# **Justice Farms and the Mediation of New and Old Detroiters:**
*An Ethnography of a Detroit Urban Farm*

A Thesis Presented to the Department of Sociology at the University of Michigan

By Michelle Rabaut

mrrabaut@umich.edu

April 2017

Robert Jansen, Assistant Professor of Sociology

Elizabeth A. Armstrong, Professor of Sociology and Organizational Studies

**ABSTRACT**

While many know the city of Detroit for its rise and fall during the mid-twentieth century, today the city is entering a new period characterized by rapid development and revitalization. Although the media paints these changes as positive, many longtime residents of the city are angered by the ways development is silencing, excluding, and displacing them from the “new Detroit.” This marginalization has resulted in antagonisms between new and old populations of Detroit, leading me to pose the question: What processes play a role in dissolving such boundaries and bridging these populations together? Using ethnographic methods, I zoom in on one site in Detroit that has successfully mediated the relationship between new and old—Justice Farms, an urban farm whose mission is rooted in prioritizing long-term residents in development while simultaneously embracing both outsiders and new populations to the city. This study reveals how brokerage is central to processes of boundary bridging and dissolution. While past literature tends to define brokerage as a single act of connecting two parties, I pull four specific cases from my fieldwork to examine how brokerage is a much more protracted process enacted to dissolve resistances to collaboration between the two parties. Although these cases occur at the micro-level, on one urban farm, they shed light on both the why and the how of macro-level boundary dynamics—that is, why boundaries exist between new and old Detroiters, and how these boundaries can be dissolved.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

To my faculty advisor throughout this exploration, Professor Jansen, thank you for your focused commitment to my project. Your detailed feedback, swift communication, and serious dedication to my ideas challenged me to become a more advanced sociological thinker. You have helped instill a strong belief in myself and in this research. Thank you for investing in me and guiding me through this endeavor.

To our Honors cohort coordinator, Professor Armstrong, thank you for lightening the heavy weight of writing an Honors thesis. No matter where we found ourselves throughout this process, the mood was always lifted in class as you helped us bond over this difficult process. Thank you for helping us to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

To my graduate student mentors, Nelson Travis Saldaña and Mikell Hyman, thank you for taking the time out of your own studies to help me in my own explorations of the social world. Your ideas have helped to push my project to new levels of sociological inquiry.

To all those involved with the Semester in Detroit program, thank you. This program and the experiences it fostered provided the motivations for this thesis.

To the University of Michigan Sociology Department, thank you for the opportunity to invest in my own research interests and for the provision of funding which made this research possible.

To all of the actors involved with Justice Farms, the site for this study, *thank you.* Words cannot describe the immense gratitude I feel for my summer spent with all of you. Thank you for your warm welcomes, your openness, your stories, your criticisms, and your wisdom. I hope to see you all in summers to come.

To my family and friends, thank you for supporting and encouraging me throughout this long and difficult process. You are all my foundation, and none of this would be possible without each and every one of you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Introduction** . . . . . . . . . . 6

**Context** . . . . . . . . . . 9

*Detroit, 2017* . . . . . . . . . . 9

*Mid-twentieth Century Detroit* . . . . . . . . . . 12

**Literature Review** . . . . . . . . . . 17

*The Study of Boundaries* . . . . . . . . . . 18

*Network Analysis and Theories of Brokerage* . . . . . . . . . . 22

**Methodology** . . . . . . . . . . 26

*Justice Farms: Cultivating Community* . . . . . . . . . . 27

*4.8 Acres of Resistance, Resilience, Resourcefulness* . . . . . . . . . . 31

*Methodology* . . . . . . . . . . 34

**Results** . . . . . . . . . . 37

*Case 1: Building Roots in Community* . . . . . . . . . . 40

*Case 2: Navigating Spaces of Power* . . . . . . . . . . 44

*Case 3: Brokerage, Chickens, and Conflicting Interests* . . . . . . . . . . 50

*Case 4: Unpolished, Confrontational, and Hustlin' Food* . . . . . . . . . . 57

**Discussion** . . . . . . . . . . 62

**Appendices** . . . . . . . . . . 71

**References** . . . . . . . . . . 76

Some of us, the only reason we are here, is because of the culture. But there's people who have been here….For some of us, welcome home. For others, welcome to Detroit. We've been building it up, we've been keeping it going. You better say hi. 'Cuz we here… Look to your left, look to your right, do you see somebody? Nobody is invisible. No one can erase this reality. There's no such thing as empty lots in Detroit. There's legacy and fractured lives. There's scaling and transcendence, that's what going on tonight. There's no such thing as empty lots. Look across the street. You see that…That's the earth. Your mother is a sentient being. She got a story to tell. She is not a market concept. Hey mama, hey mama—my mama loves me, she told me so, my mama loves me, she let me know, my mama told me anything I want, I ain't even have to ask. Regardless of that street light on that broken pole, my mama love me.

*-Julian, a native Detroiter and partner to Justice Farms, speaking to the public at an event hosted by Justice Farms. Recorded in field notes, 9/23/16.*

# INTRODUCTION

In 2017 Tyree Guyton, creator of Detroit's internationally acclaimed Heidelberg Project, was forced to relocate the headquarters of the project from Detroit's developing Midtown area. The project began in 1986 on Detroit's east side, when Guyton, a life-long Detroit resident, decided to wage "a personal war on urban blight…transforming his childhood neighborhood into a living indoor/outdoor art museum" (Tyree Guyton n.d.). Today the project draws an estimated 200,000 visitors per year from around the world (Allen 2017). The Midtown building which serves as a gallery, administrative headquarters, and meeting space for the project, and has been a home to Guyton and his artwork for over eight years, sold for $1.2 million to a real estate company, Detre 1 LLC (Hodges 2017; Allen 2017). Guyton must find somewhere to relocate, and the building will be transformed into offices and apartments.

Due to the success of Guyton, his artwork, and his impact in Detroit, this news circulated quickly amongst a wide variety of audiences. Many, both in Detroit and outside of the city, were heartbroken, shocked that development has the potential to negatively impact individuals integral to Detroit's landscape. Yet this story is not an anomaly. While the construction projects and billions of dollars being invested in the city are hailed as Detroit's "comeback" and "rebirth,"[1] there is a darker truth behind the rapid development that is not evident in these praises. Images of a "new" Detroit are surfacing, yet many lifelong Detroiters do not see themselves in the picture. Similar to Guyton's experience, rising rent is pushing residents out of spaces where current

---

[1] Bhuiyan 2017; Aguilar 2016; Thibodeau 2016; Bomey, Gallagher, and Stryker 2017; Gopal 2015; Metro-Jacksonville 2016; Bant 2016; White 2016; Seigel; Cummings 2016.

development is concentrated—downtown, Midtown, Woodbridge, Corktown[2]—and into another Detroit, marked by crumbling houses, abandoned buildings, and entire blocks of grassland (Moskowitz 2015). The promotion of shiny, new luxury apartments, upscale bars and restaurants, dog parks, and high-end clothing stores existing in the above neighborhoods often erase the prior existence of low-income residents. This has manifested in antagonisms between new and old populations of Detroit. Quite simply, as development unfolds, it is clear that there are "Two Detroits"—one, increasingly white and prosperous, and another, majority African American, low-income, and isolated (Moskowitz 2015).

How can these two communities come together to build up Detroit? To examine this question, I study one organization in Detroit that has proved successful in mediating the relationship between new and old populations to the city. This site is Justice Farms,[3] an urban farm whose mission takes a strong stance against the displacement wrought by current development efforts and demands that long-term residents of Detroit drive their own development on their own terms. What is intriguing about this organization, however, is that while there is a clear desire to prioritize long-term residents in the development of the city, Justice Farms is an international hub, bringing outsiders from all over the world into their organization. They have gained trust and respect from both populations—long-term residents of Detroit as well as newcomers. How has the organization been able to successfully mediate this relationship without sacrificing this mission, which prioritizes the well-being of longtime Detroiters?

---

[2] See Appendix C for a map of Detroit's neighborhoods.

[3] Pseudonyms have been given to names of organizations, individuals, and locations. No real names are used in this thesis in order to protect the identities of the actors and locations involved.

Using ethnographic methods, I found that brokerage—the process of linking unconnected actors in a way that facilitates some sort of exchange—is central to the bridging of groups and the dissolution of boundaries (Stovel and Shaw 2012). However, while the concept is widely studied, there is an existing gap in the literature. Brokerage tends to be described as a single act—the process of connecting two unconnected actors. Pulling four specific cases from my fieldwork, I examine how brokerage is a much more protracted process enacted to dissolve resistances to collaboration between two groups. The role of brokers, then, is not simply to connect neutral actors, but to diminish some sort of disinclination of two actors to work together. These findings at the micro-level provide insight into the divisions between new and old populations of Detroit observable at the macro-level.

In what follows, I provide a brief history of the city of Detroit, characterizing the current period of rapid development and the mid-twentieth century history leading up to this point. Next, in the literature review, I return to the central questions of this research and introduce the theoretical frameworks for exploring these questions, focusing specifically on the concept of brokerage. Following this, I explain the methodology used for this research, describing the site where this study took place and the processes of gathering data. Finally, I examine the results of this research, focusing on brokerage as a process of boundary dissolution, and move into a concluding discussion.

## CONTEXT

*Detroit, 2017*

Detroit today is experiencing a period of drastic transformation. Countless construction projects are underway and billions of dollars are being invested into the city (Bhuiyan 2017; Aguilar 2016; Thibodeau 2016). This period of rapid development is almost impossible to keep up with. There is the construction of the M-1 Rail Woodward Avenue Streetcar project, a 3.3-mile railway that will connect the downtown business districts by streetcar. The media is also excited about the development of a new arena that will become home to Detroit's hockey and basketball teams, the Red Wings and Pistons. This is a project totaling to around $733 million (AP 2016). The Planning and Development Department also plans to develop riverfront beaches, luxury condominiums, green spaces, bike trails and shops along the 400 acre riverfront (Gallagher 2016; Gallagher 2017). Apart from these larger scale projects, new restaurants, clothing stores, hotels, dog parks, apartments, and homes are being planned, developed, and opened each day. A quick Google search reveals a myriad of recent maps created to document these rapid changes.[4]

While the media paints these developments as undeniably positive, many longtime residents of the city are angered by the revitalization taking place. They feel excluded from the development and its benefits, arguing that current revitalization efforts are occurring in specific areas of the city that the majority of the population, being low-income residents, do not have

[4] http://detroit.curbed.com/maps/detroit-construction-map-news-development.
http://detroit.curbed.com/maps/detroit-development-map.
http://www.detroityes.com/mb/showthread.php?20319-Detroit-Development-Map.

access to.[5] Yusef Shakur, a community organizer in Detroit, is quoted in an article of *The Detroit News* stating, "You are creating lopsided communities. You are putting all your wealth in Midtown, downtown…Woodbridge. It's not creating an even playing field" (Aguilar and MacDonald 2015). While stores like Shinola and Will's Leather Goods[6] open in Midtown, other neighborhoods of the city are marked by "poverty-induced challenges, including reduced city services, poor-quality education, high rates of unemployment, crime, housing foreclosures, and little or no access to healthy food" (White 2011:14). The stark contrast of downtown development to the isolation of neighborhoods is shocking. As a new Whole Foods opens on Woodward in Midtown, the fact remains that over eighty percent of residents must purchase their food from party stores, gas stations, and other stores which offer few, if any, healthy choices (White 2011).

Along with the isolation from areas booming with development, many longtime residents have been forcefully pushed out of their homes due to rising rent prices or renovations tailored to higher-income populations. A telling example is of the conversion of low-income senior housing at 1214 Griswold to "The Albert," luxury apartments individuals can rent for over $1100/month (McGraw 2014). Seniors who lived in 1214 Griswold for decades received letters in the mail stating they had to be out within months due to renovations. This displacement generated much turmoil.[7] Media activist Kate Levy created a video comparing the reality of those being displaced

---

[5] According to U.S. Census Bureau data from 2015, Detroit was the most impoverished city in the nation, with 39.3% living below the poverty line.

[6] High-end, luxury-product stores that many argue are tailored for populations outside of the city.

[7] Some reactions are documented at http://www.deadlinedetroit.com/articles/8714/curbed_promotional_video_for_gentrified_cap_park_apartments_is_unbearbale_awful#.WMLRcxiZNWO.

to the language of the promotional advertisement which labels the building as empty and waiting for people to call it home. This story of forced exclusion from a "new Detroit" is not unique to 1214 Griswold, just as it is not unique to Tyree Guyton.

Additionally, the labeling of Detroit as a blank slate ready for newcomers to leave their mark is another major reason longtime residents are offended by current development. News outlets documenting new projects in the city tend to erase the low-income residents who live there. In an article discussing the current displacement taking place in Detroit, Tam Perry, a professor at Wayne State University researching the dynamics of African American aging, explains, "There's a national trope about Detroit, the idea that it's empty in a lot of ways. But when you think a community is a blank slate, you're also overlooking very vulnerable populations that have been part of the fabric of Detroit and want to remain part of that fabric" (Kleyman 2015).

To gain a fuller understanding of the tensions between current development and the longtime residents of Detroit who may or may not be included, the demography of Detroit must be examined. The population of Detroit today is 82.7% African American, with 39.3% living below the poverty line (Bouffard 2015). As development in the city draws in new populations, this influx of newcomers is majority white. Various articles document the "changing face" of Detroit, quoting census data revealing that the white population has increased by almost 14,000 residents since 2010, the first major increase since the 1950s (Aguilar and MacDonald 2015). These populations are moving into areas where development is concentrated—downtown, Midtown, Woodbridge, and Corktown. In an article of *The Detroit News* examining the population shift, a new resident to Detroit coming from a nearby suburb states, "I used to live in

Midtown and the number of young, mainly white, people hanging out there at night seems to grow all the time. And sometimes there are people standing in front of my house just taking pictures [because Corktown is a historical neighborhood]…That kind of makes me feel like a long-time Detroiter" (Aguilar and MacDonald 2015). Newcomers have been labeled terms like "muppies" (millenial-yuppies) and some have said that the "war against hipsters" has begun (Derringer 2014; Foley 2013). But why should antagonisms be directed towards those who come to Detroit as a consequence of the unfolding development? Detroit's complex history of race, residence, and work provide insights into why the current shift in Detroit—of both infrastructure and population—has been met by suspicions and resistance.

*Mid-Twentieth Century Detroit*

The city of Detroit holds a powerful reputation in the history of our nation. In what is arguably one of the most comprehensive books documenting the history of the city, *Origins of the Urban Crisis,* Thomas Sugrue (2014) describes how Detroit earned the label "Arsenal of Democracy" in the mid-twentieth-century. Detroit at this time was the icon of modernity for our nation—"the apotheosis of world capitalism" (Sugrue 2014:17). He paints a vivid picture of the city during the age of mass production, similar to scenes in Charlie Chaplin's *Modern Times*:

> The scene was a drama of might and violence, of human ingenuity and sheer physical labor, punctuated by the noise of pounding machinery, the sight of hundreds of workers moving rhythmically to the pulse of the line, the quiet but never unnoticed hovering foreman and inspectors, the interplay of mechanical power and the brawn of human arms and backs, the seemingly endless rush of workers through the gates at shift change time. (Sugrue 2014:17)

While this scene captures the hustle and bustle of a city seething with energy, this is not where the story ends. His book takes us from this "urban heyday" described above to the "urban crisis" of recent times. In stark contrast to the images above, factories today "stand as hollow shells" and the thousands of houses once "teeming with life" are abandoned and decaying, mostly overtaken by weeds and wild grasses (Sugrue 2014:3). What is interesting, however, is that this story is not Detroit's alone to tell. Other cities across the nation mirror Detroit's path from a booming industrial city to an "eerily apocalyptic" post-industrial reality experiencing intense poverty (Sugrue 2014:3). In her book, *The Next American Revolution*, Detroit activist and philosopher Grace Lee Boggs recognizes how "the city that was once the national and international symbol of the miracle of industrialization…is now the national and international symbol of the devastation of deindustrialization" (Boggs 2011:106). In order to understand why many cities have followed this path to crisis and decay, the stories we tell of the past must be complicated. Sugrue urges us to interrogate the historical narratives of Detroit to expose how "residence, race, joblessness, and poverty have become inextricably intertwined in postindustrial urban America" (Sugrue 2014:3).

Detroit reached a peak population of 1.8 million in 1950 (Aguilar and MacDonald 2015). At this time, the population of the city was 84% white, with an African American population very much on the rise. From 1940-1950, the African American population in Detroit had doubled, with many moving from the post-emancipation South (Sugrue 2014:33). Although this period of Detroit is labeled as the socio-economically prosperous period of the city, the African American population was often excluded from the benefits of industrialization. African Americans flocking to the North to gain a piece of the wealth soon realized that "an enormous

gap separated the reality of overcrowded, substandard housing and the aspirations of black migrants to the city" (Sugrue 2014:33). Despite the illegality of race-specific housing, "a mere 1,500 of the 186,000 single-family houses constructed in the metropolitan Detroit area in the 1940s were available to blacks" (Sugrue 2014:43). Contractors building homes found that deed restrictions signaled to real estate agents and developers that they should construct for whites only or they "risked the wrath of white homeowners" who made up their revenue base (Sugrue 2014:45). If refusing to sell to them did not work, white populations used "force and threats of violence against those who attempted to escape the black sections of the city," a harsh fact that is often left out of the retelling of Detroit's mid-century golden years (Sugrue 2014:24). With this, African American migrants constantly "found themselves in rapidly expanding, yet persistently isolated urban ghettos" (Sugrue 2014:34-8). Discriminatory real estate practices and federal housing policies perpetuated the marginalization of these populations. Loans and mortgages were given to populations that ranked positive on "a survey of the age of buildings, their condition, and the amenities and infrastructure in the neighborhood" (Sugrue 2014:42). However, because housing options were so limited for African American populations, living in overcrowded, unsanitary conditions was almost unavoidable. Thus, it is not a surprise that every African American majority neighborhood was ranked "hazardous", deeming those populations as unqualified for mortgages and home loans. It is often these structural inequities that arise from racist encounters on the interactional level that are left out of the telling of history.

Furthermore, because white populations did not experience discrimination at places of work or in the housing market, the "visible poverty, overcrowding, and deteriorating houses" were seen as "signs of individual moral deficiencies, not manifestations of structural

inequalities" (Sugrue 2014:9). This helped to fuel "white fears that blacks would ruin any neighborhood that they moved into" (Sugrue 2014:36). Thus, when responses by marginalized populations broke out in forms of social outburst and upheaval, the media labeled them as spontaneous "riots"—the most famous being the "Detroit Riot of 1967." Grace Boggs takes a different view, however, explaining that "Detroiters called it a 'rebellion' because it was an understandable response by young people to the brutality and racism of a mostly white police force…and also to their growing sense that they were being made expendable" (Boggs 2011:107). With a rapidly expanding African American population, many working-class whites fled to the suburbs. Since this period, over a million people have left Detroit and hundreds of thousands of jobs have followed (Sugrue 2014:3). The majority of African Americans did not have access to this escape due to the near impossibility of receiving financing. With little resources and city provisions left for those who did not have the privilege of leaving, Detroit itself has become an isolated urban ghetto, excluded from the wealth of neighboring suburbs. Today, Detroit not only has the highest African American population in the nation (82.7%), but also has the highest proportion of people living below the poverty line. A neighboring suburb created through white flight, Grosse Pointe, is 91.7% white and 3.2% African American. The estimated median income of this suburb is around $100,000,[8] a number which stands in stark contrast to Detroit's median income of $27,862 (Elliot et al. 2013). Again, despite the illegality of race-specific housing, residence in Southeast Michigan remains segregated.

As we move further into the twenty-first century, and as interest in redeveloping Detroit begins to skyrocket, it is essential to recognize that the narratives we use to understand the

---

[8] Retrieved from City Data, http://www.city-data.com/city/Grosse-Pointe-Michigan.html.

history of Detroit dictate how we view mistakes of the past and create solutions for the future. The standard narrative of the rise and fall of Detroit ignores a crucial fact: "Detroit's postwar urban crisis emerged as the consequence of two of the most important, interrelated, unresolved problems in American history: that capitalism generates economic inequality and that African Americans have disproportionately borne the impact of that inequality" (Sugrue 2014:5). In the standard narrative told of the city, why is it that when the city is prosperous (the 1950s and the current "rebirth"), it is majority (or becoming increasingly) white, and when the city is in crisis, it is majority African American? Without taking into account the structural factors underlying these enormous disparities, success or failure of the area is likely attributed to the populations that live there. This is what leads to the labeling of the current development, population growth, and housing renovations in Detroit as undeniably positive—the ultimate solutions to the urban crisis Detroit has faced in the past several decades. Just as narratives of the past failed to acknowledge the marginalization of much of the population from the fruits of industrialization, these current praises fail to acknowledge the exclusion of the majority of the population from recent revitalization. Seeing Tyree Guyton's displacement as an anomaly—as one instance that belongs to the individual—is a direct result of this.

This is all to say that what is happening now appears to many longtime city residents to repeat the systematic, structural racism and exclusions of the mid-twentieth century. These sentiments have manifested in distrust and antagonism directed at the influx of newcomers. While divisions between these two populations become clear given this context, central to this research is the examination of the processes that have the potential to bridge them. How might we begin to conceptualize brokerage across these boundaries, especially when these boundaries

surface from a complex history of marginalization and power dynamics? I now turn from the empirical case of Detroit to theoretical frameworks for exploring this context.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

As indicated above, this research examines the boundaries between longtime residents of Detroit and the influx of newcomers to the city drawn by the current revitalization. However, central to this research is not so much the maintenance of boundaries but the dissolution of them. The focus is on Justice Farms, an organization that prioritizes long-term residents in development while simultaneously incorporating outsiders and newcomers to the city into their operation. How is Justice Farms able to successfully mediate this relationship, without sacrificing the desire to prioritize long-term residents of Detroit? From this micro-level examination, I aim to answer the following macro-level questions: How can new populations be integrated into Detroit without pushing out those who have been there? How can Detroit develop in a way that is inclusive of longtime residents? What are models for these processes of mediation?

Boundary theory and network analysis are two approaches in the sociological literature that shed light on the collaboration, mediation, and integration of groups. Boundary theory tends to focus on the cultural component of boundaries—for instance, much research is dedicated to characterizing how and why boundaries exist (Weber 1946; 1968). Network analysis, on the other hand, focuses on the structural component of boundaries, contributing the powerful concept of brokers who act as bridges between actors or groups (Granovetter 1973; Gould and Fernandez 1989; 1994; Burt 2002; 2004; 2005)  Nonetheless, these two approaches each have their

limitations. Neither approach fully highlights the interactional component of boundaries. The literature tends to treat boundaries and brokerage as a switch that can simply be turned on or off—either a boundary exists or doesn't, either the broker links two groups or cannot. Both boundaries and brokerage are more dynamic than this, yet the literature has not fully addressed the complex, protracted processes that constitute boundaries and the ability of a broker to bridge them.

In what follows, I will first cover the literature dealing specifically with the nature of boundaries between groups. Next, I will discuss how network analysis propels the conversation of boundaries further by applying a structural lens. Finally, I will discuss how my own research contributes to the areas of this literature that need development.

*The Study of Boundaries*

Early literature dealing with boundaries focused on characterizing the inclusion/exclusion of groups. Weber (1946), for instance, distinguished between three types of groups—class, status, and party—and discussed how each fostered different models of inclusion/exclusion. They claimed that status is the most exclusive type of group and that this exclusion promises specific benefits to those who are included. More specifically, "a specific *style of life* can be expected from all those who wish to belong to the circle" (Weber 1946:187). The authors explained that inheritance of status is the usual origin of membership. Weber (1968) also characterized models of inclusion/exclusion in his chapter on "Open and Closed Relationships." Open relationships do not "deny participation to anyone wishing to join and in the position to do so" while in closed relationships "participation of certain persons is excluded, limited, or

subjected to conditions" (Weber 1968:43). He theorized that the main motives for closed relationships revolve around the benefits of membership. Exclusive membership allowed groups to maintain a certain "quality, which is often combined with the interest in prestige and the consequent opportunities to enjoy honor and even profit" (Weber 1968:46). Similar to his piece in 1946, he also examined the origin of membership, stating that it arises from "various conditions…qualifying tests, a period of probation, requirement of possession of a share which can be purchased under certain conditions, election of new members by ballot, membership or eligibility by birth or by virtue of achievements open to anyone" (Weber 1968:45).

These two pieces provide an early foundation for the study of boundaries. While they do not theorize boundaries in general, they do focus on specific phenomena that involve boundaries, such as membership in exclusive groups. However, their scope remains limited. Membership is treated as a situation that someone does or does not experience. With this, boundaries are theorized as a simple line between insiders of a group and outsiders of that group. This treats boundaries as a one sided barrier in which a group sets up the boundary and others try to break through it. This is too simplistic for the dynamic processes that constantly make, unmake, and remake boundaries.

Barth (1969) complicated the view that boundaries maintain themselves due to isolation and exclusion by demonstrating that boundaries persist despite flows of people across them. He was curious to see how ethnic groups maintain distinct identities when coming into contact with other groups. He found that groups maintain their identities due to their shared culture, which creates shared value systems that members judge themselves according to. This culture persists despite flows of people across boundary lines because groups create "a systematic set of rules

governing social encounters" which act to insulate "parts of the culture from confrontation and modification" (Barth 1969:16). This work furthered our knowledge of boundaries by grounding previous theory in empirical examples as well as attempting to detail the complex interactions that make up boundaries. Yet, similar to Weber (1946; 1968), the focus is on the maintenance of boundaries and the nature of exclusion, rather than the integration of groups and dissolution of boundaries.

Many questions regarding boundaries are left unanswered. In a manifesto urging sociologists to see the world as unfolding relations rather than static, Emirbayer (1997) created a list of questions regarding boundaries, relationships, and network dynamics that are not fully resolved in the field. How do we specify boundaries, since transactions across them are constantly flowing? Once we specify a boundary, how do we specify what is inside a boundary? When does a set of relations become a "thing" we can characterize? What are the dynamic processes that transform boundaries? What material processes cause shifts in boundaries?

Since this, many developments in the study of boundaries have taken place. Lamont & Virág (2002) attempted to create a cohesive survey of these developments and stated that their motivation was that "the multifarious recent developments around the concept of boundaries have yet to lead to synthetic efforts" (Lamont and Virág 2002:168). At the heart of their review is the explicit distinction between symbolic and social boundaries—ideas which "often remain implicit" in the literature (Lamont and Virág 2002:169). Symbolic boundaries "exist at the intersubjective level" and are subjective in that they deal with how individuals "categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space… and come to agree upon definitions of reality" (Lamont and Virág 2002:168). Social boundaries, on the other hand, are "objectified

forms of social difference" that "manifest themselves as groups of individuals" (Lamont and Virág, 2002:169). Symbolic boundaries, when widely agreed upon, can turn into social boundaries. Although these two concepts are central to this review, the authors emphasize the many different pathways boundary studies may take outside of these two concepts. Three recommendations for further research are proposed: (a) studying the properties of boundaries, such as their "permeability, salience, durability, and visibility," (b) studying the "key mechanisms associated with the activation, maintenance, transposition or the dispute, bridging, crossing and dissolution of boundaries," (c) focusing on "cultural membership" (Lamont and Virág 2002:186-187). These suggestions signal an urge to put attention on the material processes and micro-level interactions that make up boundaries, a gap that the present project seeks to fill.

Overall, the concept of boundaries is still evolving. Focusing on boundaries is important because it has the ability to "generate new theoretical insights about a whole range of general social processes present across a wide variety of apparently unrelated phenomena—processes such as boundary-work, boundary crossing, boundaries shifting, and the territorialization, politicization, relocation, and institutionalization of boundaries" (Lamont and Virág 2002:168). While the study of boundaries sheds light on fundamental social processes such as relationality, boundary literature tends to focus on the cultural component of how and why boundaries are created and persist. This is not to say the how and why are not important, for this lens allows us to understand the complex motivations underlying boundaries. For instance, it is evident that there are powerful reasons behind the deep suspicions and distrust longtime residents of Detroit feel towards new development and new populations. There is a strong resistance to collaboration between these groups due to a complex racial history of Detroit, and of our nation more broadly.

However, a focus on these cultural components lends itself to a focus on the problem rather than solution. To gain a fuller understanding of the various approaches to the study of boundaries, I now turn to the theoretical framework of network analysis, which attends more to the processes of bridging across boundary lines.

*Network Analysis and Theories of Brokerage*

While the above literature focuses on the cultural maintenance of boundaries, network analysis provides a framework for understanding the structure of boundaries and boundary-crossing. The concept of brokerage is central in this literature and offers powerful insight into processes of bridging populations.

In a broad sense, brokers can be thought of as "people situated between distinct social worlds" who "collect and channel scarce information in ways that make things happen" (Stovel and Shaw 2012:140). Stovel and Shaw (2012) emphasize two "crucial characteristics" of brokers. Brokers "bridge a gap in social structure" and "help goods, information, opportunities, or knowledge flow across that gap" (Stovel and Shaw 2012:141). Thus, brokerage can be defined as the process of linking unconnected actors in a way that facilitates some sort of exchange.

One of the first foundational pieces for thinking through brokerage was Granovetter's (1973) "The Strength of Weak Ties." This piece created a network model that went beyond cohesive and well-defined groups to studying "weak ties." The focus shifted from the study of groups to the study of relations *between* them. His concept of strong and weak ties refers to the strength of a relationship between actors. The strength of a tie is a "combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding), and the reciprocal services which

characterize the tie" (Granovetter 1973:1361). He argues that relationships that bridge between groups tend to be weak rather than strong. All bridges in a given social network are weak ties, but not all weak ties are bridges. These bridges have the power to transmit new information across the social network, and thus are highly valuable. This piece set the stage for literature on the unique and valuable structural position that brokers hold.

Gould and Fernandez (1989) furthered knowledge on the structural position of brokers when they distinguished between the different forms brokerage could take. The five structures of brokerage they listed are: coordinator, itinerant broker, gatekeeper, representative, and liaison. The variation in types is characterized by "the direction of information flow and the extent to which various actors are viewed as members of the same community" (Stovel and Shaw 2012:142). While each type of brokerage has its own flow of information, it is important to notice that all their cases derived from an initial person who called upon a broker to gain access to a third party. My data suggests that this might not always be the case. In some instances, it is the broker who initiates the bridging of two actors without being called upon to do so.

Gould and Fernandez (1994) expanded their conceptualization of brokerage in their study of brokerage influence in national health policy. They argued that the structural position brokers occupy does not alone equate to power. Rather, to make that position powerful depends on the type of brokerage position occupied as well as who the broker is. For example, government organizations in the position to broker are only influential in policy if they refrain from taking stands on issues, while non-governmental organizations in broker positions are influential regardless of the position they take on political issues. This suggests that governmental organizations are influential in policy because they make it possible for actors to communicate indirectly on issues of interest to *them*, not to brokers. This piece is also unique in that it brings

the act of brokerage to the macro-level rather than the micro-level, an idea I will come back to shortly.

Burt (2002; 2004; 2005) is another central figure contributing to the concept of brokerage. His work revolved around the concept of structural holes. Underlying his concept of social capital is the idea that “the value of a relationship is not defined inside the relationship but by context around the relationship” (Burt 2004:351). As the concept of social capital became more widespread, the general consensus was that social capital is “the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” (Portes 1998:6). Burt (2002; 2004; 2005) argued that brokerage provides social capital because when connections are made across groups, innovation and creativity are more likely to occur. Being near a structural hole—the space between two social worlds/groups/actors—places one closer to good ideas. Thus, performance of a closed group peaks when closure within that group is combined with brokerage beyond the group.

Other pieces look at the various sites that are conducive to brokerage. For instance, in their study on inter-ethnic relations in Iraq, Rydgren and Sofi (2011) found that inter-ethnic brokerage evolves in specific settings, such as workplaces, neighborhoods, or voluntary organizations. These spaces of interaction where contact occurs between a group and an outsider to that group are “seen as a precondition for the development of inter-ethnic social capital” (Rydgren and Sofi 2011:27). With this inter-ethnic social capital, individuals can serve as brokers between larger groups.

What this piece and much of the literature above highlight is brokerage’s “potential for macro-level consequences, which are revealed primarily through its impact on the permeability of group boundaries” (Stovel and Shaw 2012:139). This means that while brokerage itself is

"built from informal, personal relationships" that occur at "micro-level relations," it can provide insight into macro-level phenomena. This notion of bridging between micro-macro relations was emphasized earlier by Granovetter (1973), when he claimed that "a fundamental weakness of current sociological theory is that it does not relate micro-level interactions to macro-level patterns in any convincing way" (1973:1360).

Studying brokerage lends itself to generating theory on core processes such as the marginalization of specific social groups and the integration of those groups into spaces of power and capital. In their attempts to synthesize the literature on brokerage, Stovel and Shaw (2012) point out that "brokerage is one of a small number of mechanisms by which disconnected or isolated individuals (or groups) can interact economically, politically, and socially" (2012:140). Yet, while there are many examples of literature covering the topic of brokerage, this literature is fairly recent and "brokerage is rarely considered a central concept in the discipline's theoretical or analytic arsenal" (Stovel and Shaw, 2012:140). Stovel and Shaw's (2012) piece highlights the vast empirical variation within the study of brokerage, and thus, the variation in the definition of brokerage.

The above literature, while creating the foundation for my research, is limited in its conceptualization of brokerage. The focus is of the structure of brokerage rather than the interactional processes of brokerage itself. Gould and Fernandez (1994) complicated this view of brokers when they shifted from the positions of brokers to examining the various types of brokerage and the actors who occupy the space. However, there is still a gap in knowledge on the actions of the brokers and their interactions with second and third parties. Literature on brokerage, as with the study of boundaries, tends to treat brokerage as a relationship that either

exists or doesn't. However, as my data will show, brokerage is a process over time, that can succeed or fail at any point. In a more recent piece, Obstfeld et al. (2014) moved past structure to the process of brokerage. They critiqued past conceptualizations of the brokerage structure and argued that these structures can be prevalent without an actual act of brokerage occurring. However, their work is not grounded in empirical data, and their argument is solely based on proving wrong past conceptualizations. Thus, the theoretical terrain which examines the actual process of brokerage, rather than just the structure of it, must be expanded. Finally, in the literature, if brokerage is successful it tends to be treated as the transition from no connection between two actors to a connection. As my data will reveal, brokerage is a transition from a resistance to collaborate to an inclination to collaborate. Rather than begin from a neutral state of no connection, brokers must often work from a negative state of disinclination. All in all, literature must move beyond the restricted lens of brokerage as a type of structure that connects two actors. My research contributes to a perspective of brokerage that is interactional, highlighting the agency of the various parties involved.

## METHODOLOGY

To explore the concept of brokerage, and the processes of boundary bridging and dissolution more broadly, I volunteered within an organization that mediates the relations between longtime residents, newcomers, and development. This site is Justice Farms, an urban farm located in the historic Rose Hill neighborhood of Detroit. While their mission communicates a strong stance against the negative effects of development on longtime residents of Detroit, as well as their distrust of populations moving into the city, it is an organization that

strongly believes in the power of collaboration and inclusivity. Therefore, while the goals are to develop their community in a way that centers longtime residents, specifically African American residents, it was not uncommon on any given day during my field work to meet individuals from all over the world who were contributing to the efforts of Justice Farms. Through zooming in on this specific site, I hope to generate insights into the following questions: How can new populations be integrated into Detroit without pushing out those who have been there? How can Detroit develop in a way that is inclusive of longtime residents? What are models for these processes of mediation?

In what follows, I will give an overview of Justice Farms by describing the landscape, key actors, and intentions behind their work. I will then provide more detail about their mission, explaining the conditions that make this site ideal for examining the puzzle of bridging populations. Finally, I will review the empirical questions that grounded my engagement on the farm. This section will conclude with a description of my methodology and analytic strategy.

*Justice Farms: Cultivating Community*

On my way to Justice Farms for the first day of ethnographic field work, I pass many decaying, abandoned buildings and homes. It is 9:00 AM and sunny in early May. I spot an auto shop that is still in operation, along with a liquor store with men standing outside. As I drive I see a person on their lawn talking to a neighbor. A man walks down the street alone with his shoulders hunched and head down. Some people pass by me on their bicycles. The neighborhood is eerily peaceful as the sun shines on the overgrown grasses that seep through concrete and gently dominate empty parking lots or sides of buildings. This neighborhood stands in stark

contrast to the glimmering renovations of downtown areas. It is quiet and still, for the most part. Siri informs me that my destination is approaching in half a mile. I see beautiful murals and sculptures embedded in luscious greenery. I park near a hand-painted sign reading "Justice Farms."

The farm, situated in the historic Rose Hill neighborhood of Detroit, was founded in 2009 as a project under the Rose Hill Faith Development Corporation, a larger non-profit dedicated to development in the neighborhood. The non-profit provides services to the community that extend beyond the work being done on Justice Farms. For instance, in addition to growing food, the non-profit partakes in youth development programs and clothing distribution. A woman from the Rose Hill neighborhood, Louisa, is the executive director of the non-profit and her husband, Frank, is the farm manager. Both Louisa and Frank are long-term African American Detroiters. While the farm began as one small lot growing a few vegetables, today it has grown to 4.8 acres of food production, market space, a community house, and art gallery/cultural space. It is now one of the largest urban farms in Detroit.

The space is intended to serve the residents of the neighborhood and cultivate a feeling of community. The "community house", as the Justice Farms team describes it, is in the heart of the operation. There are no fences around this house, or around the farm in general, and both Louisa and Frank pride themselves on this fact. In this two story home is where community members gather, cooking classes occur, food is prepared, meetings are held, and laughs and coffee are shared. Each morning, volunteers and workers gathered around the table inside, waiting for directions from Frank. Frank is responsible for the logistics of growing the food—he knows what to plant based on what the residents prefer and how much of it to plant based on who comes to

the markets, he assigns various team members and volunteers to watering duty, planting duty, or harvesting duty, and he is the go-to voice of direction if there is ever a question about how to plant, grow, or harvest produce. Louisa, on the other hand, writes the grants for the farm, plans events, gives the tours, meets with city planners and partners, and does the interviews. Louisa is the theory while Frank is the practice.

Information regarding employment opportunities, scholarships, and resources for fixing up houses or growing backyard gardens is posted inside of this community house as well as on outdoor bulletin boards. Surrounding the house are the various lots owned by Justice Farms which produce the food—the strawberries, blueberries, tomatoes, peas, kale, and plants for local chefs and restaurants. During Saturday markets, residents can walk up to the farm and pick their groceries straight out of the ground. If individuals cannot afford the produce, there is no charge.

Art is another central component of the landscape. There are sculptures and murals of animals, trees and flowers, icons like Aretha Franklin, but also community leaders who live around the corner. These murals were painted by children and adults from the neighborhood. Developing and cultivating culture is central to their intention. One lot of the farm is dedicated to local performances that are free for all. For instance, during my ethnographic work I attended an afro-futuristic event put on by Cultural Rose, another organization of the Rose Hill community that I will describe in more detail below. On a different part of the property is an outdoor installation that displays the work of local artists. I was fortunate to view the photography project of a local high school student whose work hung during a Saturday market. Next to these vibrant lots of cultural art and produce, however, are abandoned, boarded up, and decaying homes.

Justice Farms hopes to purchase these properties in order to expand their operation. Their plan is to turn these homes into a chicken coop and a jam-production facility for the farm.

Down the street is the home of Cultural Rose, another community organization dedicated to resident-centered revitalization of the Rose Hill neighborhood. More specifically, this organization aims to support the culture and economy of the historic Rose Hill community through hosting events and performances. Their space of work is a garage turned into a vibrant hub for local artists and community members to interact. Cultural Rose is the main partner of Justice Farms, and their role on the farm is to enhance the art, architecture, and design of the farm.

There are three main members of Cultural Rose who are integral to the Justice Farms team—John, Julian, and Anne. While Julian is a native Detroiter and the "cultural lead" of the group, John and Anne have backgrounds in architecture and urban planning and are from outside of the city. Louisa constantly sought guidance from these three, and together the four of them collaborated to elevate Justice Farms, and urban farming more broadly, to new levels of creativity and innovation. For them, Justice Farms is more than a farm. It is a way to grow a new culture, build community, and empower individuals. Throughout my field work, I witnessed the immense intentionality behind the decisions the four of them made for the farm. I was fortunate to gain access to the meetings in which they discussed the vision behind the work the farm was doing: If we bring X to the farm, how does this enhance the narrative we want to tell? What is the intention behind bringing X to the farm? Are we shifting away from community interest to market interest? What is our vision? What is our master plan? These are the questions the four would pose to each other with every move forward the farm made. The members of Cultural

Rose are integral to the work of Justice Farms, and it was not uncommon for John, Anne, or Julian to give tours of the farm or lead meetings in the community house. While they facilitated the conversations around how to move the farm forward, the decisions ultimately came down to the residents who lived in the neighborhood. Once these four had a plan, they would gauge the opinions of residents. With this, Justice Farms has become a place of culture, community, love, and growth for many residents of the neighborhood.[9]

*4.8 Acres of Resistance, Resilience, Resourcefulness*

The mission of Justice Farms is explicit in its stance against the exclusion, displacement, and silencing of longtime African American residents of Detroit occurring as a result of large scale development efforts. There are three core pillars to their mission—resilience, resistance, and resourcefulness—which communicate how Justice Farms uses food as a path to justice in other realms, such as the social and political empowerment of longtime African American residents who have been historically marginalized.

Resilience is a core pillar that takes a stance against the current cultural and spatial displacement of longtime African American residents in Detroit. With over half of the Rose Hill community making under $25,000/year and with a high school degree or less,[10] Justice Farms recognizes the risk of outside developers buying property in the neighborhood. As indicated in the context portion of this thesis, renovations of homes or apartments oftentimes leads to rising

[9] More actors outside of those listed here will come up in subsequent sections of my thesis. At those points, I have done my best to include all necessary information within the text. For more information on actors, see Appendix B.

[10] Source: Data Driven Detroit.

rent prices that attract new populations while pushing out those who have been there. The neighborhood is 92.5% black/African American,[11] and Justice Farms explicitly states during tours, meetings, and other conversations that their mission for Rose Hill is to "uphold its roots… its history…and preserve the culture and people here."[12] In interviews, Louisa has stated that there is a real fear of white people moving into the area and the transformation of culture that could occur alongside this population shift. Thus, the fear is not just of spatial displacement, but cultural displacement as well. The area of Rose Hill is known for its rich cultural history of jazz clubs and famous African American performers, and many feel that if outside investors begin to buy properties this history and culture is at risk of being erased.

Resistance is a second core pillar of Justice Farms. They demand that marginalized groups stay at the forefront of development and in control of their own revitalization efforts, rather than being subject to projects developed by outsiders. This manifests in their work through their constant community engagement processes that seek resident input and feedback on the development of the farm. The mission is able to stay rooted in community interests because of their "humanity-based design process"[13] which shifts their motives for development from market interests to supporting the cultures and economies that long-time residents desire. As we will see, tensions arise between Justice Farms and an outsider to the neighborhood when Justice Farms perceives the outsider as unwilling to take the opinions of residents into consideration when planning a project for the area.

---

[11] Source: Data Driven Detroit.

[12] Spoken by John, member of Cultural Rose and partner to Justice Farms. Recorded in field notes on 5/17/16.

[13] Spoken by Julian, member of Cultural Rose and partner to Justice Farms. Recorded in field notes on 6/7/16.

Resourcefulness is a third core pillar that empowers residents to be resistant to outsider control and resilient in their presence in Detroit through the act of growing food. As indicated above, over eighty percent of Detroit residents must purchase their food from party stores, gas stations, and other stores which offer few, if any, healthy choices (White 2011). According to the USDA, food security entails "access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life" (2017). This is not the case for the Rose Hill neighborhood, and for much of Detroit more broadly. In this historic neighborhood, the number of gas stations and liquor stores outweigh the accessible grocery stores. By growing their own food and using their land in innovative ways, residents become active agents of social change rather than passive members of society. Justice Farms aims to make food organic and accessible to surrounding residents. Growing food becomes much more than growing food when this pillar stands alongside the two pillars above. Resourcefulness represents farming as a path to self-reliance and community self-determination. In this context, farming not only has the power to alleviate a food crisis, but it has the potential to demonstrate social and political change and exercise the agency of residents.

Together, these three pillars express strong views about new populations moving into Detroit and how development should unfold. There is a clear desire to prioritize longtime African American residents in the process and benefits of development, rather than new populations or outsiders to the city. And yet, what is intriguing about this organization is how many outsiders to Detroit or those new to the city come to volunteer, work, tour, invest in, or shop there. Justice Farms is an international hub, bringing outsiders from all over the world into their organization. What is even more interesting, however, is their ability to stay rooted in their mission. They are able to keep the interests of residents at the center of their work, while also collaborating with the

very populations their mission expresses fear of. How is Justice Farms able to be inclusive to both populations when developing their community?  Better yet, how are they able to successfully mediate this relationship, without sacrificing the desire to prioritize long-term residents of Detroit?

Many sub-questions follow from this: How does Justice Farms balance the desire to preserve the residential and cultural history of Rose Hill with the reality of the changing landscape of Detroit? How does the farm protect the integrity of their mission, while including such a diverse array of actors? How is trust granted upon outsiders of the organization, or in other words, what signals that outsiders of the organization have the correct politics? All of these questions can be boiled down to one, which I chose to focus on during my ethnographic field work: How does Justice Farms integrate outsiders, whether from Detroit or elsewhere, into its operation?

*Methodology*

This study is an ethnography of one urban farm in Detroit. During the months of May-October in 2016, I was an active volunteer on Justice Farms. I participated in physical labor, weekend markets, team meetings, community engagements, tours, and events that took place on site.[14] Fieldwork spanning over the five month period totaled to around 136 hours. These hours have been translated into a series of documented field notes, totaling to around 96 pages.

[14] There were a few instances where my time spent with the actors of Justice Farms was spent off site. For instance, one weekend the Justice Farms team and I went to the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History and out to lunch.

The ethnographic method aided my research goals in ways that other methods could not. Because my project dealt with social processes of trust and distrust, collaboration and resistance, and insider or outsider identity negotiation, it was pertinent that I employed a method that provided me the opportunity to become a member of the Justice Farms community rather than a distanced researcher "without a shovel." Through volunteering, I was able to observe first-hand the informal culture of the organization—the daily routines, relationships, conversations, commentary, arguments, hierarchies, and more. I tried to actively engage in conversations rather than act as a detached and observing researcher, though there were instances when I was more of an observer than a participant. By immersing myself in this way, I gained trust from the actors of the Justice Farms community and thus gained access to important meetings and quiet conversations I otherwise would not have.

There are risks in doing ethnographic work, however. For instance, Emerson et al. (2011) state "no field researcher can be a completely neutral, detached observer who is outside and independent of the observed phenomena" (2011:4). My goal, then, was not to focus on my "personal sense of what is significant" but to "attend explicitly to what those in the setting experience[d] and react[ed] to as 'significant' or 'important'" (Emerson et al. 2011:25). In order to privilege insider meaning-making over my outsider views, I employed two techniques discussed in *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* by Emerson et al. (2011). In the field notes I wrote up each day, rather than focusing on why things occurred, I described *how* routine actions were organized. This helped me to focus on what was occurring, rather than trying to prematurely interpret it through my own lens. I did not just describe interactions, but adamantly focused on the "when, where, and according to whom" (Emerson et al. 2011:27). Another tactic was to use

an inductive approach, recording as many details of the day as I could without trying to select only those explicitly about clashes between insiders and outsiders. These techniques helped me to include information that may have been outside what I thought of as significant, and thus helped me to record what was important to the local actors rather than myself as an outsider. In addition, in order to separate my emotions from the events recorded in my field notes, I created separate analytical memos consisting of all of my thoughts about what happened during the day. With these techniques, my field notes were, to the best of my ability, solely "the data," while the memos served as a journal-esque entries recording how I perceived that data.

In addition to this fieldwork, I conducted interviews with the executive director of Justice Farms, Louisa, and the farm manager, Frank. These interviews were employed to supplement the immense amount of information gained through participation on the farm. The interviews lasted from 30-45 minutes and asked questions regarding the organizational network and development of the farm and its partnerships. These took place in quiet settings on the Justice Farms site. Before the interviews, I read over the consent form and the participants signed it, signaling my ability to record the interview. For this, I used my iPhone to record, uploaded the interviews to my computer, and kept them in a locked folder on a site only I have access to.

With a stack of field notes and transcribed interviews, I used the application Dedoose to code my data. As with my process of recording field notes, I also employed an inductive approach when coding them. I did not scan the pages solely focusing on insider and outsider dynamics; rather, I created codes for any and all patterns I began to notice as I read through the pages of field notes. These codes ranged from religious themes, gender-bias, and community malnourishment to lawn-mowing duty, afro-centrism, and business-discourse. The coded

excerpts themselves totaled to 103 pages, and with this, I continued my process of creating analytical memos. As some patterns became more salient than others, I would delve into relevant literature and begin drafting potential paths for a thesis. This process continued until there was an "aha" moment of a pattern that was prevalent throughout my whole data set that I had previously let slip through my analytical gaze—brokerage.

## RESULTS

The process of brokerage was not only prevalent throughout my entire data set, but it is central to the process of boundary creation, boundary maintenance, and boundary dissolution. It was through the ethnographic method that I gained detailed insight into these processes which are at the heart of this research. Recalling from earlier, brokerage is described as the relationship "in which one actor mediates the flow of resources or information between two other actors who are not directly linked" (Gould and Fernandez 1994:1457). Brokers, thus, are "situated between distinct social worlds" and "collect and channel scarce information in ways that make things happen" (Stovel and Shaw 2012:140).

This section demonstrates that boundaries and acts of brokerage are complex, dynamic processes involving the negotiation of resistance to collaboration. In other words, boundaries do not simply signify two disconnected groups and brokerage is not the single act of connecting those groups. Rather, boundaries exist due to two parties resisting integration, and brokerage is the complex process of diminishing this resistance.

I trace how this process unfolds using four specific cases. I find that resistance to collaboration is due to barriers created by distrust or a lack of social and cultural capital. In two

of the cases below, barriers existed between a group and outsiders to that group due to suspicions around the outsider's intentions. For instance, Louisa and Frank of Justice Farms were first rejected by the community because past organizations did not stay true to their mission of serving and engaging the community. This created a fear of being exploited by non-profits, making residents skeptical of the intention behind Justice Farms. In cases where resistance to collaboration is rooted in suspicion and distrust, I find that a broker can break these barriers by either directly facilitating a flow of information between two parties or indirectly keeping a conduit open over a period of time for two parties to exchange information and work through their reservations.

In the other two cases below, barriers existed between a group and outsiders to that group due to their lack of social and cultural capital. As discussed earlier, social capital is "the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures" (Portes 1998:6). It is through social capital that actors "can increase their cultural capital through contacts with experts or individuals of refinement (i.e. embodied cultural capital); or, alternatively, they can affiliate with institutions that confer valued credentials (i.e. institutionalized cultural capital)" (Portes 1998:4). In a case described below, Justice Farms could not gain access to the spaces of power that play a major role in the success of their organization, such as city council discussions on urban planning and development. There is a resistance by those in positions of power to collaborate with Justice Farms because they lack the correct cultural capital (official credentials of urban planners) and the social capital (they are not a part of the social network). Due to this lack, they were seen as an illegitimate form of community development. In cases where resistance to collaboration is rooted in a lack of social/

cultural capital perceived as a lack of legitimacy, I find that brokers can break these barriers by supplementing the capital of the marginalized group or using their capital to vouch for the marginalized group.

The central aim of this section is to reveal how brokerage is not the single act of connecting two unconnected groups of people, but rather, it is an ongoing process that has much more to do with diminishing a resilient resistance to that connection. To demonstrate this, this section is organized by the chronological unfolding of four cases that demonstrate this role of brokerage in boundary dissolution. This structure lends itself to unveiling the prolonged nature of brokerage. As the cases unfold, it becomes clear how acts of brokerage layer onto each other in a way that enables social capital to be built and deployed over time. In other words, a successful act of brokerage often leads to an extension of a person's network, which often leads to more acts of brokerage, which lead to more extending of a social network. Thus, the implications of an act of brokerage extends beyond the contact point of two divided groups—an idea past literature has not seen. These results provide much insight about the dynamics of boundaries and brokerage—why boundaries exist, the nature of those boundaries, and most importantly, how those boundaries can be eliminated using brokers—not only on the micro-level of Justice Farms, but for the macro-level case of the divide between longtime Detroiters and newcomers.

*Case 1: Building Roots in Community*

As I set out to understand how outsiders were being integrated into Justice Farms,[15] I soon realized that the directors of Justice Farms were themselves first seen as outsiders by the residents of the Rose Hill neighborhood. In 2008 Louisa, the executive director of Justice Farms, was called upon by her mother, a reverend owning a defunct non-profit in the Rose Hill neighborhood, to engage the residents of the community. Her mother wanted her to figure out what residents needed and how the non-profit could contribute. Louisa and Frank, the manager of Justice Farms, soon found that the community was resistant to their attempts at community outreach.

Although Louisa and Frank are African American, had grown up in the area, worked in the area, and lived in the area, they were viewed as outsiders. This outsider status was conferred upon them due to their attempts at community engagement under the auspices of a non-profit organization. Louisa explains this antagonism towards non-profits below:

> what was happening, what had happened in the neighborhood was [non-profits] got funded but they didn't do the work. Or they got funded to do work, and you did something this year and next year you just didn't let it happen… they got funded to come in…The next year, I'm lookin' for them like, where ya'll at? They didn't come back. That happened a lot…what did that do to the community except piss them off? You know, because yeah it looked good, it was beautiful, but what was the benefit? It didn't benefit us, it benefitted whoever did the project. (Louisa, Interview)

Incidents like this were spoken of often during my time spent on Justice Farms. When giving tours or speaking with guests, Louisa prefaced the work of Justice Farms with stories of

[15] Recall that the empirical question at the center of my ethnographic research was: How does Justice Farms integrate outsiders, whether from Detroit or elsewhere, into its operation?

past non-profits coming into the Rose Hill neighborhood, saying they were involved, getting grants to enact change, and leaving shortly after.

> "They do a little somethin', then they left," she said. She says that this made the community feel disrespected— "like they were pawns." Even when Louisa and Frank began this farm, the community did not trust them. (Recorded in Field Notes 5/25/16)

Due to these poor interactions in the past with non-profits, residents were suspicious of another organization coming in to "help," even if they were "insiders" to Detroit and the Rose Hill neighborhood. There was a lack of trust in the commitment of non-profit organizations as well as the claimed intention of wanting to benefit the community. In the past, organizations had demonstrated neither. Residents saw Louisa and Frank's attempts in the same light.

> …when we broke ground, um we didn't have a lot of labor, again, because people didn't really think that—they were suspicious, uh, the commitment… (Louisa, Interview)

In addition to antagonism making community engagement difficult, Louisa did not know many residents in the neighborhood. Her only method, then, was to stand outside of the non-profit and engage those who walked by.

> even though I lived in the neighborhood as a child, I have one friend who still lives in her ancestral home…But basically, a lot of the other folks I didn't know. I knew Mrs. Clarissa, but I didn't know a lot of the other folks. (Louisa, Interview)

In sum, along with Louisa not knowing many people in the community to engage in order to develop a community development plan, the community was suspicious of her attempts at engagement and development. To combat this, Louisa utilized an insider—a community resident named Sheryl—in order to engage residents who were skeptical of Louisa and to broaden the number of residents she could engage. Louisa describes this below:

> there was a member of the church, Sheryl…who was quasi homeless. Not really homeless, but she was one of those people who knew where to get free bread on

> Thursdays, knew where to get free meat on Wednesdays, knew where to get clothes on Monday… And she became very valuable to me, because she knew everybody. She knew everybody. Literally, everybody…Sheryl was my connection to community, my mouthpiece, any thing I wanted 'em to know, she spread the word, she carried the news, and brought the news. I always knew what was going on because she would let me know. So that was very helpful also. Being able to get that one individual who everybody knew, and loved… (Louisa, Interview)

In this case, Louisa utilizes a member of the Rose Hill neighborhood that is known (and "loved") by many residents. Sheryl could act as a broker due to her unique position between Louisa and the other residents of the neighborhood. She was well known by residents because of her constant community presence, but also well known by Louisa because of her involvement with the church, where Louisa's mother played a central role. With this unique position, Sheryl had the ability to begin bridging these actors.

Since the relationship between Louisa and Frank and residents of Rose Hill begins from a negative state (one group resisting brokerage) rather than a neutral one (two unconnected groups), Sheryl's role as broker extended beyond the single act of connecting the groups to prolonged processes of building trust. Sheryl did this through acting as a direct conduit of information between Louisa and residents. As Louisa clearly explains in the quote above, "Sheryl was my connection to community, my mouthpiece, any thing I wanted 'em to know, she spread the word, she carried the news, and brought the news. I always knew what was going on because she would let me know." Louisa wanted to know what is happening in the community, so Sheryl spoke with residents for her. Residents wanted to know more about Louisa, so Sheryl spoke with Louisa for them. Louisa describes the effects of this below:

> What that did for us was they knew my name, they knew my husband's name, they knew that we were connected to the church, and um, it started to build a relationship with folks in-community. (Louisa, Interview)

With Sheryl acting as a "mouthpiece" between Louisa and residents, a familiarity began to build which diminished feelings of resistance, suspicion, and distrust. The enhanced communication that Sheryl enabled ultimately allowed the two groups to humanize one another—Louisa was able to learn more about what the residents needed from the non-profit in terms of development, and residents learned the faces beyond the non-profit label. As Louisa stated in the quote above, "they knew my name, they knew my husband's name, they knew that we were connected to the church." This humanization softened the concept of a new non-profit attempting to help their community. The open and ongoing dialogue made the idea easier for residents to visualize, talk about, and come to terms with. In the past, residents felt excluded from the decisions and benefits of community non-profits. The circulation of knowledge that Sheryl enabled gave residents a sense of involvement and worked to clear up suspicions around the intentions of Justice Farms and the fear of exploitation.

However, Sheryl's role in the relationship between Louisa, Frank, and residents of Rose Hill did not lead to absolute trust. Today, Justice Farms occasionally experiences distrust and resistance from various residents. This is because brokerage is not a single act, but an ongoing process that unfolds over time through other acts of brokerage which layer onto each other, as we will see below. Sheryl's role as a direct conduit of information contributed to the breaking of barriers between residents and Justice Farms, ultimately creating fertile grounds for a trusting relationship to blossom. In this case, the broker moves two parties from the state of resistance to collaboration to a willingness to engage with one another. Once the door to trust was cracked open and Justice Farms was on their way to building a solid foundation with residents of the

community, they could shift their focus to building other relationships central to their success, such as developing relationships with city planners and other Detroit officials.

*Case 2: Navigating Spaces of Power*

Justice Farms has many goals—they want to make healthy and organic food accessible to residents, drive the development in the neighborhood, fight cultural and spatial displacement, create a fertile ground for culture to flourish, etc. In their attempts at making these visions a concrete reality, the farm is subject to the laws and regulations of the city regarding farming in an urban area. For example, if Justice Farms wants to drive development through owning property, they have to work with the Land Bank Authority,[16] a public entity that owns vacant properties and lots in Detroit. As the farm covers their lots with rows of produce, they must be aware of the range of city ordinances that regulate that process. If the farm wants to raise livestock, they must abide by regulations regarding the zoning requirements of the land, the number of animals, the licensing around who can handle them, and the slaughtering and processing of those animals.

Justice Farms could attempt to navigate the legal processes described above by themselves, without building relationships with those in the positions of power that control these processes, such as the city officials of Detroit and the professional urban planners that collaborate with them. However, without the insider knowledge of professional urban planners and city officials, Justice Farms might have to compromise much of their vision of development. In this section, I describe how Justice Farms built a relationship with a city planner, Julie, not only to gain access to the people that dictate what is possible for urban farming in Detroit, but to

[16] See Appendix B for more details.

increase their success at interacting with these people. The success that Justice Farms has in navigating these spaces of power and the interactions which take place within them dictates the opportunities they have as an urban farm in Detroit, and thus their ability to develop the specific visions of the residents they represent.

When grassroots organizations like Justice Farms begin, they begin as a group of people discussing ideas. They do not have the credentials of urban planners, the degrees of architects, or the titles that symbolize competence and authority in urban development, and they are not main figures in the social networks that do possess these. Due to this lack of social and cultural capital, these groups are not seen as legitimate representation for community development, and there is a resistance to collaboration by potential professional partners. Julian, a member of Cultural Rose and partner to Justice Farms, describes this below:

> …because its coming from quote un-quote grassroots up it was not being acknowledged as a real form of community development, as architecture and practice…
> (Recorded in Field Notes 6/7/16)

As a result, Justice Farms experienced much difficult in acquiring land from the city in their early years. It was not until Louisa met Julie, a city planner of Detroit, that their situation became easier. The two women met through attending public urban agriculture discussions throughout the city. When discovering Louisa and the farm's difficulty in acquiring land from the city, Julie felt compelled to be in service of the farm and the community they represent. Julie was a part of the powerful circle that excluded Justice Farms, and thus could act as a broker. She possessed all of the social and cultural capital that Justice Farms lacked. Namely, the titles and degrees that signal an officially acknowledged authority with regards to the issues Justice Farms wanted to tackle (namely, development in urban neighborhoods).

Here, unlike in Case 1 above, it is not distrust that brokers aid with, but the problem of lack of credibility due to lack of social and cultural capital. What is interesting, however, is how brokers diminish this type of resistance. Julie not only used her social capital to connect Justice Farms to professional urban planners and city officials—those who dictate what is possible for urban farming in Detroit—but more importantly, she used her cultural capital—her insider knowledge— to help Justice Farms navigate those conversations. Once Justice Farms could successfully interact with the professionals, their chance at developing exactly what it is that the residents of Rose Hill wanted increased. The capital supplemented by Julie made it easier for Justice Farms to stick more closely to their mission of being rooted in community interest.

A main example that demonstrates this is Julie's involvement with Justice Farms as they developed a new project called Animals for Diversity.[17] This was a project that required the introduction of livestock to the operation. Justice Farms could not simply go out, purchase livestock, and bring it to the farm. Rather, there were many legal steps to take in making this vision a reality. This is where Julie came in.

Each week, Julie met with Louisa and the members of Cultural Rose to discuss how this project could realistically be implemented. Julie explained various zoning laws that hindered the idea, and the pathways that Justice Farms could take to change those laws. She offered advice on how to navigate the Land Bank Authority in purchasing more land for livestock use. She provided names of who to talk to and who not to talk to within the city departments. She walked the team through other regulations, such as number of animals, fencing requirements, noise

[17] For more information regarding this project, see Appendix B.

requirements, cleaning arrangements, etc. One of the many meetings between Julie and team members involved with the project speaks well to this process of guidance by a broker. Excerpts from the field notes at this meeting are recorded below:

> Julie is talking about how they might try to get B6 zoning expanded to industrial areas to include poultry in it. The first option would be to use zoning under the category "other" for the project and expansion but if not we will aim for B6 option to include poultry.
>
> Louisa and John both agree that the first step is to sit down and see how much real estate is needed realistically. Julie tells them that MSU has resources on animal science and what is needed for the well being of the chickens in terms of space because right now we don't have space for that many and that is a lot to begin with not knowing anything. John says that we need to talk to the artist himself, in order to match his goals with the reality of Detroit and our neighborhood. We also have to pay attention to the zoning we need as the farm expands…John again says 50 [chickens] is fine, we just need to sit down on google maps and see realistically what space we have and where we could implement this project. Space is not the issue, Julie says, but "is that space secure and can it be managed?" Also, she adds, "we have to ask if the city is comfortable with that number of chickens." John poses another question: "can people touch them, who can handle them?…I am only asking because the legal impacts the design you see"
>
> This is "design with social impact" David says. Perhaps we can begin with chicks, he says, and offers to loan Louisa's farm a few of his and everyone looks at each other and Julie says she's good with this, the only problem would be animal control but its not like they are policing around, only if there are complaints in the neighborhood.
>
> Julie also brings up "the realities of doing farming in an urban setting," which is having feral dogs around that could eat the chickens, various animals, various people who would steal the chickens to eat them or take the produce.
>
> (Recorded in Field Notes 5/24/16)

As you can see, Julie was present at these meetings in order act as a guide for Justice Farms. She used her cultural capital, her insider "know-how," to prepare them for optimal success in their interactions with the city. Below, Julian described how this supplementation of cultural capital aided Justice Farms in collaborating with city officials:

> In a very real way, a way that like checks notches off of urban planners check-lists like check check check…what we're doing is through this dynamic collaboration with architects who want to be in service of community then we are able to frame the conversations exactly how they need to be framed, uh, so that those city officials or whatever who come from the more conventional market based frameworks about how to develop—at least we're talking the same language. So really, what I'm uplifting, the importance of unique collaboration, interdisciplinary collaborations… (Recorded on tape 6/7/16)

Brokers like Julie enabled the farm to "speak the same language" as professional planners and city officials. Julie shared with them insider knowledge of city officials, ordinances and regulations as well as when it was okay to breach certain rules and when it was impossible. With this, she showed Justice Farms how to work around the existing system in ways that will keep their goals as close to their vision as possible. As Justice Farms gained the necessary cultural capital (or the right language) to navigate conversations occurring in spaces of power, such as city council, their voices that were once marginalized are now acknowledged and valued because they are seen as legitimate. They have more room to negotiate the types of economies and cultures they wish to develop in their neighborhoods because they have more room to negotiate the regulations and ordinances surrounding urban farming. Justice Farms, with the help of Julie, became another collaborator, despite their original lack of social and cultural capital—their lack of degrees and credentials; their lack of legitimacy. Julian stresses the importance of this model of brokerage:

> there's an intention about this collaboration and there's an importance for having all of these different identities at the table, its more than just like 'okay this is a good idea' like this is a necessity to have these type of deep interdisciplinary collaborations across sectors, across races—we're in a different place now this is 2016 it's not 1985 its not 2000, so, uh, we are making sure that we're pushing ourselves to be as sophisticated as possible—to be as inclusive as possible—so that we really modernize this community in a real way… (Recorded in Field Notes on 6/7/16)

The first relationship Justice Farms focused on, as we saw in Case 1, was with the residents of Rose Hill. The goal of Justice Farms is to listen to the desires of residents and turn those desires into reality. They describe themselves as a grassroots organization because of this foundation with residents; it began with residents meeting and discussing visions for community development. The downside to this is the perceived lack of legitimacy. Due to a lack of social and cultural capital, their visions of community development were under the threat of being compromised in spaces of power, such as city council discussions. Julie was able to collaborate with Justice Farms in a way that supplemented their lack of capital. She used her title to give their motivations legitimacy and make space for them in city council discussions, as well as her insider knowledge to bridge the gap of capital between the city and the farm. Julie worked with them to create a blueprint for which paths within city council ordinances, regulations, and processes they could take to have the most success in developing what residents of Rose Hill desire. With this, Justice Farms had more room to stand its ground on how they envisioned urban farming in Detroit, and development more broadly.

This case demonstrates, again, the protracted nature of brokerage. It is not a single act, but an ongoing process. Meetings with Julie lasted throughout the summer. Whereas Sheryl in Case 1 served as a direct conduit of information, Julie used her reputation and identity to break down resistance between Justice Farms and spaces of power. This dismantling of barriers is an ongoing process. Further research may attempt to outline the various steps of this dismantling. Here, it is clear that a shift of perception due to a transfer of cultural and social capital is central.

Much of the success of Justice Farms can be attributed to the connections made by Julie. The high investment in their relationship with this broker has impacted other acts of brokerage

and relationships the farm fosters. This is an implication not discussed in the literature. Case 3 below demonstrates how power dynamics between actors map onto processes of brokerage.

*Case 3: Brokerage, Chickens, and Conflicting Interests*

While love, openness, and inclusivity is a guiding principle of Justice Farms, the trial of the partnership between the farm and David, a man who lives and works outside of Detroit, reveals that there are limits to inclusivity. As with Case 1, boundaries between the two parties derive from issues of trust and suspicions around his intention in collaboration. Again, brokerage is not the simple act of creating a relationship between two parties, but the process of mediating resistance to collaboration through enabling communication. The difference between Case 1 and Case 3 lies in the fact that it is not the act the broker performs but *who the broker is* that leads to heightened communication, and thus diminished resistance, between the two parties. As with Case 2 above, Julie is the broker between David and Justice Farms. However, it is not the act of supplementing social or cultural capital that aids the disconnect, but her important role in the success of Justice Farms paired with her high investment in the partnership that ultimately leads to the collaboration between David and Justice Farms.

The story goes as follows: David, a man from outside of Detroit, wanted to collaborate with an urban farm in Detroit on the Animals for Diversity project described in Case 2.[18] David never originally intended to partner with Justice Farms. Julie directed David to Justice Farms, initiating a partnership between the two unconnected actors. At this point, Julie has been collaborating with Justice Farms and has become a highly valuable, trusted community partner.

[18] See Appendix B for more details.

Julie also has investment in Justice Farms because of her public support and representation of the farm in urban agriculture discussions taking place in Detroit.

The complications arise once the contact between Justice Farms and David is initiated by Julie. Although it is a valuable and trusted community partner bringing David into the network of Justice Farms, various reasons lead the Justice Farms team to resist collaboration. His placing of liability for the project onto the farm alone, his lack of monetary contribution to the costs of the project, and his trying to rush into the partnership were all reasons the Justice Farms team developed suspicions about the true intentions of David and his desire for collaboration. These suspicions made Justice Farms very hesitant to go into partnership with him. A main cause for concern was his lack of community engagement when bringing the Animals for Diversity project into the Rose Hill neighborhood. For instance, David conceptualized the design of the chicken coop needed for the project without hearing voices from the Justice Farms team or the community. One morning, Louisa approached the workers on the farm concerned about David's plans:

> Louisa says "I need to tell them that we need something that better fits the neighborhood landscape…We want to make sure the community is involved with this" she says. "We don't just want to drop this huge extravagant coop on the property and have people say 'why is this here'." (Recorded in Field Notes on 5/25/16)

His excessive marketing of the project while the partnership was not yet declared was also a cause for suspicion. Below is an excerpt from one of the first meetings between David and the Justice Farms team.

> "What is very important to us" David says, "is that you take this and sell it." He emphasizes the marketing they want to see behind the project. He emphasizes again the selling of this project and says "it is important in Detroit to be important to outside of Detroit" and that he wants his PR group to "shout far and wide" and to have his publicist

> come here and get the word out on a large scale. John[19] goes back to the idea of branding and how this project will look to the community. (Recorded in Field Notes on 5/24/16)

Both Louisa and John raise questions regarding the potential impact of this project on their relationship with community. There is real fear of David damaging their reputation with residents if his interests are not in line with their mission. There is also fear of David exploiting the community-rooted mission of Justice Farms. These fears are shown below, during a meeting between the Justice Farms team members regarding the project.

> Anne: in Eastern Market there is a huge add… advertising the Animals for Diversity project.
>
> Everyone is skeptical of this, since the project is not necessarily a for sure go right now, as I get from the subsequent notes below. She brings to everyone's attention her perspective which is of David using Justice Farms to promote his own brand, in which he would come in and benefit off of "our" 6-7 years of work, benefit off "our time and our dime."
>
> Joel: Is it a visitor center for his brand?
>
> Julian: "Instead of having a white wall for his art, he now has access to our farm" as the background. "Does this project diminish the value of Justice Farms?"
>
> Anne: David "needs a project in the non-profit sector" to get federal dollars to fund his own art scene-ish non profit project. She names that [certain grant organizations] "already don't like him" and working with Justice Farms will give him a good rep.
>
> Julian: "This is an inauthentic project, because its very roots are founded in self interest." Julian says David has "no intent for others" and is using a "market approach" motivated by "self interests." "There is a difference between collaborators and new projects coming into our neighborhood."
>
> Louisa adds more skepticism to Animals for Diversity stating that "the whole project evolved so quickly." She refers to a time when people from the *New York Times* were here and how the whole thing about applying to [grants] was a surprise.
>
> (Recorded in Field Notes on 9/10/16)

[19] A member of Cultural Rose. See Appendix B for more details.

Justice Farms had very good reasons to cut off the partnership with David. His behavior was counter to the mission of Justice Farms. He did not show interest in the input of residents on the project, he did not seem to consider how the project would benefit the residents of the community, and he seemed to be operating from self-interest and profit-motives. It seems that brokerage may be causing more harm than good, if Justice Farms receives a (potentially) inauthentic project that they never asked for. However, after half a year of conversations, meetings, and constant debates and turmoil around the partnership, Justice Farms ended up partnering with David. Why did Justice Farms invest so much time, energy, and resources into trying to make this partnership work?

The key here is Julie's presence as a third party. As members of the team continue to point out why David may be bad news, the following field notes shine light on the pressure to partner with him due to Julie's central role in the partnership:

> Louisa seems to realize this and agree—she does agree, nodding her head, but she says that it may be that the farm is "down a hole" because Julie, a good community partner, kind of constructed this whole thing by trying to do the farm a favor. Julie has even met Henry.[20]

Louisa also states that "the city likes the project" and reminds everyone that Julie directed David to their farm because she wanted to offer the opportunity to Justice Farms because she saw Justice Farms as qualified to take on the project. She stresses Julie's partnership with the farm, signaling how important it is to keep their relationship with this city planner. There is a clear emphasis on the presence of Julie in orchestrating this partnership. This is because Julie, as a

---

[20] Henry is the artist behind the conceptualization of Animals for Diversity. Henry lives outside of the U.S., hence Louisa's emphasis on "Julie has even met Henry." See Appendix B for more details.

broker, is invested in the success of the relationship. Throughout my field notes, Julie is recorded promoting the partnership. Examples of this are below:

> I run in and I hear Julie telling Louisa that "this place would be ideal for a project" and I hear them say the words "ecotourism" and "this is an international project."
>
> Julie says she sees [this project] having a ton of economic opportunity. If the ordinance is passed to keep animals, that creates new markets around that industry, specifically speaking of slaughter houses and other infrastructure needed to care for animals and produce animals. What she wants to do is create "an urban livestock guild" which trains people in the city who want to raise animals on their properties to know what they are doing and do it all correctly. "Nowhere in the U.S. is this happening" she says. This farm would be creating the first model of this type of economy. As livestock is welcomed into the city, there needs to be training and education that goes with it.
>
> "We are developing a model," Julie says, by starting small we lower the risk factors, and hopefully one day this can happen across the nation. This project will show us "what can happen around urban agriculture in a post-industrial city," Julie says. It is not just this livestock as art concept—it is the fact that livestock is not yet welcome into a city, it is a whole new extreme of the idea of "mixed uses" and combining urban areas with farming; Not only is Justice Farms beginning the livestock route, but they are reconceptualizing livestock through art and design.
>
> (Recorded in Field Notes on 5/10/16 and 5/24/16)

It is clear from these excerpts why Julie as a city planner would want involvement in this project coming to Detroit. The project is seen as ground-breaking, a way to push the boundaries of "what can happen around urban agriculture in a post-industrial city." While Julie has high investment in the success of the partnership between David and Justice Farms, Justice Farms has high investment in their relationship with Julie. Since the success of the partnership is something Julie wants, Justice Farms is going to keep trying to make the partnership work in order to keep their valued community partner happy. Ultimately, it is Julie's looming presence in this brokerage dynamic that leads to the active communication between Justice Farms and David.

With this additional time and effort, David proves himself to be aligned with mission of Justice Farms. One way in which he does this is holding a community engagement meeting regarding the Animals for Diversity project. This engagement addresses the questions: what will be the impact on access to healthy food? On knowledge of community? On neighborhood culture? At the engagement, there was a whiteboard on the wall ranking the interests of parties involved. From most important parties to least important parties involved in the project, the list went: close neighbors, community members, overall neighborhood, chickens, chicken keepers, David, the city of Detroit. David's presence at this community engagement, with discussions revolving around community benefit, impact, and input, softened the sharp criticisms of him had by Justice Farms. David also explicitly supported the community throughout this engagement. A moment of this is recorded below:

> We want "seamless engagement" he says, and he keeps stressing this word "seamless" and "seamlessly" put into the area…going along with the idea of seamless interaction, he tells the room that there will only be hens on this project so that noise is reduced and there will be no disturbance in this arena. (Recorded in Field Notes on 10/8/16)

In the end, Justice Farms decided to go into partnership with David. The presence of Julie helped to move the relationship between the two parties from a resilient resistance to a full-fledged collaboration. This does not necessarily mean that all distrust and suspicions were eliminated, but it does signify that these were diminished to the extent that collaboration could occur. Unlike the example of direct brokerage in Case 1, Julie is not directly facilitating information in a way that clears up suspicions. She is not hearing the concerns of David and voicing them to the Justice Farms team, or vice versa. Instead, the presence of Julie is enough to push Justice Farms to continue to work out their differences with David. Thus, Julie, because of

the relationship she holds with Justice Farms, acts as an indirect conduit of communication; her presence alone contributes to the additional time needed to work out differences between parties.

Throughout the cases, we have seen how Justice Farms collaborates with many actors. First, they build a relationship with the residents of Rose Hill, then they work to establish rapport with city planners of Detroit, and they recently decided to collaborate with David, who may not exactly align with their mission. In the cases where the more marginalized group is being approached for a partnership, there is an immense fear of collaboration. Residents fear being exploited and excluded from the benefits of a partnership, and as Justice Farms is rooted in resident interest, they express these same concerns when coming into contact with David. As we saw in Case 2, however, without collaboration Justice Farms faced the risk of being unable to stay as true as they could to their visions for community development. While isolation was a safer choice for preserving their mission, collaboration had the possibility of providing them power to speak about development in Detroit. Both collaboration and isolation can lead to group marginalization. Justice Farms takes the path of collaboration, as we have seen, and has been very successful in staying rooted in their mission to serve the residents of their community. As we will see in the final case, other black-owned farms have not been so successful with this route. They have been shut out of spaces that Justice Farms has access to. In the final case, I examine why Justice Farms is in a different position than other black-owned farms, and how this problem is mediated through acts of brokerage.

*Case 4: Unpolished, Confrontational, and Hustlin' Food*

Throughout my summer spent volunteering, it was not uncommon to hear about Louisa, Frank, and other team members traveling to various events in Detroit—from farm to table dinners, market spaces on other farms, food festivals, and urban farming conferences. One day in September, Louisa was telling me about an event in which a world-renowned chef used produce from Justice Farms and invited members from the Justice Farms team to attend the dinner. During his interview, Frank described those who attended this event as "big time people" and "CEOs driving Rolls Royces." The benefits of attending events extend beyond the time and space of their occurrence. Presence at the event listed above not only increased awareness of and promoted Justice Farms as an organization in Detroit, but it connected Justice Farms to individuals in positions of power with many resources. Events like this are one stepping stone in the imperative process of building reputation and relationships with individuals and groups who have the means to contribute support to the organization. When discussing it with me, Louisa pointed out the privilege Justice Farms had in attending the event and how others do not have such a position:

> She tells me that she acts sometimes as a linkage between African farms/"other black farms" and organizations like this who run bigger events because other black farms don't usually get the attention…because "they're not as well polished, per se" and "people judge them" so she really wants to get word out about some of the black run farms. (Record in Field Notes on 9/15/16)

As Louisa so clearly verbalizes, other farms in Detroit are not in the same position as Justice Farms, and because of this they are not seen as viable options to participate in events like the one described above. In her interview, Louisa elaborates on this disparity faced by other black-owned farms:

> L: Many of the growers that I work with…because of their limitations a lot of them don't get exposure to bigger markets or to more folks. But they have great stuff. You know, like Sean and Alicia, who grew the best looking celery I've seen in a couple years, outside of ours. They don't—they can only sell at Grown in Detroit or—
> M: Because no one knows them?
> L: Or because—yeah. Yeah. Or because Sean is black and he looks like a—so he's not polished. He's just hustlin' his food so…he'll harvest a bunch of stuff and be like 'look I got this beautiful kale do you want it' and people'll be like 'No, I'm buyin' mine from plum street market or no I'm buyin' mine from here'. So, you know, its hard for them.
> M: So you try to act like a gateway?
> L: I try to. You know, to connect them to get their stuff out there

Louisa signals two things in this excerpt—the isolation of other black-owned farms and her role in connecting them to others. Similar to Case 2, other black-owned farms are excluded from larger events or opportunities due to a lack of social and cultural capital. Other black-owned farms, she points out, have certain "limitations." They miss opportunities to grow because they lack the correct appearance, or the correct cultural capital. As Louisa states above, "he's not polished. He's just hustlin' his food." "People judge them," she told me, and the door to opportunity is closed because they are not seen as legitimate farms or legitimate partners. In both cases, the marginalized group is stigmatized because they lack a professional reputation.

Unlike Case 2, however, the problems other black-owned farms face go beyond titles and professionalism. When asking Louisa why she felt that she could play this role of broker for other marginalized farms, she told me: "we're not confrontational…we can demonstrate capacity…we are meeting the need" (Louisa, Interview). However, in the excerpt above, the problem is not that other black-owned farmers, such as Sean and Alicia, are not demonstrating capacity or meeting a need. As Louisa states, "He's just hustlin' his food" and "they have great stuff… the best looking celery I've seen in a couple years, outside of ours." The difference that remains between Justice Farms and other black-owned farms is the non-confrontational manner

of Justice Farms. This sentiment is revealed in Frank's interview, when he attributes their willingness to collaborate with all backgrounds as a reason for their success:

> I think that's what draws in other people from other nations, they understand and they realize how friendly we are and what we're about and what our goal is, to be friendly with everybody. You know, not be, Detroit only, or, or…urban, I mean, um, what do I want to say? Across, across… I don't want to say across, um, okay. You're Detroiters but then you also have your suburbanites, okay. So we don't want to cater to suburbanites but we don't want to cater to all Detroiters either. We want to be flexible, where we can deal with anybody in any situation. Let me put it that way. And we've been pretty successful I think. (Frank, Interview)

A case in point of this willingness to collaborate is in Case 2, when Justice Farms makes the decision to build relationships with city planners rather than attempt to work in isolation. Whereas Justice Farms, the marginalized group in Case 2, partnered with Julie to get to a third party, it is not communicated in this case that other black-owned farms are calling upon Louisa in the same manner. In Case 2, Justice Farms recognized how crucial collaboration with professionals was to their success. We do not see that same recognition here, and it seems Louisa is taking it upon herself to do what is best for other black-owned farms by attempting to network for them.

Therefore, it is not simply being "unpolished" as Louisa emphasizes when describing the problems other black-owned farms face. Rather, it is the combination of being black and being confrontational. This case embodies a rich tension that stems from a complex racial history of both Detroit and our nation more broadly. It is a story of a deep rooted distrust towards collaboration; a conversation of black nationalism and separatist notions of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King Jr. It is a story that remains central to African American liberation politics.

An interesting moment during my time spent with Justice Farms shines light on this tension of collaboration or confrontation relayed in this specific case. The Justice Farms team and I traveled to the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History one Saturday afternoon. Below is a moment shared between Louisa and the tour guide, regarding collaboration and disparity:

> We get to a room where a slave is tied to a tree, and a mural is painted of slaves tethered together, with one slave whipping the others, helping the white slave master. "Why do you think the slave is helping the white man?" [the tour guide] asks us. "He is a collaborator" he says after. "We see the same thing happening in Downtown Detroit… it's a colony." He continues to speak about this idea of the oppressed collaborating with the oppressor, that when this happens, like in Downtown right now, "people lose control…of politics, education…" Louisa keeps agreeing and saying "mhm, mhm." "Collaboration is also a means of survival," Louisa says, "because he is getting less harsh treatment for himself." "Yes," [the tour guide] says, "but he could also collaborate with other slaves." (Recorded in Field Notes on 5/21/16)

If the problem of isolation other black-owned farms face is due to their confrontational nature, it is no surprise that Louisa is able to act as a broker due to her collaborative nature. Justice Farms is an organization that takes pride in their collaborative nature, and this has brought them much success. As Louisa points out above, "collaboration is also a means of survival, because he is getting less harsh treatment for himself." Through collaborating with Julie, Justice Farms is now in a position where city officials and other planners and organizations in Detroit know it to be a dedicated, professional farm that can fulfill what they set out to do. This has given them a more 'official' standing when it comes to urban farms in Detroit, and people, from all sectors and backgrounds in Detroit, know they can trust Justice Farms to deliver. Because of this position, Louisa is able to vouch for other, less-known, and less-reputable farms, and have her opinion be seen as valid. In other words, because "big name" people and organizations, as Frank describes them, give Louisa the time of day unlike other black-owned farms, Louisa can share her opinion

and know that it will be taken seriously and be considered. Along with developing a reputation of being a responsible, leading urban farm in Detroit, however, Justice Farms has also proved their reputation of being "for community." In other words, most of the residents of Rose Hill now trust that Justice Farms operates from community interests, will bring community benefit, and is dedicated to the residents of the community rather than being profit-motivated or self-interested. With this, Justice Farms sits between two distinct social worlds, and Louisa understands both sides of the equation, each with their different forms of cultural capital that contribute to perceived legitimacy. This puts her in a perfect position to broker the two parties.

Yet, in contrast to Case 2, where the broker is working side by side with the marginalized group to build their social and cultural capital, Louisa vouches for other black-owned farms that are marginalized. She uses her reputation of professionalism and respectability that Justice Farms has gained in order to boost the reputation of those other farms. In the excerpts above, Louisa clearly states her role in breaking the cycle of stigma against other black farms, telling me that she attempts to "connect them" and "get their stuff out there." Because she is in a position that is in contact and trust with individuals and organizations hosting larger events in Detroit, she uses that position to promote the names and brands of marginalized farms that she knows of. This is a unique position of power for Louisa where she has the ability to confer trust onto farms that otherwise would not get the attention.

## DISCUSSION

Central to this discussion is the idea that brokerage is not the single act of connecting two actors, but rather it is a prolonged process of diminishing resistance to that connection. It is important, first, to understand the nature of resistances in order to understand how brokers reduce those barriers. In the case of Justice Farms, resistance to collaboration between groups was either due to distrust or a lack of social and cultural capital. There were two cases of each, and the reason behind resistance depended on the social position of the actor. On the one side, it was residents of the Rose Hill neighborhood and the Justice Farms team representing them who felt a deep distrust in collaborating with a given actor. On the other hand, it was those in positions of power, possessing resources—such as professionals, city officials, and those hosting events in Detroit—who were acting in a more exclusive manner on the basis of social and cultural capital. In Cases 1 and 3, residents of the community and Justice Farms felt a deep distrust in collaboration due to the fear of being exploited and excluded from the potential benefits of a relationship. In comparison, in Cases 2 and 4, professionals, city council officials, and those hosting events in Detroit did not have this same fear of exploitation because they possessed the more powerful position in their potential partnerships. Their resistance to collaboration was on the basis of actors not possessing specific social and cultural capital, or actors not being equipped to be a part of their circle.

The actions of brokers vary for each case, depending on the nature of the resistances described above. In cases where resistance to collaboration was rooted in suspicion and distrust, I find that a broker can dissolve these barriers by either directly facilitating a flow of information between two parties or indirectly keeping a conduit open over a period of time for two parties to

exchange information and work through their reservations. In Case 1, Sheryl does this directly by speaking to both parties for the other party. In Case 3, Julie serves as an indirect conduit of communication because her investment in the relationship impels Justice Farms to work out their differences with David over a long period of time. In cases where resistance to collaboration was rooted in a lack of social and cultural capital perceived as a lack of legitimacy, I find that brokers can break these barriers by supplementing the capital of the marginalized group or using their capital to vouch for the marginalized group. In Case 2, Julie collaborated with Justice Farms to give them the tools to successfully interact with those in positions of power. In Case 4, Louisa used her powerful structural position to vouch for other black-owned farms and bring them into larger opportunities.

Brokerage, then, is not the simple act of connecting two groups, but the complex process of diminishing disinclinations to connect. Past literature tends to treat brokerage as a relationship that either exists or does not, focusing solely on the structure of brokerage and positioning of brokers (Gould and Fernandez 1984; 1994; Burt 2002; 2004; 2005; Rydgren and Sofi 2001). The ethnographic nature of my work lends itself to expanding the theoretical terrain of the concept because it highlights the interactional processes that make up an act of brokerage and exposes how brokerage is a process over time that can succeed or fail at any point. The four cases also show that the implications of an act of brokerage extend beyond the contact point of two divided groups—another idea past literature has not seen. As the cases unfold, it becomes clear how acts of brokerage layer onto each other in a way that enables social capital to be built and deployed over time. This approach brings in the agency of the actors, showing how the success of a broker depends not just on structural position, but on the relationships with the various parties involved.

These insights on brokerage as a process also reveal much about boundary dissolution. I found that boundaries are not just one switch that can simply be turned on or off, rather, they consist of layered resistances. These layered boundaries consist of the negotiations of resistance and inclination of two parties to partner with one another. Thus, brokerage is not the transition from a neutral state of relationship (no connection between two actors) to a positive state (connection between actors), but rather a transition from a negative state (two actors are resistant to connecting) to a neutral or positive state (two actors are willing to attempt connection or two actors connect). In other words, brokers may not eliminate every layer of the boundary, but they have the potential to eliminate some of them. If the nature of boundaries exposed in the four cases above holds true for more macro relations,[21] this research provides key insights into the current tensions between longtime residents of Detroit and the influx of newcomers.

The arguments made by the public against the recent revitalization of Detroit state that current projects are pushing out low-income populations while bringing in higher-income populations, with the added racial factor that the low-income populations are overwhelmingly African American and the high-income populations are overwhelmingly white. Longtime African American residents are highly skeptical of and resistant to development projects, just as residents of the Rose Hill community are skeptical of and resistant to a non-profit coming to revitalize the area, and just as Justice Farms is skeptical of and resistant to David bringing a project into the area. In all three cases, it is a specific history of structural inequity that leads to strong feelings of

[21] Recall that Stovel and Shaw (2012) highlight brokerage's "potential for macro-level consequences, which are revealed primarily through its impact on the permeability of group boundaries." (2012:139) They state that while brokerage is "built from informal, personal relationships" that occur at "micro-level relations", it can generate theory for macro-level phenomena that may be harder to empirically study and gain data on.

distrust in welcoming a collaborator with open arms. In the past, non-profits came into the Rose Hill neighborhood claiming to bring community benefit and develop for the residents' interests. What residents realized year after year was that non-profits came, benefited off the land and the people, and left shortly after. The historic Rose Hill neighborhood is 92.7% African American and over half of the neighborhood is making under $25,000/year with a high school degree or less. The story of resistance against development in the Rose Hill neighborhood is no different than the story of Detroit more broadly. New development projects and incoming populations are met with resistance by long-term Detroiters due to a history of marginalization and exclusion from similar periods of prosperity in the city. Recall that in the 1950s, "a mere 1,500 of the 186,000 single-family houses constructed in the metropolitan Detroit area in the 1940s were available to blacks" (Sugrue 2014:43). This fact speaks volumes to the myriad of ways in which African-American populations have been marginalized from the development, growth, and prosperity in the city of Detroit. When this history is not acknowledged, the suspicion and resistance of African-American Detroiters is seen as arbitrary and unjustified. This was recognized by Julian, a member of Cultural Rose and partner to Justice Farms, when he discussed his hesitancy to work with David on the Animals for Diversity project:

> Julian says that we must also be careful too, because if we deny the project, this might take our farm into a narrative of white supremacy that "those black folks don't want development and don't want to improve things." (Recorded in Field Notes on 9/10/16)

When this historical perspective is left out of the picture, resistance to development is seen as a problem of individual moral deficiency on the part of long-term residents, displacement is seen as an anomaly occurring only to well-known artist Tyree Guyton, and history repeats itself.

However, to understand the full picture of the resistance to collaboration between longtime residents and newcomers, we must also understand the resistance from the side of newcomers. Adding to the tensions between these two populations is the fact that many newcomers ignore those who have been in the city for years. This not only happens on a macro-level, as when the media paints Detroit as a blank slate, but on a micro-level, as when newcomers walking down the street ignore their neighbors who were there first. “Just Say Hi” is a recent topic that explores this phenomenon. While this slogan can be found across the internet,[22] Detroit literary and music legend, Marsha Music, has written a poem on this topic that has received high acclaim. One excerpt of the poem is included below:

> All around Detroit we talk, from shops to congregations
> There’s much discussion of the city’s new gentrification
> and all the changes with the folks a’moving to the D
> the changes in our lifetime thought we’d never live to see
> We talk about The Newcomers, with righteous consternation,
> ol’ school exasperation, ‘bout a disconcerting thing –
> “They don’t even SPEAK!” we say, when we get on the subject
> our mantra of rejection of in-vi-si-bi-lity
> Our indignation hides the sting of truly being unseen,
> of being looked - right through - in our own city
> Ralph Ellison, he wrote of this so many years ago
> Walk past and never turn an eye to see us oh! what pity
> Detroit’s a place wherein we “speak” to you in varied tones
> Hey! Hi! Hello! How ya’ doin’? Whazzup? What’s happ’nen’?  Whaddup Doe!
>
> Detroit is widely said to be a big, small southern town
> the separation’s one or two degrees, is what we’ve found
> We nod our heads at passersby; acknowledge other folks
> Goes back to railroads underground, rebukes of ol’ Jim Crow
> We do affirm and say a word to those whom we pass by
> A simple thing but means a lot to us, so

[22] See: http://www.atdetroit.net/forum/messages/89914/94890.html?1174618684 and http://sites.lsa.umich.edu/dcbrp/2016/07/15/just-say-hi/

Just Say Hi!

(Music 2015)

The macro-level case of newcomers resisting integration with longtime Detroiters is comparable to Case 2 and 4 above, where resistance to collaborating with a group is based on the lack of social and cultural capital of that group. As discussed above, in these cases, it is important to recognize that those resisting collaboration are in more powerful positions in the social structure than those wishing to collaborate. This dynamic is similar to the resistance of newcomers to older populations. As indicated earlier, the influx of newcomers is a specific demographic of higher-income, mainly white, populations. The resistance they have in speaking to and interacting with longtime African American residents may be due to the disparity in social and cultural capital. Further research needs to be conducted to understand if this is truly the case.

While the four cases of this study shed light on the reasons behind resistances between new and old populations of Detroit, they also reveal how interactional processes of brokerage can begin to dissolve these resistances. In the cases where resistance is rooted in distrust, brokers break down some of the many levels of resistance by enhancing communication between the two parties in a way that clears up suspicions by familiarizing and humanizing each party. These findings suggest that enhanced communication by brokers who sit in between the new and old populations of Detroit has the potential to diminish resistances felt by longtime residents of Detroit. On the other hand, in the cases where resistance is rooted in the possession of social and cultural capital, brokers with the correct capital who are willing to vouch for, represent, and support those without it can act to break down boundaries between two parties. These findings suggest that in order break down the resistance of newcomers, brokers who possess the required

social and cultural capital must act in ways that show longtime residents are legitimate persons for developers and outsiders to interact with. Further research might explore in more depth why long-term residents need brokers to enhance their capital, despite having been in the city longer than newcomers. Why is length of residency not enough to legitimate these actors? What is the underlying cause of these divides? Racism? Economic disparities? More researcher must be conducted in order to explore these types of exclusions.

Finally, I want to comment on the word "resistance" that I have been using throughout this thesis. Resistance does not signify the drawing of a concrete line between one group and another group; indeed, that is precisely the idea this thesis is refuting. Resistance signifies that the divisions between groups is not concrete, but rather a set of layered reasons that lead to hesitancy in collaborating or partnering with another group. Not all longtime residents are resistant to newcomers; and those that are resistant does not mean that they are angry and exclusionary, it simply means that in some ways they are hesitant to embrace collaboration with open arms. Also, the state of resistance is contradictory, like many social processes. A person may be resistant to collaboration while still interacting with those they are resistant to. This is what we find in the cases above, when two divided actors are being brokered and they are in a state of negotiation between resistance and inclination to work together. Brokerage never ends at a complete state of reconciliation or inclination either. Rather it is the process of diminishing as much resistance as possible. For instance, in Case 3, Justice Farms partners with David, but this does not signify that all resistance has vanished. It was through my ethnographic methodology that I was able to see this protracted nature of brokerage and the soluble nature of boundaries themselves. As a volunteer on Justice Farms, I witnessed the countless conversations, meetings,

and more that made up the transition from a disinclination to partner to an inclination to partner that occurs within an act of brokerage. Further research may focus on expanding the empirical terrain, going beyond the scope of this one organization to many in order to develop theory on types of resistances that may exist across cases, as well as the steps brokers take in diminishing these resistances (initial contact, enhancing communication, etc.). Also, further research may focus on how various socio-cultural aspects map onto brokerage, such as in Case 3 when Julie's social position and relationship to Justice Farms impacts the success of brokerage. As we can see from these cases, the study of micro-level social dynamics and processes of boundaries and brokerage has the potential to generate much insight into macro-level dynamics and processes bridging and integration.

“I live in the east side of Detroit—not Midtown, Downtown, Corktown. I consider myself an actual Detroiter. You hear about our problems but you never actually talk to us. We just need to talk to each other. Once we feel heard, understood, and appreciated, we will join in.”

*Spoken by a Detroit mother and community organizer at a public event held in the Cass Corridor Commons on 3/30/17*

**APPENDIX A**
CONSENT FORM

# CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

*Organizational Analysis of Detroit Urban Farming Initiatives*

Principal Investigator: Michelle Rabaut, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan

Faculty Advisor: Elizabeth A. Armstrong, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, University of Michigan

Faculty Advisor: Robert S. Jansen, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, University of Michigan

This is a supplement consent form asking your permission to be recorded during an in-depth interview. Recording interviews is promoted to ensure that our information is accurately recorded.

## INFORMATION

The purpose of this study is to examine urban farming initiatives in Detroit as a larger solution for 21st century social change. You may be asked for a secondary interview to extend on information captured in the initial one. Interviews will collect information on the social dynamics, organizational culture, and tactical strategies of the urban farm, as well as challenges and future aspirations. The interview will not exceed an hour and a half. If you are comfortable with our conversation being recorded, I will record the conversation and late transcribe it. The recording will be deleted when I finish my project to ensure confidentiality.

## POTENTIAL BENEFITS

This study will not bring you specific benefits outside of an opportunity to share in-depth information about your farming initiative and personal views and opinions. Your participation, however, will be of considerable benefit for educational as well as practical purposes. I hope this study will contribute to the knowledge on bottom-up social change and community-driven development and collaboration.

## POTENTIAL RISKS

This project is not intended to provoke any physical or emotional discomfort. However, you may choose to share sensitive and confidential information during the interview. You may decline to answer any interview question and you can end your participation in this study at any time. All efforts will be made to ensure confidentiality with regards to personal accounts during interviews, conversations, or behavior.

## CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you personally will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by using a pseudonym instead of your name when transcribing the interview. I will keep interview tapes and pseudonym keys separate from the transcripts for the semester. These materials will be destroyed after a final thesis is completed.

## PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether or not to be in this study. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

## IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about this research, please contact the principal investigator: Michelle Rabaut, a student in the Department of Sociology, at 313-980-2152 or mrrabaut@umich.edu. You may also contact faculty advisors: Elizabeth A. Armstrong (elarmstr@umich.edu) or Robert S. Jansen (rsjansen@umich.edu).

## CONSENT

By signing this document, you are agreeing to allow recording of your interview. You will be given a copy of this document for your records and one copy will be kept with Department records. Be sure that questions you have about that study have been answered and that you understand what you are being asked to do. You may contact the researcher at any time with questions.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_______________________________________
Printed Name of Subject

_______________________________________ _________________________
Signature of Subject Date

**APPENDIX B**
LIST OF ACTORS

Louisa

Louisa grew up in Rose Hill but moved out of the area, staying in Detroit, when she started work at a real estate firm. The massive housing foreclosure in 2008, medical problems in her family, and a dislike of the corporate environment were all reasons that led Louisa to move back to the Rose Hill neighborhood. Around that time, 2008, Louisa's mother, a reverend in Rose Hill, asked Louisa to help her get her non-profit back on its feet. Louisa did that, and this effort became Justice Farms. Due to her professional background, Louisa has many valuable skills that have brought Justice Farms much success. While Frank ran the physical operation of growing food, Louisa was responsible for the behind the scenes logistics. She was off site about 80-90% of the time. On any given day, Louisa was meeting with city officials to discuss the expansion of their operation, speaking with major grant-providing organizations, participating in city-wide or nation-wide urban agriculture discussions, or collaborating with Cultural Rose on visions to develop the neighborhood. It was Louisa's responsibility to keep the mission at the heart of the work Justice Farms was doing. When I arrived to the operation, Louisa met me with open arms and expressed gratitude for my involvement.

Frank

Frank was born in Detroit, but raised in Memphis, Texas. At the age of 19, he came back to Detroit and lived in the Southwest area of the city. It was after meeting Louisa and becoming involved with the non-profit that the two of them together moved back into the Rose Hill neighborhood. Frank is the farm manager and is responsible for supervising the farming work. Each day, those who were there to work for the day—this could be official workers, volunteers, or community members—would wait in the community house for Frank to arrive and give us directions. I was in contact with Frank when setting up my volunteer work for the ethnography. On my first day, Frank waited in the community house for me to arrive, gave me a tour of the farm, and told everybody to be nice and respectful to me. Frank is a very blunt, pragmatic manager. He would calculate how much to plant of each vegetable based on how much he expected community members to consume. (Louisa, on the other hand, would tell us to plant anything we wanted to try, and to plant however much we wanted.) He is very serious about farming and fulfilling his duty to grow an abundance of healthy food. I was surprised that when I arrived on my first day, he did not ask about my research but simply gave me a quick tour and a shovel. On my last day, however, he became sentimental, urging me to stay in contact with the farm.

Rose Hill Faith Development Corporation

The RHFDC is the non-profit that developed the project of Justice Farms in 2009. The non-profit was founded in 2000 by Louisa's mother, a reverend at a local church. The main purpose of the non-profit is the development of the historic Rose Hill neighborhood. Its primary focus is job provision and youth development programs. The non-profit hosts after school tutoring programs, sports programs, and arts and crafts programs for youth. In 2009, Justice Farms began as another wing of the non-profit. This was seen as an opportunity to meet the food needs of the area, as well as teaching youth customer service skills, marketing skills, financial literacy, conflict resolution, teamwork, and other principles that can come from growing and

selling food. The mission of RHFDC is to contribute to a sustainable Rose Hill historic community through encouraging healthy lifestyles with diverse cultural, physical, social, and educational programs. The core values of this non-profit are honesty, integrity, respect, accountability, sharing, caring, and love.

Cultural Rose

Cultural Rose is a project that began in 2014 in the Rose Hill neighborhood. Overall, it is considered a collaborative effort to support Detroit's Rose Hill neighborhood. Their focus is culture, and they grow and support the culture of the area through events, exhibits, workshops, and performances that focus on music and design. They believe that design is a powerful tool for social change, and they design objects, environments, and situations to bring people together in surprising ways. The Rose Hill neighborhood provides the perfect urban and cultural background for this project. As the Rose Hill area is home to many famous R&B and Soul musicians, music is central to their cultural focus. They aim to sustain the cultural vibrancy of the area, both past and present. Justice Farms is a main partner of the organization, and they believe that the landscape is one of their best assets. They work with Justice Farms to make the landscape usable for everyone to enjoy. Overall, Cultural Rose is dedicated to urbanism, art, music, and culture. They advocate for local, underexposed artists.

Julian, John, and Anne, are the three main members of Cultural Rose who interacted with Justice Farms on a daily basis during my ethnographic field work. Other actors were involved with the organization and with our farm, but their involvement is not pertinent to this research. Julian was the visionary who had his roots in Detroit, while John and Anne were the professional planners that collaborated with him to make these visions of Detroit more powerful. Both John and Anne are from outside of Detroit.

David and the Animals for Diversity

The Animals for Diversity project was developed by a man from outside of the United States, Henry. The project revolves around chickens. Each country has their own rooster, which is a symbol for humanity itself. The artist, Henry, breeds various country's chickens together to make a statement about global diversity. As the project is brought to Detroit, its very own "Detroit Chicken" will be bred. Usually, this project is just for artistic performance. However, as there is a problem of food insecurity in Detroit and in the Rose Hill neighborhood more specifically, where the project will take place, the project will be used for both art and food. This project and the negotiations around the man who brought it to Detroit, David, made up the bulk of the meetings between Louisa, Cultural Rose, and Julie.

Land Bank Authority

The Land Bank Authority (LBA) is a public entity responsible for vacant property in Detroit, rather than property that was abandoned or foreclosed. They hold auctions throughout the year for the properties under their ownership. Since one of the goals of Justice Farms is to expand their operation, in order to drive the development of the area through ownership of the property, building a relationship with the LBA has become central. Prior to the LBA, which came into existence in 2014, Justice Farms was facing difficultly in purchasing property for the non-profit. Through collaborative relationships with city partners Justice Farms has been able to buy properties at the various auctions the LBA holds. The auctions of the LBA have the benefit of selling properties cheaper than other city auctions.

**APPENDIX C**
NEIGHBORHOODS OF DETROIT

Source: Loveland Technologies

## REFERENCES


Aguilar, Louis. 2016. "Chris Ilitch: 52 Projects in Works Around Wings Area," *The Detroit News,* October 3. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (http://www.detroitnews.com/story/business/2016/10/03/ilitch-billion-detroit-investment/91495684/)

Aguilar, Louis, and Christine MacDonald. 2015. "Detroit's White Population up after Decades of Decline," *The Detroit News,* September 17. Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/detroit-city/2015/09/17/detroit-white-population-rises-census-shows/72371118/)

Allen, Robert. 2017. "Heidelberg Project Gallery Forced to Relocate from Midtown," *The Detroit Free Press,* March 23. Retrieved March 24, 2017 (http://www.freep.com/story/news/local/michigan/detroit/2017/03/23/heidelberg-midtown-detroit-moving/99538028/)

Anon. n.d. "About." *Tyree Guyton.* Retrieved March 24, 2017 (http://www.tyreeguyton.com/about).

Anon. n.d. "Ten Cities of 100,000 or More with Highest Percentage of Blacks or African Americans, 2000 and 2010." *Info Please.* Retrieved March 12, 2017 (http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0884135.html)

Anon. n.d. "Top 100 Cities Ranked by Black Population Percentage." *Index Mundi.* Retrieved March 12, 2017 (http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/cities/rank/black-population-percentage)

Anon. 2016. "Detroit Population," *World Population Review.* Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/detroit-population/)

Anon. 2016. "Detroit: The Motor City's Rebirth in Images," *Metro Jacksonville,* July 22. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (http://www.metrojacksonville.com/article/2016-jul-detroit-the-motor-citys-rebirth-in-images)

Anon. 2017. "Detroit Neighborhood Map," *Live Detroit.* Retrieved March 15, 2017 (http://www.livedetroit.org/detroit-neighborhood-map/)

AP. 2016. "Red Wings' New Arena Cost Jumps by $105M to $733M," *USA Today,* November 8. Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/nhl/2016/11/08/detroit-red-wings-new-arena-cost-jumps-by-105m-to-733m/93478708/

Bant, Jennifer. 2016. "Detroit is America's Great Comeback Story," *The Star,* September 10. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (https://www.thestar.com/life/travel/2016/09/10/detroit-is-americas-great-comeback-story.html)

Barth, Frederik. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Norway: Universaitetsforlaget.

Bhuiyan, Johana. 2017. "Ford is Putting $1 Billion into an A1 Startup, Detroit's Biggest Investment Yet in Self-Driving Car Tech," *Recode,* February 10. Retrieved March 23, 2017 (http://www.recode.net/2017/2/10/14576730/ford-investment-uber-google-self-driving-cars-argo-ai)

Boggs, Grace L. 2011. *The Next American Revolution*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Bomey, Nathan, John Gallagher, and Mark Stryker. 2017. "How Detroit was Reborn: The Inside Story of Detroit's Historic Bankruptcy Case," *The Detroit Free Press,* n.d. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (http://www.freep.com/story/news/local/detroit-bankruptcy/2014/11/09/detroit-bankruptcy-rosen-orr-snyder/18724267/)

Bouffard, Karen. 2015. "Census Bureau: Detroit is Poorest Big City in U.S.," *The Detroit News,* September 16. Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/michigan/2015/09/16/census-us-uninsured-drops-income-stagnates/32499231/)

Burt, Ronald S. 2002. "The Social Capital of Structural Holes." *The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field* 148-190.

Burt, Ronald S. 2004. "Structural Holes and Good Ideas." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(2):349-399.

Burt, Ronald S. 2005. *Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cummings, Peter. 2016. "Detroit's Rebirth: The Next Step—Inclusion," *Stay Thirsty Media,* n.d. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (http://www.staythirstymedia.com/201610-094/html/201610-cummings-detroit.html)

Derringer, Nancy. 2014. "In a Gentrifying Detroit, An Uneasy Migration of Urban Millennials," *Bridge,* August 21. Retrieved March 14, 2017 (http://www.bridgemi.com/detroit-bankruptcy-and-beyond/gentrifying-detroit-uneasy-migration-urban-millennials)

Elliot, Meagan, Daniel Feinglos, Rob Pressly, Emily Provonsha, Laura Reading, Simone Robinson, Yuanhao Wang, Shu Yang, and Shanshan Zhou. 2013. *History's Future in the North End.* Ann Arbor: Urban and Regional Planning Program, Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Michigan, 2013

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Eieldnotes*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1997. “Manifesto for a Relational Sociology.” *American Journal of Sociology 103*(2):281-317.

Fernandez, Roberto M., and Roger V. Gould. 1994. “A Dilemma of State Power: Brokerage and Influence in the National Health Policy Domain.” *American Journal of Sociology 99*(6): 1455-1491.

Foley, Aaron. 2013. “The First Shots In The War Against Detroit Hipsters Have Been Fired,” *Jalopnik,* July 29. Retrieved March 13 2017 (http://jalopnik.com/the-first-shots-in-the-war-against-detroit-hipsters-hav-950892545)

Gallagher, John. 2017. “Detroit's Riverfront Plan Includes a Beach, More Parks, Fewer Condos,” *The Detroit Free Press,* March 01. Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://www.freep.com/story/money/business/john-gallagher/2017/03/01/detroit-riverfront-greenways-development-riverwalk/98544290/)

Gallagher, John. 2016. “How Do You Develop Detroit's 400-Acre Riverfront?” *The Detroit Free Press,* January 30. Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://www.freep.com/story/money/business/michigan/2016/01/30/detroit-riverfront-urbanism-architecture/79468200/)

Gopal, Prashant. 2015. “Detroit’s Rebirth as ‘America’s Great Comeback City’ Hits Roadblock as Taxes Kill Homeowners’ Dreams,” *Bloomberg News,* March 12. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (http://business.financialpost.com/news/economy/detroits-rebirth-as-americas-great-comeback-city-hits-roadblock-as-taxes-kill-homeowners-dreams)

Gould, Roger V., and Roberto M. Fernandez. 1989. “Structures of Mediation: A Formal Approach to Brokerage in Transaction Networks.” *Sociological Methodology* 89-126.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. “The Strength of Weak Ties.” *American Journal of Sociology 78*(6): 1360-1380.

Hodges, Michael H. 2017. “Heidelberg Project Party Marks Move from Midtown Office,” *The Detroit News,* March 23. Retrieved March 24, 2017 (http://www.detroitnews.com/story/entertainment/arts/2017/03/23/heidelberg-project-throws-party-mark-eviction-midtown-offices/99547984/)

Kleyman, Paul. 2015. “Detroit Gentrification Means ‘Forced Relocation’ of Black Seniors,” *New America Media,* June 03. Retrieved March 14, 2017 (http://newamericamedia.org/2015/06/detroit-gentrification-causing-forced-relocation-of-black-seniors.php)

Lamont, Michèle, and Virág Molnár. 2002. “The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences.” *Annual Review of Sociology 28*(1):167-195.

McGraw, Bill. 2014. Videographer Tweaks Controversial Promo For The Albert Apartments. *Deadline Detroit,* April 01. Retrieved March 13, 2017 (http://www.deadlinedetroit.com/articles/8919/a_videographer_tweaks_the_controversial_promotion_for_the_albert_apartments#.WOD89BiZNWO)

Moskowitz, Peter. 2015. “The Two Detroits: A City Both Collapsing and Gentrifying at the Same Time,” *The Guardian,* February 5. Retrieved March 24, 2017 (https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/feb/05/detroit-city-collapsing-gentrifying)

Music, Marsha. 2015. “Just Say Hi! The Gentrification Blues,” *Infinite Mile: A Journal of Art and Culture(s) in Detroit,* January. Retrieved March 17, 2017 (http://infinitemiledetroit.com/Just_Say_Hi.html)

Obstfeld, David, Stephen P. Borgatti, and Jason Davis. 2014. “Brokerage as a Process: Decoupling Third Party Action from Social Network Structure.” *Contemporary Perspectives on Organizational Social Networks 40*:135-159.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. “Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology.” *Annual Review of Sociology 24*(1):1-24.

Rydgren, Jens, and Dana Sofi. 2011. “Interethnic Relations in Northern Iraq: Brokerage, Social Capital and the Potential for Reconciliation.” *International Sociology 26*(1):25-49.

Scarritt, Arthur. 2010. “Broker Fixed: The Racialized Social Structure and the Subjugation of Indigenous Populations in the Andes.” *Critical Sociology 37*(1):1-22.

Seigel, RP. “What’s Behind Detroit’s Rebirth?” *Eniday.* Retrieved March 22, 2017 (https://www.eniday.com/en/education_en/what-behind-detroit-rebirth/)

Stovel, Katherine, and Lynette Shaw. 2012. “Brokerage.” *Annual Review of Sociology 38:*139-158.

Sugrue, Thomas J. 2014. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thibodeau, Ian. 2015. “With Over $1.6 Billion Invested in Downtown Detroit, What does Dan Gilbert Own?” *MLive,* February 20. Retrieved March 23, 2017 (http://www.mlive.com/business/detroit/index.ssf/2015/02/with_over_16_billion_invested.html)

USDA. 2017. "Food Security in the U.S." February 21. Retrieved March 16, 2017 (https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/)

Weber, Max. 1946. "Class, Status, and Party." *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

White, Monica M. 2011. "Sisters of the Soil: Urban Gardening as Resistance in Detroit." *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts 5*(1):13-28.

White, Sam. 2016. "In Detroit's Rebirth, Embrace Native and New Voices," *The Detroit Free Press,* December 18. Retrieved March 22, 2017 (http://www.freep.com/story/opinion/contributors/2016/12/17/detroits-rebirth-embrace-native-and-new-voices/95511664/)