been going on here. Besides preserving some of the old murals artists produces new pieces every year, so the alley is always an updated version of the inspiration of the artists. As a comparison to Balmy alley, Clarion alley is more diverse and shows visually a boundary between the less gentrified and more gentrified Mission. While Balmy ally in many cases confirm the Latin American presence in the neighbourhood, the murals in Clarion alley show the culturally diverse neighbourhood. I would say this is an example of a boundary that exists in the Mission because of the styles and the use of area. It includes everybody that lives in the neighbourhood and there are also annual event in the alley that everybody can participate in. The murals in Clarion Alley are a hybridization of the existing mural art in the Mission. The changes in the district has created a new identity, and self-definition do not exists in a social vacuum (Friedman 1992), and identities are grounded in the relations to other identities. I will use Jonathan Friedman's examples of the old Greek identities to show how the new population recreate the past into the present. The representation of the Classical and Hellenistic period that the Greeks are famous for today are just a small part of what happened in Greece at that time (Friedman 1992). As an example the Greeks were extracting themselves from the Ottoman Empire towards the Roman Empire, but it's the Classical and Hellenistic period they are remembered for. Friedman argues that "the past is always practised in the present, not because the past imposes itself, but because subjects in the present fashion the past in the practice of their social identity" (Friedman 1992: 853). The identities of the Greeks are reproduced in the present grounded on the past. I will argue the long-term residents use their art and artistic expression to show their identity, and claim that the Mission is a Latino neighbourhood. The new population adopts some of the expressions, and hybridize the Latino expressions to something else. The recreates the expressions and make their own culture of it.

The murals in the Mission show different expressions. These expressions also come from different types of capital. Taste becomes obvious here. While the Balmy alley murals are based on more traditional Mexican styles of art, Clarion alley has a more

pop cultural characterisation. Here artist in Clarion alley has adopted some of the original Mexican style of art, and mixed it with more pop-cultural influence. Here they have blended Latino culture with a more western culture. The newer population in the Mission are influenced from United States, and they bring their own taste into the murals. Since San Francisco would be considered as a cosmopolitan and defined of the openness that a cosmopolitan has (Binnie 2006a) the artist want to show some of this openness in the murals. The levels of taste is different with the Latinos and the new population, but still they gives an idea of how the artist interpreter the objective structures. What the artists extract from the objective structures in the Mission is visible on the walls of Mission District.

The murals in the Mission are something that is a part of what makes the Mission a distinct neighbourhood. There is a lot of identity connected with the murals here because they tell the story for some of the inhabitants. Others know the artists and the stories and grew up personally with them. The murals portrait a mythical union between the Latinos in the neighbourhood, and this mythical union connect them. Without this mutual memory there would not be a community in the Mission like the Latino community. David Hume (Hume and Nafstad 2009) writes that without memory we would not have the notion of the chain of cause, and effects that made us who we are. It is through experience and because we are able to recollect a common history that unity is created. The murals are a daily reminder of the common past and reality that individuals from the Latino community have lived, or someone amongst their family and friends have experienced. The murals are a constant reminder of a common history and rooted marginalization that the Central and Latin Americans have experienced in the USA. The murals are a part of what gives life and soul to the Mission. Murals show some of the identity in the public picture in the Mission, because they show what is important for the people that live in the neighbourhood.

Prominent figures in the Latino community that wanted to preserve the Mission encouraged people to maintain and cherish the Latino influence that the Mission has had the last 50-60 years. They set the tone for what Latino culture is. Many of the cultural schools in the neighbourhood have dance classes, music classes, art classes and so on. Most of these classes had a Central- and Latin American and Caribbean influence. These classes were open for public and didn't have too high fees, these

classes and events maximized the Latino culture and made it popular and worth preserving. The San Francisco Carnival is another way of showing the Latino culture of the residents of the Mission. For people who already have the incorporated accesses to the Latino colours, the music, the dance and so on, it is a reminder of the culture. For people who are not that familiar with Latino culture the event gives a taste of something new and exotic. As mention earlier the accesses are not static, and events like these can convert some accesses. It is about showing that Latino culture is a good thing, this is good taste and a higher form of culture; it is about showing something of great value. While the new population of the Mission do not value the Latino culture as a whole, they do values aspects of it.

### **Carnival – colours and culture**

The San Francisco Carnival is an event where everybody can participate in. This is a huge carnival event in San Francisco and the parade starts at 24<sup>th</sup> Bryant Street and ends at Harrison Street, and on the way it stops by Mission Street. The carnival is a celebration of the various Latino culture and is celebrated during Memorial Weekend. At the ending area there are other events that are connected to the parade going on during the entire weekend. The parade itself takes place Sunday morning. Everybody is welcome to either participate or to come and see the parade. The preparation starts months in advance, and it is a lot of work with choreography, costumes and planning. This is the only event where my informants said that all residents in the Mission could participate. The parade has many different groups that dance, and people from all over the Bay area are involved. At the parade in 2010 there were many different people, but I expected more participating from the new population there since I was told this was the big event of the year in the Mission, and I was told that lot of people were coming to see the parade. The people I saw present, both as participating in the parade and as the audience were mostly families, Latinos and non-Latinos, adults or younger people of colour. The low numbers of hipsters, young professionals and students disappointed me since I was told there should be a very diverse crowd. It is possible that 2010 was just a year where not many hipsters, young professionals and students came to see the parade, but I do think this was the normal turnout. Since this was Sunday morning and many people use the Sunday to sleep late they might not bother to go, or maybe the interest is not there for some people. There can be several reasons

why the new population didn't go to the parade, but my empirical results argue that this was an event that was supposed to be a celebration of cultural art traditions and it was supposed to unite people, but many hipster, young professionals and students didn't participate. This event gathered people from the Bay area that was interested in the carnival, even if it was accessible to everybody in the neighbourhood much of the new population didn't attend. The lack of interest for the carnival with the new population was obvious, and this is an example why the conflict with the gentrification exists there. Amongst the new population there is little interest in preserving what already exist in the Mission, there is little interest in why the Mission is like it is. When this group grows larger it might have some consequence for the Latino influence that is still strong in the Mission.

## Chapter 4

### Groups and categorization

How we understand and categorize each other is an important and complex process. There are two aspects of categorization I will present in this part of the thesis. The first one is the cognitive patterns of categorization. That is subconscious processes that chunk objects together, and the human mind categorize these objects in groups that belong together. The process of categorization will be explained thoroughly in the first part of this chapter. Another way of categorization is through social structures. What separates them from us? The American society is the foundation of how the social life in Mission District function. The majority of the residents in the neighbourhood are the long-term residents, but it's the new population with the economical influence that is the dominating category. In the last part of the chapter I will discuss ethnicity and race towards the concept of class. I will explain this through the use of class and ethnicity in this chapter.

#### Prototype and cognitive categorization

Johnny's the interactions with the long-term residents are restricted to transactions of goods in the neighbourhood. There aren't many Latinos in his close circle of friends. When he got the question of why he had no personal relationships with Latinos in the neighbourhood, he reacted with straightening his back, and he looked like needed some seconds to decide what to answer. When he finally answered he said that the reason why he didn't have a lot of Latino friends is because of different life choices:

I don't know, ehh... you know, its a really complex question obviously. One thing that I can think of, I mean, the predominant immigrant culture in the Mission is the Latino culture, and from what I see and know is that it tend to have a really strong family structure, you know, like the family tend to stay together, be very focused on family activities, tend to be have like large and or extended families, so like they seem to have, you know created big tight net of social structure of their own, that maybe, like if it was the kinda name where was like immigrants groups not having big families, that were like single type people or, you know people without a lot of kids and seems like, maybe, that... the demographic of the Caucasian population tend to be the opposite I think. It tends to be single people or tends to be couples with no kids and that kinda thing, so I think the demographic is really different.

Johnny is in his 40s and married but he had no kids. The typical Latino get married younger, and have kids earlier than the demographic of the new population. Because of his reaction to the question it seemed like it was more to it than just that they have different lives. As a result of the time he used to answer the question, and his general

understanding of the neighbourhood it seemed to be more going on in his mind, than only finding the answer to the question. He said that for him the answer has nothing to do with race and ethnicity, as it has to do with different choices and lifestyles. For Johnny, Mission District is an eclectic and creative neighbourhood. For him the Mission is about the environment, and a place where individuals have space to evolve their own personal and professional character. His understanding of the district is separated from the more family oriented perspective that distinguishes the typical Latino population in the Mission. Johnny's answer, told me that he had not thought about why he didn't not have any personal relationships with people of another category in the neighbourhood. For him this has not been an issue. He lived his life in the Mission and appreciated how the Mission satisfied his need from a neighbourhood. The workers in the stores he frequently used knew Johnny as a customer, and they talked about casual things, but they weren't personal friends (even though he's used the stores a long time). It was friendly relationships, but not personal ones in Johnny's opinion. He know that the Mission is a Latino neighbourhood, but what make this neighbourhood special and valuable for him has little to do with the Latino character per se, but more with the creative and eclectic feature. His answer concern the differences between him self and the typical Latino. He created a picture of the Latinos as one homogenous group, and within this group it is about family and the relationship in between them. The cognitive patterns of Johnny's categorization are related to theories of prototypicality.

In the 1970s Eleanor Rosch started researching prototype theory. These theories show that humans divide our world in abstract definitions of categories, and we process thoughts and objects with these categories. An object is included and absorbed within a concept or a category because of a similarity with a prototype, also called a basic form. The prototype would be the most typical example on this category (Rosch and Lloyd 1978; D'Andrade 1995). I will use one of Rosch's (1978; D'Andrade 1995) examples to explain this. Rosch asked some respondents in Berkeley to rate objects within a category. The members of a category were to be categorized by how it represented the idea or image of the category. The prototypicality that the respondents were to rate was different sorts of birds. The member of the category of birds who got the highest score was the robin, and the penguin got the lowest score. Rating like these demonstrated that categorization is connected to cognitive effects. People have a



tendency to name objects with a higher prototypicality when asked to give examples from a category (D'Andrade 1995). Rosch (1978; D'Andrade 1995) claim that the human brain remembers things as a whole, not a list of features. Rosch (1978; D'Andrade 1995) is basing this argument on two propositions. The first is that the brain of animals and humans categorizes because they try to collect as much information as possible with the least cognitive effort. "... a person might know of the attributes and their correlation structure but exaggerate that structure, turning partial into complete correlations" (Rosch 1978: 41). The second proposition is that the world as we perceive it consist of structured information rather than a random collection of features (Rosch 1978; D'Andrade 1995). By perceiving structured information instead of a collection of features the world will be more logical and easier to absorb for the human mind. Johnny's prototypes of Latinos are the family oriented person with close ties to the community around him or her. This is the way he categorizes, even if he knows that people are more diverse than his categories. Johnny rates family oriented persons with a high prototypicality within the category of Latinos in the Mission. On the other side, my Latino informants categorize the opposite category of hipsters, young professionals and students as young people that only wants to party and have fun. In prototypically ratings people have a tendency to enumerate things with a high prototypically ratings when they are asked to give an example from a category. When residents of the neighbourhood talked about family oriented Latinos and hipsters that just care about partying, they use their prototypes, their highest ranked example in their categories. Both the long-term residents and the new population in Mission District have other characteristics than the mentioned aspects. The reason why people refer to family oriented Latinos and the hipsters that parties is because these features are typical behaviour for the categories. If we didn't have these thought patterns the human mind would be chaos because we could not easily separate object from each other. The human mind needs to categorize objects and actions because this is how the mind can perceive the world as whole, and comprehend the connections of the received information.

In addition to cognitive categorization, we also categorize more conscious as well. The collectivities make categories in the Mission. The individuals in this category do not necessarily recognize themselves as a group, but from the outside they are a collectivity and therefore defined as a category. The collectivity of the Latinos in the

Mission is a group because they recognise themselves as a group (Jenkins 2008). It's in the agent's conscious categorization we find smaller subgroups based on nationality, lifestyle and other unifying interests. The collectivities that don't recognize themselves as a group have a large impact on the neighbourhood. The American society is large and diverse, and the society is not only divided by cognitive patterns, but also more conscious separations.

### **The American way**

The USA is built by immigrants, and by initiative of these immigrants. One of the most famous quotes from the Declaration of Independence is:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness (Jefferson 1776)

This quote has been a part of defining what USA is as a society. In the modern society it means that everybody has to trust them self, and that everybody has a similar chance to make it as the rest of the American citizens. This is not completely true, but there is a culture in the USA for admiring the progressive individual who shows that he or she can be successful. The appreciation of the individual achievement creates an incorrect image of equality in the American society. The reality is that various people have different opportunities. If you ruin your opportunities, you are a part of what went wrong, and you made poor decisions. Robert Bellah (1996) sees the United States as a capitalistic society where economy and individuality are strong forces. The American society has turned out to be a society of separation (Bellah 1996). Everything has been broken down to smaller parts, and they have been categorized. These segmented parts tells who the individual are: which church you go to, if and where you went to school, where you come from are just examples. At the same time the United States is a country of coherence. A generalization is that the Americans stand united behind their flag, and that they celebrate their freedom (Bellah 1996). 4<sup>th</sup> of July is still celebrated with people gathering together, and they mark the occasion with fireworks. Bellah (1996) argues that the individualism is a phenomenon increase larger as times goes. Bellah (1996) claims that the need to promote the sense of self is a characteristic of the American society. USA is a huge country, and there need to be boundaries between people. Some of the large recognized identity markers in the United States are ethnicity, but there also is a discourse of class that isn't that obvious (Ortner 2006). By framing Mission District in the structures of USA, we can

clearly see the impact of how important ethnicity and class is to understand the relation between the categories in the neighbourhood. Looking at USA through the perspective of class and ethnicity I will show the frames where Mission District exist in. These perspectives are important to understand the social structures of the Mission, because these perspectives are boundaries between the categories of the Mission.

### **Ethnicity**

In the Mission there are several ethnicities on different levels. There is the Latino community on one level: the Latino population, the Philippine population, other Asian ethnicities and African American population that have lived in the Mission for several decades. There are several nationalities and ethnicities in this group, but it's called the Latino community because this group has some of the same goals, values and statuses in the district. At another level in the Mission there is the Caucasian population, other parts of the African American population and other parts of the Asian population, which is called the hipsters, young professionals and students. What categorizes this level is that people are more mobile, and moves in and out of the neighbourhood. There is little continuity amongst the individuals in this category.

The two main groups are the ones described over and in chapter 3. The ethnicity is divided into two different categories. Within these categories there are subgroups and categories, which often it is divided in different ethnicities. It makes smaller ethnic communities, especially within the long-term residents community. Richard Schermerhorn's definition on an ethnic community is:

An ethnic group is defined here as a collectivist within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood. Examples of such symbolic elements are: kinship patterns, physical contiguity (as localism or sectionalism), religious affiliation, language or dialects forms, tribal affiliation, nationality, phenotypical features, or any combination of these. A necessary accompaniment is some consciousness of kind among members of the groups. (Schermerhorn 1996: 17)

Schermerhorn mention that an ethnic group can be the majority, but then they often lack power and will be called "mass ethnics" (Schermerhorn 1996). This means that the ethnic group will be the majority when it comes to measurable numbers, but they will not be the dominant category. Schermerhorn's definition is up for debate because of his definition of an ethnic group is always seen as a part within a larger society,

always connected with the Other, and the definition can be interpreted as the ethnic group will never be the majority and dominant one. The definition is useful because it drag in the common ancestry, memories of a shared past, and a cultural focus on shared symbolic elements (Schermerhorn 1996). It shows attention to aspects that are important to the residents of the Mission. The common past is something that is important boundaries between the categories. A large difference between the long-term residents and the new population is how their social structure is built, and the structure have recreated itself by historical patterns of values according to Bourdieu's theories of social structure. Their common historical past and the understanding of the symbols is what create ethnicity. In the Mission the majority of the population are the long-term residents but the majority in San Francisco are non-Latinos. In the Mission the minority is the category with the largest economical influence, and this is the category, which was most liberal to gentrification and change. Schermerhorn's (1996) definition relay on different elements of a common culture. Isabel doesn't have a link towards a country of origin as many others from the long-term residents in the neighbourhood. She doesn't speak much Spanish, and she is born and raised in the USA. Her connection is to the neighbourhood, and the people she know there. She share a connection to the space that is created by the Latino community, and she want to belong with them because of their shared history and experiences in the neighbourhood. Other people in the neighbourhood may have the same in common but also they do not belong with the Latino community. Mission District is a part of western world, and there are many choices the population has to make to belong to the ethnic community. They have to make themselves heard in the changing neighbourhood. They also had to take the time to connect with the community around them, and still living their own life. To be a part of the community, these obligations should be met. It's important to unite the group or category around the elements they share.

Barth's perspective is that ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification made by agents themselves, and they have the characteristic of organize interaction between people. In the article "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries" Barth (Barth 1996) discuss how ethnic groups maintain them self. An ethnic group is basically self-perpetuating. The ethnic group share fundamental cultural values, make up a field of communication and interaction, and finally a membership which identifies itself in the

interaction with others (Barth 1996). In Barth's perspective the shared cultural arena is not the most important aspect of an ethnic group, but it lies in the mechanisms that the boundary maintains. Several other groups may share cultural aspects, but it's not culture that makes an ethnic group. An ethnic group are the social relevant factors, because the social interaction is what members of an ethnic group can analyse, validate and invalidate another person membership on non-membership by. This process of validating membership is a process, and using Barth's generative model can show this. When agents are going to decide membership of an ethnical group the agents start the negotiating by trying to over communicate the relevant statuses that confirms the positions and commitment to each other. The actors try to maximize their values by over- and under communicating and negotiating with in the limitations and incentives their statuses gives them (Barth 1994). By acting on what the other parts actions it's a process of validating membership. It's in the negotiating part of the process where the boundaries may be found. The by over- and under communicating statuses one adjusts to the boundaries of the group, no matter if one is a member or not. It's within the boundaries the ethnical groups are identified (Barth 1996). The Latino community in the Mission is not one ethnicity, but it has several ethnicities within the categories. Within the ethnic groups they have their own way of detecting each other. The relationship between the long-term residents and new population in the neighbourhood has much information within the boundaries. It was not just because of ethnicity, but in the boundaries between the two categories is where the information of the different values of people lies. While the new population has more abstract commitments towards their environment and the people around them, the long-term residents have commitments towards the community. The different forms of commitment and values are the reason why these two categories have a clash of interest. The residents of the Mission want the same: a nice neighbourhood to live in. It's the comprehension of what a nice neighbourhood is that is part of separates the two categories. The difference in opinion of what the dwellers want from the Mission, establish the boundaries. The members of the categories make the identification of the boundaries. Barth has studied the communication of boundaries in ethnical groups, and I will use some of the same arguments to explain the separation of the long-term residents and the new population. "if a group maintains it's identity when members interact with others, this entails criteria for determining membership and ways of signalling membership and exclusion" (Barth 1996: 79). In the Mission, if member

that communicates with the other category, his or hers membership is up for determination. It doesn't mean the every time there is communication across the boundaries; the members need to validate their belonging to a category. It means that there are levels of communication. During transactions the communication is allowed and membership is validated or invalidated through the process as explained with Barth's generative model, but there is little communication between two categories on other levels. It was hard for me to be admitted in the community of the long-term residents as explained earlier, and I couldn't get a membership with the long-term residents because of my membership with the new population. These processes include the members, and exclude the outsiders. My role as a photographer at the Jamestown Community Centre is an example. A member of the staff agreed that I was going to take pictures of the annual meeting at the 25<sup>th</sup> of March 2010. Almost none of the participants knew who I was, and I got curious looks from the participants, but not many of them spoke to me. Before the meeting started some of the staff spoke briefly to me, and especially a collage student that was volunteering, and she had little connections to the community besides working at the Centre. The meeting was held mostly in Spanish. When some of the kids from the centre, or English speaking board members held their contribution they spoke English, and one of the staff translated to Spanish out loud. There was one table where the staff circulated on translating silently to the participants at the table. I was taking pictures, so I could not sit down and listen to what was said. It was obviously that I was an outsider, and the other participants were expectant of me. I was as an observer beside as a photographer, but this is one of the situations where I could really notice awkwardness since I was not a part of the community. My role there was as a photographer, and most of the participants didn't know I was there as an anthropologist. My guess was that they saw me as a part of the newer population and weren't interested in me at all. The boundaries that were between us weren't visible, but I noticed that there were some boundaries I felt were intimidating. It might have something with my personality (I avoids conflicts if it's possible), but I knew that I was an outsider in this situation. I tried to negotiate my status as an outsider through working voluntary as a photographer, and I tried being nice and humble. I didn't fit in because the participants were there at a meeting, their focus were on the Community Centre, and the communication were lacking between us since the meeting were in Spanish, and I didn't understand much. The boundaries, which I felt were a little intimidating, also held me back a little. The negotiations of

statues confirmed me as an outsider, and it was clearly that I didn't belong there. It was more than a separation of ethnicity, but a separation of class as well.

### **The silenced separation of class**

The difference of class is connected with the different taste in various categories of people. Bourdieu (1984) connects the different tastes with a social hierarchy. The taste come from the dispositions of the agent, and the dispositions are the meaning of his or hers practises and perceptions, and are connected to habitus. The need of culture is the products of the dispositions, habitus and education i.e. cultural capital, and how this is influenced by the taste of the agent. The school system and the incorporated habitus create a difference in taste that drives a separation of class. None of the residents from the district mentioned class during my fieldwork. I found this somewhat peculiar since the divide between the two categories was quite visible. They could easily talk about the separation of the two categories, but there was no mention of class. By not naming class, my guess would be that the issue of class is under communicated in the Mission. Ortner (2006) argues that even if there are no mentions of class in the American society, there definitively are class structures. It is not recognised in folks discourse, but the structures of class still exists there. Some of her reasons for the under communication of class is studies of African Americans and other poor minorities rely on discrimination, prejudice, stigmatization and pain (Ortner 2006). She (2006) gives an explanation on why Americans do not use the word class, and argues that it is connected to mobility and individualism. The American society has glorified mobility and opportunity. By appreciating individuals achievement the society are making non-mobility not only failure of individuals, but also change the discourse from class to race, gender and ethnic origin (Ortner 2006). Class derives from logic of capitalistic economical rationality and connected different sources of incomes as well as yielded amounts of incomes, profits and losses. The ethnical and racial differences come from logic of shared identities and externally projected pollution and stigma (Ortner 2006).

### **The new middle class**

The typical description of the new middle class in the Mission is the hipsters, young professionals and students. Many of the hipsters, young professionals and students

come from a middle class society, even if some of them would not perceive themselves as middle class. Some of the residents in the district moved to the Mission because they wanted to get away from the middle class values. The middle class in the USA is desirable for its security and material affluence, but it is perceived as undesirable for the ways it is patterns as culturally “the Other” and because the mobility pull one away from relatives, friends and neighbours (Ortner 2006: 31). In Ortner’s (2006) view of the middle class she has also observed a separation of generation. How the middle class is perceived as culturally the Other, and the desire to control one’s kids might be connected through the fear of being a lower class. Parents attempt to control their children longer compared to the lower classes. The reason for this controlling behaviour is the threat of the child’s future as a part of the working class. The parent tries to control issues of education, occupation and the children’s marriage. Ortner (2006) claims that this parent-child conflict is a part of the middle class discourse. This opinion is true according to my experience with the new middle class in the Mission. While some moved to the Mission because of work or studies, some moved to the Mission to get away from their parents and their “judgmental environment” as some of the hipsters called it. Several of the hipster residents said they needed to get away from home to be able to “express themselves”. Parents and friends from home were set in lifestyles that they didn’t fit in. The middle class culture is about having an education, get married, have kids, being financial safe and develop the sense of self. The sense of self is strong amongst the new middle class, and the selfhood are stronger with individuals from the new population who moved to the Mission because of the pressure from home of living a certain lifestyle, a certain education, a and have certain relationships with people around. One 26-year-old woman I met had never taken her boyfriend back home, because she didn’t think her parents would accept him. The new middle class in the Mission has an American way of living, in other words a more western way of life than the long-term residents that are influenced by Central- and Latin America. A general impression of the new middle class is that the main ethnicity in this category is Caucasian.

### **The working class**

In the Mission the Latinos are the lower and working classes. A class contain the other class within itself (Ortner 2006). This can be seen in the lower classes in the



Mission. They have a perception of how the new middle class is, and as a result of this notion they know how they experience the middle class, and then either acts like the middle class, or they separates themselves from the middle class. This creates in some cases a problematic choice of lifestyle, and how they should relate to different values of the classes. The values of the lower classes in the Mission are connected to relationships in the community. It is in the shift between the working class and the middle class the different classes finds itself. It's in the split the choices lie, and through the process of maximizing ones values the agents make the choice of belonging to the working class exists. It is not only the choice of where the agent wants to belong, but also social structures play a part. Who you are brought up to be will always be a part of the habitus. The cultural capital is part of what shapes the subject of how he or she relate to the structures around. The structure creates a pattern for the subject, and in the individualistic society of America there is room for choices. Even if the agent belongs to one class, he or she knows the boundaries towards other classes, and they can make the choice of crossing these boundaries through education and personal change. For resourceful individuals, staying in the working class shows that the agent know where the spilt between the working class and the middle class are. By relating to the shift between the classes, and knowing the boundaries between the classes, the working class contains the middle class within itself.

Kristeen Paton's contribution to "Classed intersections: Spaces, Selves, Knowledge" (2010) bring up the issue of gentrification in working class society. Her definition of gentrification is that

Gentrification is a hegemonic process that seeks to realign class identities to be more congruent with neoliberal post-industrial economy: it is implemented to make working-class neighbourhoods 'posh' by realigning the dispositions and social practices of residents rather than merely altering the neighbourhood demographic. (Paton 2010: 138)

The identity of the working class is here the object for transformation. The gentrification process does not change the demographic of the neighbourhood, but is also related to neoliberal policies and restructuring, not just the cultural change alone (Paton 2010). The change that gentrification cause is a transformation of the residents that already lives there. By giving the inhabitants an option, and that new influences are altering the population, the gentrification are gentrifying the working class subject as well (Paton 2010). The gentrification destabilize formerly fixed such as the working class support for social housing, by supporting homeownership (Paton 2010).

By supporting homeownership the neighbourhood got more neoliberal and opened for more of the financial market. This in turn creates an opening for the new middle class to alter the neighbourhood even more.

Who you know matter in the Mission. The relationships in the working class community are based more on reciprocity than amongst the new middle class. Relationships do not cross the difference of class much, and the relationships are stronger within the working class compare to the middle class. The reason is because of the middle class has a more independent structure than the working class. Locations as the Jamestown Community Centre are important for the working class, and it is a part of the relationships in the Mission. The relationship in between the working class is more influenced by reciprocity compared to the middle class, which is more individualistic. Paton (2010) claims that the working class do not resent the gentrification process. The members do not stand up and say that they don't wish for being gentrified. The reason for this is that if they publicly resent the process they will be classified as a working class person. By bringing back Ortner's argument about one of the reasons why the American society doesn't mention class, is because of the discrimination and the stigma of being lower class. The working class do not want to be perceived as lower class. The discourse as a working- or a lower class person will be present if people from the lower classes start resenting the gentrification process in public. The gentrification process creates the space for a higher class than the lower classes in the Mission, and this space are filled with the new population. In the Mission there has been groups protesting of making the Mission district into an office park, but there have been less direct protest of the gentrification process. By standing up and resisting the gentrification process the agent is assumed to be of the lower class, because he or she doesn't appreciate the taste of the new population. Another reason is because the process start slow, and when it reached a certain point it was hard saying no because of the silenced term of class. By actively attacking the gentrification process the separation of class is visible. The issue will also often concern of where to resist, and will there be enough support to be heard by the dominant part. In the Mission, the residents protested against making the district into an office park. They manage to do so because there were enough people demonstrating. An office park would not fit either the new populations values of an exiting and eclectic neighbourhood, or the long-term residents values of a community.

### **Separation of class**

The divide between the two categories are visible in the streets. Mission Street has a larger Latin America influence, and more functional characteristics with supermarkets, banks, reasonable clothing stores, buses and both BART stations in the entire Mission District. Walking down Mission Street you know that you are in the Latino part of San Francisco. You find mariachi bands or *los mariachis* near the BART station on Mission Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Street on Saturdays, and there might be bands in restaurants. During the FIFA World Cup when Mexico won over another team, it almost turned into a block party: there was cars honking, Mexican flags everywhere, people were celebrating and the atmosphere was all about pride and joy to the Mexican identity. The lower classes presence in the Mission is visible because of their everyday solidarity and interaction with the community. The new population, now almost solely uses some area that used to be influenced by the community.

Dolores Park is one of the largest parks in the district. In Dolores Park there used to be an annual dance performance called Xilonen ceremony. Isabel told me that this is a ritual where the Aztec ancestors celebrated the young girl's transition into womanhood, and this tradition they still were maintained in the Mission. The organizer of the Xilonen ceremony moved the performance from Dolores Park to Folsom street between 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Street. The performance was moved because of the changing use of Dolores Park. Before the gentrification everybody in the neighbourhood visited Dolores Park, but now the demographic has changed. On an everyday basis during my fieldwork there wasn't many families there, but mostly young adults. An example from President's Day 2010 describes the use of the park at the time of my fieldwork. Monday the 15<sup>th</sup> of February was Dolores Park filled with a lot of visitors from their late teens to people in their 40s. It was a beautiful day and the sun was shining. A lot of people were out for a picnic, relaxation or to cure their hangover after last night's party. The demographic category was as usual hipsters, young professionals and students that either lived in the neighbourhood, or came there from other parts of the city. There were mostly young adults sitting in groups in the park. They were talking, playing music, and playing different park games as juggling with balls and tightrope balancing. Some had a picnic and some were drinking alcohol or/and smoking marijuana. The park had tennis courts, basketball courts, a big playground and green areas that were open for the public. There were a lot of dogs in

the park as well, and these dogs were often running without a leash, and played with toys or other dogs. There weren't many families in Dolores Park that day. In Isabel's words: "Dolores Park is a place for grown-ups and their dogs". She doesn't go to Dolores Park anymore. She said that it wasn't what it used to be, and she believes that she doesn't belong there anymore. It used to be a place where families could go and have fun. There are some families there, but it's often couples from the middle class with one child.

### **Ethnicity and class**

Ortner (2006) argues that one need to see ethnicity in a correlation to class. How class is understood in USA is often connected to ethnicity. According to Ortner (2006), race and ethnicity been the dominant discourse of social difference and how citizens of USA experience the society around them. She argues that the concept of class is strongly connected with race and ethnicity. The categories of race and ethnicity is used by the citizens of USA, but the discourse of class is at large parts not suitable as a valid description of the society in USA. However, connecting class to race and ethnicity the discussion gets more complex, but at the same time more true to the social reality, and according to how the Mission is categorised of the residents. The notion of race and ethnicity is self-explanatory categories in USA, and by knowing other peoples race and ethnicity one imagine that one understands the explanation for their behaviour, the cultural history and status in America (Ortner 2006).

According to Ortner (2006) there are two different approaches to the issue of how ethnicity and race are connected to class. The first approach is ignoring class. Race and ethnicity are described as primary social categories, and that the access to resources are given or denied according to ethnicity and race. The second approach has an economical perspective where class factors have primacy of determining people's chances in life (Ortner 2006). The reason why race and ethnicity is important parts of this approach, are because they separate the Other through prejudice and discrimination, but they do not constitute cultural formations (class) that influence how people operate in the world (Ortner 2006). The identity connected to both ethnicity and class is important to understand Mission district by.

USA is often considered as a cultural melting pot, and there are different cultures everywhere. There are a huge mix of races and ethnicities, and because of all this mixing of race and ethnicities the citizens of USA has to localize themselves in the cultural terrain. One of the large approaches to this issue has been through multiculturalism. Hollinger (1995) claims that multiculturalism directed itself as the opposite of the narrowness of the prevailing culture in the USA. Multiculturalism tried to unify the various cultures in the United States. Guiliana B. Prato (2009) argues that multiculturalism is a diverse concept and the definition depends on the perspective of the discipline. One perspective treats multiculturalism as objectifying culture, and placing cultures as opposites (Prato 2009). The approach of multiculturalism treats culture as an object, and we should use tolerance and understand the flow of culture instead of seeing culture as a “thing”. She has the same point of view as Hollinger (1995) who argues that we need to take a step beyond multiculturalism because

Multiculturalism is like many historic movements that speak compellingly to the anxieties and aspirations of a distinct historical moment, but are then inhibited from meeting new challenges by the generality of the commitments to which they owe their existence: it has outgrown itself. (Hollinger 1995: 2).

However Hollinger (1995) reasons for using the perspective “postethnic” as a new solution. A postethnic perspective has a more fluent relationship to historical set boundaries. It is a perspective that works within the present days values and ideas, instead of a perspective grounded historical knowledge and values (Hollinger 1995). The term multiculturalism is more static than the postethnic because postethnicism has less limitation. It is more connected to ethnicity than multiculturalism (Hollinger 1995). Prato (2009) and Hollinger (1995) argues for less limitations when discussing cultures and differences. Hollinger (1995) argues that identities of individuals are often acquired through affiliation both intentionally and unintentionally. My informants amongst the long-term residents were highly educated, had the possibility to not be a part of the working class, but this was their choice. Their identities were connected to the Mission as home. Because they were connected to the Mission, had a background from the Latino community and they were *Latinos*, they were perceived as members of lower classes by the new middle class. In these two cases the ethnicity gives them certain rights and obligations, and these rights and obligations are connected to the working class through being a Latino. They chose the identity of the Latino. They had the chance through the mobility that comes from education to move

away from Mission District, and create new a space for themselves. They chose to stay in the Mission, and to coexist with the changes that went on there. Isabel and Esteban's values made them take the choice to stay in the Mission. They wanted to maximize their own values by stay and empowering the Latino community. By making the choice to stay, they empowered the community by their own presence. The structural incentives and limitations of their status made it more valuable for Isabel and Esteban to be a part of the changing structures of Mission District. The choice was based on Isabel and Esteban's habitus and cultural capital as Latinos. The process of maximizing their statuses by the incentives and limitations were a large part of what made them stay in the Mission. In the ethnical perspective of their status, they both stayed within their category as Latinos. Because of their status as Latinos in the Mission, they often are placed in a lower class economically (even if this is not necessarily the truth), and it is expected by the new middle class that they be of a lower class. Both of them made the decisions of a higher education and use their present situation to give back to the community through work and actions. By giving back they creates opportunities for the kids and teenagers the still live in the Mission. Both Isabel and Esteban are example of how the perspective of postethnism give the agents a choice, and that they are not bound by biology and history. Even if the agents stayed in their environment, they still had the choice based on their incentives and limitations. The postethnic perspective refuses that history and biology orders the affiliation, and that it orders the choices individuals make (Hollinger 1995). The postethnic perspective doesn't indicate the ethnicity has nothing to do with the process of making decisions, and it questions how much history and biology has to do with the decision making process.

The emic category of working class is racially loaded and is often connected with racial and ethnic minorities (Ortner 2006). Even if race and ethnicity is connected with class in this perspective, it has different origins. Race, ethnicity and class are so strongly connected in the Mission because of how you perceive your self, and how other perceives you. The differences doesn't always come from an externally point of view. Isabel as a highly educated woman with a good job, and her family in the neighbourhood has certain expectations to her. She is not stereotypic Latino, but she still has the status of a Latino because she was born and raised in the Mission, her ethnicity, her volunteering in the neighbourhood, and the background of her family.

Her rights and obligations are connected to being a Latino, and she had to adjust to the incentives and limitations of the values of her status of a Latino. She is active in the Latino community of her own choices. She could easily belong in the new middle class in the neighbourhood, but she wants to belong with the Latino community and the long-term residents. Her status as highly educated and with an affordable lifestyle could put her with the new population, but her values put her in the category with the long-term residents of the Mission. Still, she had experiences with other long-term residents that weren't all good. She told me that she went into a bar in the Mission with some friends of her, and during the evening one of her friends got stabbed by another guest at this bar. The reason why her friend got stabbed was that he was at the wrong place at the wrong time. Some of the other guests saw her friend, and assumed that he was from a rival gang in the neighbourhood that had crossed the boundaries. This was not true, since her friend didn't belong to a gang, but he was a Latino. Just by the look of Isabel's friend the other guest expected that this was someone that didn't belong. The expectation of a random Latino in a bar was a gang member, show that within the category of the long-term residents, there are expectations of who and what you are.

Race and ethnicity are reasons for separations in the society of USA, and there may be series of actions and personal experiences as a result of this separation. Isabel expressed her thoughts about the segmentation she thought she experienced in the district. She told me when she went to a restaurant in the Mission, she could see how the staff gave less priority to her orders. Her orders were not paid attention to, so she had to wait longer than other guests for service. The new population were given larger attention by the staff. Hollinger (1995) gives attention to the fact that many of the young people that go off to prison are African American, but he argues that it's not race that makes them prisoners, but the lower class that makes them disposed for criminal behaviour. Economical and educational opportunities are not the only reason why people from lower classes go to jail, but the lower classes often get fewer opportunities to test these social and cultural boundaries. The youth from the long-term residents community in the Mission resents the new population according to Isabel's daughter. They expressed that they thought it was unfair that their schools and local environment were given less priority than the schools in richer areas of San Francisco. For younger residents growing up in the Mission they get frustrated

because they can't get the resources they want and need. The schools are downsizing because there are fewer kids and teenagers in the neighbourhood. Larger families have to move from the neighbourhood because the living costs are too high. New couples that only have one child, often moves when they have more children or when the child is getting older. A result of this is that the schools in the neighbourhood are lacking the resources they need to satisfy the students because of budgets given by the government. This was one of the issues that Isabel's daughter has noticed and was frustrated over. The new population neglected the families and community, and because of this unintended neglect the schools are lowering their standards as a result of the governments budgets. By using the logic of cultural capital, the result of this is that the long-term residents kids are the losing party. The quality of the schools and the quality of the education are lowering their standards. This working class are reproduced as a lower class because of few opportunities, and with small chances to adjust the social structures of the neighbourhood.



## Chapter 5

### Gentrification

Ruth Glass wrote a definition of gentrification in 1964:

One by one, many of the working class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle classes – upper and lower. Shabby, modest mews and cottages – two rooms up and two down – have been taken over, when their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive residences... Once this process of gentrification starts in a district, it goes on rapidly until all or most of the working class occupiers are displaced, and the whole social character of the district is changed. (Glass 1964: xviii-xix)

The definition is one of the first and a classic definition of gentrification, but it still explains the process of changing classes in an urban neighbourhood well. Over the years there have been several approaches to gentrification. One perspective is the consumption and economical perspective. Neil Smith (1979; 1987) argues that the gentrification process is about movement of capital, and the social change is a result of the economical changes such as broader economical processes in an urban area. These broader economical processes concern a valuation of the land market and investment and disinvestment in sectors of the built environment. Another perspective of the gentrification process is the importance of cultural, political and lifestyles values beside the economical consumption. David Ley (1980; 1987; 1994; 1996) has focused on a more cultural perspective. Ley (1996) writes about the new middle class as political liberal, elitist and of their general lifestyle. The new middle class is a complex category and has a large impact on the area that is gentrified. Ley's perspective in "The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City" (1996) are on the complex influence the new middle class has on a neighbourhood during gentrification. Smith and Ley use two different perspectives, but they agree at one point: gentrification is a complex process. Beside that my informants doesn't speak much of class, a lot of the literature on gentrification explores levels of development and class. Both Smith and Ley focus more on the new middle class, and less on the long-term residents in a changing neighbourhood. Theories of gentrification have a tendency to focus on the new middle class, letting the working class and the long-term residents go overlooked. A reason for this can be that the literature focus on what causes the change, and what that has changed in an area. The social character turn out as changed during the gentrification process, and it's a higher class that now is the original in the area. That is one of the reasons why the focus is on the middle class.

Studying gentrification can only be done after the process has started, because it's hard to predict when these changes are going to start. The anthropologist probably enter the gentrification process after it started, and then it might be more tempting to focus on the changing element: the new population. Another reason might be that most of the researchers are middle class themselves, and when they do studies in their own society or a similar one, they often focus on the similar, not the other i.e. the working class. It is the middle class that gives rise to the change, and many anthropologists direct the attention to the change. The area that is gentrified has often transformed the resident's classes, and now it's a middle class society. My perspective on the complex gentrification process is a cultural approach. I will focus on values both at the long-term residents and the new population.

### **Mission District – one neighbourhood?**

Schwirian has a definition of a neighbourhood which says: “a population residing in an identifiable section of a city whose members are organized into a general interaction network of formal and informal ties and express their common identification with the area in public symbols” (Schwirian 1983: 84). He argues that a neighbourhood is not the same as a residential area because there are no patterned relations between the residents. So is the Mission a neighbourhood or a residential area? All the inhabitants in the Mission call it “the neighbourhood”, but because of all the changes in the neighbourhood, and all the difference in the area, is it right to call it a neighbourhood when we use Schwirian's definition? The connection between the Latinos and Mission District is obvious since the area has a distinct Central- and Latin American character. This is the area where many of the residents grew up, and they have a tie to the Mission through history and cultural belonging. Other people from the Latino community did not grow up in the Mission, but moved here as immigrants or moved here from another place in the United States. One of the reasons they have ties to the Mission is because of the Latino culture there. Many people who moved into the Mission did so because there is something familiar there. They speak variations of Spanish and Spanglish (a mix between Spanish and English), and they find people from different countries or people with ties to Central and Latin American countries. In the Mission they find something that reminds them of home. Symbolism of the Latino culture is very obvious in the Mission, and all the symbolism is part of

the characteristic in the Mission as mentioned in the earlier chapters. The murals, the music and the language are all a part of what connects the Mission to the long-term residents. The long-term residents are rooted in the Mission, and one of the core values is the community.

The new population have a connection to the Mission based on different reasons compared to the long-term residents, but at the same time similar grounds. They have the connection to the atmosphere in the Mission, which is founded on the Latino character. The atmosphere is exotic for people moving from other parts of USA, and other parts of the world. The city has a Latino influence but still it is a western, if not almost European city when it comes to style. While Los Angeles is huge, and the best way to go around is by car, San Francisco is smaller, more compact and the public transportation in San Francisco has good standards. Many of the buildings in the Mission and San Francisco are built in a Victorian style, which is older than the Latino influence. The blend of different styles in the Mission, from old Victorian styles, the European influence by the Irish and Germans, and the Latino influence is a part of how the Mission is experienced today. This creates the eclectic vibrant neighbourhood that the new population desire. They also add their own character on the neighbourhood through the use of art, but also in how the areas are used. The transformation of Dolores Park is one example of this use. Now, the park is used more as a place where young adults and their dogs can relax, and the park is not as suitable for afternoon activity for families anymore. The people who go to the park often bring alcohol and drugs (the most obvious one is marijuana), and the dogs often run around with no leash. There is often someone with a guitar who plays and sings, or someone with an electronic player. The most common music they play is indie and hip-hop. Cultural forms of expressing oneself are highly valued with the new population. It doesn't matter much how you express yourself, as long as you do it through artistic forms such as music, visual art, dance or fashion.

Both categories of the long-term residents and the new population have a connection to the neighbourhood, even if these connection and attraction are based on different things. What is shared in the Mission is the love for art and artistic expression. Even if it is different styles of art, the artistic form is still valued highly. There are different relationships between people from these two categories, and because of these

different relations there are various tastes in art, but appreciation of types of art is present. When it comes to other aspects of life in the Mission these two categories doesn't share much. There are large differences in the two lifestyles. While the long-term residents of the Mission are more conservative when it comes to values such as family and work, the new population is more focused on the individual perspective. The symbolism that Schwirian argues is necessary for an area to be called a neighbourhood are present through art, even if the artistic inspiration comes from different places and aspects of life. My Latino informants could not find much they thought they would share with the new population. The core values between the two groups were too contrasting. My informants from the new population didn't think exactly the same. They felt that they could share something with the Latino population. Some of them said that they shared the appreciation over living in the Mission. They shared the appreciation over what the Mission was at the time of my fieldwork. This was not an idea my informants from the Latino community agreed on. There was a disagreement over what they share both on the symbolical level, and the level of ideas. Schwirian's definition says that the Mission is a residential area, and not a neighbourhood, even if the residents call it "the neighbourhood". There are two parts in the neighbourhood: Mission and Mission Dolores. These two areas can with Schwirian's definition each be called a neighbourhood because Mission Dolores is more gentrified than the rest of the Mission. Mission Dolores is on the west side of the neighbourhood, and this part separates itself from the east part because of the demographic are the new population. While the east part of the neighbourhood consist of a larger blend of residents. There are several symbolisms that connect the residents together, and I would also go so far to suggest that the residents within the Mission and Mission Dolores might see themselves a part of two different parts of Mission District.

All the residents call Mission District "the Mission". The population in an area should be able to make the choice if they want to call the area they live in a neighbourhood, or a residential area. I don't want to devalue the resident's own choice of referring to the Mission as a "neighbourhood". In this case a neighbourhood is an area where the residents choose to call it a neighbourhood. The reason why they call it a neighbourhood has historical reasons, which still hold because the changes in the neighbourhood are quite new. The city has drawn the borders between

neighbourhoods in the city and they are still valid. The changes in the neighbourhood are only 10-15 years old so the population still calls it “the Mission”. It is in their habit. It is a way of separating their neighbourhood from the other neighbourhoods in the city. The Mission has been known for its Latin American characteristic, and this is what the residents still want their neighbourhood to represent, even if the newer changes have also made it known for being a hipster neighbourhood. When the residents of the area still call it the same, there is a loyalty and a desire to keep the area as one neighbourhood. The different ideas of what the Mission is supposed to be, are a result of the residents' different perspectives.

### **Objective structures and social realities**

How the agents experience the objective structures depends on their cultural capital and habitus according to Bourdieu. Appadurai gives another approach toward the perception of the social reality. Appadurai argues for five dimensions of cultural flow in the globalised world: ethnoscaping, mediascaping, technoscaping, finanscaping and ideoscaping. The scapes lean towards fluidly and irregular shapes of landscapes (Appadurai 1996).

These terms with the suffix *-scape* also indicate that these are not objectively given relations that look the same from every angle of vision but, rather, they are deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: national-states, multinational, diasporic communities, as well as groupings and movements... the individual actor is the last locus of the perspectival set of landscapes, for these landscapes are eventually navigated by agents who both experience and constitute larger formations, in part from their own sense of what these landscapes offer (Appadurai 1996: 33).

Of the five dimensions it is the mediascapes and ideoscapes that have a current of interest for this paper, but I will give a short introduction to the three other scapes as well. The scapes are explained by Appadurai (1996): With ethnoscapes he refers to people in the shifting world, such as tourists, immigrants, refugees, guest workers and other individuals or groups that move around, and affects their environments. Technoscapes move fast over different kinds of boundaries that earlier were impervious boundaries. This includes both mechanical and informational, and high and low technologies. Technology is more accessible now in the globalised world. Finanscapes is more than just transactions and the flow of money and currency, but the exciting point are the global relationships between ethnoscapes, technoscapes and finanscapes. These three scapes are both independent and at the same time dependent of each other. More separated from these three scapes are mediascapes and

ideoscapes. Mediascape is the distribution of electronic capabilities to produce and spread information. The media produces the information, and the media is then creating an image of the world, which is influenced by many aspects as their mode, their hardware, their audience, and the interest of those who own and control them. The information in the globalised world is created and produced by agents who might have a personal angle on themes and subjects. The medium that is sent to a recipient is not as objective as one would hope for. The objective structures in the world always have a subjective interpretation of them, and this interpretation is often influenced by cultural capital and taste. It is not only *how* the information is imparted, but also *what* is imparted. “Mediascapes...tend to be image-centred, narrative-based accounts of strips of reality” (Appadurai 1996: 35). Ideoscapes are also connected to images, but they are often political or have something to do with ideology of state and counter ideology oriented towards getting power over a state or pieces of the power. Ideas, terms and images of topics with an Enlightenment worldview are used here. Freedom, welfare, rights, sovereignty, representation and democracy are ideas that came with the Enlightenment and influenced the ideoscapes (Appadurai 1996). The background of the agent who is going to be a recipient of the ideas, terms and images is important to pay attention to. The morphology creates different ideoscapes, and they shape themselves in various national and transnational contexts (Appadurai 1996). Ideoscape and mediascape are closely connected because of their narrative approach. The interpretation of the presentation of the topics and terms of mediascapes and ideoscapes is what connects them more than the first three scapes. The world is deterritorialized because of the flow of money, commodities and persons around the world. As a result of this flow the mediascapes and ideoscapes find their fragmented counterparts (Appadurai 1996). Connected with the gentrification and the relationship between the two categories in the Mission, the meaning of the ideas, terms and images are not always understood the same way. The ideas, terms and images just give the partial right illusion of the Other. However, deterritorialized people use ideoscape and mediascapes as a guide to understand the Other, their understanding is not necessarily the same understanding as the Others has of themselves.

Cosmopolitans seek the differentness and the openness towards the Other. They do try to understand the Other on its own premises, but the different scapes may make the understanding of the Other difficult. A cosmopolitan is not just a resident of a city,

cosmopolitanism has to do with the agents behaviour towards other people. The interaction between the residents and people from outside the city is what creates cosmopolitanism. The articles in Jon Binnie's "Cosmopolitan urbanism" (Binnie 2006a) has various definitions of cosmopolitan, but most of the definitions have one thing in common, which is an openness to diversity in an urban area. There are two aspects of this openness: the global aspect and the local aspect. The global aspect of cosmopolitanism has to do with the flow and circulation of people and cultural diversity to these areas. The local aspect concerns how cosmopolitanism is created and maintained in the local space (Binnie 2006b). Ulf Hannerz defines cosmopolitanism as

A more genuine cosmopolitanism is first of all an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other. It entails an intellectual and aesthetic openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrast rather than uniformity. (...) cosmopolitanism can be matter of competence, and competence of both generalized and a more special kind. There is the aspect and a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting. (Hannerz 1996: 103)

The definition shows that cosmopolitanism is about openness towards other cultures, and it is about knowledge and how this knowledge is used. One needs to understand the culture and being able to reflect over it. Cosmopolitanism has a hegemonic aspect to it, because an outsider enters the local arena, and is able to judge and compare the local culture with other cultures. By knowing and understanding more parts of the world, the world is somehow under control (Hannerz 1996). The world is more and more globalized, and as a result of this, the world is getting more interrelated. There are larger flows of people from various places, and cultural difference is present at the local level. To see the cosmopolitanism in the light of gentrification there are a difference between locals and cosmopolitans. While locals have a traditional rooted knowledge based on who you know on a local level, cosmopolitans base their influence on their knowledge tied to the Other (Hannerz 1996). The cosmopolitans knowledge come from what they have learned *about* the Other. They have another approach to the local environment compared to what the locals have of themselves. Appadurais scapes may help explain the differences of approach since the mediascapes and ideoscapes create partial guides to the Others, and this illustrates the social reality of the Other. By connecting cosmopolitanism and cultural capital I see a correlation. There are different types of knowledge in the discussion, and there is a resemblance between cosmopolitans and intellectualism. Cosmopolitanism has a decontextualized cultural capital (Hannerz 1996). Their knowledge about the Other

and communities is learned a different way compared to how locals absorb the local cultural capital. The cosmopolitans knowledge has a more intellectual approach than the locals who incorporate the knowledge. The aim of the knowledge is different between a cosmopolitan and a local. The cosmopolitan has the aim to learn and incorporate the knowledge and cultural capital of the Other, while the locals incorporate the cultural capital of their own category. The locals do not see their culture as the Other; they see their culture as the primary culture.

Hollinger debates cosmopolitanism and pluralism and argues for the pluralism sees cosmopolitanism as a threat to identities, while cosmopolitanism sees pluralism as an unwillingness to engage the complex dilemmas and prospects presented by contemporary life (Hollinger 1995: 4). Pluralism is when two or more social systems coexist. The conflict in the Mission surrounds itself around the issue of pluralism and cosmopolitanism as well. The long-term residents and the new population have different identities and values, but share the same location. The communications on a deeper level between the two categories are practically non-existent, but still there have been some adjustments to each other. Gary Bridge (2006) in his article “The paradox of cosmopolitan urbanism: rationality, difference and circuits of cultural capital” proposes that cosmopolitan urbanism is “the conjunction of particular forms of professional, rational knowledge and it’s acquisition in the spaces of the key metropolitan centres” (Bridge 2006: 53). With this definition he also claims that there is openness to difference, and that knowledge in a metropolitan area is transversal between spaces and cultures instead of knowledge and rationality based on hierarchy and fixed location (Bridge 2006). He discusses various types of knowledge, and how knowledge is both innate and acquired in the space of a city. In an area where different cultures and people are living closely together, rationality and knowledge flows easier between various groups of people. Rationality does not need to be the same for the residents, it is not a universal truth and rationality amongst the residents in the Mission is not the same for everybody.

It’s at the local scale that cosmopolitan is created. It is between the open and tolerant, and the bounded local where cosmopolitanism is created and maintained.

Cosmopolitanism reproduces itself at the local level because the residents in an area produce and reproduce their cultural capital within the local facilities (Binnie 2006b).



The long-term residents and the new population are very much unlike, and a consolidation of cultural capital amongst these two categories has happened, even if it's at a tiny level. How cosmopolitans reproduce themselves may be from an idea or an image they obtained through the scapes. They can reproduce themselves within an image or an idea. By using local facilities and their own idea of what the local culture is, they can create a hybrid culture of the local culture. The cosmopolitans and negotiate their own status so it's accepted by the residents. The neighbourhood is under considerable changes, so the cosmopolitans adjust to the local culture that exists in the present. In the Mission, there are two dominant categories of knowledge and culture, but what the local culture is questionable. How the agents that recently moved to the neighbourhood adjust depends of how the agent perceives the neighbourhood. There are different reasons why agents move to the neighbourhood. What they have in common is that most of them want to try to adjust to the local environment. With two dominant categories in the neighbourhood, the agents need to understand what the local culture is. For the new population the local culture may be the Americanized culture, while for Latinos in the neighbourhood the local culture is the Latino culture. What the agent sees depends on where the mind is, therefore in what kind of scape he or she connects with. To explain I use an example I have used earlier. Johnny perceived the Latinos in the Mission as family oriented people. As explained earlier he does this because the human mind need to categorize like this, or else the mind would be overwhelmed by thoughts and there would be chaos in the mind. He categorizes like this because he has ideas and images he obtain from the mediascapes and ideoscapes. On the other hand, the term hipsters have some stereotyped characteristics. The image and idea of a hipster is often connected to being different, in a partly negative way. The idea and the image of a hipster is produced by the mass media, and it is just a partly guide of the hipster, but still this is the realistic comprehension of a hipster by agents from the Latino community. The images that are produced by the mass media create a subjective understanding of the Other. This is understood as the social reality, but it is just an interpretation.

The cosmopolitans of the Mission would be people from the new population who not originally come from San Francisco. Not everybody from the new population is a cosmopolitan, but the individuals that have openness towards the Other, has the intention of trying to understand the Other and their own values. If the cosmopolitans

understands the locals on their own premises is another question, but they have the intention of trying to understand. They are often considered highly educated and wealthier than the locals. They have played a part in changing the neighbourhood, maybe not intentional, but still they have been a part of the gentrification with their expression of good taste in cuisine, housing or schooling for instance. Their knowledge and taste are often inimical to the openness and differentness that definitions of cosmopolitans implies (Binnie 2006b). The desire to live in a city with all the differentness would show an openness to the Other, but at the same time, people who move to areas that are being gentrified often seek a certain way of life. The interest in the Other is present but it might be at a more superficial level. The decontextual cultural capital as Hannerz (1996) writes about is present in the Mission. The new populations cultural capital is not the same as the long-term residents capital. The new population has a comprehension that the long-term residents are the Other, and know that their way of life are not the same. The same does the long-term residents think about the new population. There is an idea of the Other from both sides. Both the long-term residents and the new population have a relation with the Latino culture in the Mission, but there is a different understanding of it. The aesthetic consumption in the Mission is for example visible through various forms of murals. The appreciation of the Mexican and Latin American food and beverage is present with the new population, but it do not go any deeper than enjoying a good meal and that's about it. The people who will represent cosmopolitans are often at the upper end of the gentrification market, and their cultural capital doesn't need to correspond with the people at the lower end (here: the Latino community) (Bridge 2006).

San Francisco is known to be an open-minded city, and a city that encourage people to be themselves. This has a lot to do with the very openly gay community, and this reflects on other parts of the city as well. San Francisco is a city where one does have a lot of freedom to act as one want to. In this way San Francisco is very exotic in the sense that it's known to be a tolerant city, and this draw many people to the city. The city of San Francisco is in comparison to definitions of Binnie (2006a) a cosmopolitan. The Mission has also open-minded residents, and on a daily basis I met and saw many various types of people on the streets. But in all this there are some more conservative people in the Mission, they didn't like what happened in the neighbourhood. On the surface it seems like a neighbourhood that is harmonic and all

sorts of people can blend in, but there are boundaries between people. Some younger Latinos feel resentment towards the new population, because they believe that the new population has an “easier life” than them. Some people from the long-term residents community think that the new population do not have enough respect for people in their nearby environment. The other way around, the new population are not open to see long-term residents situation in the neighbourhood. Both categories of long-term residents and the new population are not really open to each other. Most of the population in the Mission lives their lives independent of each other. There is openness towards how other people live their lives in the Mission, but people don't think much about other people in the neighbourhood. The openness that Binnie discusses in “Cosmopolitan Urbanism” (2006a) is present in the Mission, but the acceptance of the difference is questionable. The two main categories of the population in the Mission do see each other and interact on an everyday basis, but they doesn't get much involved with each others lifestyles.

### **The gentrification in the Mission**

The Mission has the openness towards the cultural diversity that a cosmopolitan has. As a paradox the openness that residents of the Mission has to the Other, just go towards accepting that other people may be different from themselves. There is little understanding between the categories, it is just accepted to be different and being open to the difference. The paradox in the Mission is even if it seems like a very tolerant neighbourhood, there are little communication and interaction between the old and the new population. The conflicts between the two groups are under communicated.

In the Mission the gentrification process started when artistic people, and people with an alternative lifestyle moved into the neighbourhood. They were looking for a cheap, exciting and urban place to stay. Here could they live without paying as much rent as they would have to do other places in the San Francisco area, and they had an inspiring environment to work in. At first the new population was not a large group, but this started a process of further more people moving into the neighbourhood. There came a wave of young, new people moving into the neighbourhood. As new people moved into the neighbourhood came different needs from the new population.

New stores, bars and restaurants were started up to meet the new needs of the neighbourhood. During the last 10-15 years, more and more people have moved to the Mission, and the largest category that moved to the neighbourhood is the hipsters, young professionals and students. Some places the separation between the gentrified part, and the less gentrified part of the Mission are more obvious. Mission Street and Valencia are two streets just 50-100 meters apart, but the distance in space is more significant. The impression of Mission Street is that this is a street with ethnical influences from Mexico, Central America, South America, Caribbean and some Asian influence. Many of the stores there have a practical function and they sell groceries, household equipments, cheap shoes and clothes, bridal and evening gowns with a Latin touch. You can get Mexican and Latin American cuisine everywhere. There are people selling movies, jewellery and goods that have a questionable origin on the street. This can be pirate copies of movies, illegal goods or just objects some people are reselling. There are also food-carts where people are selling ice cream, hotdogs, fruits and Mexican food on Mission Street. There are people on the street at almost all times, everyone from women with children, youth skipping school, homeless people, people passing through, to men playing craps on the street. The north end of Mission Street that is closer to 16<sup>th</sup> Street is shadier than the south part around 18<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> Street. Around 16<sup>th</sup> Street there are more obvious drug addicts and prostitutes on the street. Mission Street consists of a large mix between families, young crowds, hipsters, young professionals, and homeless people. Valencia Street is very different from Mission Street because there are more of the smaller niche boutiques that sell everything from designer clothes, alternative oils and tea, bookstores, many bars, all sorts of restaurants from French, Italian, Californian to Arabic cuisine, and organic groceries stores. Here you find more hipsters, young professionals and students rather than the Latino families. The street is not as busy as Mission Street, but it is also less personal compared to Mission Street. At Valencia people don't know each other the same way as people know each other and the stores on Mission Street. The atmosphere is more impersonal on Valencia Street, my conjecture is that since the residents that use the facilities on Valencia Street are the new populations, and they might live in the Mission just for a couple of months or years. They have become more impersonal towards the other residents. The Mission is not "home" for these residents as the Mission is for other people such as Esteban. Valencia Street is miles apart from Mission Street metaphorically speaking because the Latino ethnic

influence that Mission Street has is almost gone in Valencia Street. Valencia Street has a more hip and trendy influence.

### **Personal reflections on the gentrification in the Mission**

The gentrification process is complex and impact people in different ways. How people experience the gentrification process in the Mission depends on how the process meet or doesn't meet their needs. For most of the new population the process doesn't affect them as much because the gentrification adjusts the neighbourhood to their advantage. This is why the Mission is a popular place to move to: it's urban, different from other neighbourhoods and relatively cheap. For the long-term residents the gentrification is making the living situation harder, and it affects individuals in this category. The new more affluent dwellers are affected mostly on a group level since they turn into a category when they move to the Mission, and the people from the Latino community has to move out as individuals, and at the same time this affect the community. In general the term gentrification describes the changes a neighbourhood goes through as described above, but there are different levels of gentrification. In the Mission there is still a lot of the Latino character left in the neighbourhood, but there are different opinions of how far the transformation of the neighbourhood has gone.

Esteban is the most conservative and thinks that the gentrification is not necessary, and in his opinion the Mission was a better place to live before the gentrification. The Mission was grimier, and there were more gangs and crime, but then he felt that the Mission still belonged to him and the people he care about. Esteban used the Fillmore neighbourhood as an example of what he is afraid of is going to happen in the Mission. There is little chance that the Fillmore will ever be like it used to be when it was a more jazz inspired and less affluent neighbourhood, and he is afraid the Mission he knows is going to fade more and more over time. Even if the Mission is one of the less wealthy neighbourhoods in San Francisco, it has a cultural richness you can't find other places in San Francisco, and Esteban is worried that there will be no place for the strong Central and South American culture in the gentrified Mission District. Esteban talked about people and businesses that came to the Mission, and wanted to improve the neighbourhood, and this improvement did not consider or honour what

was already there. This bothered him, even if he appreciate local initiative he thought that much of the businesses that opened the last 10-15 years has little to do with what the Mission, is or should be for him.

Johnny is in general positive to the gentrification process because he thinks that the changes bring out a potential for the Mission as an exciting and individual neighbourhood. He felt bad that people who had been living there for years needed to move, but unfortunately the gentrification process made this the reality. He thinks there are different levels of gentrification, and that there is a big difference between the gentrification that happen in the Mission versus the gentrification that that happen in South Beach where they built AT&T park, the stadium of San Francisco's major baseball team the Giants. He told me that this used to be an area with big empty storage houses and old factories, and when they decided to build the stadium there also popped up different chain stores like Starbucks there. If that is the transformation that would happen in the Mission he would not like it, and him and his wife would probably move. Johnny encouraged local initiative because he prefers to live in an eclectic and vibrant neighbourhood that don't allow corporate chains and corporate stores to move in. He didn't think that he had to change himself to adjust to the changing neighbourhood, but he could see that the neighbourhood had to change. He could see lots of groups getting together to prevent that the Mission District ended up as an office park, prevented rapid change, and worked against the loopholes that could get people thrown out of their apartments. As Johnny was a part of the gentrification process, the change that happened in the neighbourhood has not affected him in the same way as it has affected the long-term residents. One of the reasons why Johnny did not need to change was because the neighbourhood had changed into his advantage. Johnny explained that he don't only have bad associations with gentrification. For him the gentrification process is progress and change, but change is necessary and improves the neighbourhood for the residents. He think it is sad when people are forced to move, but in his opinion when families are growing bigger it's the normal pattern for urban American dwellers to move out of the city, and in to the suburbs. According to Johnny it should be easier to stay in cities when the family are expanding, and when he and his wife are having a child, they have no intention of moving out of the Mission, even if it's the pattern of urban American dwellers.

Isabel cares for the change that has happened in the neighbourhood. She appreciates that the neighbourhood is safer and cleaner than what it used to be, but she knows that these new things were not built for her and her family. It was built for the hipsters, young professionals and the students, she just happened to be here so she can enjoy all of it. That is why she is offended by gentrification. Gentrification for her is offending, and means that she and her family and friends were not special enough for developing the neighbourhood before the new population came along. Many of her friends and people that lived here when she grew up had to move away from the Mission. For her the gentrification process is pushing out a group of people, and often the group that has to move is the people that built the place. So even though she thinks it is a better neighbourhood in the materialistic way, she also thinks that the neighbourhood has lost some of its value in terms of people and community. Isabel resents the hipsters, young professionals and students because she thinks there is a lack of respect by people living in the neighbourhood. The lack of respect, in her opinion, came because of a large part of the new population that moved in the neighbourhood the last couple of years. They didn't respect their neighbours when it came to partying, and they didn't respect that during the night it should be quiet because of the families, and that people had to wake up early for work. There was also a lack of respect in the public areas. When families and women were walking the streets with strollers, they had trouble walking past larger groups with young adults that are blocking the sidewalk. Cafés and coffee shops were placing tables and chairs on the sidewalk making it more difficult for people to walk past them. I felt the same when I went for a walk. There were many people on the sidewalk so it was hard to walk past them sometimes. In my opinion this problem didn't always have much to do with the newer population moving in the neighbourhood, but that there were in general many people on the streets, and sometimes it got a little crowded.

Both Jason and Sarah have negative associations with gentrification, but the difference between them is that while Sarah reflected instantly over the fact that she is a part of the gentrification process, Jason did not see himself as a part of the gentrification process. Jason thought it was sad that people had to move from their own neighbourhood, and doesn't like gentrification much. When he started to reflect about the gentrification in the Mission, he realized that he was using the infrastructure and the facilities there, and in some way he was a part of the Mission right now, and

therefore was a part of the gentrification process. This seems not to be an unusual way of reflecting over their own presence in the Mission, and my guess is that many members of the new population didn't see themselves as a part of the gentrification process. When I talked to people in the neighbourhood about gentrification and their role in it, there was a mix between people seeing themselves as a part of the process, and people who thought that they weren't really involved in what went on around them (some of them felt they were just hanging around not doing a lot neither to develop nor preserve the neighbourhood). They were just residents in this neighbourhood, and not always thinking about that the money they left in the stores, restaurants and bars affected their neighbourhood in different ways. People may support various businesses even if they are not aware of it themselves. Sarah didn't like gentrification either, but was aware of the fact that she was a part of the gentrification. She was a part of the process of closing stores that had been there for years, and that she was part of new stores that satisfies other needs were popping up in different locations. She tried to stay away from the stores on Valencia Street since she didn't want to support the more expensive stores in the neighbourhood. She said that she preferred the markets on Mission Street because these markets were cheaper for her, and she knew that by supporting the more expensive stores, the result would become that the living expenses in the neighbourhood would rise even more.

The problem of gentrification and change in the neighbourhood also affected Isabel's daughter (15). Her friends worry about their future in the neighbourhood. Most of her friends blame the gentrification process on the hipsters, young professionals and students that moved to the neighbourhood. Isabel's daughter has both connections in the Latino community and at private schools she goes to. The demographic at her school is mostly Caucasian. When she was younger she tended to be more as her friends at school, but then she got comments from her friends in the neighbourhood about her "acting too white". These comments made her become more "ghetto" as she called it, and by that she meant more make-up, bigger hair and more jewellery. When she looks more "ghetto" she gets comments from people at school such as "the bigger the O (big round earrings) the bigger the ho'", which mean that females that are considered to be "ghetto", and also considered more promiscuous. Ortner (2006) has touched the area of sexuality and class in middle class high schools, and she argues for that there is an impression of the working class is the bearer of an exaggerated



sexuality while the middle class is the bearer of respectability. There are also a large difference in clothing, language, hairstyles, attitude towards teachers and schoolwork, but the largest difference is towards and practices of sex. “Middle class kids, both male and female, define working class kids as promiscuous, highly experienced, and sexually unconstrained” (Ortner 2006: 33). By taking the choice of being more “ghetto”, and in this situation separation herself distinctly from her classmates, Isabel’s daughter was making a large decision of choosing the Mission as an identity marker. It may be hard for a teenager to fit in both worlds. She is in between the two social realities and this affects her because she can’t fit in both places. She wanted to belong in the Mission since it’s where she grew up; it is there she feels at home and familiar. It is her choice, wanting to belong in the Mission. She maximized her status as a Latino to show a belonging to the Mission. Except going to college, she wish to stay in the Mission when she gets older. She doesn’t discuss the situation with her friends much because she think there is some resentment towards the gentrification and the new population amongst here friends. Because of this there are no use to talk about it, people will just get sad and angry when they do. Since she has one foot in each world, and a mom that earns enough money to stay in the Mission she don’t want her friends to feel sad and force the difference between them forward again.

### **Economy**

In February 2006 Mission Economy Development Agency (MEDA) published the “Socio-economic profile of the Mission District” (Eiseman 2006). MEDA is a non-profit organization that works for economical justice for low- to moderate- income Latino families through asset development (MEDA 2011). In this report there is documentation of the population, ethnicity, income and household size, and housing and businesses in the Mission. The economy in the Mission is vulnerable because the incomes of the households are lower than the average in the city and the household sizes are larger. The Latinos in the neighbourhood have even lower income and larger households than other residents in the area. One of the last points of the report is that the majority of the population of the Mission rent their homes. The demographic and income is based on the year 2000 census, and Dunn and Bradstreet corp. provided the business pattern in 2004. The data the report is based on are not brand new, but they show a valid picture of the resent situation of the Mission District, and they are in

consensus with my own impression with the Mission during my fieldwork in 2010. The numbers is properly not the same in 2010, but still it is a demographical and an economical diverse neighbourhood. (There was a new census in 2010 but the result is not published by the time this paper was written.) The result of the census in 2000 says that the median household income in Mission District is \$48,227, and the median income of San Francisco is \$55,509. Caucasian household has the highest income in the neighbourhood, while Latinos in the Mission has the lowest median household incomes compared to both Caucasian and Asian households (Eiseman 2006: 2). By the numbers of year 2000 the Mission both had the lowest income, and the highest number of people in the household, and because of this the Mission is one of the cheapest and most vulnerable neighbourhoods to live in San Francisco.

The economical situation is complex in the Mission. It is the part of San Francisco where you find many homeless people, and people that might stay in the Mission illegally. It might be hard to find the correct numbers of how many people who actually lives in the Mission, and the reality of their income. There are many homeless people in the Mission because the temperature is higher there and in general the weather is better in the Mission. The mountains Twin Peaks shelter the Mission from much of the cold fog from the Pacific Ocean that cools down large parts of the city in the evening, night and the morning. The group of homeless people pull down the median income, or they are not even a part of the 2000 census because of the problematized logistics with reaching this category. People from other countries who either do not have a citizenship in the US, speak other languages or people who just do not want to answer the question on the census for different reasons also live in the Mission. This is why the census is not 100% accurate, but still it gives a valid image of the state of Mission District in the year 2000.

The financial crisis of 2008 has had an impact on many of the residents of Mission District. "The times are harder" was an expression I heard from many people when we talked about the economy. In most of these settings they both talked about themselves and others, and it was compassion with each other and a unity when most of the people talked about the financial crisis. When it came to loosing a job everybody were in the same situation. It would be a difficult situation for several of the residents in the Mission. It would be hard finding a new one because the recession

impacted many parts of the economy and businesses all over the USA. On Mission Street storeowners said the same thing: that the recession was hard and they needed to save money, and the two last years were the worst. One of the stores started up 4 years ago, and the other store was 20 years old. The old store was a clothing store and they focused on sporting goods, because that was something that always sold well at their store. The store that had been open for 4 years were a store where they sold different merchandises such as clothes, suitcases, toys, decoration and so on. They were both the kind of store that the majority of the population in the Mission could shop in, and they had goods that were meant for families and residents in the area.

### **The rent marked**

When the new category of people started to move in to the neighbourhood in the middle of the 1990s, and wealthy people started to buy houses relatively cheap and rented them out. An effect was that the rent prices started to increase, and as a result of this many of the long-term inhabitants had to move out of the Mission, and find new homes outside of the city. This is gentrification as described in the introduction. There are restrictive rules on housing rentals, rent control, which tries to subdue rental prizes on apartments and houses. This basically means that the rent can only be raised a certain amount each year as long as the contract between the landlord and tenant is valid (Union 2011). This protects tenants rights and maintains the rent level in the neighbourhoods in San Francisco. This is also the case in the Mission, and the housing rent is still considerable cheap compared to the rest of San Francisco. Still the last 10-15 years the rent in the Mission has increased, and the result was that many of the long-term residents had to move out of the Mission. Their houses and apartments were then available and the landlords who either already owned the house, or bought it from the original residents would rent them out to new tenants. Since the landlords doesn't need to relate to the last contract and rent they can sign a contract with a proportionately higher rent.

### **The conflict between the residents**

There are two main categories of residents in the Mission. There are the long-term residents as one category and new population as the second category. The new population demand a physical and social space for themselves in the Mission. If they

are going to get this space they need to receive it from somewhere, and the space they have demanded is the west side of the Mission. The new population doesn't limit themselves only to the west side, but they move in other parts of the neighbourhood as well, even if the west side is predominantly the gentrified part. The new population are a threat to the long-term residents because they have the economical resources to stay in the neighbourhood. The individualistic lifestyle of the new population is opposite to the Latinos lifestyle.

### **Different values**

The values are very different between the two categories. The objective structures are not perceived the same at all times. An example is how the Day of the Dead is interpreted. The Day of the Dead is celebrated in early November. Because my fieldwork that started January 2010 and ended in July 2010 I could not personally take part in this celebration, but my informants told me about it. Day of the Dead is a holiday that is celebrated in the Mission amongst the Latino population to honour late family members. They gather family and friends to honour and remember the deceased ones. In the Mission this is also an opportunity to honour the Latino culture in the Mission. The participants dress up with either masks or painted faces trying to imitate skeletons and skulls. This has a deeper meaning than just dressing up for fun. Day of the Dead has to do with remembering deceased family members and their past. There are altars built on the streets, and there are different cultural events with music, artists and rituals. Both Esteban and Isabel felt that the new population was not respectful to this event that should be used honouring their deceased loved ones. They felt that the Latino legacy was ridiculed because the hipsters, young professionals and students in the area did not really understand what the Day of the Dead meant for the Latino population in the neighbourhood. The long-term residents have another perception of the event, and it has another value for them in comparison to the new population. Both Esteban and Isabel thought that the new population were disrespecting their traditions in the neighbourhood. They thought that the hipsters, young professionals and students did not take this serious and just were a part of it so they could play dress up. The new population took part in the event, but they didn't have the same relationship to it. This is supposed to be an alcohol-free event, but Isabel and Esteban both said that the new population used this as just another day to

party. Participants from the new population that took the Day of the Dead serious might still not have the same perception of the event as the members from the Latino community. To bring up the topic of mediascapes and ideoscapes again, the participants have different ideas and images of what they are participating at. The Latinos are raised with this concept, and their idea of what the Day of the Dead is come from that perspective. Their perspective is connected to emotional ideas and images from the past. The new population who are not raised with this concept do not have the same connection. They have other images and ideas connected to the event. They might honour their loved ones as well, but at the same time the inspiration and the desire to celebrate the Day of the Dead are not from the same incentive. The participants from the new population that took the event serious had a cosmopolitan approach to the Day of the Dead. They tried to understand the event with openness and respect, but the locals perceive the respect as disrespect. When it comes to the event there are two ways of acting in the neighbourhood. There are two different views of the ritual. Both focuses on honouring deceased family members, but on different levels, one of the levels the long-term residents are born and raised with they have incorporated the ritual, and the other level is adopted.

By using this perspective we focus on the hidden conflict in the Mission, which is about different forms of capital. Conflict is often about others conception of value towards ones own conception of value. My argument is that the gentrification process is a result of changing values amongst the residents, and it is the American individualism that take over from the community-based values. The group who has the dominant conception of value is the new population. The Mission still had a large Latino influence in the Mission in 2010, but as Esteban and Isabel said, a lot had changed the last 15 years. The changes are a result of the new population moving into the neighbourhood.

The more coherence there is between the circuits of economical and cultural capital, the more likely it is that the field is socially elite and exclusive, and this works against the ideal of cosmopolitanism being open to otherness (Bridge 2006: 65)

The new population made the choice to keep something of what made Mission District “the Mission”, and the influence that is kept is the artistic character. The artistic character is adjusted towards the new population’s taste. An example of this is Clarion alley. The new population that move into the neighbourhood are often liberal, and the eclectic sense of the Mission appeals to the new residents. The artistic form in

the Mission has become hybridization and it has changed from an expression of community to an elitist form of street art. It is “new” and exciting for the new population, and it represents the community for the long-term residents. Friedman’s (1992) point out, it’s the past that recreates the present, and the new population use the already existing Latino influence in the neighbourhood, and made it their own. While the new population has focused on the artistic character, the family-oriented community of the Latinos are struggling. Because the long-term residents will be the exposed category, they will have fewer possibilities to change the dominant individualistic culture. The new population will continue to be the dominant category. The new population also adds a “greener profile” to on the neighbourhood. The predominated taste is focusing on the eclectic atmosphere and the environment. The new population are suppressing the cultural capital of the long-term residents through the balance of class.

The values of the Latino community are connected to how people organize their lives, and how they understand Mission District through the relations they have to people around them. There is a strong group identification based on similarity to the people around, and distancing to people who are different from you. Everybody from this category are individuals but there is also a sense of collectivist that unites them. The values in the Latino community are strongly connected to the relationship and community. The new populations values are also connected to people around them, but in another way than the long-term residents. People from the new population are more individualistic. Their values are connected to what kind of status they have themselves according to others. Even if an agent is individualistic and does what he or she pleases, he or she also seeks a recipient to approve or disapprove the actions.

## Chapter 6

### Conclusion

This thesis has been a study of how the gentrification process is influenced by the dwellers in the neighbourhood, and how the process of gentrification shapes the dynamic of the residents. The argument I have made is that the gentrification process is affected by the values of the residents in Mission District, and it's the dynamic of the residents that limits the process of gentrification.

The residents limit the gentrification process through their cultural capital and habitus. It is in the dispositions of their incorporated habitus and the acquired cultural capital where taste is found, and within the taste we also find the values of an agent. So, the values of an agent is embodied by the social human, and at the same time acquired through institutions such as education, titles and experiences. Habitus and cultural capital give an explanation of how agents recognize, evaluate and understand actions or titles to make sense of the social world. The residents of Mission District has acquired their values through a large process of experiences and incorporated dispositions. The various backgrounds, and different incorporated knowledge of the population in the Mission have made that the two categories perceive the gentrification process differently. The values of the long-term residents are orientated around the community, and in relations with the people they surround themselves with. These values appear in local cultural events, artistic expressions and through recognition of common grounds amongst the long-term residents. The new populations values are more based on individuality and following one's desire. The changing neighbourhood has had a large influence of that. With the new population more amusement and entertainment scenes, which suits the new populations needs have opened in the neighbourhood. With these places opened the area got more attractive for the new population, and even more people are drawn to the area. The residents limits the progression of gentrification by making choices based on that they want to maximize their values. The dynamic between the residents is shaped by gentrification, because the new population and the long-term residents are negotiating their values. How the people in these two categories comprehend the other category are influenced by the how they categorize each other, but because of the lack of

communication, they have to rely on the stereotyped knowledge of the other category. The flow of ideas and images creates stereotyped conceptions of the Other. The deterritorialized human acquire ideas and images that are produced by the mass media, but these ideas and images are only partial guides to the understanding of the Other (Appadurai 1996). The new population move into the neighbourhood with an understanding and openness of the Other, but this understanding and openness often relies on images and ideas that the new population have obtained through the global and local flow of information. The new population are often deterritorialized people that use mediascapes and ideoscapes (Appadurai 1996) to understand the locals, but this understanding is not necessarily the same understanding that the locals have of themselves. The intention of understanding the long-term residents based on their own values may be there, but the accomplishment may not be that successful. The long-term residents understanding of the new population, is that they are the reason for the gentrification process, and that the gentrification process are not considered to the long-term residents values. The two categories have different needs from the neighbourhood, and as a result they perceive the space of Mission District differently. While the residents want a perpetual home that creates security for them and their families, the new population experience the Mission as a stop on the way. It is a nice place to live for a while where the rent is cheap, and it has developed so the new population can find whatever they desire there.

The gentrification process generates the conflict of values amongst the residents because there is a lack of communication and interaction. What the local culture in the Mission actually are, is questionable because there are two perspective of what the Mission is supposed to be. Bridge (2006) argues that during a gentrification process there can be two conflicting cultural capitals present, and in the Mission these two conflicting capitals both limit and make the process proceed. By this process of negotiating of values, the gentrification is shaped by the residents' values, and their relation are a result of the gentrification. The dynamic of the residents in Mission District are the limitation and incentive of the progress of gentrification, and as Barth (1994) argues: the process is influenced the ego possibility of profit of values.



## References:

Albano, A. L. (2011). "MissionDolores: Welcome." Retrieved 14.02, 2011, from <http://www.missiondolores.org/>.

Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Banks, M. (1996). Ethnicity: anthropological constructions. London, Routledge.

Barth, F. (1994). Manifestasjon og prosess. Oslo, Universitetsforl.

Barth, F. (1996). Ethnic groups and boundaries. Ethnicity. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 75-82.

Bellah, R. N. (1996). Habits of the heart: individualism and commitment in American life. Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press.

Bing, A. (2008). San Francisco. Footscray, Lonely Planet Publications Pty Ltd.

Binnie, J. (2006a). Cosmopolitan urbanism. London, Routledge.

Binnie, J. (2006b). Introduction: grounding cosmopolitan urbanism: Approaches, Practices and Policies. Cosmopolitan Urbanism. J. B. J. H. S. M. a. C. Young. Abingdon, Routledge: 1-34.

Blu, K. I. (1980). The Lumbee problem: the making of an American Indian people. Cambridge, Cambridge university press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (2006). Structures and the Habitus. Anthropology in theory: Issues in epistemology. H. L. a. S. Moore, Todd. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing: p. 407-416.

Bourdieu, P., D. Østerberg, et al. (1995). Distinksjonen: en sosiologisk kritikk av dømmekraften. Oslo, Pax.

Bratt, P. (2009). La Mission. USA.

Bridge, G. (2006). The paradox of cosmopolitan urbanism: rationality, difference and the circuits of cultural capital. Cosmopolitan Urbanism. J. H. Binnie, Julian; Millington, Steve; and Young, Craig. Abingdon, Routledge: 54-69.

Broady, D. (1991). Sociologi och epistemologi: om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologin. Stockholm, HLS förlag.

- Cerwonka, A. (2007). Nervous conditions: the stakes in interdisciplinary research. Improvising theory: Process and Temporality in Ethnographic Fieldwork. A. M. Cerwonka, Liisa. Chicago, University of Chicago Press: 1-40.
- D'Andrade, R. G. (1995). The development of cognitive anthropology. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- D'Andrade, R. (2006). Moral Models in Anthropology. Anthropology in theory: issues in epistemology. H. L. a. S. Moore, Todd. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: 513-522.
- Eiseman, M. (2006). Socio-economic profile of the Mission District. San Francisco: 1-34.
- Eriksen, T. H. and O. B. Frøshaug (1998). Små steder - store spørsmål: innføring i sosialantropologi. Oslo, Universitetsforl.
- Friedman, J. (1992). "The Past in the Future: History and the Politics of Identity." American Anthropologist **94**(4): 837-859.
- Glass, R. (1964). London: aspects of change. London, Macgibbon & Kee.
- Goffman, E. (1968). Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Goffman, E. (1992). Vårt rollespill til daglig: en studie i hverdagslivets dramatik. Oslo, Pax.
- Hannerz, U. (1996). Transnational connections: culture, people, places. London, Routledge.
- Hollinger, D. A. (1995). Postethnic America: beyond multiculturalism. New York, BasicBooks.
- Hume, D. and P. Nafstad (2009). En avhandling om menneskets natur: et forsøk på å anvende den eksperimentelle metode på moralske emner. Oslo, Bokklubben.
- James, A. (1997). How British is British food? Food, Health and Identity. P. Caplan. Abingdon, Routledge: 71-86.
- JamestownCommunityCentre (2009). "Our Values - Essentials - Jamestown Community Centre - San Francisco, Mission District, Children, youth, Families." Retrieved 29.01, 2010, from <http://jamestownsf.org/essentials.php?article=69>.
- Jefferson, T. (1776). Retrieved 27.04, 2011, from <http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/document/>.
- Jenkins, R. (2008). Social identity. London, Routledge.

- Ley, D. (1980). "Liberal Ideology and the Postindustrial City." Annals of the Association of American Geographers **70**(2): 238-258.
- Ley, D. (1987). Reply: The Rent Gap Revisited. The Gentrification Reader. L. L. T. S. a. E. Wyly. Abingdon, Routledge: 103-106.
- Ley, D. (1994). Gentrification and the Politics of the New Middle Class. The Gentrification Reader. L. L. T. S. a. E. Wyly. Abingdon, Routledge: 134-150.
- Ley, D. (1996). The new middle class and the remaking of the central city. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MEDA (2011). "MEDA - About us." Retrieved 03.02, 2011, from <http://www.medasf.org/AboutUs.html>.
- Ortner, S. B. (2006). Anthropology and social theory: culture, power, and the acting subject. Durham, Md., Duke University Press.
- Paton, K. (2010). Making Working-Class Neighbourhoods Posh? Exploring the Effects of Gentrification Strategies on Working-Class Communities. Classed Intersections: Spaces, Selves, Knowledges. Y. Taylor. Surrey, Ashgate Publishing Limited: 137-157.
- Prato, G. B. (2009). Introduction - Beyond Multiculturalism: Anthropology at the Intersections Between the Local, the National and the Global. Beyond Multiculturalism. G. B. Prato. Farnham, Ashgate Publishing Limited: 1-19.
- Rosch, E. and B. B. Lloyd (1978). Cognition and categorization. Hillsdale, N.J., Erlbaum.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (2006). The Primary of the Ethical: Prospositions for a Militant Anthropology. Anthropology in theory: issues in epistemology. H. L. a. S. Moore, Todd. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: 506-512.
- Schermerhorn, R. (1996). Ethnicity and Minority Groups. Ethnicity. J. a. S. Hutchinson, Anthony D. Oxford Oxford University Press: 17-18.
- Schwirian, K. P. (1983). "Models of Neighborhood Change." Annual Review of Sociology **9**: 83-102.
- Smith, N. (1979). Toward a Theory of Gentrification: A Back to the City movement by Capital, not People. The Gentrification Reader. L. L. T. S. a. E. Wylm. Abingdon, Routledge: 85-96.
- Smith, N. (1987). Commentary: Gentrification and the Rent Gap. The Gentrification Reader. L. L. T. S. a. E. Wyly. Abingdon, Routledge: 99-102.

TeachForAmerica (2010). "Teach For America - Our Approach." Retrieved 02.05, 2011, from <http://www.teachforamerica.org/what-we-do/our-approach/>.

Union, S. F. T. (2011). "San Francisco Tenants Union." Retrieved 30.04, 2010, from <http://www.sftu.org/rentcontrol.html>.