5-21-2024

Contested Places: A Typology for Responding to Place-based Harms

Amie Thurber
Portland State University, athurber@pdx.edu

Amy Krings
The Ohio State University

Mónica Gutiérrrez
University of Denver

Jason Sawyer
Old Dominion University

Greer A. Hamilton
University of Michigan

Journal of Social Work

Contested Places: A Typology for Responding to Place-based Harms

Journal:	*Journal of Social Work*
Manuscript ID	JSW-23-0036.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Racism, Social work practice, Conceptual issues, Social justice, Practice knowledge
Abstract:	Summary: In response to historic and ongoing devaluation of certain people, and concurrently, the places they live, many communities are grappling with how to respond to place-based harms. This has produced a wide range of responses, such as calls for "Land Back", reparations programs, arts-based neighborhood regeneration, and local history initiatives. This paper explores the potential roles community practitioners can play in these contested places. Drawing on a review of the literature, this paper offers an emerging typology for responding to place-based harms. Findings: The proposed typology includes six place-based approaches: Reparation, Remembrance, Regeneration, Resistance, Harm-Reduction, and Repatriation/Rematriation. The authors distinguish each approach by its target and temporal focus, common strategies, primary change agents, and vulnerabilities. While drawing on transdisciplinary scholarship, authors also describe social work's engagement with each approach. Applications: This emerging typology may assist social work practitioners, scholars, and students as they study and employ strategies for intervening in contested spaces. It also suggests areas for future research in conjunction with responses to place-based harms.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

	Reparation	Remembrance	Regeneration	Resistance	Reform	Repatriation and/or rematriation
Target/goals of approach	To materially invest in/redistribute resources to communities that have been displaced, damaged or disrupted.	To uplift histories of communities that have been displaced, damaged or disrupted as well as legacies of resistance/struggle.	To regenerate the social, cultural, and civic ties of communities have been displaced, damaged or disrupted.	To protest current state action/ inaction, make demands of the state, and/or build autonomous spaces in the midst of ongoing harms.	To reduce risk of disparate displacement, damage, or disruption to marginalized communities.	To restore stolen land to indigenous people, and/or to restore Indigenous people's ability to fulfill care-giving responsibilities to the land and people.
Temporal focus	Past harms	Past harms	Present and future harms	Past, present and future harms	Present and future harms	Past, present and future harms
Primary change agents	Policy leaders, state actors, people/ groups 'in power'	Cultural workers, community leaders, researchers, educators, and/or humanities organizations	Cultural workers and/or community leaders in areas affected by harms	Peoples affected by harms and/or those allied	Policy leaders, state actors, community development professionals, public-private partnerships	Tribal governments, Indigenous community leaders/members, and those allied
Strategy examples	- Reparations from private institutions and municipalities - Housing Preference Policies 'Real rent'/indigenous land tax initiatives	- Truth and Reconciliation Commissions - Symbolic reparations/ heritage sites - Educational/arts-based initiatives focused on contested histories	- Place keeping initiatives - Social, cultural, and/or civic activities initiatives that foster community - Participatory action research	- Direct action, protest, occupation - Community organizing - Movement building - Mutual aid	- Participatory planning - Equitable development and planning	- Land acquisition through purchase, Indian Land Trusts, and/or litigation. - Efforts to return tribal remains, artifacts, and other sacred belongings to tribes. - Language schools
(Potential) Vulnerabilities	- Limited reach/scope - Tensions between individual vs. community benefit	- May increase awareness and empathy; limited evidence of fostering social action - Focus on past can reinforce invisibility/ marginalization in present	- May increase awareness and empathy; limited evidence of fostering social action - May diffuse energy for material redistribution - May be co-opted and contribute to future harms	- Safety risks associated with direct action - Maintaining cohesion within contingent collaborations - Difficulty sustaining momentum	- Focus on reform/ incremental change can neutralize more robust transformative changes - Efforts to increase local power can be co-opted by privileged people/ groups	- Can require significant time and/or resource. - Risk of knowledge/ cultural appropriation - Power imbalance when working with and/or against colonialist systems

Contested Places: A Typology for Responding to Place-based Harms

Introduction

Many communities face divisions over what or who 'belongs', and where; what and whose history should be memorialized, and how; and what and whose futures are invested in, and why. As community practice scholars and practitioners, we are inspired by Ramirez' call to "act in ways that are accountable to the peoples who are being dispossessed, as they make demands of the city and/or build autonomous spaces amid mass dispossession" (2020, p. 683). And yet, as we have navigated place-based harms created by settler colonization and systemic racism, we have been struck by the diverse and at times divergent calls to action. In our five different communities across the United States, these struggles have resulted in protest demands for "Land Back!" and toppled confederate memorials, equity-oriented development practices and housing policies rooted in reparation, local history projects and arts-based neighborhood regeneration. As we considered what gives rise to these contestations, what these various responses have in common and what distinguishes them from one another, we realized that while it may sound simple *to act in ways that are accountable to the peoples who have been or are being dispossessed*, choosing an effective course of action is not always clear.

After briefly contextualizing place-based harms, this paper offers an emerging conceptual framework designed to assist community practitioners in distinguishing between responses to these harms, and discerning if, when, and how various approaches may be useful. Drawing on a review of the literature and our practice experience in contested places, we catalog six approaches to addressing place-based harms: Reparation, Remembrance, Regeneration, Resistance, Harm-Reduction, and Repatriation/Rematriation. It is our hope that this emerging

typology can assist social work practitioners, scholars, and students as they engage in contested

spaces.

What are place-based harms, and why do they matter to social work?

Place-based harms can be understood as the intended, unintended, and potential threats to

wellbeing that result from the devaluation and perceived disposability of certain people and

communities, and concurrently, the places they live. Their contestation thus requires attention to

person *and* environment, that is, to the relationship between people and the places they live.

Place-based harms in the United States share three core characterizations. First, they are

often expressions of settler-colonization and systemic racism, which—while distinct from one

another—rely on a similar construction of whiteness (Harris, 1993). Throughout U.S. history,

whiteness has conferred the legal power and/or cultural expectation to own (land, objects, and

subjugated people), to exclude, to take, to exploit, to extract, and to exterminate (Harris, 1993).

Secondly, they often (though not exclusively) manifest through state-sanctioned and

localized policies and practices that cause harm to racialized people and places. Manifestations

of state-sanctioned and localized place-based harms include: the economic deprivation of

reservation communities through federal mismanagement of tribal funds and failures to honor

treaty obligations; redlining of Black, immigrant, and other communities of color which

historically and contemporarily restrict loans and other forms of investments; hyper surveillance

and high rates of police violence enacted in Black and Latino neighborhoods; as well as land

grabs and gentrification-fueled displacement in communities of color. Sacrifice zones, places

where the health of the environment and residents is sacrificed for the benefit of proximate

industry or hazardous land uses, can be understood as a visible result of place-based harm

(Teixeira & Krings, 2015). Place-based harms wound both people and places; there are physical

and psychic costs to place-based harms, <mark>which can have generational effects to the health and wellbeing to both people and the land itself.</mark>

Third, these sanctioned attacks to peoples and places produce *contested spaces*, geographies shaped by histories of conflict and struggles for power (Bakshi, 2014). These may be sites of past or present conflict as well as sites of pilgrimage; places shaped by collective memories of love, loss, fear, and resistance; and areas where systems of oppression affect how people use, experience, and navigate space (Purbrick & Dawson, 2007). It is the contested nature of these places that give rise to calls to return land to Indigenous Peoples, to retire monuments to slaveholders, to adopt planning practices that explicitly center the priorities of impacted communities, and/or to invest in cultural initiatives that celebrate the struggles of particular people to survive in particular places.

<mark>Given the centrality of advancing justice to our profession's mission, social workers have a responsibility to understand and intervene in contested places.</mark> Yet, just as places become contested, so too are calls for change. Conflicts can emerge over the appropriateness and efficacy of various strategies. To effectively join with others to address place-based harms, community practitioners must discern the benefits and vulnerabilities of various approaches. Interventions commonly used by macro practitioners–such as community organizing, community development, community building, and policy practice–are broadly applicable to place-based harms, though more specific approaches and strategies are needed to align interventions to local contexts (Sawyer & Brady, 2020). Social workers have begun to map these specificities by type of contestation (see Jones and McElderry (2021) on reparations, and Thurber, Krings, et al. (2021) on gentrification). The following typology builds on these efforts, offering a comprehensive guide to responding to place-based harms.

A Typology of Responses to Place-based Harms

Place-based harms vary in scale. While there are place-based harms that require intervention at a national and international level, the focus of this paper is primarily on local responses enacted at the neighborhood, community, city or regional scale. Drawing on a review of the literature and our practice experience in contested places, we observe six approaches to addressing place-based harms: Reparation, Remembrance, Regeneration, Resistance, Reform, and Repatriation/Rematriation. These six approaches can be conceptualized as transdisciplinary tools in a community practitioner's toolbox, many of which are employed by grassroots organizations. This typology is designed to assist community practitioners in making sense of approaches already emerging in communities, and acting in solidarity with such efforts.

The following sections explore each approach in turn, describing its target and temporal focus, common strategies, primary change agents, and vulnerabilities. We summarize social work's engagement with each approach, though in many sections, the social work literature is quite thin. In practice, these six approaches are not mutually exclusive; they can be used singularly, sequentially, and/or in combination. Further, not all approaches will be appropriate or effective in all settings. Our aim is to be descriptive, rather than prescriptive, so that practitioners can critically consider the relevance of each approach to their specific context.

Place-based Reparations

Place-based reparation involves the distribution of material resources to people and places that have been subject to harms in the past. The scale of reparations initiatives varies widely, from the billions of dollars paid by the German government to Holocaust survivors, to targeted 'right to return' policies implemented in historically Black neighborhoods that help

residents displaced by Urban Renewal return to their home communities. This section focuses on place-based reparations initiated by localized institutions.

Target and temporal focus: The target of place-based reparations is to materially invest in and redistribute resources to localized communities that have been displaced, damaged or disrupted in the past. Reparations initiatives may be designed to serve individuals (for example, through home ownership grants for the relatives of people whose land was taken) or to uplift a community as a whole (for example, through investing in community economic development) (Roht-Arriaza, 2004). Reparations programs can also steer resources to communities that lack legal avenues to achieve a financial settlement, as is often the case with environmental injustices (Kaimen, 2016).

Strategies: There are increasing examples of place-based reparations initiatives undertaken by institutions such as schools, churches, and municipal governments. In 2019, several US-based colleges that profited from the enslavement and trade of Black people established reparation funds for descendants of those enslaved (Lockhart, 2019). That same year, the city of Evanston, Illinois approved $10 million for reparations in response to its history of forced segregation, discriminatory housing practices, and Jim Crow segregation–practices that contribute to the city's present-day racial wealth gap (Brown, 2022). Following the police murder of George Floyd, a host of municipalities followed Evanston's approach (Simone, 2021). While some of these policies trace back to the harms of slavery, others target more contemporary harms, such as the destruction of Black neighborhoods during Urban Renewal, and the disproportionate displacement of communities of color as a result of gentrification (Iglesias, 2018; Thurber et al., 2021). There are also examples of grassroots reparations initiatives, such as Real Rent Duwamish (Topolářová, 2020). In recognition of the federal government's failure to

uphold the 1855 treaty with the Duwamish Tribe, more than 21,000 people who live or work in

the Seattle area are now making voluntary ongoing payments to the tribe

(https://www.realrentduwamish.org/).

Change Agents: While demands for place-based, community-centered reparations most

often emerge from communities that have experienced historic harm, this approach generally

requires policy leaders, state actors, and institutions to make investments. Thus, advancing place-

based reparations often takes time to generate momentum, overcome opposition, and garner

sufficient political influence and public support.

Vulnerabilities: The primary vulnerabilities from place-based reparations stem from

such effort's incompleteness. Many initiatives are designed with restrictions on who can access

funds and how funds can be used. For example, Portland, Oregon's N/NE Preference Policy

permits participation to applicants "who were displaced, are at risk of displacement, or are the

descendants of families displaced due to Urban Renewal in N/NE Portland" (Portland Housing

Bureau, 2019, p. 109). Yet, despite creating over 400 affordable apartments in the neighborhood,

thousands remain on the waitlist, and income restrictions disqualify many who cannot afford

market rate rents in what is now a highly gentrified area. Policies such as these are reparative in

intent, though limited in impact, and highlight tensions between programs designed to serve

individuals versus those designed for broad community benefit (Roht-Arriaza, 2004; Thurber et

al., 2021).

Social work engagement: A recent study found that a majority of social workers

perceive reparations for Black Americans to be a useful strategy for addressing racial inequities

(Jones et al., 2022). That said, there is scant evidence of social worker involvement in advocating

for, designing, implementing, or evaluating community-centered reparations (exceptions include Jones and McElderry, 2021 and Thurber et al., 2021).

Place-based Remembrance

In the context of historic harms, place-based remembrance can be conceived as a form of moral, rather than material, reparation. As Roht-Arriaza explains, "Moral reparations are as important—often more important—than material ones. They cover a wide range of measures, most having to do with a felt need for telling the story, for justice, and for measures to avoid repetition" (2004, p. 159). Place-based remembrance initiatives have particular relevance to communities whose stories have been omitted from dominant place-histories, including those communities that are no longer present in a place - for example, due to Indian Removal and homes seized through eminent domain.

Target and temporal focus: The target of place-based remembrance initiatives is to uplift histories of struggle and legacies of resistance from communities that have been harmed. While such efforts may require material investment, the focus of place-based remembrance is not on redistributing resources but rather on resurrecting stories of people and places that have been buried, ignored, or forgotten.

Strategies: Place-based remembrance strategies include Truth and Reconciliation Commissions to investigate and document past harms (Androff, 2022); educational/arts-based programs or installations designed to change public awareness, attitudes, and or relationships to the past and to place (Till, 2012); critical memory work to disrupt official and sanctioned memorialization and offer counter-commemorations (Moulton, 2021; Till, 2012); as well as ceremony designed to foster healing for people and places that have been harmed (Androff, 2022). The intended audience may include those 'inside' communities affected by harms, and

those 'outside' affected communities. Similarly, place-based remembrance initiatives can emerge

from within impacted communities, from organizations or agencies located outside the

community, and/or from collaborations between the two.

Change agents: Depending on the focus of the initiative, change agents may include

cultural workers, historians, educators, researchers, and community advocates. Many

educational/arts-based initiatives are undertaken through local grassroots efforts. For example, in

Chicago's Rogers Park neighborhood, a group of abolitionist artists regularly post the names and

ages of everyone killed by police in the city. The site serves as a visible depiction of collective

loss, and a gathering place for people to mourn, reflect, learn, and organize. Larger, more

permanent efforts (such as the creation of a permanent memorial) often require buy-in from

funders and policy-makers.

Vulnerabilities: There are a number of decision points when developing place-based

remembrance initiatives, each with its own vulnerabilities. Questions include: Will the initiative

be time-limited, ongoing/recurring, or permanent? What and whose histories will be

foregrounded, and what and whose will be left out? While time-limited events may have limited

reach and impact given their ephemeral nature (Thurber & Christiano, 2019), permanent

monuments, as Moulton notes, "can often simply serve as a hollow gesture by the political and

cultural ruling class" (2021, p. 2.). Decisions about what and whose histories to center are also

complex. Focusing exclusively on past harms toward a particular community can inadvertently

marginalize the community's stories of survival, regeneration, and future desire. Relatedly, a

focus on contemporary place-based harms—the seizure of Black homes during Urban Renewal,

for example—can contribute to the invisibility of other harms that occurred in the same place—

such as forced removal of Indigenous Peoples (Moulton, 2021).

The impacts of place-based remembrance initiatives may also be a limitation. In a review of the literature on place-based arts and educational interventions in gentrifying neighborhoods, Thurber & Christiano (2019) found that these approaches may increase awareness and empathy, but have limited evidence of fostering social action.

Social work engagement: Although many of the strategies and goals associated with place-based remembrance initiatives are aligned with community practice, we found limited social work scholarship in this arena. One exception is a recent piece by Androff (2022), who argues that social workers should support legislative action for a U.S. Truth and Reconciliation Commission on racial healing. Research on the Neighborhood Story Project, an action research intervention that engages residents living in contested places to study and take action in their communities (Thurber, 2019; Thurber, Krings, et al., 2021), documents nine projects across Tennessee, several of which focus on remembrance (see https://www.humanitiestennessee.org/programs-grants/core-program-overview/neighborhoodstoryproject/).

Place-based Regeneration

Place-based regeneration spurs the cultural vitality of specific places and populations that have been marginalized. We differentiate place-based regeneration from broader urban development strategies referred to as 'cultural regeneration' that foster economic activity through building a city's involvement in the arts (see Miles & Paddison, 2005), and also from cultural placemaking activities that are primarily driven by economic interests, such as efforts to market a neighborhood's cultural significance to outsiders in order to generate increased tourism revenue for the city.

Target and temporal focus: The target of place-based regeneration efforts is to regenerate the social, cultural, spiritual, and civic ties of communities that have been displaced, damaged, or disrupted. The primary difference between place-based remembrance and place-based regeneration is the temporal focus. While regeneration efforts emerge from an understanding of the past, the temporal focus of this approach is on the present and future.

Strategies: Many place-based regeneration initiatives can be considered forms of creative place-keeping, a term cultural activist Robert Bedoya (2014) uses to describe artistic and social practices residents employ to preserve and create cultural memories in gentrifying Latinx neighborhoods. Place-based regeneration strategies include events that bring people together in economically devalued places, such as second line parades in New Orleans (Lipsitz, 2018). Some regeneration strategies may make physical contributions to place, such as an artist-led effort to repurpose row houses once slated for demolition in Houston's historically Black Third Ward district (Lipsitz, 2018). Others make cultural contributions, such as a Detroit-based women's hip-hop collective that draws on "the imagery of failed urban renewal and local efforts to reclaim ecological and economic sustainability" (Farrugia & Hay, 2020, p. 2). Still others make civic contributions, such as participatory research that engages residents of contested places in social action (Thurber, 2019). These diverse strategies "reveal value in undervalued places and undervalued people" (Lipsitz, 2018, p. 522), and reflect a shared goal of knitting together a sense of belonging, connection, and collective future *among people* and *between people and a particular place* that has been the locus of harm.

Change agents: Place-based regeneration efforts are often homegrown, emerging from within communities that have been devalued. Such efforts may be led by cultural workers and/or neighborhood leaders, or emerge in partnership with facilitators from outside a particular

community. Thus, while such initiatives require local engagement and leadership, they are

typically not reliant on municipal investment. That said, if local leaders desire to scale up their

regeneration efforts, they may require funding and partnerships through larger agencies.

Vulnerabilities: Like remembrance, time limited and/or one-off place-based

regeneration efforts can be ephemeral. Funders may eagerly support cultural and symbolic work,

though reluctant to materially invest in disenfranchised communities. Further, grassroots place-

keeping efforts risk being co-opted by foundations or municipalities whose goals may not align

with local residents' goals. For example, arts and cultural festivals that attract interest outside the

neighborhood may inadvertently catalyze gentrification (Rahder, & McLean 2013) and

contribute to rising costs and displacement.

Social Work engagement: There is strong alignment between the core values of place-

based regeneration—belonging, connection, and collective survival—and social work. Some

place-based regeneration strategies link to those used in macro practice, such as community

building and participatory action research. That said, we found few published examples of social

work engagement in place-based regeneration efforts (exceptions include Thurber, 2019). Other

strategies, particularly creative interventions, may be less familiar for social work practitioners.

There have been calls for social workers to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations with social

practice artists (Nissen, 2019; Malka, 2022), though none emerging in response to place-based

harms.

Place-based Resistance

Place-based resistance refers to the multitude of ways those directly affected by place-

based harms oppose these conditions. Place-based resistance includes strategies that are

intentionally disruptive and abrupt (Evans et al., 2014), pragmatic and incremental (Alinsky,

1971), and/or prefigurative (Bell et al., 2019; Rameau, 2012). Despite differences in strategies

and tactics, the commonality between forms of place-based resistance is a rejection of the status

quo arising from communities whose residents and/or land has been deemed disposable.

Target and temporal focus: Place-based resistance may seek to prevent and/or protest

place-based harms, to press for accountability, and/or demonstrate alternatives to harming

practices and policies. There is often a temporal urgency in place-based resistance, though that

urgency may be in response to harms in the past, present, or future, or harms that are

multitemporal. For example, in the protests following the murder of George Floyd, monuments

to Confederate soldiers across the United States became symbols of past and present harms, and

sites of resistance for local activists (Green, 2020).

Strategies: Four commonly utilized place-based resistance strategies (which can be

deployed separately or in combination) are direct action, mutual aid, community organizing, and

movement building. *Direct action* is characterized by disruptive tactics that eschew reform-

based, incremental approaches and seek to force abrupt changes (Evans et al., 2014). As noted

above, monuments are frequent sites of protest. Between 2015 and 2021, protest led to the

removal of 352 monuments to "enslavers, settler colonists, and other problematic figures" in the

United States (Green, 2020, p. 488). Occupation is another form of direct action used to prevent

and/or protest place-based harms. In West Oakland, CA, five Black mothers and their children

launched Moms 4 Housing, moving into a vacant home owned by a national private land

speculation firm, and drawing attention to mass displacement of Oakland's Black residents

(Ramirez, 2020).

In the context of place-based harms, *mutual aid* efforts create alternatives in the midst of

ongoing devaluation of people and the places they live. For example, the Umoja Village

Shantytown was a Black-led effort in Miami, FL to respond to the affordable housing and houselessness crisis by turning vacant land into housing (Rameau, 2012). What began with a group of unhoused people and activists taking over a vacant lot grew into a community that fed and sheltered more than 150 people over six months, before tragically burning down (Rameau, 2012). This form of mutual aid can be seen as simultaneously place-based regeneration and place-based resistance, as organizers actively protested the land speculation and predatory development processes contributing to houselessness.

Community organizing is a form of place-based resistance in which residents and community-based stakeholders build power by taking collective action and asserting political claims (Bobo, Kendall, & Max, 2001; Fisher, 1994). In Flint, Michigan, for example, residents successfully documented the scope of lead in their drinking water–as well as the austerity-based and undemocratic political system that enabled it–to pressure the state to switch to a safer, though more expensive, water source (Krings et al., 2019). In other political contexts, residents and community organizations come together to prevent or mitigate place-based harms through negotiating, building coalitions, and other consensus-based approaches. For example, community benefits agreements can enable host communities to prevent or mitigate place-based harms associated with undesirable land uses such as waste incinerators, hazardous industries, or heavy transportation facilities (Krings & Thomas, 2018).

Finally, *social movements* catalyze or link localized place-based campaigns with broader movements for progressive change. For example, the fight against the Dakota Access Pipeline, popularly known by the hashtag "#NoDAPL" was grounded in the local efforts of water protectors from the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to prevent the construction of a major oil pipeline that threatened the tribe's water supply and desecrated burial and other sacred sites (Dennis &

Bell, 2020; Tysiachniouk et al., 2021). Tribal members put their bodies in the way of

construction, and were met with physical violence by private security and law enforcement

officers. As their efforts were broadcast nationally and internationally, support for #NoDAPL

mushroomed: 10,000 people traveled to the camps to support the water protectors; tribal nations

worldwide made solidarity pledges; and the fight moved through state, national, and international

tribunals, sparking indigenous resistance to similar pipeline projects internationally

(Tysiachniouk et al., 2021).

Change agents: Change agents in place-based resistance primarily comprise those

directly affected by place-based harms, and their individual or institutional allies. Community

organizing and movement building strategies can involve coalition work, wherein local groups

join with associations and organizations to consolidate power and resist anticipated harms

(McBay, 2019).

Vulnerabilities: Vulnerabilities of place-based resistance approaches vary somewhat by

strategy. The more oppositional strategies, such as protest and occupation, often carry safety

risks. Some resistance strategies emerge in improvisational ways and under emotionally-charged

contexts; difficulties maintaining group cohesion toward agreed-upon goals can slow or impede

action. Infighting can lead to diminished support from allies and stakeholders (Chambers, 2018).

For all forms of place-based resistance, there is a danger that outsiders and even coalition

partners might attempt to co-opt or re-brand the struggle (Tysiachniouk et al., 2021). In addition,

communities with limited power and resources can become fatigued by years of struggle,

conceding to those whose intentions are to return to the status quo (Gutiérrez & Gant, 2018).

Social work engagement: The seminal work of Robert Fisher (1994) in the area of

neighborhood organizing and Gutiérrez and Lewis (1999) on feminist organizing lay the

groundwork for the integration of place-base resistance in social work. Recently, social work scholars have examined place-based resistance to social issues such as gentrification (Krings & Copic, 2021; Krings & Schusler, 2020) and they have considered how the COVID-19 pandemic inspired new forms of resistance such as local mutual aid work that provides for people's basic needs while working for radical change (Bell, 2021).

Place-based Reform

Place-based reform approaches incorporate harm reduction and mitigation strategies in response to place-based harms (Smith, 2012). Reform approaches are similar to reparation in that they often involve the distribution of resources. However, rather than seeking to ameliorate harms from the past, place-based reforms are designed to minimize current and future harms, particularly those resulting from state action. This approach emphasizes deliberative process and incremental change, and is often associated with rational, technocratic processes and strategies led by the public sector in collaboration with private and non-governmental organizations (Sawyer & Brady, 2020).

Target and temporal focus: Place-based reform aims to reduce the risks of displacement, damage, or disruption to communities by: (1) identifying those populations and communities most vulnerable to place-based harm; (2) reforming existing and/or developing new policies/practices to improve conditions for the most vulnerable communities in the present; and (3) addressing, minimizing, and/or mitigating harms in the future. Although those advocating reform may acknowledge past harms, the focus is on present and future wellbeing.

Strategies: Two common place-based reform strategies include participatory planning and equity-informed planning and development. Participatory planning arose as a response to technocratic, expert-driven urban renewal planning and poverty remediation programs in the

early and mid-20th century. For example, participatory planning has been a key strategy to address persistent racial health disparities in Richmond, CA. The city hosted a series of workshops with residents and community leaders which revealed that "cumulative toxic neighborhood stressors" such as environmental pollution, fear of violence, racial discrimination and threats from immigration and customs were the primary contributors to poor health outcomes for Black and Latino residents (Coburn et al., 2014, p. 1908). As a result, the city ultimately adopted a "health-in-all policies" initiative with strategies to mitigate the neighborhood stressors.

Within state agencies, there is increased attention on equity-informed planning and development. For example, many U.S. cities are adopting 'equitable development' plans that direct development to improve quality of life for all residents, while minimizing harms to low-income communities and communities of color. The city of Portland, OR, adopted Racial Equity Plans for its City Bureaus that identify specific strategies to reduce inequities that "are a result of public policy and are maintained by existing government structures": the city's Water Bureau identified goals to track and correct racial disparities in water access and water quality, and the Bureau of Transportation set goals to improve sidewalks in communities of color (https://www.portland.gov/officeofequity/racial-equity-plans#).

Change Agents: Place-based reform approaches are typically led by state and municipal leaders, often in response to demands for change from residents. Some reform efforts are enacted in collaboration with civic associations, nonprofit organizations, and public-private partnerships; others solicit participation of residents who are directly affected by place-based harms to participate in listening sessions, design charets, or to serve in advisory roles. Community Development Corporations or human service organizations may also lead reform processes.

Vulnerabilities: Reform processes tend to be dominated by rational bureaucracy and focus on incremental change, which can neutralize more robust transformative changes (Sawyer & Brady, 2020). Professionals, partner organizations, foundations, and even community development efforts can prioritize and emphasize predictive outcomes, and privilege "expert" knowledge over residents' preferences (Fursova, 2018; Quimbo et al., 2018). This dominance of technocratic and rational planning can supplant inclusive and democratic approaches (Markus & Krings, 2020).

Social work engagement: Social workers were among the Progressive era reformers calling for participatory planning (Reisch, 2018). As a result, many community practice models have been utilized to advance place-based reform, including community development and coalition building (Fisher, 1994; Gamble & Weil, 2010). Asset Based Community Development , a community development approach that centers the strengths of communities and people experiencing social problems, has been taught and implemented in social work (Sawyer & Coles, 2020) though some document its potential for cooptation by the neoliberal state (MacLeod & Emejulu, 2014). Some social work scholars have critiqued place-based reform approaches, in particular the vulnerability of participatory processes to replicating power inequities between residents and professionals in ways that reinscribe place-based harms (Markus & Krings, 2020).

Place-based Rematriation/Repatriation

Place-based repatriation and rematriation can be understood as decolonizing responses to place-based harms to Indigenous Peoples and their ancestral lands. Though definitions vary, place-based repatriation generally signifies a transfer of land ownership rights to Indigenous Peoples (Gray, 2022). In the North American context, place-based repatriation advances

decolonization to the degree that it diminishes the amount of land owned by settlers, and increases the land base of tribes. That said, repatriation works within the epistemological frame of settler laws and understandings of ownership. In contrast, place-based rematriation is rooted in Indigenous Knowledge Systems (Dumbrill & Green, 2008). Robin Gray (Mikisew Cree) introduced the term 'rematriation' in 1988 to describe indigenous feminist approaches to decoloniality (Gray, 2022). In the decades since, uses of the term have proliferated. Rematriation is increasingly used to refer to the restoration of Indigenous Peoples care-giving responsibilities to the land and people (Newcomb, 1995; Gray, 2022). While some tribal communities simultaneously pursue both rematriation and repatriation approaches, access to these approaches differs based on a tribe's size, resources, and federal-recognition status.

Target and temporal focus: The goal of repatriation is the restoration of land to Indigenous Peoples. On the question of 'how much' land should be returned, Tuck and Yang are unequivocal: "Decolonizing the Americas means all land is repatriated and all settlers become landless" (2012, p. 27). While it may be difficult to imagine a timeframe within which such a project would be complete, we focus here on responses to place-based harms that are rooted in and move towards decolonization broadly and "land back" specifically. The goal of rematriation is the restoration of relationships of reciprocity between Indigenous Peoples and their homelands. As described by Steven Newcomb (Shawnee/Lenape), this relationship "involves the ability to maintain and to pass on to every new generation the languages, ceremonies, customs, and laws of our respective peoples" and "maintaining our sacred ties to our ancestral lands" (1995, p. 3). Repatriation and rematriation strategies simultaneously attend to harms in past and present, and possibilities for future generations and their relationships to place.

Strategies: Strategies to advance place-based repatriation include tribal efforts to buy back ancestral lands, the establishment of Indian Land Trusts (Manning, 2011), and litigation to reclaim stolen land and/or assets (Merijan, 2010). In the United States, many tribes are buying parcels of land to expand their tribal land base and/or to preserve sites of historic significance. For example, in 2022, the tribal councils of the Oglala Sioux and Cheyenne River Sioux purchased land at the site of the 1890 Wounded Knee massacre, where U.S. soldiers slaughtered hundreds of Lakota gathered for a spiritual ceremony. The land will be preserved as a sacred site (Pember, 2022). Litigation has also been a successful repatriation strategy, helping tribes reclaim land mismanaged and stolen by the U.S. federal government. In 1996, Blackfeet tribal member Elouise Cobell and four co-plaintiffs launched the largest class-action lawsuit in the U.S. against the Department of Interior and Department of the Treasury for mismanagement of Indian trust accounts. Its $3.4 billion settlement, reached after a bitter 13-year legal battle, is the largest in U.S. history (Merijan, 2010). The $2 billion allocated to a land buy-back program returned 2.3 million acres to tribal communities across the United States.

Strategies to advance rematriation seek the restoration of relationships to the land through use of ceremony, following indigenous protocol, and at times, litigation. Robin Gray, a Mikisew Cree scholar, offers a case-study of a nearly decade-long effort to return songs captured by a self-styled "music hunter" in 1942 from Ts'msyen tribal members, and later sold to and archived at Columbia University (2022). Traditional songs are an important part of the tribe's relationship to the land, and tribal protocols govern the use of songs, including who can sing and hear them, where, and in what conditions. In the first phase of rematriation, Gray facilitated tribal listening sessions of digital recordings of the stolen songs. As Gray describes,

> While non-Ts'msyen archives engender stasis in our songs, our community-based research engenders aural resuscitation: the act of breathing life back into our captured sonic heritage through place-based listening practices. In a process of recovery, revival, and reconstitution grounded in Ts'msyen listening protocols, we breathe life into our songs, and they breathe life into us. (2022, p. 21)

While restoring tribal access to the songs has been powerful, their goal is a complete return. Gray explains: "By Ts'msyen law, Columbia University must relinquish any assumed ownership rights to the Ts'msyen songs from the Boulton Collection and must take them out of public circulation to mitigate the threat of misappropriation, misuse, and misrepresentation" (2022, p. 23). This struggle, while ongoing, reflects rematriation in process; an effort to restore Ts'msyen people's relationship to place, as manifest through sacred songs.

Primary Change agents: Rematriation and repatriation initiatives are driven by tribal governments, indigenous-led organizations, and indigenous community leaders/members. Such efforts emerge from and are directed toward indigenous communities. Although there may be opportunities to align initiatives in solidarity with other liberation movements (see Johnston, 2021), there are distinctions in the goal of decolonization vis a vis other human rights approaches that may make such alliances irreconcilable and/or undesirable (Tuck and Yang, 2012).

Vulnerabilities: Place-based repatriation and rematriation approaches are not quick-fixes. Whether following tribal protocols to return stolen songs (Gray, 2022), or pursuing legal action to reclaim stolen land (Merijan, 2010), they often require long-term investments of time, and can necessitate significant resources. Repatriation and rematriation approaches often necessitate careful consideration of if and how collaborations with non-indigenous people and organizations will occur. While the uptake of discourses of decolonization among liberal-learning, non-indigenous people is high–particularly within education and the social sciences–it does not provide the foundation for meaningful solidarity work (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Similarly,

there are important points of friction that must be recognized prior to solidarity work. For example, the call for "Land Back"—the return of U.S. land to indigenous communities—is in tension with reparations strategies that help Black Americans regain land in historically Black neighborhoods. Further, many repatriation and rematriation strategies involve engaging with 'white man's laws' that do not reflect Indigenous Peoples beliefs and values, and historically have failed to protect indigenous communities.

Social Work engagement: There is a growing literature related to decolonial and anti-colonial social work practice (Bell et al., 2019; Gray et al., 2013) and Indigenous Knowledge Systems in social work (Billiot et al., 2019; Dumbrill & Green, 2008; Masoga & Shokane, 2019). That said, we found no published examples of social work engagement in place-based repatriation or rematriation efforts.

Implications, Limitations and Applications of the Typology

This emerging typology can be understood as a heuristic device to offer conceptual clarification of various responses to place-based harms. This framework is not without limitations. We have centered responses to place-based harms in the U.S. and do not claim to represent the fullness of responses to place-based harms internationally. Furthermore, while we have focused on place-based harms that are expressions of systemic racism and settler colonialism, place-based harms can be expressions of multiple forms of othering, as evidenced by tragic events such as the Pulse nightclub massacre targeting the LGBT community in Orlando, FL in 2016, the Tree of Life synagogue shooting in Pittsburgh, PA in 2018, and frequent attacks on mosques throughout the country. As it is considered in differing contexts, we hope this heuristic can help generate new ideas, reveal gaps in responses, or opportunities to develop new interventions (Swedberg, 2017).

Despite these limitations, we suggest a number of immediate applications of this framework. For community practitioners, examining the approaches separately illuminates their distinct contributions and vulnerabilities (see Figure 1), as well as how political and social contexts shape what communities' goals and strategies. For example, Reparative and Reform strategies generally require buy-in and investments from the state, whereas Resistance, Remembrance and Regeneration strategies can be undertaken by grassroots community groups. Furthermore, this typology may provide pathways for sequencing and/or combining approaches. For example, if a community desires place-based reparation in the long-term but lacks the requisite buy-in from policy-makers, other approaches may be useful in the short term to build awareness and momentum for change. We find that some form of resistance often precedes other approaches; while community outrage doesn't always lead to a response from policy-makers, we did not find examples of state-initiated responses to place-based harms absent of community demands.

[Insert Figure 1.]

Social work educators may find application of the typology in macro practice courses, where it can be used to structure course content, to contextualize case-study of various responses to place-based harms, or to scaffold community-engaged projects addressing place-based harms in student's communities. This typology also suggests ample areas for research in conjunction with, and/or to explore the efficacy and uses of, these approaches. A deeper understanding of place-based harms–including contestations associated with them–can extend the field's understanding of community practice in contested places. Further, ongoing research may help explore complexities and tensions in this work. For example, place-based harms often layer over time; a single neighborhood may have been a site of dispossession for Indigenous people,

Chinese rail workers, and Black communities. How can communities attend to multiple, and possibly competing claims for repair? What are the possibilities, and limitations, of solidarity across efforts to address place-based harms in our communities, and where should community practitioners fit within them?

Conclusion

In this paper, we offer a preliminary typology of six approaches for responding to place-based harms. Given the vastness of place-based harms—generations of people and places impacted by land theft, contamination, displacement, and abandonment by state—we are equally struck by the possibilities and insufficiencies of these approaches. In our own experience, as we have witnessed interventions that invest in harmed communities, or uplift history and legacies of resistance, we are struck by the incompleteness of these initiatives. In some ways, all of these interventions are insufficient. We can never fully make right the harms that have occurred and continue to happen. This is perhaps another contribution of this typology, by exposing the uses and limitations, it helps us to be honest with ourselves and our communities about what this work can and cannot do, and to make sense of disappointments communities have in spite of various interventions.

Nonetheless, we believe that place-based Reparation, Remembrance, Regeneration, Resistance, Reform, and Repatriation/Rematriation can make meaningful differences in communities impacted by place-based harm, enacting different ways of being/feeling/knowing in contested spaces, and illuminating alternative possibilities of living. We hope this framework can assist social work practitioners, scholars, and students discern how best to join in, seed, and otherwise support community responses to place-based harms. It is ultimately up to affected

communities to decide what these approaches might offer, and the role of community

practitioners to join in partnership with these ongoing struggles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Alinsky, S. (1971). Rules for radicals: A pragmatic primer for realistic radicals. Vintage Books.

Androff, D. (2022). A U.S. truth and reconciliation commission: Social work's role in racial

healing. *Social Work, 67*(3), 239-248. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swac018.

Bakshi, A. (2014). Urban form and memory discourses: Spatial practices in contested cities.

Journal of Urban Design, 19(2), 189-210.

Bedoya, R. (2014, September 15). Spatial justice: rasquachification, race and the city. *Creative

Times Report*. https://creativetimereports.org/2014/09/15/spatial-justice-

rasquachification-race-and-the-city/

Bell, F. M. (2021). Amplified injustices and mutual aid in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Qualitative

Social Work, 20*(1-2), 410-415.

Bell, F. M., Dennis, M. K., & Krings, A. (2019). Collective survival strategies and anti-colonial

practice in ecosocial work. *Journal of Community Practice, 27*(3-4), 279-295.

Billiot, S., Beltrán, R., Brown, D., Mitchell, F. M., & Fernandez, A. (2019). Indigenous

perspectives for strengthening social responses to global environmental changes: A

response to the social work grand challenge on environmental change. *Journal of

Community Practice, 27*(3-4), 296-316.

Bobo, K., Kendall, J., & Max, S. (2001). *Organizing for social change: Midwest Academy manual for activists* (4th ed.). Santa Ana, CA: Forum Press.

Brown, D.M. (2022, August 23). Evanston's historical reparations program: A 101 guide. *Evanston RoundTable*. Retrieved on December 1, 2022 at https://evanstonroundtable.com/2022/08/23/evanstons-historic-reparations-program-a-101-guide/

Chambers, E.T. (2018). *Roots for radicals: Organizing for power, action, and justice.* 2nd Ed. Continuum Press.

Corburn, J., Curl, S., & Arredondo, G. (2014). A health-in-all-policies approach addresses many of Richmond, California's place-based hazards, stressors. *Health Affairs*, *33*(11), 1905-1913.

Dennis, M. K., & Bell, F. M. (2020). Indigenous women, water protectors, and reciprocal responsibilities. *Social Work, 65*(4), 378-386.

Dumbrill, G. C., & Green, J. (2008). Indigenous knowledge in the social work academy. *Social Work Education, 27*(5), 489-503.

Evans, S.D., Kivell, N., Haarlammert, M., Malhotra, & Rosen, A. (2014). Critical community practice: An introduction to the special section. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology, 6*(1), 1-15.

Farrugia, R., & Hay, K.D. (2020). *Women rapping a revolution: Hip hop and community building in Detroit.* California Series in Hip Hop Studies. University of California Press.

Fisher, R. (1994). *Let the people decide: Neighborhood organizing in America*. Macmillan Reference USA.

Fursova, J. (2018). The "business of community development" and the right to the city. Reflections on the neoliberalization process in urban community development. *Community Development Journal, 53*(1), 119-135.

Gamble, D., & Weil, M. (2010). *Community Practice Skills: Local to global perspectives.* Columbia University Press.

Gutiérrez, L. M., & Gant, L. M. (2018). Community practice in social work: Reflections on its first century and directions for the future. *Social Service Review*, *92*(4), 617-646.

Gutiérrez, L.M., & Lewis, E. (1999). *Empowering women of color.* Columbia University Press.

Gray, R. R. (2022). Rematriation: Ts' msyen Law, Rights of Relationality, and Protocols of Return. *Native American and Indigenous Studies*, *9*(1), 1-27.

Gray, M., Coates, J., Yellow Bird, M., & Hetherington, T. (2013). *Decolonizing social work*. Ashgate Pub. Company.

Green, H. (2020). 2 Shifting landscapes and the monument removal craze, 2015–20. *Patterns of Prejudice, 54*(5), 485-491.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707-1791. https://doi.orgy/10.2307/1341787.

Iglesias, T. (2018). Threading the needle of fair housing law in a gentrifying city with a legacy of discrimination. *Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Development.* 27(1), 51-65.

Johnston, L.J. (Host). (2021, December 16). Corrina Gould, #Landback, and the Art of Indigenous Land Trusts [Audio podcast episode]. In Nihizhí, Our Voices: An Indigenous Solutions Podcast. https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/corrina-gould-landback-and-the-art-of/id1591832998?i=1000545393230

Jones, V.N., & McElderry, C.G. (2021). Social work and reparations: Applying a restorative

justice approach. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work. Advanced*

Online Publication. https://doi: 10.1080/15313204.2021.1949774.

Jones, V.N., & McElderry, C.G., & Conner, L.R. (2022). Social workers' attitudes towards

reparations for African American descendants. *Journal of Social Work.* 22(4), 1031-1055.

Kaimen, C.M. (2016). Environmental justice and community based reparations. *Seattle*

University Law Review, 39, 1327-1374.

Krings, A., & Copic, C. (2021). Environmental justice organizing in a gentrifying community:

Navigating dilemmas of representation, issue selection, and recruitment. *Families in*

Society, 102(2), 154-166.

Krings, A., Kornberg, D., & Lane, E. (2019). Organizing under austerity: how residents'

concerns became the Flint water crisis. *Critical Sociology, 45*(4-5), 583-597.

Krings, A., & Schusler, T. M. (2020). Equity in sustainable development: Community responses

to environmental gentrification. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 29*(4), 321-334.

Krings, A., & Thomas, H. (2018). Integrating green social work and the US environmental

justice movement: An introduction to community benefits agreements. In *The Routledge*

handbook of green social work (pp. 397-406). Routledge.

Lipsitz, G. (2018). Conjuring sacred space in gulf coast cities. *Journal of the American Academy*

of Religion, *86*(2), 497-525. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/lfx087.

Lockhart, P.H. (2019, June 20). America is having an unprecedented debate about reparations:

What comes next? *Vox.*

https://https://www.vox.com/identities/2019/6/20/18692949/congress-reparations-

slavery-discrimination-hr-40-coates-glover

MacLeod, M. A., & Emejulu, A. (2014). Neoliberalism with a community face? A critical

analysis of asset-based community development in Scotland. *Journal of Community*

Practice, *22*(4), 430-450.

Manning, B. R. M. (2011). *Trust in the land: new directions in tribal conservation*. Tucson, AZ:

University of Arizona Press.

Malka, M. (2022). Teaching note- Creative place making: An interdisciplinary point between

social work and art studies. *Journal of Social Work Education, 58*(3), 568-578.

Markus, G. B., & Krings, A. (2020). Planning, participation, and power in a shrinking city: The

Detroit Works Project. Journal of Urban Affairs, 42(8), 1141-1163.

Masoga, M.A., & Shokane, A.L. (2019). Viewpoint: Indigenous knowledge systems and

environmental social work education: Towards environmental sustainability. *South

African Journal of Environmental Education, 35*(1), 1-11.

McBay, A. (2019). *Full spectrum resistance, Volume one: Building movements and fighting to

win*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.

Merjian, A. H. (2010). An Unbroken Chain of Injustice: The Dawes Act, Native American

Trusts, and Cobell v. Salazar. *Gonzaga Law Review, 46*, 609-658.

Miles, S., & Paddison, R. (2005). Introduction: The rise and rise of culture-led urban

regeneration. *Urban Studies, 42*(5-6), 833-839.

Moulton, A. A. (2021). Black monument matters: Place based commemoration and abolitionist

memory work. *Sociology Compass, 15*(12), DOI: 10.1111/soc4.12944.

Newcomb, S. (1995, Spring/Summer) "PERSPECTIVES: Healing, Restoration, and

Rematriation." *News & Notes,* 3-4..

Nissen, L. B. (2019). Art and social work: History and collaborative possibilities for

    interdisciplinary synergy. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 29(6), 698-707.

Pember, M.A. (2022, September 9). Wounded Knee comes home at last. Indian Country Today.

    https://indiancountrytoday.com/news/wounded-knee-land-comes-home-at-last

Portland Housing Bureau (2019). State of Housing in Portland. Portland, Oregon. Retrieved from

    https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2020-04/phb-soh-2019-web.pdf

Purbrick, L., Aulich, J., & Dawson, G. (2007). *Contested spaces: Sites, representations, and*

    histories of conflict. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quimbo, M.T., Parez, J.M., & Tan, F.O. (2018). Community development approaches and

    methods: Implications for community development practice and research. *Community*

    Development: Journal of the Community Development Society, 49(5), 589-603.

Rahder, B., & McLean, H. (2013). Other ways of knowing your place: Immigrant women's

    experience of public space in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research,* 22(1), 145-

    166.

Rameau, M. (2008). *Take back the land: Land, gentrification and the Umoja village shantytown*.

    College Park, GA: Nia Publishing.

Ramirez, M.M. (2020). Take the houses back/take the land back: Black and indigenous urban

    futures in Oakland. *Urban Geography, 41*(5), 682-693.

Reisch, M. (2018). *Social policy and social justice: Meeting the challenges of a diverse society.*

    (3rd Ed.). San Diego, CA: Cognella Academic Publishing.

Roht-Arriaza, N. (2004). Reparations, decisions, and dilemmas. *Hastings International &*

    Comparative Law Review, 27, 157-219.

Sawyer, J. & Brady, S. (2020). A framework for analyzing, developing, and applying community practice interventions. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 47*(3), 113-141.

Sawyer, J. & Coles, D.C. (2020). Strengths perspective in critical macro practice: Tentative guidance for strengths-based policy, organizational, and community transformation. In J. Attwood, A. Mendenhall, & M.M. Corey (Eds.). *Rooted in strengths: 30 years of strengths perspective in Social Work* (131-148). University of Kansas Press.

Simone, B. (2021). Municipal reparations: Considerations and constitutionality. *Michigan Law Review, 120*(2), 345-391.

Smith, A. (2012). Indigeneity, settler colonialism, white supremacy. In D. M. HoSang, O. LaBennett, & L. Pulido (Eds.), *Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 66–90). Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Swedberg, R. (2018). How to use Max Weber's ideal type in sociological analysis. *Journal of Classical Sociology, 18*(3), 181–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X17743643

Teixeira, S., & Krings, A. (2015). Sustainable social work: An environmental justice framework for social work education. *Social Work Education, 34*(5), 513-527.

Thurber, A. (2019). The Neighborhood Story Project: A practice model for fostering place attachments, social ties, and collective action. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention. 49*(1). doi: 10.1080/10852352.2019.1633072

Thurber, A., Bates, L.K., Halverson, S. (2021). Can preference policies advance racial justice and wellbeing in gentrifying neighborhoods? *Journal of Community Practice, 29*(4), 405-422. 10.1080/10705422.2021.1992557

Thurber, A., Christiano, J. (2019). Confronting gentrification: Can creative interventions help people keep more than just their homes? *Engaged Scholar Journal, 5*(2), 95-115.

Thurber, A., & Krings, A. (2021). Gentrification. *In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Encyclopedia of Social Work.* Oxford University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199975839.013.1413

Thurber, A., Krings, A., Martinez, L. S., & Ohmer, M. (2021). Resisting gentrification: The theoretical and practice contributions of social work. *Journal of Social Work, 21*(1), 26-45.

Till, K. E. (2012). Wounded cities: Memory-work and a place-based ethics of care. *Political Geography, 31*(1), 3-14.

Topolářová, E. (2020). Creating constitutive solidarity in Seattle: Praxis between Duwamish tribe and the Real Rent Duwamish movement. *Identity, 20*(4), 306-320.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1–40.

Tysiachniouk, M. S., Horowitz, L. S., Korkina, V. V., & Petrov, A. N. (2021). Indigenous-led grassroots engagements with oil pipelines in the US and Russia: the NoDAPL and Komi movements. *Environmental Politics, 30*(6), 895-917.