ABSTRACT

Residential historic preservation occurs through *inhabitation*. Through day-to-day domesticities a suite of bodily comportments and aesthetic practices are perpetually at work tearing and stitching the historic fabric anew. Such paradoxical practice materializes seemingly incompatible relations between past and present, people and things. Through a playful posture of experience/experiment, this dissertation attends to the materiality of historic habitation vis-à-vis practices and performances in the Coronado historic neighborhood (1907-1942) in Phoenix, Arizona. Characterized by diversity in the built and social environs, Coronado defies preservation’s exclusionary tendencies. First, I propose a theoretical frame to account for the amorphous expression of nostalgia, the way it seeps, tugs, and lures ‘historic’ people and things together. I push the argument that everyday nostalgic practice and performance in Coronado gives rise to an aesthetic of *pastness* that draws attention to what is near, a sensual attunement of care rather than strict adherence to preservation guidelines. Drawing on the institutional legacy of Neighborhood Housing Services, I then rethink residential historic preservation in Coronado as urban *bricolage*, the aesthetic ordering of urban space through practices of inclusivity, temporal juxtaposition, and the art of everyday living. Finally, I explore the historic practice of home touring in Coronado as demonstrative of urban hospitality, an opening of self and neighborhood toward other bodies, critical in the making of viable, ethical urban communities. These three moments contribute to the body of literature rethinking urbanism as sensual, enchanted, and hospitable.
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Chapter 1

HISTORIC MATERIALISMS

The past is best used by being domesticated—and by our accepting and rejoicing that we do so.
-David Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country, 1985, 412

Residential historic districts are paradoxical places. They are tasked with simultaneously protecting and civilizing the past, keeping the old yet making it anew. Historic districts are present-day, ongoing creations purportedly representing a historical period of significance that, arguably, never existed as such. In deeming segments of ordinary urban environs “significant” for their representativeness of the past, they inadvertently become exceptional in the present. Historic homes and streetscapes are “preserved,” strangely, through their use. Many decry residential historic preservation as a hopelessly nostalgic endeavor, an attempt to define and fix a past in place. Others find fault with using the idea of history as pretense to control rates of change and spatial orders in built environs. Despite contradictions and criticisms, the nation’s 8,500-plus residential historic districts attest to the fact that the practice matters (Byrne 2013).

Historic neighborhoods pose more questions about everyday urban life in the present than they answer about the past.

This dissertation takes, as its starting point, the enigmatic questions posed by the materiality of residential historic preservation. I push the argument that residential historic preservation is an act of sense making in the present. The material affordances of everyday “historic” living—anachronistic atmospheres, glass doorknobs, textures of old wood—are sources of meaning and meaningfulness. Practices and performances in historic inhabitation, the rescue, re-imagining, and inhabitation of remnants, arise from
the powerful directives of material relations that ignite aesthetic sensibilities. The contours of a neighborhood, an identifiable character, tone, and shape, take form through ordinary, day-to-day material exchange. More than a concern for a specific time period, residential historic districts reveal the agency of pastness, an everyday sensual urbanism with ethical implications in the making and remaking of place.

Historic districts are particularly evocative in Phoenix, Arizona. Known as caricature of its namesake, a city of newness, if not perpetual rebirth, Phoenix has embraced residential historic preservation with quiet fervor. The first two residential historic districts of Phoenix were created in 1986: Roosevelt and Coronado. Just ten years later, in 1996, Phoenix had designated 40% of its eligible residential building stock as historic (structures at least 50 years old), the highest percentage of any large American city at the time (Kossan 1988; cited in Boer 2004). Today, 35 residential historic districts cover much of central Phoenix, an incongruous patchwork in the inner core of the quintessential “ahistoric” sprawling metropolis. The Coronado historic district happens to be home to the City’s first master-planned subdivision and the first urban in-fill project, magnifying temporal ambiguities in historic preservation.

In three academic papers I explore the materiality—the relational constellations of people and things—of the historic Coronado neighborhood in central Phoenix. Characterized as eclectic and artsy, Coronado is known for diversity in the built and social environs, defying prevailing stereotypes of residential historic preservation as elitist, conserving, and exclusionary. Coronado’s historic significance lies in its representativeness as an early 20th century working-class suburb, a past and present that seem strangely out-of-sync, imparting a delightful sense of temporal ambiguity.
Juxtaposition in architectural style and great variations in upkeep imbues each block of Coronado with a perplexity that cannot be mistaken for historic charm. Coronado’s extra/ordinary characteristics—at once typical and unique, mundane and magical—reveal tensions that speak to the complex, quotidian ways people and things assemble.

In Chapter 2, I propose a theoretical frame that apprehends the amorphous expression of nostalgia: the way it seeps, tugs, and lures historic people and things together. I rethink nostalgia as enchantment with distance, a distance that cannot be bridged, an elusive sense of the past that cannot be quelled. Practice, performance, and materiality in historic inhabitation give rise to an everyday aesthetic of pastness, an embodied ethics of care rather than strict adherence to historic preservation codes and guidelines. Chapter 3 focuses on key practices in urban revitalization in the 1970s and 1980s by the non-profit organization Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) as critical in cultivating Coronado’s present day eclectic historic aesthetic. I rethink residential historic preservation as urban bricolage, the aesthetic ordering of urban space through practices of inclusivity, temporal juxtaposition, and the art of everyday living in contrast to historic preservation’s institutional legacy of exclusionary practices. In Chapter 4, I explore the premier historic practice, home touring, as a potent performance entangled with dreams of home and historic preservation. I make the case that home touring in Coronado is demonstrative of urban hospitality, an opening of self and neighborhood toward other bodies, critical in the making of viable, ethical urban communities.

The theory informing this dissertation is drawn from a collection of approaches flying under the banner of urban materialisms. This world-view perceives the properties of matter to be the commonality between people and things. Rather than a world divided
by binary, and hierarchical thinking (human/nonhuman, material/immaterial, 
subject/object), in this approach everything has the capacity to affect and be affected. 
From this vantage point the city is, in the words of Amin and Thrift (2002, 157), “an 
agitation of thought and practice.” Thought, talk, habits, gestures, and other everyday 
bodily relations between people and things are the site of the urban. Urban geography, in 
this approach, investigates the material composition of the contemporary city, exploring 
“why different cities and different urban spaces have different affective capacities” 
(Latham and McCormack 2004, 719). Microsites and micropolitics, occurring at the 
scale of the body, the home, and in ephemeral social interactions, are privileged. And 
aesthetic modes of apprehension—sensing, feeling, affect—and techniques of art are 
employed to amplify such minor forms of social life.

In reimagining our worldly relationships in this way, assumptions about who, or 
what, deserves care are called into question. This dissertation pushes the argument that 
historic habitation is one way of sensing the urban differently. This everyday sensual 
urbanism, I contend, has ethical implications for ways that we perceive and treat peoples, 
places, and things. In the sections that follow I review key ideas in the “new” 
materialisms literature, its application in rethinking urban habitation, and how it informs 
the methods in this dissertation. I return to this literature in the final chapter to consider 
the overarching contribution of these papers in rethinking the urban as sensual, 
enchanted, and hospitable.
New Materialisms

Sensuality is awakened from the outside.
- Alphonso Lingis, *The Imperative*, 1989, 21

Pushed by poststructural and posthumanist thought new or affective materialisms find matter to be the commonality from which everything takes place. The work is inspired by the first principle of the *material imagination* as articulated by Anderson and Wylie (2009, 319): “matter potentially takes place with the capacities and properties of any element (earth, wind, fire, air) and/or any state (solid, liquid, gaseous).” A world comprised of transmutations of matter erodes and dissolves binaries such as human/nonhuman, animate/inanimate, material/ immaterial, and subject/object in attending to ways that bodies affect and are affected by other bodies (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Anderson and Wylie 2009). I follow a Spinoza-Deluezian tract in the expressiveness of materialities as ongoing affective currents and fields: the viscerally felt preconscious intensities traversing all bodies (peoples and things) (Massumi 2002; Latham and McCormack 2004). In this approach relationships between disparate phenomena in varied states and forms are apprehended through the material imagination, a way of thinking with the imperatives of matter. Guiding this line of thought is the idea that materialities are, from the beginning, processes which are turbulent (Anderson and Wylie 2009, 322). Whether seemingly too ephemeral to last or too enduring to change, all materialities have agency, the capacity to affect and be affected (Massumi 2002).

Secondly, and drawing on the postphenomenology of Merleau-Ponty (1968) and Lingis (1998), Anderson and Wylie contend that materiality is interrogative. Sensibility and materiality are already entangled prior to cognition, bodies of all kind are always
already sensing and being sensed by other bodies: molecular movements, chemical transformations, atmospheric pressure, sound, and light. Things, argues Lingis (1998), are that with which we sense, they are first and foremost imperatives. In posthumanist terms, the “the self,” “is precisely a matter of motes and grains swirling within and precipitating from such levels of heat, light, movement,” for all bodies, are “chaotic exhibitions of matters and sense” (Anderson and Wylie 2009, 327).

The third property of the material imagination outlined by Anderson and Wiley (2009), inspired by the work of Deleuze and Guattari (2004), is the inherent excess of materiality. Materiality is always organizing, dispersing, repeating, and diverging, in ways that exceed human apprehension. Couched in terms of non-representational theory, we can say that inquiry into the excess of material relations takes representations seriously, as “incessant presentation” (Dewsbury et al. 2002, 438), considering ways they come before and go beyond signification and coding (Massumi 2002). Given the mutability of matter emphasis here is placed on “doings,” what materiality does—its affects and effects—more so than in defining and arresting what it is (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004).

**Urban Materialisms of Habitation**

The urban, in this approach, is understood to be emergent from intricate, self-organizing assembling of everyday matter and matterings (Latham and McCormack 2004; Bennett 2001, 2010): zoning maps, pipes, digital signals, bricks and mortar, termites and feral cats, meteorological events, dreams and secrets. With a multitude of material relations in play, inquiries in urban materiality proffer opportunities to rethink social practices and the built environs anew. One vein of urban materialisms brings
habitation to the fore. Dwelling is the performative enactment of everyday habitual life, becomings of self, place, home, and world (Ingold 2000; Urry 2000; Casey 2001; Harrison 2007; McHugh 2007). The too familiar, the unseen, and the messy minutiae of everyday life must be attended to (Harrison 2000). Everyday urban life is eventful. “Performance is a heightening of everyday behaviour,” argues Thrift (2008), “rather than something standing apart from it” (135). The inter-actions of people and things are precarious, they must be repeatedly enacted, practiced, or performed to persist, and there is always the latent potential for each instance to be otherwise (Goffman 1959; Butler 1990; Thrift and Dewsbury 2000; Harrison 2000; Dewsbury et al. 2002).

The sensate, for Harrison (2000), is the surface through which mundane, habitual, and infra-ordinary material relations take place. The senate is the “surface and limit of everyday life,” the emergent interface between self and world, at once enframing perception, constituting subjectivity, and disclosing the remainder (Harrison 2000, 502). To attend to the sensate, the interface of material relations in everyday life, is to take seriously the imperatives of matter (Lingis 1998). The façade of human mastery is revealed through sensibility (Bennett 2001, 2010). “We do not make our habits,” Harrison reminds us, “they are never really ‘ours’” (2000, 510). In this stream of thought the realm of everyday sensate life is also couched as aesthetics. Drawing on the term’s Greek etymology, the sensible perception of things rather than its German-derived concern for beauty (Seremetakis 1994; Paterson 2007), aesthetics “is concerned with material experiences, with the way the sensual world greets the sensate body, and with the affective forces that are generated in such meetings” (Highmore 2010, 121).
A “social aesthetics,” argues Highmore (2010, 119), is involved with the “sticky entanglements of substances and feelings, of matter and affect.” Rather than “untangling” sticky material entanglements, we must make contact with them. In this way, the haptic dimensions of aesthetics are elevated to emphasize the ways we are always, already touched by things through sensorial registers, affect, and emotion (Fisher 1997; Paterson 2007, 2009). Many authors attending to habitual material relations comprising everyday life disclose the ways we are touched—affected—by something fleeting or seemingly absent such as memory (Seremetakis 1994; Crang and Travlou 2001; Anderson 2004a), ruins (Edensor 2005, 2007), heritage (Crang and Tolia-Kelly 2010), spectral remains (McCormack 2010a), boredom and atmospheres (Anderson 2004b, 2009). Common in these works is attention to the infra-ordinary, the affective intensities which are at once “determinate and indeterminate, present and absent, singular and vague” (Anderson, 2009, 77).

Building on this literature, this dissertation considers the everyday materiality of historic habitation, strange practices wherein preservation is carried out through the bodily habits and dispositions of everyday life. Memory erupts, nostalgia seeps, and history manifests atmospherically and in the quality of light emanating through old single-pane windows. Practices and performances of historic homemaking, oft perceived as “domesticating the past,” arise in relations between people and things, neither the property of one or the other. The sensual affordances of old homes and objects are captivating—enchanting—giving rise to historic practices and performances. The aesthetic juxtaposition between old and new proffers opportunities for new practices, for things to be otherwise. Ultimately, constellations of historic objects, homes, and
inhabitants generates new sensibilities, new subjectivities as forms of dwelling in the modern world.

**Experience/Experiment in Historic Habitation**

Research in the vein of urban materialisms and non-representational theories is tasked with apprehending the excess and fleeting nature of everyday life without diminishing these fragile qualities. I employ a methodology of practice, an “experiment/experience” (Connolly 2006, 2010; McCormack 2010b) in which epistemological assumptions about individualistic mind/self/cognition and “truth” are minimized in favor of a “third kind” of knowledge that is more tentative, and co-produced through bodily activity (Thrift 2008, 122). Following earlier theorists of everyday life (Benjamin 1968; de Certeau 1984; Lefebvre 1991), this approach strives to “become aware of the unseen” (Harrison 2000, 497) and “make different things significant and worthy of notice” (Thrift 2008, 123). Such approaches rely on an everyday “activist politics of disclosure” (Thrift 208, 123) through which the closest things—the insignificant, the ephemeral, and habitual—are elevated. Everyday life is apprehended through sensory ethnography (Pink 2009), techniques including “sensory aesthetics, the use of media, collaborative methods, the reflexivity of being in the everyday, and accounting for the ‘flow’ of everyday life” (Pink 2012, 31). This affirmative ethos of experience/experiment privileges sensing-feeling-thinking in the midst of things, according with Guattari’s (1995) ethico-aesthetic paradigm as a way of engaging with the expressiveness of materiality across sensory registers (McCormack 2010a).
My efforts to apprehend and elevate the everyday aesthetic sensibilities in Historic Coronado evolved through two key experience/experiments: inhabitation and collaborative visual methods. I lived in the Coronado district from 2007 to 2011. I engaged in immersive participant observation (Crang and Cook 2007), the messy business of performatively traversing participant/observer, insider/outsider boundaries via everyday life (Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). In addition to the day-to-day goings on, I attended Coronado Neighborhood Association meetings and associated events, participated in neighborhood list-serves (E-Hood Coronado and Coronado News Digest), contributed to the Coronado newsletter, *The Dispatch*, volunteered as a house-sitter on the 2009 Coronado home tour, served on the Coronado home tour planning committee in 2010, and in the capacity of home tour co-chair in 2011. I also cast a wide web of experiments employing a range of qualitative ethnographic methods, including 40 informal and formal interviews with active residents often in their homes (Sin 2003), interviews with preservation officials, a survey in *The Dispatch*, historical/archival research, and the collection of neighborhood ephemera (past and present).

During this time period I participated in Phoenix Transect, Arizona State University’s long-term visual research project in the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts initiated and directed by Mark Klett. Through experimental collaboration with multiple photographers, including Katie Lehman, Bryon Darby, Jason Roehner, and Mark Klett, the visual research in this dissertation was generative in creating “thinking-spaces,” processual spaces for research-creation (McCormack 2010b). Image making, in this dissertation, was not an act of illustration but rather a source of knowledge production and expression. This form of thinking affords images with agency, inventiveness, and
expressiveness (Latham and McCormack 2009). Visual research was integral in apprehending and expressing the aesthetic sensibilities of Coronado’s residents and homes; exploring the juxtapositions of historic homes and contemporary practices; conveying the liveliness and agency of objects and homes; and generative of the effects and affects of preservation practices. To assemble such variegated, and at times, contradictory information I draw on the aesthetic framework of *bricolage* to assemble relations between people and things (Denzin and Lincoln 2005; Kincheloe 2005). In collaborating with multiple photographers in the visual research for this dissertation I heed calls arising from the recent turn toward geography-art collaborations to take aesthetic modes of knowledge production seriously and explore ways of drawing attention to the ways authorship is always multiple (Tolia-Kelly 2012).
Chapter 2

URBAN ENCHANTMENTS—MATERIALIZING NOSTALGIA

In the sunset of dissolution, everything is illuminated by the aura of nostalgia…
—Milan Kundera, *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, 1984, 4

Matterings

Nostalgia—longing for the past—is intoxication, a cloying elixir, a romance with one’s own fantasy. Despite derision and peril trailing the expression, nostalgia persists. Even the city of incessant rebirth, Phoenix, Arizona houses a cozy cityscape of period revival rooflines; pitched Tudors, low-slung Bungalows, and tiled Spanish Colonial silhouettes seemingly resting in tranquil repose. The smattering of 35 residential historic districts comprising the downtown residential core engender an infamously ahistorical city with temporal ambiguity. The cobbled together remnants of the City’s first suburbs exude a desperate absence of “real” history and the captivating charm of history in the making. Are the personable accoutrements adorning each house, such as dusty Adirondack chairs on the porches of worn Bungalows, exuding or awaiting a simpler time?

Residential historic districts ostensibly “preserve” ordinary landscapes and homes through inhabitation. Yet, the very practices that gave rise to the size, form, and aesthetic of these homes are not—and cannot be—the same as contemporary practices and performances in maintaining them. Ideas, memories, and imaginings emerge as sense is made in the present. As a collection of remnants, residential historic districts and historic homes necessitate an everyday corporeal attunement to the present needs of past things. Decisions about repair, restoration, maintenance, and furnishing evolve through domestic practice, the

---

1 Kevin McHugh is the second author on this paper.
sensual directives of things (Lingis 1998). Bodily attentiveness to what feels right supersedes the preservationists desire for architectural and historical accuracy. As a practice born from loss, historic preservation demonstrates a curious intersection of nostalgia and dwelling. We direct our attention to one Phoenix historic district, Coronado, where nostalgia melts, softens, and creatively reshapes the preservationist impulse to freeze time in place.

Following repeated criticisms of “bad history,” there have been recent attempts to awaken nostalgia from its dream state, to make it “critical” and “productive” (Blunt 2003; Cashman 2006). Rather than viewing nostalgia as diffuse longing for an imagined past, these approaches orient nostalgia to the present and future while “placing” nostalgia within a specific geographical frame: the home. We argue that it is precisely the amorphous and sensual qualities of nostalgia that makes it a propulsive force in dwelling. Moving beyond nostalgia as a representation of, or personal longing for, “the past” or “home”, we engage nostalgia as transpersonal, affective currents coursing through bodies, objects, things. Nostalgia, we assert, is less about time (a specific history) and more about diffuse longing for a sense of pastness; less about home (a specific geography), and more about cultivating sensual environs.

In our approach, nostalgia’s elusive nature speaks to enchantment with pastness, an unbridgeable, but felt, spatio-temporal distancing. Encounters of affective distance engender attentiveness to what is near, to sensing closely. We make the case that nostalgic practice, performance, and materiality in historic Coronado gives rise to an everyday aesthetic of pastness. This is a mode of urban sensing and practice premised on an embodied ethics of care, not adherence to strict preservation guidelines. In these ways, we contribute to the rethinking of nostalgia and residential historic preservation from the perspective that all types
of materiality—human-nonhuman, animate-inanimate—have the capacity to affect and be affected (Massumi 2002). All matter is lively and expressive (Anderson and Harrison 2010; Blackman and Venn 2010; Braun and Whatmore 2010; Hinchcliffe et al. 2005; Whatmore 2002). A lineage of “new” materialists championing presentational practices offer guidance in thinking-writing encounters between people and things as creative cultural geography (Wylie 2010; Dewsbury 2010).

We begin by situating nostalgia as a material expression afoot in the world. Nostalgia, we contend, is enchantment with distance, a sensate encounter that, paradoxically, engenders practices of nearness between people and things. We situate this framework within Phoenix’s historic Coronado neighborhood where historic preservation and nostalgia entwine in cultivating an aesthetic of pastness. In three vignettes, we pair imagery, qualitative research, and literature in conjuring Coronado’s aesthetic. As a performative, “ornamental” photographic technique, vignetting involves the “softening or shading away the edges of the subject” (Oxford English Dictionary 2013). Our nostalgic aesthetic approach abstains from demystifying the very expression we make gentle contact with in presenting Coronado’s sensibilities (Bennett 2001, 2010; Marks 2002; Thrift 2008). We conclude by outlining nostalgia and historic preservation as urban sensibilities with ethical-aesthetic implications.

Our inquiry into an aesthetic of pastness in the Coronado historic neighborhood rethinks nostalgia as an urban sensibility (Sennett 1994; Zardini 2005; Pallasmaa 2005, 2009; Adams and Guy 2007; Cowan and Steward 2007). This work heeds calls to make sense of the everyday (Harrison 2000; Highmore 2002; Latham 2003) through inquiry into the sensible and infrasensible modalities of urban materialisms (Latham and
McCormack 2004; Anderson 2009; Anderson and Harrison 2010). In this work, we aspire to Anderson and McFarlane’s (2011, 126), “ethos of engagement with the world, one that experiments with methodological and presentational practices in order to attend to a lively world of differences.” Toward this aim, our aesthetic inquiry relies on the creative products of multiple photographers participating in Phoenix Transect, a long-term visual research project at Arizona State University. The keen visual sensibilities of Katie Lehman and Mark Klett were particularly critical and generative in the taking-place of research-creation (McCormack 2010b; Dewsbury et al. 2002). Our affirmative, creative-critical approach accords with Woodyer and Geoghegan’s (2012) recent call to eschew postures of rationality for enchanted modalities in both theory and praxis. We aspire to convey nostalgia as enchantment, “the simultaneous experience of charm and uncanniness” (Woodyer and Geoghegan 2012, 17); an aesthetic encounter engendering sensual attunement toward remnants and historic homes and ambivalence in adherence to historic preservation codes, guidelines, and factual narratives.

**Materializing Nostalgia**

Industrialization, modernization, and militarization in 19th century medical discourse have been credited with influencing nostalgia’s evolution from a physical ailment (a painful longing for a lost home) to a mental disorder, and finally, to the bittersweet emotion of longing for a past time (Lowenthal 1975; Davis 1979; Austin 2007). As such, nostalgia has been mobilized in several ways: as a modernist tool of suppression against the protests and memories of displaced communities (Smith 2000), as subversive to the modernist agenda (Stewart 1988), as associated with many post-revolution conspiracies of the twentieth century, and, ultimately, as having the potential
to serve disparate political agendas (Cashman 2006). The widespread deployment of nostalgia as political tool and marketing ploy, has brought about regressive associations with an imagined past, sometimes called “bad history” (Lowenthal 1985, 1989b; Chase and Shaw 1989). In recent years, negative perceptions of nostalgia have been supplemented with critical conceptualizations challenging nostalgia as dis-placed, ahistorical, and apolitical (Boym 2001; Blunt 2003; Cashman 2006). Broadly speaking, much of the writing on nostalgia continues to fall into two schools of thought: ‘backward looking’ nostalgia, understood to be revisionist, regressive, and debilitating, and ‘forward looking’ nostalgia considered to be productive, critical, and therapeutic.

We pose an alternate view; a re-thinking of nostalgia as affect with sensual effects anterior to conscious meaning. We situate our inquiry into the agency of nostalgia within the ongoing project of new materialisms (Coole and Frost 2010; Anderson and Wiley 2009; Bennett 2001, 2010; Connolly 2002, 2010). Ontologically, this collection of approaches takes (re)presentations and all forms of matter seriously, seeking to dissolve distinctions between material and immaterial, human and nonhuman, subject and object. Whether an object, an idea, or a meteorological event, all materialities have agency, the capacity to affect. In this way, calls to “re-materialize the urban” (Latham and McCormack 2004) recognize that all forms of urban matter (infrastructure, thoughts, events, objects) are expressive and inter-act. In this sense, beings called human are always already more than human.

Enchanted Distance

Despite efforts to demystify nostalgia, the supernatural agency of the notion seems inescapable. In pairing the Greek roots nostos (to return home) and algos (a
painful condition) Johannes Hofer’s (1934, 381) neologism audibly conjures nostalgia’s affects. Fred Davis echoes these mystical, performative powers in writing, “It is almost as if…*the word sought of its own accord* that murky and inchoate amalgam of sentiments to which so homely a word as homesickness could no longer render symbolic justice” (1979, 5 emphasis added). Efforts to articulate the felt experience of nostalgia invariably enlist language of the occult and medical discourse. Beyond human control, nostalgia affects by means of enchantment, infection, contagion, and possession. Nostalgia’s chirality occasions its recursive and conjunctive status as both sickness and cure. Even those who bemoan persistent medical tropes in nostalgia discourse, turn to the expression’s earlier literary “origins” where magical beings, such as Homer’s Sirens, cast the first nostalgic spells (Dames 2010).

Nostalgia, we contend, is enchantment with distance. Susan Stewart (1993, 23) intones nostalgia as the “desire for desire” that cannot be quelled. Alternating distance in space-time, nostalgia is the sensory experience of desire for something lost, some thing that is unnamable and unreachable, momentarily present in fleeting fragments.

As in an album of photographs or a collection of antiquarian relics, the past is constructed from a set of presently existing pieces. There is no continuous identity between these objects and their referents. Only the act of memory constitutes their resemblance. And it is in this gap between resemblance and identity that nostalgic desire arises. The nostalgic is enamored of distance, not of the referent itself. Nostalgia cannot be sustained without loss (S. Stewart 1993, 145).

The impulse to collect and preserve material remnants begins with the felt loss of a moment, a sentiment, a shape, a feeling, a way of life. Yet, through acts of keeping, of seemingly holding oblivion at bay, the loss of a moment, a thing, is most pronounced. In this distance, suspended in fleeting memories, vague imaginaries, and barely felt
sensations—neither here nor there—we float in a paradoxical state of longing, for the sake of longing. *Estrangement* (Lowenthal 1975). Central to nostalgia is an affective spatiality and temporality of loss, a distance that cannot be bridged. Unquantifiable yet felt intimately, nostalgic distance is a sensate gauge of proximity, a “structure of feeling” floating at “the edge of semantic availability” (Harrison 2000, 498). As a sensation lacking explanatory logic or adequate representation, nostalgia is laced with discomfort.

The felt desire of an unbridgeable distance is by definition affective, an increase in a body’s capacity to affect, and be affected (Massumi 2002). Affective desire multiplies intensities, generating potentialities of bodies, what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1994, 173) describe as, “nonhuman becoming.” Nostalgia is defined by relational spacing, a kind of desire Luce Irigaray (1993, 8) describes as demanding “a sense of attraction: a change in the interval, the displacement of the subject or of the object in their relations of nearness or distance.” Pre-personal and immanent, nostalgia is an affective meeting of subject and object, a summons between bodies human and nonhuman (Anderson and Wylie 2009; Lingis 1998).

Nostalgia assembles disparate materialities in partial and prismatic ways; we—subject and object—become bewitched, enchanted, afflicted. The nostalgic, says Boym (2001, 13), “directs his gaze not only backward but sideways, and expresses himself in elegiac poems and ironic fragments, not in philosophical or scientific treatises. Nostalgia remains unsystematic; it seduces rather than convinces.” This fleeting state is enchanting, entrée to immanent agency of matter and its ethical potential, what Jane Bennett (2010) terms “vital materiality.” Enchantment, says Bennett (2010, xii), strengthens the “agentic capacities” of all bodies, human and nonhuman, increasing their
capacity to affect when perceptions of human mastery are diminished. Bennett points toward “pre-modern” comportments such as superstition, animism, and anthropomorphism as holding potential to cultivate a capacity for naiveté, a suspended state of wonder. Nostalgia, we contend, is an enchantment fostering openness with potential for extending habits of care.

In this approach, nostalgia is lively, pre-personal affect which registers in, and through, the sensory contact of bodies and things. A fleeting glimpse, a faint scent, a rough textile weave are momentarily presenced, re-membered in olfactory registers, limbs, and skin. Such encounters are not limited by a specific past, place, or memory. Their distinctiveness arises through viscerally felt modulations of distance—subject-object spacings, an event of “praesentia” (Hetherington 2004, 167) or “refracted enchantment” (Ramsay 2009). Simultaneously present and absent, nostalgia’s felt contours are contradictory, pleasurable and melancholy, bitter-sweet (Pickering and Keightley 2006). Such an unwieldy expression captivates and assembles disparate and fleeting materialities, including human bodies. Building on Nadia Seremetakis’s (1994) argument that nostalgia is memory of the senses, we contend that the defining effect of nostalgia is aesthetic, sensing that is neither “backward” nor “forward,” but closely. Cognitive registers such as continuity, depth, and factual accuracy succumb to texture, grain, tone and detail. From this vantage, the past is seen/felt in fine-grained texture, a quality of light, the weight of objects, an excess engendered through propinquity (bringing near). Enamored with distance, the nostalgic body cultivates practices of nearness: collecting, repairing, restoring, displaying, and maintaining remnants. Yet,
practices of sensate spacing can only fleetingly suspend, not bridge, the distance between subject and object.

We embrace the Greek etymology of aesthetic: to feel, sense, perceive (Highmore 2010; Paterson 2007; Seremetakis 1994). This form of social aesthetics, says Highmore (2010, 121), “is primarily concerned with material experiences, with the way the sensual world greets the sensate body, and with the affective forces that are generated in such meetings.” Aesthetics, in this way, is necessarily entangled with everyday, sensorial perception, affect, and diverse materialisms.

**Historic Coronado**

“Coronado” refers to one of the largest and oldest historic districts in Phoenix, and to the Greater Coronado community, a one square mile area in east central Phoenix housing three historic districts (Coronado, Country Club Park, Brentwood), plus the “non-historic” sections in-between. The Coronado was built as a working class streetcar suburb comprised of small, modest homes. Its significance lies in ordinariness, not as a legacy for the wealthy or social elite of Phoenix (Laird 1986). With architectural significance dating between 1907-1942 in Coronado, 1939-1946 in Country Club Park, and 1926-1956 in Brentwood, zoning boundaries corral half a century of diverse architecture. Mid-century legacies of massive suburbanization, white flight, redlining, urban disinvestment, and the federal subsidization of the periphery have transitioned Coronado to an inner city neighborhood. With side-by-side variation in architectural style, great jumps in period of construction, and homes displaying varying states of maintenance, it is impossible to trace the narrative of Coronado to any singular history—
even an early suburban one. Owing to its eclectic “funky” character (Figure 1), Coronado exudes a delightful sense of pastness.

Figure 1. Emblems of diversity in religious affiliation (e.g., Catholics, Sikhs, Buddhists), gay pride, and historic fabulation frequently adorn homes in historic Coronado. Photographs by authors, 2009.

The cohabitation of dilapidated turn-of-the-century farmhouses, rejuvenated bungalows, revivified Spanish Revivals, Tudor rehabs, and scattered newly constructed modern, minimalist homes, seems charmingly improbable. Akin to Stewart’s (2007, 106) description of the contents of a drawer, “it is as if, under the spell of an internal time system, [the homes]…summoned like to like, gathering things to things under some magnetism that human volition does not know.” Relics, remnants, and remains have the uncanny ability to captivate and enchant in ways that contemporary, completed objects
simply cannot (Edensor 2005, 2007; Ginsberg 2004). The seduction of ruins, asserts Boym (2001, 15), is that they enable “one to experience historicity affectively, as an atmosphere, a space for reflection on the passage of time.” The pace of modernity generates conditions of perpetual loss, as new remnants are always in the making. The allure of historic homes is the promise of sensual seduction. Don and Maureen, active Coronado residents and historic district realtors, sell it this way:

These “one-of-a-kind” properties beg to be lived in, loved and cherished…Memories of weddings, births, graduations and reunions are woven into the tapestry of these historic homes with every dent in the floor, chip in the tile, or crack in the window. Unintentional time capsules are sometimes exposed while peeling the years from a dining room wall, or re-tiling a bath. Other times, these artifacts sit entombed and undiscovered while still managing to give their surroundings a warmth that we can’t quite put our finger on…These are fabrics interwoven throughout our historic areas, our senses and our hearts (HistoricPhoenix.com, 2010). ii

Coronado’s enigmatic historic sensibility makes it difficult to discern whether historic preservation status simply “sets the stage,” with appropriate props and script for nostalgic performance to ensue, or whether preservation is nostalgic stagecraft. David Lowenthal (1985) cleaves toward the latter, asserting that guidelines and practices of historic preservation arise from the nostalgic impulse. Social, ecological, and economic benefits aside, the preservationist’s desire to rescue and rehabilitate remnants, Lowenthal argues, is (negatively) nostalgic.

Preservation has become a rampant cult. All over the world, individuals and institutions save more and more from every possible past. The resources devoted to salvaging and celebrating surviving remnants mount exponentially. Few cultures are exempt from, few individuals uninfected by, the mania for memorabilia. Why is this so? It reflects a wider modern preoccupation with the past - the nostalgic temper (1985, 67).
Nostalgia’s mystical affectivities and alluring, cult-like practices are enchantments. The earliest transitions of nostalgia from disease to aesthetic, asserts Austin (2007), occurred through therapeutic treatments of associative performance; the nostalgic substituted return home with pleasurable, sensual home-like enactments. Nostalgia is not encountered cognitively, but rather, through sensual performance and everyday practice. One such nostalgic practice is the performance of home, history and preservation at the annual Coronado Home Tour (Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Coronado Home Tour on Willetta Street. Photographs by Katie Lehman, 2010.](image)

Once reserved for viewing elite residences, the home tour has become an annual event in residential historic districts across the country celebrating the architectural distinctiveness of ordinary homes. The ubiquity of domestic touring in Phoenix warrants an entire home tour season each spring. On the one-day Coronado event, private homes
are opened to the public, and much more than the ogling of historic architecture occurs; bodies jostle in family-photo laden hallways, drawers are opened, rugs lifted, nods of homemaking approval exchanged, memories surface, and tales are told (Figure 2). In touring everyday spaces of home, habitual practices are brought to the surface, made present through encounters with spaces, objects, and fellow tourgoers.

The bodily act of touring a domestic space facilitates both intimacy and distance from daily home practices, past and present, rendering the mundane remarkable. The spectrum of materiality on offer, from the original 1920 bathtub to the flat screen TV, transmits ways of inhabiting temporal disjunctions. A sense of pastness emerges on home tour through practices of arranging, displaying, remembering, looking, and touching (Anderson 2004a). Such a collective sensory experience holds potential for disrupting bodily habits as new ones emerge. This collision of technologies, building materials, and social interactions echo Walter Benjamin’s study of the Parisian arcades, where the quickening pace of urban life generates new perceptual modalities (Highmore 2002). Harrison (2000, 511) writes, “alternation in dwelling may be produced by potentials in the combinations of materials, alterations in the texture of the weave.” Nostalgia circulates and “passes through us” (Harrison 2000), cultivating historic sensibilities and subjectivities.

The Coronado home tour began in 1982 when Neighborhood Housing Services initiated the practice as a community development strategy. The annual ritual highlights homes both in and out of official historic-zoned areas of the Coronado community. The vignettes and images presented here center on interviews (pre-tour, day-of, and post-tour) with Willetta Street residents made during 2010 (Figure 3). We also draw on formal and
informal interviews (2007-2011) with active residents residing throughout Coronado. Accounts by residents are supplemented with our own immersive participant observation (Crang and Cook 2007) as both authors resided in Coronado at differing times and for varied durations. Interviews were restricted largely to residents who attended, participated in, or helped to organize community events such as the neighborhood association meetings, monthly social events, and the annual home tour.

![Figure 3. The north side of the 1800 block of Willetta Street on Tour day. Photographs by Mark Klett, 2010.](image)

 Functioning as a microcosm of the community at large, two themes repeatedly bubble to the surface before, during, and after home tour: nostalgic enchantment with remnants twinned with ambivalence toward linear notions of history and preservation.

Chris, a Willetta Street resident whose home was open to the public on the 2010 tour, puts it this way;

I went on the tour because I’m completely fascinated with older homes. You go into a home these days, a modern built home, and it’s square and boring and there is no personality, and you can tell it’s cheaply made—they don’t have any life in them, you know? My folks are from the Midwest and we go visit my grandparents and…everybody back there lives in all these old homes—and it just like, personally, blows me away—there’s so much detail in every little part of it. It’s like what happened to the world? Where did all this go? And that’s why I go, I’m assuming that there’s a little bit of that in other people and that’s probably why they go—it’s just like—that stuff, it’s just gone and there’s remnants of it, of that era, there’s remnants of it. People are intrigued by it and they want to see it.
That’s why I do it; I’m guessing that’s why other people are into it (Interview 4/24/2010).

This sensual disposition toward remnants—corporeal attentiveness to craftsmanship, texture, detail, temporality, and uniqueness—characterizes preservation practices in Coronado. We contend that tangled practices in historic preservation in Coronado rise from enchantment with nostalgic distance, not strictly personal memories (vignette 1), the past (vignette 2), or history (vignette 3), per se. We frame nostalgia in Coronado as engendering an aesthetic of pastness, a relational spacing of distance expressed as sensual attunement.

**Vignette 1: Enchanted Orbs**

![Figure 4. Debbie and her doorknobs. Photographs by Katie Lehman, 2010.](image)

Prior to her arrival on Willetta Street, Debbie began collecting glass doorknobs anticipating the day when she would have an old house, with old doors in which to place
them (Figure 4). The doorknobs she collected, long removed from their place of origin, were desirable in their own right—without door, house, or key—as aesthetic objects with special weight, shape, and sensation in the palm of the hand. After decades of neglect, no longer the handheld threshold of movement between rooms, the doorknobs seemed to forget their innate purpose. Now, as artful objects, handled with admiration and intention, they become capable of opening worlds of imaginative potential. Unrestricted to the confines of memorable experience, and lacking the burden of a historian’s knowledge of doors and doorknobs, Debbie feels a tinge of glamour, romance, and mystery emanating from the glass orbs. What is it like, we ask, to live in a world in which doors and doorknobs are magical?

“Things”, says Nigel Thrift (2008, 9), “answer back.” Peter Schwenger (2006, 3) elaborates: “Not only does our existence articulate that of an object through the language of our perceptions, the object calls out that language from us, and with it our own sense of embodied experience.” A sensate awareness of loss, viscerally encountered in palms and fingers, cannot be affirmed intellectually. Yet, magic in glass doorknobs persists, and not just for Debbie. Brad Kittle, vice president of the Antique Doorknob Collectors of America, attests to the craftsmanship and quality of a well-worn knob, “The old glass has a watery look and refracts light differently. And when you hold it in your hand, it just feels better” (Hughes 2010). But, in the event the “original” feature is lackluster, failing to play the part, modification or replacement in Coronado is commonplace. A transplanted doorknob or newly built door “work” performatively to suffuse environments with pastness, an affective assemblage beyond the original.
Debbie’s old house, a 1930s Tudor Revival on Willetta Street came with many original features—original wood floors, built-in cabinets, tile, and, in a stroke of good luck, glass doorknobs. Also of much pride to Debbie is a collection of her grandparent’s artifacts, her quilt, his framed rosary, and the toy hutch he built for her as a child. Unlike the original “salmon terra cotta” colored tile she went to great lengths to protect during extensive plumbing repair, the petit hutch she played “house” with as a child, has undergone aesthetic improvement. Debbie changed the original color, removed original doors, and, replaced the original metal fixtures with, not surprisingly, glass pulls and knobs. We pause—attempting to make sense of her decisions to both preserve and “degrade” a family heirloom—she hurries to explain.

I love old. I think I lived when Al Capone lived, I was one of those flapper girls, you know, cause I just love that era. I was always intrigued with the mafia and gangsters and then I hear the mafia used to settle in this neighborhood—did you hear that?...I learned that down in the second house…where they had all the problems …the prostitute house—they said that this was an area where the shady characters, when they moved to this city, lived…in this neighborhood because they knew each other and did shady things. Isn’t that interesting? (Interview 4/10/10).

Debbie’s explanatory remarks, delivered in earnest, sit comically. How to explain a passion for glass doorknobs likened to a romance with Al Capone and the mafia? Nostalgia is meandering, adrift, unwieldy. It is not, ultimately, a longing to return to a particular place or time. Lacking in referent, it is longing for the sake of longing. The illusive, shifting surface of nostalgic home is predicated on creative assemblage of imagination, texture, tone—not recreation, but creation. Debbie’s mafia fantasy in Coronado, for example, was gleaned from the new owner of a Spanish Colonial Revival, Carah, who rescued her house from its former life of prostitution and pornography. The
remnants of this criminal element and a 1930s-ish streetscape are just enough to craft lineage to Al Capone.

**Vignette 2: Architecture of Porn and Prostitution**

![Figure 5](image-url)

**Figure 5.** The house of porn and prostitution. Photographs by Katie Lehman, 2010.

According to the Coronado home tour brochure, Carah’s painted brick Spanish Colonial (Figure 5) “wears a mix of roof styles; a flat roof with stepped parapet at center, two low-pitched gables, and a shed roof over the entry combine to create the curb appeal of this darling home.” But Carah fell in love with this house “because it was old,” because it was nothing like her suburban upbringing where, “there is no history, everything is BRAND NEW …and made in a factory” (Interview, 4/17/2010).iii Rebounding from the sterility of the outer-suburbs, like many Coronado residents, Carah wanted a house with “character and stories.” She got more than she bargained for. The *storied excess* of Carah’s house enabled Debbie to resurrect the mafia on Willetta Street,
satiated the appetite of hundreds of tourgoers, and still, Carah needed time away from the too-intense personality of her darling home.

While the 80-year old house undoubtedly accumulated the dispositions of its many occupants, its most recent inhabitants, made the greatest impression. As a former house of pornography and prostitution, says Carah, the illicit activities were literally built in. The new alterations included a paved alley entrance, complete with an electronic gate for “discrete” entry, and a recently dug “basement” (sans windows) accessible only through a secret door opened with the turn of a fake electrical box (the door also featured locking options from either side). When the plumber discovered a three-foot block of multi-colored prophylactics blocking the original pipes, all the rumors swirling around Carah’s house were instantly confirmed. “I’ve always felt like there are some houses that are sad houses,” says Carah, “and I kind of feel like my house is a sad house.”

Sometimes I sit in the living room and think, gosh it’s so sad that I love this house so much and the people that live here mean so much to me and that at one point nobody appreciated this house whatsoever, it was just a place for prostitutes to bring tricks, really that’s what it was you know? And I mean it’s even built right into the house, that that is what the house was for.

But sadness, clarifies Carah, is not the only sentiment expressed, “the house,” she asserts, “is definitely haunted.” Strange voices, the auto-activated shower and doorbell, and most disturbingly, the morning Carah awoke with sheet imprints on her back spelling “evil,” went beyond benign spectral shenanigan.

I don’t even believe in this stuff and we ended up having a priest come over and bless the house, and I paid way too much money to have a psychic come and do a cleansing of the house also, because it got to the point where it was scary. Like, I was scared to live there.

Luckily, the spiritual interventions seemed to work.
On tour day, information displayed at Carah’s house jovially informed viewers that the home’s original owner, Albert M. Austin, a bookkeeper for the Phoenix Gazette, purchased the property for $3,900 in 1930. It also states that Carah is on the hunt for glass doorknobs because hers were removed by the previous owners, and to check out the “secret” basement built for illicit activity! Her house became instant legend, the hands down favorite on the home tour. Abuzz with whispers and ogling, tourgoers touch the fake electric box, descend the steep stairs, and stand in the basement, retelling the story to those who had not yet heard. Moving between the original wood-beamed ceiling, built in niches, contemporary furnishings, and xxx-rated happenings, a sense of pastness emerges out of this material choreography, each object made present in enchanted distance. Fact and fiction, old and new, crime and drama are rendered indiscernible by such sensual encounters. “The ability to oscillate between near and far,” says Laura Marks (Marks xvi) about haptic visuality, “is erotic.” In nostalgic distance contact is made through sensual touch, and bodies resonate with increased affectivities.

In the course of researching the history of the homes on tour, two intriguing details were uncovered by Donna, Coronado resident and historian: Albert M. Austin’s wife committed suicide in Carah’s home and what was rumored to be the oldest house on the block, the aerial photographs evidenced, was not. Carah, who learned these shocking details just prior to home tour, immediately wove the suicide into the home’s “history”: a suicide began the unfortunate chain of events leading to porn and prostitution. Haunted indeed. The historical detail, that the oldest house was not the oldest after all, fell flat. Despite the “factual” proclamation in the tour brochure, the original claim to fame—the oldest—cast a halo of distinctiveness, a presence. Tourgoers and the home’s owner
prefer this version. What sort of magic ensues from demystification? None. Nostalgia is antidote.

Vignette 3: Historic Hyperbole

![Image of Terry's Tudor](image)

**Figure 6.** Terry’s Tudor. Photographs by Katie Lehman, 2010.

The ideal “historic” home experience, assert many on Willetta Street, *can* be achieved through careful historical research and factful preservation efforts—*just look* at Terry’s 1930 Tudor Revival (Figure 6), says Carah.

I think that Terry, who lives across the street from me, knows more than anyone else on this street about the [1930s] time period…I mean, you’re not born knowing those things…these things take research, they take knowledge and then, to redo them properly…I mean his house is the best on the block, you walk in and it’s exactly how it would have been in the ‘30s.

The artfully crafted, 1930s-*ish* atmosphere exuded by Terry’s Tudor exemplifies the ambiguities of historical and architectural “authenticity” in residential preservation. Terry’s historic *inhabitation*—lengthy and laborious practices of identification,
protection, maintenance, repair, replacement, and retrofitting advocated by preservation guidelines—necessitate attunement to the lively materiality of remnants. Other than the 18 historic windows restored in accordance with preservation grant guidelines, almost every interior feature and furnishing underwent more creative transformations in accordance with sensual directives. The experience of one dresser aptly describes the tale of everything in Terry’s home.

This is a dresser from a burned down house that was completely ready for the garbage and I completely restored it, lowered the drawer down and made it a TV cabinet. And once I put the stain on it, it came to life. TV’s weren’t a predominate feature back then so I didn’t want a big glowing TV in your face (Interview, 4/1/10).

From artwork on the walls, “obviously contemporary pieces, modern pieces—but have the essence of the period,” the matching vintage pink glassware and light fixtures, to the 1930s DVD images circulating on a computer screen, Terry’s Tudor does, in some moments, feel exactly how it would have been in the ‘30s. Or, at the very least, it feels achingly familiar and warm, like the copy of a copy, it is: a 21st century take on a 1930s American Tudor Revival that was made in the image of a British mid-1800s Mock Tudor, itself a reimagining of a medieval Tudor.

While the reach of preservation guidelines extends only to the visible exterior architectural features of the home, many residents, like Terry, reside here precisely because historic character radiates inside and out. The blurring of public-private domains is a central feature in historic districts where the very act of inhabiting a private home is a commitment to the public good (Heuer 2007). Most notably, the historic home tour reworks inside-out notions in the public experience of touring private spaces (looking, touching, discussing). The Phoenix architectural preservation guide summarizes the
essential rule (and paradox) laid out in the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, “the guidelines suggest that new work be architecturally compatible with and reflective of, though not necessarily imitative of, the original features” (City of Phoenix 1992, 14). Worries of false historical appearance consume preservationists and historians (Beasely 1994); they want a compatible *copy*, not an imitative one.

Committed to their house, not the preservation guidebook, residents have no such fears; atmosphere, ambience, and character are often best achieved by *muddling* boundaries between “original,” “new,” and the much loved, “*old.*” Moreover, in closely apprehending the felt needs of a historic house and its materials, the house itself often reveals and dictates *its own needs.* “Auratic” objects not only return the gaze, they “speak” *affectively,* without signs, symbols, or linguistic means (Sherratt 171). “The ruin calls the tune that the visitor is to follow” (Ginsberg 2004, 166). Despite the destruction and debris wrought by drug-using squatters in the near past, Terry sensed the kind of atmosphere his home wanted; it *spoke to him,* he said. Terry puts it this way,

> This isn’t my personal style, the house dictated this, you know? I think when people see a 1930s house they’re kind of expecting for the inside to have that element, and so it’s almost like that gives it a character in and of itself. So, it’s not really about who lives there, it’s about the house.

What directives are given by remnants (Lingis 1998)? What does the remainder of an original oak wood floor or a burned, discarded old dresser decree? *Save me.* The practices arising from nostalgia and historic preservation is a symbiotic dance of *search and rescue, lost and found.* The remnant body (wood floor, old dresser) is resuscitated, *rescued* and the human body experiences “lost,” and longed for, *sensations.* They press
upon each other in a material exchange of wood grain and finger pads, and they part;

Terry, more wood-like and the old dresser, more Terry-like. *Becoming historic.*

Well, I don’t know that it’s nostalgia, it could be. But I’ve gotten several comments from many people that have been in my house since [home tour] that they feel like it’s so *comfortable.* And I think that that has to do with the period of time that it was, probably an easier, softer, gentler time then. And since I’ve generated the [1930s] furniture everyone just feels so comfortable, and that’s great.

The “*sensory* connection between perceiver and artifact”, says Seremetakis (1994, 11), has “unintended historical after-effects;” the senses are awakened and their resonance supersedes other modes of knowing. Terry’s description of the 1930s as an “easier, softer, gentler time” evidences nostalgia’s hyperbole; “the largely unexamined belief that THINGS WERE BETTER (MORE BEAUTIFUL) (HEALTHIER) (HAPPIER) (MORE CIVIALIZED) (MORE EXCITING) *THEN THAN NOW*” (Davis 1979, 18, original emphasis). Undoubtedly erroneous at a factual, historical level, assertions like these arise from logic of the *senses.* “The movements that feel the grain of wood or the nap of fur are neither desultory and spasmodic nor preprogrammed and willful; they organize as they proceed.” Immanence characterizes sensory attunement, ordinary things magnified becoming twinkling “marginalia” (Thrift 2010, 157).

**Aesthetic of Pastness**

Objectivity is commonly, but erroneously, attributed to *distance.* The view from afar is necessarily obfuscated. Rather than “seeing more clearly,” distance makes it *difficult* to see; details go undetected, features merge, shadows loom. Nostalgic distance is illusory; imagination and somatic memory are at work. In this sense, history in Coronado is shallow; *surfaces,* not lines, of history are attended to. An unbridgeable
longing, untethered to linear history, nostalgic practice is at odds with the historian’s agenda and the preservationist’s rule. Quality, craftsmanship, and structural integrity are the oft-cited merits of historic homes and their interior accessories, but they are frequently compromised in the quest for sensual pastness. As an assemblage of architectural remnants, each modified through the pragmatism and whimsy of multiple generations of inhabitants, it is impossible to limit Coronado to any singular narrative, history, or preservation code. Nostalgia, in the case of Coronado, speaks to openness, the “unfinished nature” of dwelling (Harrison 2007, 642).

Visitors and residents of historic places, the “heritage” literature concludes, are plagued by nostalgic impulses to romanticize the past and repeatedly express ambivalence toward historic accuracy in built environs (Alderson and Low 1976; Lowenthal 1989a; Tipson 2004). Yet, rarely are these findings—that nostalgia and sensual materiality matter—taken seriously. Consider, for example, Cameron and Gatewood’s (2000) findings that visitors to historic sites seek numenous experiences; spiritual encounters with something of quasi-religious or magical agency (objects, places, phenomena). Numen-seeking motives identified in their study include the impulse to experience “harmless escapism,” encounter first-hand “authenticity,” or gain personal connectivity “with events or people of the past” (2000, 123). We read these “motives” as desires of enchanted distance: nostalgia. Likewise, consider the findings that the public supports both historic preservation and fake historic architecture (contextual replicas) but does not support rigid prescription in architectural styles (Levi 2005). Again, the desire for diverse sensual environs and creative imaginings supplants historic accuracy and control. Or, as a final example of the pervasiveness of nostalgia as aesthetic sensibility,
take note of the findings from an investigation into what people *remember* from historic sites: visceral impressions of the architectural ambiance (“awe-inspiring”) and details of the structure’s craftsmanship and character ("something you don’t see these days") (Farmer and Knapp 2008, 350).

Similarly, the residential historic preservation literature now claims that historic districts are less about history in the built environs and more about “the needs of the present” (Hamer 1998). In Coronado, like the rest of the country, early residential preservation efforts in the 1980s were seen as a defensive strategy to save houses and neighborhoods from urban renewal projects, freeway construction, and new development. Residents deployed local history to protect their neighborhoods. Thus the defining theme in the history of historic districts, concludes Hamer (1998), is *survival*. In the following two decades, historic districts, (including Coronado) were considered to be a gentrification tactic, enabling people from elsewhere to simply buy ‘good’ urbanism and a superficial sense of local heritage (Hamer 2000; Boer 2004). “To many [Phoenix] residents” says Johnson (2007, 176), “historic preservation has no obvious value beyond purely aesthetic reasons.”

To the dismay of some preservationists and historians, residents of historic districts continue to wield “history” and “preservation” as *means* to an end. And what is this end? The *meaning* of historic place is the desire for sensuous experience: *aesthetic survival*. The nostalgic impulse to *rescue* “historic” objects, houses, and neighborhoods is a somatic impulse, felt receptivity to imperatives of a sensual world. Attempts to rationalize these sensate desires under banners of history and preservation are inevitably
exposed for what they are—sugarcoating, air brushing, romanticizing—an *aesthetic of pastness*.
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**Figure 7.** Twinkling marginalia. Photographs by Katie Lehman, 2010.

Cleaving toward the “lightness of being,” nostalgia enacts, what Schwenger (2006, 16-17) describes as “a precapitalist intimacy with things. Yet it is only in such a nostalgic return *[distance]* that this intimacy occurs.” Nostalgia’s proximal sensibilities are obtained as a *result* of seeking to bridge nostalgic distance. To see a likeness in glass doorknobs and the mafia, rational thought is relinquished for heightened sensitivity to a suite of “lost” somatic sensations. “Sensory changes occur microscopically through everyday accretion,” writes Seremetakis (1994, 3), only reappearing “after the fact in fairy tales, myths, and memories that hover at the margins of speech.” An enchantment with nostalgic distance heightens sensitivity to what Benjamin calls “the petrified unrest’
of things” (cited in Thrift 2008, 9). In this way, acts of rescue, repair, display, and inhabiting history extend the nostalgic encounter to the everyday, as new subjectivities, new “styles of living” (Harrison 2000, 513). In the case of Coronado, historic homes furnished with domestic objects afford opportunity for engaging in a suite of urban “micro-movements” (Sennett 1994), from tip-toeing around creaky floorboards, polishing silver, carefully cleaning uneven surfaces, to wondering how a particular architectural oddity came to be. In Coronado, somatic re-remembering and re-imagining are cultivated (Figure 7).

In supplanting historic logic and fact with what feels right—pastness over the past—Debbie, Carah, and Terry cultivate ethical dispositions toward objects, things, and place. Unreflexive and spontaneous response acquired through everyday bodily comportment and coping is the basis of embodied ethics (Dreyfus and Dreyfus 2004). Jane Bennett (2001, 3) contends that a code of obligation and adherence is “still not sufficient to the enactment of ethical aspirations, which requires bodily movements in space, mobilizations of heat and energy, a series of choreographed gestures, a distinctive assemblage of affective propulsions.” Ethical comportment, not a written code of conduct, is the basis for ethical subjectivities. Through recovery, refurbishing, and re-imaginings, an ethical disposition toward matter emerges. Love at first sight, loving restoration, and other amorous expressions push nurturing relationships between people and things (Lastovicka and Sirianni 2011). “The disease of nostalgia is rooted in facets of our humanity whose ‘cure’ would leave us deeply impoverished, even horribly mutilated.” Historic homes pass through us, as we pass through them, “for a style,”
writes Lingis (1998, 38), “is not something that we conceive but something we catch on to and that captivates us.”

Sense-making is at the heart of nostalgic practices in Coronado. It is our contention that residential historic preservation, the inhabitation of and caretaking for remnants, and nostalgic practice, the modulation of distance and subject-object relations, inculcates ethical habits of care toward bodies and forms of matter. Such an enchanted urbanism destabilizes fantasies of human mastery, affirming the “ethical insufficiency of the intellect” in creating meaningful places. The cultivation of sensory environs through nostalgic practices, as in Coronado, contributes vibrancy and diversity. Nostalgia and its effects reverberate in the delicate interstices between the mindful and the mindless.
Chapter 3

URBAN BRICOLAGE IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Making Do

Heritage is not made up of objects it has created but of creative capacities and of the inventive style that articulates, as in a spoken language, the subtle and multiple practice of a vast ensemble of things that are manipulated and personalized, reused and “poeticized.”


Historic districts are creative urban assemblages. Fragments of the built past are appropriated, arranged, bounded, and maintained in light of present-day concerns. Meaning and meaningfulness arise en route, from the addition and subtraction of bits and pieces, from techniques of rupture and suture. “History” is made—perpetually enacted—through aesthetic modes. The notion of bricolage, the artful practice of “making do” most famously developed by Claude Lévi-Strauss, speaks to an everyday aesthetic of invention. Since 1750 the verb bricoleur has characterized an aesthetic practice variously defined as, “making provisional repairs,” “making a living doing odd jobs,” “do-it-yourself,” and, as the phrase “de bric et de brac” indicates, the use of found pieces “at random or in any old way” (Kelly 2008, 26). Bricolage is a practice of assemblage, a way of thinking the relations between “wholes and parts” (McFarlane and Anderson 2011, 162). In this way, the bricoleur borrows “from other spheres and practices in order to generate if not something new then at least something else” (Applin 2008, 72, original emphasis). Widely applied in the fields of art and anthropology to understand a range of aesthetic practices, I argue that bricolage has important implications for rethinking residential historic preservation.
Residential historic districts garner special distinction as paradoxical places. First and foremost, as David Hamer argues, there is not much history to be found in the nation’s 8,500-plus residential historic districts (Byrne 2013). “Historic districts are very carefully *crafted* and *maintained creations*. They are not as ‘history’ would have left them” (Hamer 1998, x, emphasis added). To the chagrin of many historians and preservationists, historicity and architectural integrity in historic districts are perpetually supplanted by contemporary, quality-of-life concerns and “superficial” aesthetics. Worse, many have found that seemingly benign historic aesthetics—*taste, style,* and *character*—are constantly at work performing the very elitist and exclusionary practices the institution of historic preservation has been attempting to rectify (Duncan and Duncan 2001, 2004; Boulton 2011).

In Phoenix, Arizona, the Coronado historic neighborhood is a poignant example of *resistance* to the conserving impulse that so frequently embodies historic preservation practices. Unlike most historic aesthetics, which succumb to homogeneity, Coronado’s “eclectic” aesthetic engenders inclusivity. “Diverse” and “artsy” are Coronado’s signature features that have long been espoused by those who live in and out of the neighborhood. The May 2011 issue of *Phoenix Magazine*, for example, named the Coronado neighborhood as one of the top ten best places to live in the Phoenix Metro, fondly referring to it’s eclectic mix as “Funkytown.” When queried, residents attribute Coronado’s present day variation in built and social environs—its *urbanity*—to its period of historical significance. Yet, Coronado’s ‘history’ is characterized as an ordinary 1920’s-30’s working-class *suburban* neighborhood replete with the homogenizing practices of that time. Tethering present-day character, style, and ambiance of historic
environs directly to a narrow temporal window, a “period of significance,” is beyond “bad history;” aesthetic modalities are at work.

To bridge this gap between aesthetic composition and period of significance, I rethink residential historic preservation as urban *bricolage*, the inventive practice of making do with the material remains at hand. The urban *bricoleur* embraces subjective, creative *curatorial* approaches in preservation, animating what “scientific” aesthetic practices so frequently “kill.” Such practices rely on the logic of the senses, aesthetics as sensing-feeling, an intuitive “pre-logical” approach that assembles disparate fragments in the invention of something new, something else. Residential historic preservation, from this vantage, sheds the façade of representing architectural and historical “origin” truths. The weight of linear timelines and architectural taxonomies is lifted to reveal new sensual combinations of texture, tone, speed, and weight. As a *pragmatic* impulse, objects and remainders of the past *and* present hold equal value in their ability to address the task at-hand. Cleaving toward a generative practice that unfolds in accordance with the changing arrangement of parts, *bricolage* revels in the artfulness of everyday life, its contingency and dynamism.

First, I animate the notion of *bricolage* by drawing on theories of social aesthetics (Paterson 2007; Highmore 2010), new materialisms (Coole and Frost 2010), and everyday life (de Certeau 1984). In this collection of approaches, all forms of materiality *matter* (Thrift 2008; Bennett 2001, 2010); human and nonhuman, visible and invisible—bodies of all kind have the capacity to affect and be affected (Massumi 2002). In light of this framing of *bricolage*, and guided by Lévi-Strauss, I consider the aesthetic practices of historic preservation. I then present the case of historic Coronado with its ordinary
period of significance and extraordinary present-day aesthetic. To do so, I draw on qualitative, ethnographic research conducted from 2007 to 2012, including immersive participant observation, interviews, historical research, and collaborative visual methods including rephotography (Fox 2001; Klett 2004). The visual contributions of Jason Roehner, Bryon Darby, Mark Klett, and Phoenix Transect, the long-term visual research project at Arizona State University, were particularly influential (http://www.phoenixtransect.org/). Finally, I turn to the institutional urban revitalization efforts of Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) in Coronado in the late 1970s and 1980s to bridge the gap between Coronado’s period of significance and present-day eclecticism. Three NHS aesthetic practices of urban bricolage, I contend, are influential in generating Coronado’s distinctive historic character: expansive boundaries, spatial juxtaposition and asynchronicity, and home making as an “art of the everyday.”

Bricolage, Assemblage, and Everyday Life

In *The Savage Mind* (1966) Lévi-Strauss argues that the divergent modes of worldly apprehension employed by “primitive” and “modern” peoples are parallel, non-hierarchical routes in the production of knowledge. The “savage mind,” he asserts, employs sensible techniques of *bricolage* in everyday life. To the outsider practices such as myth and ritual appear to be “makeshift” ways of *making sense* of the world. In contrast, “the engineer” (e.g. the scientist, the historian) exemplifies the intellectual, linear logics and formal practice of “modern man.” While the *bricoleur* is concerned with “the concrete,” sensual, somatic knowledge afforded by the “physical” world at-hand, the engineer reveals its higher order “abstract” properties purportedly through discovery of “the new.” For Lévi-Strauss, savage and scientific minds are bound up two
modes of knowledge making, sensibility and intelligibility, each necessary for and contingent upon the other. In many instances, and despite different methods, scientific inquiry confirms conclusions of the “prelogical” savage mind. The discernment between poisonous and medicinal plants, he demonstrates, might be made by way of magic or microscope.

Lévi-Strauss expounds upon the ways magic and science employ techniques of assemblage in transformative ways. Both practices, he argues, aim to discover causal relations among various worldly “arrangements” (1966, 12). A ritualistic utterance or particular grouping of ordinary objects do not represent a transformation—they enact it. Likewise, the systematic naming and ordering of biological taxonomy has the power to quite literally create new species, new forms of life. Associations, groupings, and orderings, critical in the arts and sciences, arise from both intuitive and systematic means. Tobacco smoke and cruciferous plants, demonstrates Lévi-Strauss, each have a “logic of sensations” whose particular chemical compositions are knowable through sensual and intellectual modalities (1966, 12). Importantly, Lévi-Strauss emphasizes that both modes of knowledge acquisition revolve around aesthetic sensibilities. Aesthetics, in this sense, accords with the term’s Greek etymology, the sensible perception of things, rather than its German concern with beauty (Seremetakis 1994; Paterson 2007). In this framing, aesthetics is concerned with the ways feeling, sensing, and perceiving are enmeshed with things (Highmore 2010). Collectively, this everyday embodied knowledge generates habits, styles of life (Harrison 2000).

But the two organizational forms also, seemingly, diverge. While the engineer strips and limits pieces and components of their agency through advance identification
and formal classification, the sensual practices of the *bricoleur* both arise from, and are constrained by, the materiality of everyday life. Unlike the engineer who attends to a greater “universe” of matter, the *bricoleur* “addresses himself to a collection of oddments left over from human endeavors” (Lévi-Strauss 1966, 19). Remnants, remains, and remainders “guide and direct the movements” of the *bricoleur* (Lingis 1998). For the *bricoleur*, says Lévi-Strauss, “‘speaks’ not only *with* things…but also through the medium of things” and as such, the resulting assemblage will “inevitably be at a remove from the initial aim, a phenomenon which the surrealists have felicitously called ‘objective hazard’” (Lévi-Strauss 1966, 21). In this way, *bricolage* is a *process* of worldly engagement (Dezeuze 2008), more than final product. Driven by the impulse to assemble manifold pieces for later use, processes of saving, collecting, gathering, and hoarding ensue. Thinking *bricolage* as assemblage, as has been long done in the arts (Seitz 1968), reveals it as processual, contingent, dynamic and necessarily more than human (Anderson and McFarlane 2011). Such practices unfold as part of the relational dynamism afforded by the materiality with which assemblages “hang together” (Woodward, Jones and Marston 2010, 274). Remnants, fragments of spatio-temporal “wholes,” proffer potent sensual directives through both the presence of a past (memory) and its absence (oblivion) (Augé 2004). Remnants are *generative*, acquiring, muddling and re-cycling meanings with each (re)use.

For Michel de Certeau (1984, xviii), *bricolage* characterizes the “artisan-like inventiveness” and wayward movements embodied in everyday practices; “wandering lines” and “errant trajectories” (tactics) resist institutional assimilation and homogenization (strategies). Characterized by “extraneous movements,” such as “a ball
rebounding, a dog straying or a horse swerving from its direct course to avoid an obstacle” (Lévi-Strauss, 1966, 16), *bricolage* is reactionary, intuitive, and improvisational. “Sly as a fox and twice as quick,” says de Certeau (1984, 29), “there are countless ways of ‘making do’”. Yet, this devious depiction reveals a tension in bricolage arising from its utilitarian functioning. As a “tactic of the weak” (de Certeau 1984), *bricolage* is an operation of the amateur or underdog, whose makeshift maneuvers defy or simply work around the cumbersome weight and authority of institutional hierarchies. At times wily and others circuitous, *bricolage* adopts the necessary maneuvers given the task and materials at hand. *Bricolage* is a practice everyday life, occurring within institutional and structural constraints. Yet, as demonstrated within the arts, the critical and creative capacity of bricolage lies in its ability to unsettle institutions from within (Applin 2008; Dezeuze 2008; Kelly 2008). Through the use of non-art materials, such as perishable, discarded, or mass-produced objects from everyday life, the very idea of art is challenged by *bricolage* (Seitz 1968). “This space between pleasure and necessity,” says Dezeuze, “is perhaps where the true potential of *bricolage* lies. It runs through the economies of desire and obsolescence…” (Dezeuze 2008, 37).

**Historic Preservation as Remnant Complex**

Historic preservation has always simultaneously embodied aesthetic practices of both Lévi-Strauss’ *bricoleur* and engineer. Much like art, contradiction and tension ensue from twinning the logics of myth and science. The impulse to rescue, ritualize, and reuse fragments of the past speaks to an aesthetic ordering of *bricolage*. The spellbinding allure of remnants, in their partiality and emphemerality, is first apprehended by sensory knowledges (Ginsberg 2004). Born from a changing array of inexplicable humanistic
desires (Murtagh 2006), preservationists have long poeticized the subjectivity of the practice (National Trust for Historic Preservation 1999). For example, in the influential edited collection of preservation essays titled *The American Mosaic* (Stipe and Lee 1987), W. Brown Morton III speaks to the artistry and relativity of preservation;

> The tesserae of the American preservation mosaic resembles the pieces in a kaleidoscope. Some familiar fragments remain visible although they may change in relationship to one another, while new fragments from an ever-expanding national vision continually replace others that no longer transmit the light (Morton 1987, 146).

When preservation *is* viewed in this light, as an undulating collection of relational mosaic tiles, the practice takes on a mystical hue. Through acquiring and sequencing historical information in a specific order, a fragment of the built environs *becomes* historic. From this vantage point, historic designation appears an act of transmogrification; or, at the very least, an inventive practice. A preservationist’s statement of significance is in many ways a *creative* practice, an aesthetic ordering akin to the artist-as-bricoleur depicted by Lévi-Strauss.

> The painter is always mid-way between design and anecdote, and his genius consists in uniting internal and external knowledge, a ‘being’ and a ‘becoming’, in producing with his brush an object which does not exist as such and which he is nevertheless able to create on his canvas (Lévi-Strauss 1966, 25).

The idea of historic designation, imbuing an ordinary object with significance by its listing on historic registers, makes it something *else*, something more than the parts from which it is comprised (Kelly 2008). For the bricoleur, says Lévi-Strauss, an existing object re-purposed in this way, is always multiple, “it is always earlier ends which are called upon to play the part of means: the signified changes into the signifying and vice versa” (1966, 21). Dilapidated building or historic structure? It all *depends* on
which relations are aligned, what things cohere, and for what duration. Historic preservation alters the meanings of buildings, houses, and environs through the creation \textit{and} destruction of material relations. Historic objects are not simply “found,” rather, they are \textit{curated} through the collecting, editing, and ordering of material remains: building permits, death certificates, directories and newspaper articles, and architectural typologies (Tomlin 1998).

In the quest for institutional legitimacy and authority, preservation has increasingly “scientized” (Mason 2003) the unwieldy and alternating material relations between bodies and buildings, time and space. The “aesthetic conventions” of the preservationist, argues Christine Boyer (1994, 32), such as new vocabulary and protocol, transform the spatial ordering the city. As the primary mechanism through which historic preservation asserts theoretical and legal legitimacy, the statement of significance “gathers together all the reasons why a building or place should be preserved, why it is meaningful or useful, and what aspects require most urgent protection” (Mason 2003, 64). Formalized in the 1966 Historic Preservation Act, the statement of significance has become increasingly standardized and routinized, containing only those physical fragments of the past that fit linear categorization (i.e. documentation) and prevailing meanings (i.e. mainstream history). Cleaving toward practices of the engineer has undoubtedly contributed to the success of historic preservation in the U.S, but this approach has not been without consequence. As Tomlin (1998) asserts,

\begin{quote}
Unlike scientific phenomena, however, history is not simply a sequence of events. Neither is it composed simply of periods, artifacts, or styles...historical thought is not in the facts or evidence, however, but in the relationships between them, as a construction of the mind...historical significance is very subjective (Tomlin 1998, 204).
\end{quote}
A key criticism of the institution of preservation, and the idea of significance, is the failure to account for the *contingency* of the entire enterprise (Mason 2003); meaning and meaningfulness in historic urban environs is *created, varied, and dynamic*.

Preservationists repeatedly claim that the practice imbues environs with temporal *continuity* necessary for a coherent sense of place. But for others, historic preservation ultimately creates *discontinuity*, spatially and temporally, by way of artificial and rigid demarcation from the goings-on of life. The complex connectivity between *memory* and the *urban fabric*, is more often than not, simplified, fixed, or severed (Mason 2003). After decades of preservation-induced aesthetic control, many historic neighborhoods appear preposterously out-of-sync. Witness the contrivance of Main Streets and house museums, and many historic neighborhoods, caricatured and “taxidermied” (Jacobs 1992, 373) by excessive efforts to “freeze” time and meaning in place. Through suffocatingly narrow and fixed spatio-temporal boundaries, preservationists have, in many ways, “killed” that which they sought to rescue (Tipson 2004). In adopting the rigid practices of the engineer, historic preservation has become characterized by *morbidity*, the absence of movement, paralysis and rigor mortis.

Additionally, the use of scientific techniques in determining significance, such as quantification and linear taxonomies, has also inadvertently threatened the health of urban environs through the sterilization of material diversity. This is of particular concern for historic districts where structures and qualities of urban environs that cannot fit into the metrics of significance are subsequently deemed “non-contributing” and deprived life-saving services. The list includes that which is too old (pre-history), not old
enough (younger than 50 years), not healthy/wealthy enough (poor architectural integrity often due to lack of financial resources), or is otherwise “abnormal” (outliers, unclassifiable). The homogenizing practices of significance engender an antiseptic historic aesthetic that privileges landscapes of wealth and fame over ordinary and marginalized places and stylistic uniformity wedded to a single temporal moment over dynamism and diversity (Green 1998). The consequences, Tipson (2004, 316) argues, are not insignificant; they include the “gross misconceptualization of history, gentrification, and the association of preservation with aesthetic elitism.”

The failings of historic preservation are repeatedly expressed in mixed urban metaphors derived from the arts and sciences. Metaphors of textiles, namely the strength and complexity of the urban fabric, and those of biology, such as the health of the urban body are comingled, revealing the ways the built environment is already hybrid, always assembled (Whatmore 2002). Tension and contradictions in historic preservation arise from failing to take seriously the interconnectedness of urban environs, how they are stitched and grafted from disparate materiality, most of which cannot be fit into the conditions of historic significance. The linear logic of historic preservation, the belief that freezing urban fragments will single-handedly make them meaningful and productive once again, is characterized by Roberta Brandes Gratz (1994) as a “remnant complex.” “Meager pieces of urban fabric,” she argues, “are being rescued, restored and celebrated as if the city itself had been rewoven back to full strength” (Gratz 1994, 258; cited in Hamer 1998, 17). Efforts to merely retie ‘‘knots’ in the unraveling city fabric” will not suffice (Boyer 1994, 18).
In *The Living City* (1994), Gratz argues that historic preservation as a means of urban revitalization can only succeed in creating living places when it is employed as part of a broader technique of “urban husbandry.” For Gratz, such an approach is characterized by an ethic of care responsive to community’s social and economic needs, demonstrated by prioritizing the knowledge of residents over professionals, incremental change over master plans, and large enough boundaries to sustain urban life. Echoing Jane Jacobs call in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961/1992), Gratz argues that “the condition of a city’s fabric—its street life, human scale, architectural variety, cultural and commercial diversity and patchwork blend of old and new—is the key to its ability to weather economic shifts and social change” (1994, 159). The most successful examples of district or regional historic preservation that strike a balance between old and new structures and inhabitants are those that employ a “multifaceted renewal agenda” (Ryberg 2012, 207). In lending pliability, agility, and diversity to the urban fabric, these communities temper residential historic preservation’s conserving and exclusionary effects with other urban revitalization practices such as providing low-interest home loans to low-income households and using Community Development Corporations (CDCs) to ensure organizational viability (Ryberg 2011).

**Coronado’s “Significance”**

Formal demarcation of an original history in time and space privileges the “first” stage over the *entire* history of a historic district (Hamer 1998, 22). Subsequent institutional practices of maintaining the aesthetics of this bounded period only widen the spatio-temporal rupture. Despite the fact that historic designation is often the most monumental force of change in the neighborhood’s history, residents of historic
communities repeatedly present causal links between what they see *now* and what was significant *then*. Historical accuracy and the “legibility of historical forces working on the urban landscape” says Tipson (2004, 298), are inevitably supplanted by a “period” aesthetic. Though the period of significance might not contain the actual, initial history of the site (pre-history, agricultural uses, etc.), the first stage always comes to reign over the subsequent stages in the history of a historic district (Hamer 1998). The four chronological stages in the Coronado historic district include: the period of significance (1907-1942), the period between the original history and when the original history was noted (1943-1982), the history of historic preservation itself (1983-1986), and the history as a historic district (1987-2013).

Figure 8. On 16th Street looking north from Granada Road 1934 and 2011. Built in 1929, Whittier Elementary School (structure on the left) was the second elementary school in the neighborhood (the first, Emerson, was built in 1921) in response to rapid population growth. Both schools remain in use today. Photography by Jason Roehner, 2011. (1934 Image Courtesy of the Arizona State Library, Image # 98-3282).

Such is the case in Coronado. Designated historic in 1986, with a period of significance dating between 1907-1942, Coronado’s distinctiveness lies in its ordinariness; it is significant *because* of its representativeness as a working-class streetcar suburb, not the legacies of the rich, famous, or social elite. Built two and a half miles from downtown Phoenix, Coronado embodies an ordinary, white middle-class domestic
story of the city, including discrimination in home ownership based on race and health through the use of restrictive covenants (Bolin, Grineski, and Collins 2005; Grineski, Bolin, and Agadjanian 2006; Lukinbeal, Arreola, and Drew 2010). Between 1900 and 1929 construction in Phoenix was booming; cotton fields and dairy farms were sprouting single-family dwellings and elementary schools at a quick clip (Figure 8). In what would become the Coronado neighborhood, the Brill Street trolley was guiding development from downtown, northward along 10th Street, to its terminus at Sheridan Street. One-story brick and wooden frame Bungalows and several commercial establishments followed the Brill Street Line. Houses were usually built one-at-a-time, with empty lots and the occasional farmhouse remaining in-between, imparting a pell-mell appearance to the emerging domestic landscape.

Owing to the distance from Central Avenue, the City’s major commercial corridor, the homes constructed in Coronado were modest in size, built to house a working-class population. The 1930s brought more revival styles, such as English cottages and Spanish revivals, but construction slowed owing to the Great Depression. During this period the rental population in Coronado grew with many families retrofitting their barns and storage sheds into livable units so they might generate rental income. Coronado Park and other federal Work Projects Administration (WPA) projects such as sidewalks and roads were also underway (Figures 9 and 10). In 1939, Andy Womack constructed the City’s first master planned subdivision in Coronado, Womack Heights, which contained 24 homes built all-at-once (Figure 11). After the suspension of construction during World War II, the community experienced continued growth with early Ranch and International styles making their debut. In 1941, Country Club Park, a Federal Housing Administration (FHA) fueled subdivision on the northern edge of the neighborhood, introduced curvilinear streets. In 1948, the Brill Street Trolley was
replaced with bus service and the streetcar suburb began its transition to an urban neighborhood.

![Building Project Gains Momentum At Womack Heights](image)

Figure 11. Built in 1939 by Andy Womack, the twenty-four homes of Womack Heights set the record for the first subdivision built all at once (Courtesy of the Arizona Republic, Section 2, Page 6, 10/22/1939).

Decentralization of the population in the 1950s and 1960s was particularly frenetic in Phoenix. The legacy of redlining, urban disinvestment, population growth, white flight, and the federal subsidization of newly constructed homes on the periphery created a new geography. Master-planned developments, such as John F. Long’s community of Maryvale, were luring white residents with the usual suite of dreamy amenities. Del Webb enchanted retirees with the opening of Sun City in 1960. Compounding the demographic shifts, commercial expansion and a freeway proposal through the core of Phoenix were encroaching upon already fragile urban communities. Located at what used to be the northernmost edge of Phoenix, Coronado’s sub-to-urban transition occurred in fewer than 30 years.
The initial sense upon entering the historic Coronado neighborhood in central Phoenix Arizona, is that time here is out-of-joint. Expectations of harmonious uniformity, or time-stilled, so frequently manifest in historic districts, are not to be found here. A stroll might reveal a tidy, restored 1930s-era brick Bungalow, a ramshackled apartment complex, circa 1950, a seemingly abandoned 1920s Spanish Colonial revival, and an ultra-modern, small in-fill house with lap-pool. Juxtaposition in architectural style, year of construction, and upkeep imbues Coronado with makeshift craftiness (Figure 12). The jumble of new and old, “original” and faux, engenders an amorphous sense of pastness. The creative flare adorning homes, such as abstract sculptures and
statues of Our Lady of Guadalupe, lend buoyancy to the weight of blighted houses peppering many blocks. Densely planted, overgrown palm trees, stray dogs, and the occasional peacock sighting imbue even the more manicured blocks with wildness.

Figure 13. Decade of house construction in the Greater Coronado neighborhood. The area is bounded by Thomas Road (north), the 51 Freeway (east), and the 10 Freeway (south), and 7th Street (west). Map by Brian Pompeii, 2011.
Figure 14. Phoenix’s 35 residential historic districts. The Greater Coronado neighborhood is bounded by Thomas Road (north), the 51 Freeway (east), and the 10 Freeway (south), and 7th Street (west). The Greater Coronado encompasses three historic districts (Coronado #6, Country Club Park #7, and Brentwood #3) and the non-historic sections in-between. (City of Phoenix map)
Encompassing an area greater than one square mile that includes three residential historic districts (Coronado, 1907-1942; Country Club Park, 1939-1946; Brentwood, 1926-1956) and the non-historic sections in-between, the Coronado neighborhood is chockablock with material remains. The historic districts alone encompass a residential landscape spanning five decades, the first half of the twentieth-century. If the “non-contributing” homes and non-historic sections of Coronado are considered, the last one hundred years of jumbled domestic materiality co-exist (Figure 13).iv When extended to include the Greater Coronado, the official boundaries, the neighborhood’s land area expands eastward, across 16th Street, to encompass another half-square mile swath of seemingly another neighborhood (Figure 14). Predominantly lower-income and Latino, Coronado east lacks the architectural integrity and socio-economic diversity of the core.v Bounded by arterial roads to the west and north, and by freeways east and south, the Coronado neighborhood association’s (CNA) unwieldy boundaries are as inexplicable as the makeshift composition of any given block.

The array of businesses and services dotting the perimeter, and several in the core (Figures 15-17), contribute to Coronado’s aesthetic medley: New India Bazaar, Wy Knot Café, Gourmet House of Hong Kong (where CNA meetings are now held), Band-Aids (a strip club), a religious supplies store, a soda fountain, yoga studios, hair salons, dozens of local eateries (from the contemporary chic Barrio Café to the affordably popular—carnicerias, taquerias, dulcerieas, Jack-in-the-Box), and more. Residents boast of Coronado’s (almost) “cradle-to-grave” lifecycle amenities beginning with Banner Good Samaritan Hospital, Phoenix Children’s Hospital, Jewish Family and Children Services, Youth Empowerment Project (a LGBTQ youth center), the Foundation for Senior Living,
and Mercer Mortuary. And virtually all other neighborhood institutions are represented, including a number of schools (elementary, high school, Montessori), churches (at least 4), Sikh temples (2), and parks (3).

Thanks to the financial limitations of the neighborhood’s forbearers, who constructed small homes, many with rental units, Coronado houses a variety of household types and affordable live-work scenarios. For these reasons, the claim that Coronado houses more artists, designers, and architects than any other neighborhood in Phoenix, might not be hyperbole. Just as every block is peppered with, what seems to be, one of everything—a blighted, rumored-to-be drug house, a tidy, clichéd porch with matching Adirondack chairs—an artist’s abode or architecture studio is also likely to be found. And just as it is difficult to drive down a single street without spying evidence of some minor creative endeavor, such as a mural, sculpture, or inventive lawn ornamentation, abandonment is also requisite: dirt yards, broken cars, boarded up houses, stray cats and dogs. For Coronado’s historic aesthetic to cohere around difference, no single practice can dominate. Coronado style depends upon those who do not participate in it.

Figure 15. Traffic circle at 12th and Oak Streets. Photograph by Jason Roehner, 2011. (1984 images by Linda Laird, Courtesy of the State Historic Preservation Office).
A single commercial intersection within the neighborhood, at 12th and Oak Streets, reveals thirty years of Coronado eclecticism, despite historic designation. In 1984, when Coronado residents, NHS, and the preservation firm Linda Laird and Associates embarked on the historic survey, unremarkable structures at the intersection of 12th and Oak Streets housed (Figure 15, from left to right) a mysteriously unidentified business, Hire’s Market (food, beer & wine), the Professional Musician’s Union, and the Arizona Showmen’s Association, a social organization for carnival workers. Today, the traffic circle is home to Southwest Solar Solutions, Sunshine Market (groceries, beer & wine, Lotto, liquor), the Professional Musician’s Union, and the Tuck Shop, a boutique neighborhood restaurant.
Constructed in 2004 from a City of Phoenix Fight Back West grant, the roundabout itself is a source of neighborhood pride. In addition to deterring speeding cars on neighborhood streets, 12th St. businesses embody Coronado’s creative, something-for-everyone sensibilities. Present-day gentrification concerns directed toward the Tuck Shop (Figure 16) are tempered by the affordability and consistency of Sunshine Market, supplying neighborhood events with coffee, cigarettes, and wine since 1990. In fact, Salem hosted the official 2011 home tour wine tasting event at Sunshine Market (Figure 17) and commissioned a Coronado artist (and member of Calle 16, a mural non-profit organization) to install the new historic neighborhood signage (on a non-contributing property) for the festivities.
Coronado’s statement of significance and its Bungalow logo are comparable to those of many residential historic neighborhoods, but Coronado’s present-day historic character, style, and aesthetic practice are anything but ordinary. Unlike many historic “Bungalow” communities, whose aesthetic is deployed toward exclusionary aims (Duncan and Duncan 2001, 2004; Boulton 2011), Coronado’s historic aesthetic is characterized by diversity in built and social environs. This sentiment regarding Coronado’s contemporary significance is oft repeated.

The Coronado neighborhood exemplifies this diversity in every sense of the word. Not only is it home to Phoenicians from all backgrounds and walks of life, but it is home to hundreds of small businesses and a diverse collection of residential styles” (Mayor Greg Stanton, Coronado Home Tour Brochure, 3/3/2013).

I think it’s the irregularity, the non-uniformity of the neighborhood that kind of speaks its own history…It’s the lack of sterility that engenders connections to people who are different from you. People who are afraid of those kinds of connections tend to go to more sterile areas…[such as] the new developments that claim to emulate older structures. People [there] still have the mentality of no cultural contamination, no hanging with people who are different…[Danny, interview, 12/9/08].

Coronado’s history is loosely deployed in articulating the neighborhood’s distinctive present-day “eclectic” atmosphere. Active Coronado residents attribute the social diversity and creative sensibilities of the neighborhood to the array of historic architectural styles, the visible heterogeneity in the built environs. And they go further. Coronado, they argue, is an urban neighborhood with a legacy of modestly sized, architecturally diverse homes that enable the pursuit of creative and sustainable living. The features of their historic homes, such as unique architecture and the absence of garages, afford present-day Coronado with creativity, sociality, diversity, and reduced-consumption. Small closets, for example, are now cited as opportunities to “downsize,”
reduce meaningless over-consumption, and pursue more ecological lifestyles. In attempting to make sense of past and present, Coronado’s early suburban limitations are endlessly couched as opportunities; a historic halo effect is palpable.

We live in a neighborhood of beautiful tree-lined streets, dotted with the loveliest bungalows, one with an unparalleled history, true diversity in every sense of the word and STYLE. Yes, we have STYLE. If you walk down the street, you see one home after another, each one distinctive in style. There will be a territorial-style one next to a Tudor one next to a pueblo-style one, and so on. All of these houses were built around 1925, when Phoenix was expanding. Mine is an Arts and Crafts bungalow and I'm slowly renovating it, trying to rescue its original charm. The truth is, I love small houses and I suspect I always will. There's this thing in this country, people are convinced that bigger is better. There's so much anxiety about not having enough closet space or not enough bedrooms. But what's that all about, really? I believe in living economically and ecologically (Michelle, 2009 E-Hood Coronado website post).

I am definitely committed to living downtown and living in a neighborhood. I DO NOT want to live out in a suburb, I’ve never wanted to live out in a suburb and I’ve NEVER wanted to live in a gated community, if I want to live in a gated community I’ll go to prison! (Dianne, interview, 4/26/10).

We are unique in our location within the larger Phoenix metropolitan area. The Greater Coronado Neighborhood does not have natural barriers that define it, nor is it a gated/guarded, planned community but rather an open community. It is fortunate to have strong, significant man-made vehicular arteries like McDowell Road running east and west and 16th Street along with 12th street running north and south through it. The life bloodlines of the residential areas beyond these arteries we call home. It is also very fortunate to have on its outermost boundaries Interstate 10 to the south, and State Route 51 to the East (Wayne, 2009 E-Hood Coronado website post).

The ubiquitous recitation of sentiments such as those expressed by Michelle, Dianne, and Wayne lend their assertions credibility. It’s told as if the original developers, architects, and residents intended for Coronado to be a model of diverse, creative, and sustainable urbanism of the early 21st century. And despite the fact that each of these four residents have resided in Coronado for between 15 to 30 years and been active in Coronado’s historic preservation and community development, they fail to
adequately or accurately address Coronado’s (sub)urban history. In addition to conflating tree-lined streets (which they aren’t) and the presence of revival architecture with “unparalleled history,” for example, Michelle attributes Coronado’s stylistically diverse architecture to a single decade (the 1920s), when in fact this variation occurred because the original houses were constructed, largely ad-hoc, over the course of 40 years. Dianne lobs exaggerated disdain at the exclusionary features of modern suburbia without acknowledging Coronado’s own history with such practices. And finally, Wayne does injustice to both Coronado’s suburban and urban history by contending that Coronado is not master-planned in any way (the Womack tract is) and ascribing Coronado’s arterial roads and freeways with life-giving properties, when they nearly killed the residential character of the neighborhood in the 1970s and 1980s.

(Sub)urban contradictions pervade preservation discourse in Coronado because it is impossible to logically anchor the present-day urban environs to a narrow spatio-temporal window. The ambivalent role of linear ‘history’ in one of the City’s first historic districts underscores the fact that the pursuit of historic designation was never really about history. Aesthetic practices in historic districts reveal the complex matterings fueling historic preservation. Efforts to link Coronado’s present-day qualities as anti-suburban are undeniably flawed; yet, the intuitive sense that Coronado has a unique legacy of diversity and creativity is in many ways, correct. The events giving rise to Coronado’s dynamism and contemporary look are not included in the “statement of significance” but in the practices cultivated in the 1970s and 80s that continue to unsettle the conserving tendencies of historic preservation to this day. Contrary to first impression, time, in Coronado, is not unhinged. Time was never ordered in Coronado
like planks of painted wood in a white picket fence. Rather, the sense of temporality in Coronado alternates, this way and that, changing with the light, with the particular arrangement of parts that come into view. The historic aesthetic sensibility in Coronado is elusive, it seeps around the official period of significance incorporating styles from many times and places. Like much of the neighborhood, Coronado’s stylistic sensibilities were crafted bit-by-bit, block-by-block.

**One Great Block After Another!**

The impetus for Coronado’s present-day material composition and social comportment can be traced to the nationwide democratizing impulse of the 1960s civil-rights era. Cities faced with the abandoned fragments of older neighborhoods sought to rectify the effects of White flight, redlining, and disinvestment in the urban core (Bright 2000). In addition to neighborhood associations, churches, and other social services, two newly created urban revitalization models are attributed with transforming inner-city neighborhoods (von Hoffman 2003): (1) Community Development Corporations (CDCs), non-profit organizations created specifically to rebuild neighborhoods with funding from philanthropic sources, and (2) Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS), a new type of non-profit organization, termed a “financial intermediary,” that would provide low-interest home repair loans and other homeowner services to “high risk” inner-city residents with federal funding from the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NeighborWorks America 2012). Despite federal support for staff salaries and some financial lending, the NHS model, adopted from Pittsburgh, relied on multi-stakeholder, public-private partnerships to craft a network of financial and social services that would enable the neighborhood to ultimately function without an NHS presence. Both NHS and
CDCs shifted the burden of responsibility in impoverished communities from the individual to the broader “community” (MacSween 1995), including federal and local government, private financial institutions, charitable foundations, business, and the strong involvement and commitment of neighborhood residents.

In 1975, Phoenix Councilman Calvin Goode brought the NHS model back from a national conference and by the end of 1975, NHS Phoenix was incorporated with Coronado selected for its pilot program. Despite rapid degradation of its housing stock, blight, and a growing rental population Coronado’s distinctive architecture and an overall high degree of architectural integrity made it an ideal candidate for urban revitalization. The involvement and political clout of former Phoenix Mayor John Driggs (1970-1974) also proved invaluable. Driggs, who grew up in Coronado (2217 North 8th Street) and graduated from North High in 1945, was part of the preliminary NHS committee and served as the organizing NHS president. The first NHS target area encompassed the historic core of the neighborhood, where the oldest homes reside and the possibility of successful rehab was greatest (from 7th Street to 16th Street and McDowell Road to Virginia Avenue) (Figure 18). This initial service-provision boundary excluded the section south of McDowell Road, where the Good Samaritan Banner Hospital expansion was underway, the section east of 16th Street, where architectural integrity was poor, and the slightly newer area north where the homes were in less need of rehabilitation.
Figure 18. Original NHS boundaries. From Coronado’s SCD, 1986.
Central to NHS philosophy and practice is the improvement of housing and community through coordinating the resources of multiple institutions and nested spatial scales. This form of “resource gathering” has been framed in the institutional organization literature as *bricolage* (Ciborra 2002; Duymedjian and Rüling 2004; Le Loarne 2010). Despite perceptions of a lonely tinker, the *bricoleur’s* assemblage practices, of *indiscriminate gathering*, position her within a complex network of people and objects. A “rubbish pile” approach proffers opportunities for the useless discards of one thing, to be recombined and repurposed toward useful aims. The first two years of NHS centered on resource assessment within the neighborhood and the pursuit of financial support from multiple sources. For example, in 1976, NHS was able to purchase an office (a Bungalow located at 1002 East Palm Lane) and hire an executive director and staff with a Community Development Block Grant and create a rehab loan fund with funding from the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation ($100,000) and the City of Phoenix ($300,000) (NHS n.d.). As a signature feature of NHS America, low-interest loans made homeownership and improvement in Coronado possible for families with limited access to credit, including low-income, ethnic minority, and single-parent households (Collins 2005).
After the lending services were in place, NHS focused on training residents in do-it-yourself home inspection, repair, and maintenance the second two years (1977-1978) (Figure 19).

- A contractor list for residents was compiled and distributed.
- Resident workshops addressing home security and energy efficiency were conducted.
- The purchase and rehab of vacant properties made possible by Community Development Block Grant funds from the City.
- A City-sponsored home safety inspection program was implemented for 144 residents.
- A building inventory, identifying owner occupied and rental properties began.
- A paint-discount program was launched.
- Zoning awareness and education occurred from encroaching development.
- A neighborhood tour was conducted by the influential business group, Phoenix 40.
- An art show, Christmas party, “nonsense day,” and other festivals were held in Coronado park.

In addition to solidifying the relationship between residents and NHS, these early projects established home and neighborhood improvement practices as integral to the emerging sense of Coronado cohesion. This ethics of care for house and neighborhood—of making
old homes, and in turn, the neighborhood livable—was instilled by NHS a decade before historic status was established in 1986. To reverse decline in housing and social cohesion, NHS harnessed the pragmatic know-how of any and every stakeholder to aid the neighborhood with what NHS termed “self-reliance.” Though the term often connotes individualism, self-reliance for NHS meant community resiliency, the acquisition of a diverse set of resources (loans, materials, services), skills (grant writing), and relationships (lenders, city departments) to weather an array of urban challenges.

Whether by partnering with local financial lenders or by implementing a paint discount program, the tactics deployed by NHS were the same ones they hoped to inculcate in the neighborhood: making do. The scrappy ethics of self-sufficiency employed and fostered by NHS draws on the active form of agency and learning tethered to bricolage (Applin 2008). Embodied in the NHS slogan, “One great block after another!” is the incremental, pragmatic practice of neighborhood revitalization; making projects of varied scope (from one house to many) and duration (a few hours to eight years) en route (Figure 20). I point to three NHS practices of aesthetic composition as forms of urban bricolage critical in the making of Coronado’s distinctive historic comportment: expansive boundaries, heterogeneous juxtaposition, and practices of everyday, artful borrowing.
Neighborhood Housing Services of Phoenix, Inc.
One Great Block After Another!

Figure 20. NHS report cover, 1988. (Courtesy of Nona DiDomenico)
Everything But the Kitchen Sink

*Bricolage* connotes critical practice through the juxtaposition of materials—debris, refuse, and ordinary objects—never intended to be used as-such (Kelly 2008). Whether out of necessity or happenstance, the result of these arrangements can be arbitrary, jarring, comical, and strange. The homely quality of *bricolage*, writes Kelly (2008, 24), “has the potential to conjure up an image of recalcitrant clutter” lending assembled products “potential ugliness and lack of marketability.” The outcome of *bricolage* resists predefined categories as a mode of thinking and making. This unassimilable aspect resonates in Coronado. As an incremental approach of everyday pragmatism, not the quest for beauty, harmony, or unity, the urban *bricoleur* casts a wide net, open to any and everything that might be of use.

The spatial incongruity between the Coronado historic district and the Coronado neighborhood association boundaries reveal a tactic of *bricolage*. Coterminal boundaries for historic zoning and neighborhood organization are standard in most historic neighborhoods precisely because the narrow, rigid parameters of historic significance function as mechanisms of exclusion. Small “exclusive” geographic areas of zoning generate small units of social organization, or vice versa. Boundary drawing is a form of *editing*, a discriminatory selection process whereby decisions are made as to who is and is not included. Moreover, historic boundaries and landscapes are enforced by *aesthetic* modes, what Duncan and Duncan (2001, 388) refer to as a “subtle but highly effective mechanism of exclusion.” Rigid, homogenous, and bounded aesthetic practices restrict stylistic diversity in the built and social environs.
These exclusionary practices are usually not seen as such. Instead, they are defined as preservation...social exclusion in itself is often not the goal; preserving the “look of the landscape” is the primary intention. It is not certain types of people that are to be excluded; rather, it is any increase in the number of houses that is to be avoided (Duncan and Duncan 2001, 390, emphasis added).

Social exclusion, in most historic communities, occurs through the delimiting of a small geographic area and strict enforcement of historic aesthetics; new home construction within these boundaries is contested. Prior to historic designation, the initial 1975 NHS Coronado service area included just over 2000 dwelling units and almost 5,000 residents. More an act of corralling, the NHS aesthetic sensibility accords with “the more, the merrier” rather than “less is more.” This ‘hoarding’ sensibility instilled by NHS engendered Coronado with an array of urban fragments for future use.

In 1978, the City of Phoenix introduced the Special Conservation District (SCD) zoning overlay into the City’s plan to protect the residential character of central city neighborhoods through the creation of design review for new construction. NHS pursued the adoption of a SCD to align with the already established NHS target area (Figure 21). The laborious eight-year process in the pursuit of neighborhood conservation formally established an aesthetic approach of keeping. Through the completion of the SCD petition in 1980, which required door-to-door signature collection to demonstrate that at least 30% of the neighborhood favored the implementation of a Coronado SCD (Coronado SCD 1986), the SCD petition demonstrated the mobilizing potential of Coronado’s abundant and diverse residents. In 1981, after approval by the Phoenix Planning Commission, four more years of intensive efforts ensued to develop the SCD plan, including community forums, surveys of housing condition, land use, historic structures, available services and methods for improvement. Rather than a small list of
sanctioned historic architectural styles, the guiding logic of the first official SCD boundary established an inclusive ethic of *neighborhood* conservation that would come to shape future boundary decisions in Coronado.

Figure 21. NHS boundaries (original and expansion) and SDC boundaries. From Coronado’s SCD, 1986.
During this time, the research and outreach generated for the SCD was in parallel with other key NHS projects. Importantly, in 1981 NHS expanded their service area east to what was 20th Street and what would become SR-51 freeway and south to the I-10 freeway in lassoing the Greater Coronado (Figure 14). This boundary expansion increased NHS service provision from 2060 to 4620 dwellings units (NHS 1987, 1988a). As part of this expanded effort, NHS relocated their office out of Coronado’s “core” to the southeastern section of the neighborhood. In 1983, when NHS received a grant from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to conduct a historic survey of 4500 homes and pursue designation on the National Register of Historic Places, the Coronado neighborhood boundaries were at their feasible maximum. Although the building stock of the Greater Coronado was surveyed for historic district feasibility the northern and eastern sections were either not eligible due to the age requirement (property 50 years or older) or poor condition (the north east quadrant) (see Figure 13). Importantly, historic preservation was sought as one of many means toward the goal of neighborhood conservation and community development.

The historic survey, completed in 1984, was spearheaded by the preservation firm Linda Laird and Associates, in conjunction with over 2000 volunteer hours and an equal number of NHS staff hours (Neighborhood Horizons 1984). In February 1986, the Coronado neighborhood was listed on the National Register and shortly after, nominated to the Historic Property Register of the City of Phoenix. In the same month, the core group of residents held its first neighborhood association brainstorming meeting; by the end of 1986, the bylaws were created, elections were held, and the goals of the Coronado Neighborhood Association (CNA) were adopted. That spring (May 21st 1986), the City
Council approved the Coronado SCD, giving protection to the existing densities and land uses in the Coronado core. When it was officially incorporated as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization in January 1988, CNA opted to implement the most expansive boundaries possible, those established by NHS as the Greater Coronado (Figure 22).

Figure 22. A copy of the 1988 CNA boundary map proposal (above) and a proposed Coronado bumper sticker. They appear on the same page in the original document, demonstrating the conflation of “historic” with the Greater Coronado. (Courtesy of Nona DiDomenico)
Because of this *inclusive* boundary-making act, the newfound social status of the official Coronado historic district was shared *broadly*. To this day, residents within the Greater Coronado refer to their neighborhood as *historic* regardless of whether they live within the boundaries of the three designated districts, Coronado, Country Club, and Brentwood. Because historic designation in Coronado was one tactic of many in the making of a viable, affordable, and self-reliant neighborhood, “historic” doesn’t carry its aesthetically narrow, rigid, and exclusive connotations. Since 1986, Coronado has *expanded* its historic boundaries in 1992 and again in 1999. A third expansion, proposed in 2007, and expected to be completed in 2010, was halted by City budget cuts and the passage of Proposition 207, a statewide measure that stymied the creation and expansion of all new historic districts (Figure 23).\(^{vi}\)

**Figure 23. Proposed Coronado Historic District Expansion Study Area.** (Courtesy of the Coronado Neighborhood Association)
Today, this sense of history in Coronado is aptly described by former resident Jason in terms of *bricolage*, as “finding value in things that have been cast off,” and the art and celebration of “practical living—not just a nebulous connection to history” (interview, 12/10/2008). The aesthetic experience in Coronado, its *provisional* historic character, speaks to the shapeshifting quality of *bricolage*. Jason and his partner Ralph depict the eclectic charm of Coronado as comparable to the familiar “old hag/pretty woman optical illusion; cute versus squalor” (interview, 10/27/10). On a bright spring day, over twenty years after her tenure as NHS director in Coronado ended, JoAnn Trapp observes that Coronado’s hodgepodge composition endures, “There are some days when you look at the neighborhood and it looks like a pile of crap, and then other days, like today, it looks quite charming.”

Coronado’s *discordance* is also due, in large part, to its history of ambitious boundary making. Large geographic boundaries have proved a bit unwieldy in practice. Despite various efforts to better integrate the two sides of 16th Street, for example, the arterial road has always been a significant barrier to interaction. Even with the expansion of the NHS service area beyond the core into “Coronado east” in 1981, the SCD recommendations for this area indicate that the lack of historic architectural integrity (northeast) and age limitations (southeast) precluded this area from historic designation at the time (Neighborhood Horizons 1984). The protections and significant investment brought about by historic designation in the three other quadrants of Coronado (core, north, and south) are notably absent in Coronado east today. In the 1970s and today, a number of homes and apartments in Coronado, especially the eastern section, have been neglected by absentee landlords for so long, they appear uninhabitable.
Despite various efforts to better connect the two sections, such as printing the neighborhood newsletter, *The Dispatch*, and other materials in Spanish and English, Coronado east holds their own monthly meetings. Yet, over the years the two sides of 16th Street have collaborated on several large grant projects, such as the City’s Fight Back Programs (of which the Greater Coronado has been awarded three: West, East, and Southwest), and gathered annually for the Day of the Dead celebration held on an old palm tree farm in Coronado east. Most notably, in 1995, the neighborhood received a $1.5 million Comprehensive Community Program (CCP) grant from the Department of Justice, of which $11,000 sponsored ten murals to beautify the neighborhood, encourage residents to maintain their properties, and stop graffiti.

This legacy paved the way for the recent formation of Calle 16, a non-profit organization comprised of 16th Street business owners, residents, and artists dedicated to supporting community through murals. Two decades of Coronado support for murals have set the stage for 16th Street to become a corridor of Latino urbanism boasting mural tours and some of the best Mexican food in town. Coronado residents on both sides of 16th Street recently wrote and received two City grants for Calle 16 funding (in addition to home tour funds raised in 2010). And despite little knowledge of NHS and their efforts to build, “One great block after another!,” as the early NHS materials proclaim, Calle 16’s slogan resonates with every intention to continue the incremental and inclusive community building, “One wall at a time” (Calle 16 2013). Coronado east and west will never likely “fit” together, and maybe one day they will even part ways, but the act of joining them has certainly tempered the historic aesthetic from running wild; if it can, it does. While gentrification speculation has trailed Coronado (Kukino 1983), the
cacophony assembled through indiscriminately large boundaries ensures that Coronado will probably always be both, “up-and-coming” and “gentrification proof.”

**Adversity Makes Strange Bedfellows**

For de Certeau, “poaching” is a form of *bricolage* in which time, matter, and meaning come undone. Such a practice, he says, “does not keep what it acquires, or does so poorly” (de Certeau 1984, 174). An urban aesthetic of multiplicity reveals the devious agency of time and memory in the city (Crang and Travlou 2001). As method of acquisition and production, poaching “liberates” and arranges fragments, including time, but keeps them loose, exposed to wear and tear, and future reordering. Poaching, says de Certeau, “does not compose a unified set: it is another kind of ‘mythology’ dispersed in time, a sequence of temporal fragments not joined together but disseminated through repetitions and different modes of enjoyment, in memories and successive knowledges” (de Certeau 1984, 174-175; cited in Applin 2008). As a form of “borrowing,” *bricolage* also carries connotations of secrecy (Kelly 2008), of concealing things and meanings amidst the disarray and overlappings.


Neither monochrome nor chronological, Coronado’s eclectic aesthetic has been heavily influenced by a critical practice of urban *bricolage*: in-fill. Today, historic
districts quiver with unease at the mention of the term, but in the late 1970s there was no in-fill housing in Phoenix. In 1978-79, a partnership between John and Gary Driggs of Western Savings and Loan, the influential Valley homebuilder John F. Long, and NHS is believed to be the first in-fill project in City. Acclaimed as Arizona’s largest homebuilder, John F. Long is best known for bringing modern, affordable single-family suburban homes to Valley residents. Maryvale, his iconic post World War II development, is heralded as the first completely master-planned community in Arizona, but few are aware of the 21 in-fill houses built on scattered vacant lots throughout Coronado (Figure 24). As if to prepare the fledgling neighborhood for the uphill fight they would endure the next 30 years, it appears that John F. Long built only two models in the Coronado: The Challenger and The Champion (Figure 25).

![Figure 25. John F. Long renderings of “The Challenger” (Plan 932-1 “Elevation B”) and “The Champion” (Plan 932-3 “Elevation L”), 1970. (Courtesy of the Arizona Historical Foundation and the John F. Long Family)](image)

The project idea, according to Gary Driggs, was to give Coronado a “little shot in the arm” through the construction of new affordable houses. “Rather than grandiose plans,” says Gary, it’s better to do the one or two actual things you can get done, one step at a time. Call it incrementalism, or whatever you want…define an objective, get it done, move on. That’s the principle” (5/19/11). With the precedent of resourceful pragmaticism built into Coronado’s foundation, the first in-fill project paved the way for
MORE in-fill, the “Move on Rehab Experience” (MORE). Conceived in 1982 and carried out in 1986 and 1987, Coronado’s second in-fill project, MORE, is believed to be the first urban in-fill project in Phoenix to combine house relocation with “sweat equity.” To reduce blighted vacant lots and generate affordable housing, the project relocated eight houses, primarily 1920s brick Bungalows, from the path of the SR-51 freeway (Piestewa freeway) onto vacant lots in the Coronado neighborhood. Rather than a traditional down payment, the eight selected families provided 40 hours a week of labor to rehabilitate the relocated homes (NHS 1988b).

The two in-fill projects speak, each in their own way, to an urban bricolage practice of poaching. In the late 1970s, when urban disinvestment and blight was at its peak, a casual observer might have viewed the shiny new John F. Long homes plopped between sagging Bungalows, as stolen property. In some sense, they were. The modern suburban materials and straight lines of the Long homes clashed with Coronado’s anachronistic architecture. At the time, the Long homes embodied all the superlatives of the new master-planned suburban promise, the very forces that led to Coronado’s decline, yet, there they sat, out-of-place, with old urban amenities: a City pool, public parks and schools, urban hospitals, a funeral home, liquor stores and much more. But the injection of new affordable suburban homes amidst the rag-tag remains of the first suburbs also gave new meaning to both—this is the inventive effect of urban bricolage.
Both in-fill projects were critical investments at crucial moments in Coronado, likely contributing to increased property values, a boost in home-ownership, improved resident morale, and future financial investment. But these were not the only effects. The idea that “old houses never [need to] die,” as the MORE slogan exclaims (Figure 26), characterizes NHS’s strong ethic of neighborhood conservation instilled prior to the pursuit of historic preservation. An old house or vacant lot within a neighborhood can and should be, used, re-inhabited, and re-incarnated. Literally poached from the path of the freeway and re-assembled by residents, the eight MORE homes are testament to the liberatory potential of urban bricolage, its ability to discreetly reorder time-space. Compatible in architectural style and period of construction to many existing homes in the neighborhood, the MORE homes and their unique story quickly disappeared from view. The appearance of temporal compatibility with many (but not all) of their neighbors belies the fact that the MORE homes are spatially out-of-joint. The 1970s John F. Long homes initially disrupted the existing temporal unity on their respective Coronado blocks, but with wear and tear, they too acculturated; today some appear neglected, some have been re-imagined, while others have “gone under the knife” in a futile attempt to retain their youthful zest (Figure 27).
The City’s first in-fill became less visible, and therefore less memorable, with time. By 1984, when the neighborhood was making the case for their historic significance, the attributes of John F. Long homes that were initially praised—modern construction and the contemporary suburban aesthetic—became detractors. “New” was out, “old” was in. The historic survey inventory forms are blank in the section for “builder” and no mention is made of the “significance” of these homes. The cunning work of oblivion. Despite combing the neighborhood with JoAnn Trapp and seeking assistance from the John F. Long family (among others) I was only able to identify and verify the building permits for 16 of the supposed 21 in-fill homes. Given aesthetic camouflage of the eight MORE houses, it is due entirely to the memory of JoAnn Trapp that they can still be located. While the number of in-fill homes is obviously minor, both in-fill projects set the institutional precedent for the mix-n-match aesthetic pervading Coronado today. Generally, most preservationists would oppose Coronado’s in-fill projects exactly for this reason. Conflicting modern architectural styles create discontinuity in historic streetscapes. The relocation of structures from their original site or rehab practices that mimic the original historic features too closely are criticized for
“falsifying” historic environs. New and old clash, original and faux become indiscernible. This is the historic Coronado aesthetic.

As interlopers, the JFL and MORE homes are markers of an urban compositional practice of juxtaposition and heterogeneity. Strange bedfellows make good neighbors in Coronado. While most residents today know little of the history behind the mélange of houses on any given block, the mystery and intrigue of their assembly, strangely present and absent, is undoubtedly sensed. This is the “objective hazard” of urban bricolage, intentions and meanings will come undone. But loosely tied knots, that maintain their elasticity and strength, will loop, wind, and fashion themselves anew.

Love Thy Neighborhood

Figure 28. JoAnn Trapp, director of the nonprofit Neighborhood Housing Services for ten years, at a Coronado Renaissance Faire in Coronado Park, circa early 1980s. (Courtesy of Jerry and Marge Cook)

After well over thirty years of federal support for Neighborhood Housing Services, the organization imparts a sense of institutional authority. But in the 1970s and 80s, as the first NHS operation in Phoenix, with a small staff and lots of neighborhood volunteers, NHS in Coronado was ad-hoc and experimental. Interviews with JoAnn
Trapp (Figure 28), the NHS director for the ten most influential years (1978-1988), and the surviving NHS ephemera reveal NHS Phoenix had a creative side. Themed festivals, pot-lucks, theatrical performances, and craft nights best characterize NHS in Coronado during this time. Owing to her own creative impulse and a degree in urban planning, JoAnn made it her mission to infuse NHS activities with found fragments of motivational urbanism at every opportunity. Everyday ways of recycling and borrowing are central to the *bricoleur’s* aesthetic; keen and crafty improvisational techniques imbue the ordinary and mundane tasks of daily life with *inventiveness* (de Certeau 1984). Donning the pages of every surviving NHS pamphlet, event invitation, report, and document are borrowed imagery, quotes, and aphorisms of neighborliness, civic pride, and inspirational urbanism. The embellishments are whimsical, spirited, and handmade (Figure 29). Through repetition, it is not difficult to see where the aesthetic of neighborhood creativity and diversity touted in Coronado today, might have originated.
While the mantra “one block at a time” captures NHS’ emphasis on incremental pragmatism, “love thy neighborhood” promotes the extension of care beyond private homes and immediate neighbors to the Greater Coronado. In one NHS flier, a borrowed biblical proverb is paired with a found image of cartooned village people (Figure 30). With a simple turn of phrase and the addition of hand-pasted labels that reference crucial NHS partners (the bank and City hall), the flier transforms Coronado’s urban challenges,
including its size and diversity, into opportunities. Seemingly a bit too optimistic for today’s standards, in the mid-1980s when the urban core was facing surmounting blight and abandonment, and the City had not yet adopted a housing maintenance ordinance, a bit of exaggerated communalism might have been well-received.

Figure 30. An NHS flyer and the Coronado Neighborhood Association’s (CNA) logo ballot. (Courtesy of Nona DiDomenico)
Figure 31. The 1980 NHS Annual Dinner Program titled “This Old House” which opens to reveal the sing-a-long lyrics for each of the NHS stakeholder groups. (Courtesy of Nona DiDomenico)

The theme for the NHS annual dinner in 1980, for example, was “This Old House,” the title of the 1950s billboard hit, which in turn, was borrowed from the 19th century song “The Little Old Log Cabin in the Lane.” Originally a mournful eulogy to a dying man and his house, in the handmade NHS program (Figure 31) the lyrics were altered to cheerily celebrate home and neighborhood repair through four sing-along parts, that of residents, NHS staff, financial lenders, and the city of Phoenix. All surviving NHS documents are garnished with this cheeky sense of community-based optimism to likely counteract the dreary realities of urban poverty and neglect. Consider some of the ambitiously civic-minded quotes collected and sprinkled between paragraphs of financial statements and project reports in NHS documents.
• A strong city can be built with brother helping brother. -Roman proverb
• In great cities men are like a lot of stones thrown together in a bag; their jagged corners are rubbed off till in the end they are as marbles. -W. Somerset Maugham
• A town that boasts inhabitants like me / Can have no lack of good society. -Henry Wadsworth Longfellow
• Being human is itself difficult, and therefore all kinds of settlements (except dream cities) have problems. Big cities have difficulties in abundance. But vital cities are not helpless to combat even the most difficult problems. -Jane Jacobs,
• Tis the men, not the houses, that make the city. -Thomas Fuller
• Make no little plans, they have no magic to stir men’s blood. -Daniel Burhnam
• I dream’d in a dream I saw a city invincible to the attacks of the whole of the rest of the earth, / I dream’d that was the new city of Friends… -Walt Whitman
• On the city’s paved street / Plant gardens lined with lilacs sweet;/ Let spouting fountains cool the air,/ Singing in the sun-baked square. -R.W. Emerson

These boosterish NHS sentiments and imagery deploy, the axiom, “it takes a village,” at every turn. A premium was noticeably placed on the collective good; home repair and maintenance are acts of care for your neighbor, neighborhood, city, and nation. And in some sense, the propaganda-lite worked. When the early Coronado neighborhood association (CNA) voted on their logo in 1986, the NHS aesthetic lineage of an ethic of care for your home-neighbor-hood is evidenced on the ballot (see Figure 30). The logo runner-ups contain some form of house-as-neighbor affection: three houses as neighbors, multiple houses holding hands, two hands shaking imposed on a house, and a house being hugged. Noticeably the most professional and iconic logo, the winning Bungalow logo was drawn by Coronado resident and artist, Sue Piel. The process of obtaining historic designation, of solidifying Coronado’s significant period and architecture, undoubtedly influenced the rise and contagion of a Bungalow aesthetic in historic neighborhoods throughout the 1980s. With its rarified history of craftsmanship, most historic Bungalow neighborhoods with similar icons are deployed toward exclusionary aims (Boulton 2011). But Coronado’s Bungalow logo, still in use today, re-presents an aesthetic lineage of
plurality, a tolerance for varied styles and ways of life, including, paradoxically, those who abstain from house and neighborhood care (Figure 32). Despite its seemingly lonely singularity (a single house cannot make a neighborhood), residents perceive it as multiple. The last 25 years of CNA’s successful community grant-writing efforts, manifest in traffic calming projects, blight reduction, and public art, demonstrate this ethic.

Figure 32. Iterations of Coronado’s Bungalow. The metal sign with the slogan, “A neighborhood that cares” (left), is noticeably neglected. This image aptly depicts Coronado’s aesthetic of plurality (i.e. A neighborhood that cares, even for those residents who don’t). The newest Coronado banners (far right), a joint CNA-City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office project, were installed at Coronado points of entry, including the non-historic sections. Coronado east was excluded owing to the complete absence of a historic section. Photographs by the author.

Probably the most influential and enduring practice to enact NHS’s zealous community-oriented, domestic-pride aesthetic is the annual Coronado home tour; a performative gesture of welcome. In 1982, the first home tour, a dozen Coronado residents bravely opened their newly NHS renovated homes to the general public for the touring. Historically, home touring took place in the homes and estates of the nation’s elite, but, like all else NHS borrowed, poached, and re-used, it looked and meant
something quite different in Coronado. Titled “NHS’s Gift to Phoenix,” the first Coronado home tour displayed the minor achievements of a marginal urban neighborhood, a significant proclamation that urban neighborhoods were worth investment. And thirty years later, on a single spring day, a dozen homes are opened to the public for neighbors and strangers to meander through, peeking and prodding, inquiring about paint color, window treatments, yard care techniques, and types of insulation. Coronado home tour, like many of the NHS practices cultivated here, epitomizes an “art of the everyday” (de Certeau 1984).

Today, many historic home tours perform the exclusionary aesthetic established through historic designation by opening the largest and most architecturally or historically “significant” homes to the public. In contrast, Coronado home tour was initiated as one of many practices in the making of an inclusive neighborhood, and even after historic designation, it enacts this *open* ethic of neighborhood care. Critical in performing this ethic, Coronado home tour highlights houses in and out of the three historically zoned districts. Moreover, Coronado’s home tour celebrates a legacy of neighborhood home care, a more open stance to historic preservation, established by NHS. In addition to homes that have been maintained in accordance with the historic guidelines, Coronado home tour always features homes that challenge or breach perceptions of historic, such as homes that are newly constructed, rehabbed or expanded with ultra modern aesthetics, or even those who have “violated” historic guidelines (such as unapproved window replacement). Similarly, Coronado home tour enacts its identity as an inclusive neighborhood when those who open their homes to the public represent a
range of family types: renters and homeowners, young urban professionals and retirees, singles and families, hetero and homosexual couples.

Yet, there is one population not represented by the homes displayed on home tour: Coronado east. Despite openness to the spectrum of historic ethics, Coronado’s home tour today revolves around the celebration of Coronado’s historic architecture more than the display of basic housing rehabilitation, the initial NHS aim. With fewer institutional protections, fewer homeowners, and lower incomes, most houses in Coronado east bear little resemblance to their 1920s and 30’s selves. Coronado has not found a way to meaningfully incorporate the homes east of 16th Street into home tour, but given the resourcefulness of so many ‘parts,’ maybe a solution will reveal itself in time.

**Urban Brick-A-Brac**

It is true that restored buildings, mixed habitats belonging to several worlds, already deliver the city from its imprisonment in an imperialistic univocity. However enamel-painted they might be, they maintain there the heterodoxies of the past. They safeguard an essential aspect of the city: its multiplicity.

-Michel de Certeau and Luce Giard, *The Practice of Everyday Life V.2*, 1998, 137-8

In their chapter “Ghosts in the City,” (1998) de Certeau and Giard speak to the wild enchantment of ruins and the promise and peril of their capture via historic preservation. Preserved sites and structures alone, de Certeau and Giard argue, cannot convey the unseen yet, most meaningful, “wordless histories” of the city (142). Memories in urban life reside in bodily comportments, revealing alternating relationships with things; vocabularies, dressing, decorating, talking, cooking and other ways of making do. These seemingly minor everyday bodily doings in the home, neighborhood, and city, assert de Certeau and Giard assert, are “bricolages…they invent collages by marrying references from various pasts to excerpts from presents in order to make them
into series (gestural processes, narrative itineraries) where opposites come across” (1998, 141). The past, in this view, is processural and assembled, neither the property of the built environs or inhabitants, but somewhere in-between. The imposition of narrow temporal windows, tight geographic boundaries, and rigid aesthetic parameters in the making of historic districts can limit an essential aspect of urban history: aesthetic practice.

“Preservation,” observes Lowenthal (1985, xvii), “has deepened our knowledge of the past but dampened creative use of it.” In limiting aesthetic practice, residential historic preservation suppresses these inventive styles of everyday life that creatively entwine past and present (Harrison 2000). All residents of historic homes, including transplants and those with limited financial resources “have a right to select their own aesthetics,” argue de Certeau and Giard (1998 140). And, conversely preservation should be concerned with preserving the full spectrum of aesthetic architectural practices in the city, not simply those according with prescribed styles. Without greater aesthetic inclusion and local variation residential historic preservation risks depleting the past and present of its “wordless histories”—the source of everyday meaningfulness in the city.

I present the notion of urban bricolage, in theory and praxis, as an affirmative stance from which residential historic preservation might be thought anew. As a comportment, a thinking and organizing of material remains, bricolage helps consider residential practice as a curatorial act, an inventive means of ordering urban space. Importantly, institutional practices established through preservation, the ways of thinking, arranging, and aestheticizing urban environs, are perpetuated by the practices of residents, integrated into bodily comportments, shorthand phrases, and other forms of
embodied knowledge (Harrison 2000). Thinking residential preservation as urban 
*bricolage* privileges practices of inclusivity, juxtaposition, and the art of everyday life 
over the preservation’s institutional legacy of conserving and exclusionary practices.

In exploring the way Neighborhood Housing Services adopted institutional 
practices of urban *bricolage* in the making of the historic Coronado neighborhood, I 
make sense of the paradox between Coronado’s present-day character and its period of 
significance. Residents today often cite the legacy of the historic built environs as 
contributing to Coronado’s diversity and creativity, but most inhabitants are unaware of 
the legacy of social practices initiated by NHS that they *themselves* embody. But this 
intuitive sense, apprehended aesthetically, that Coronado has a history of inclusivity is 
correct. Ironically, it is the very act of becoming historic that erases the near history of 
NHS from the neighborhood’s consciousness. But *bodies*, house and human alike, 
remember. There isn’t a single house in Coronado that hasn’t been touched by fliers, 
home inspections, and inspirational boosterism of NHS. Almost every house in 
Coronado was witness to or active participant in the SCD and historic survey housing 
inventories. And *many* homes, in-fill or not, bear physical marks of NHS-assisted home 
repairs. While residents might not consciously know it, they too *enact* the legacy of NHS 
practices through, for example, verbal reference to historic Coronado as inclusive of the 
*Greater* Coronado, shrugs of tolerance for a neighbor’s “art” installation or lack of 
upkeep, and willingness to open their home for public viewing on home tour.

Of course, Coronado residents do not always enact an NHS-inspired sensibility of 
neighborly love at every opportunity. Some never come close. Embroiled debates at 
neighborhood meetings and on the listserves ensue. And there are plenty of “bad”
neighbors who, for example, breach historic zoning with modern rehabs, dump trash in alleys, or let half-a-dozen Chihuahuas bark all night. In fact, for Coronado to be

*Coronado*, an urban historic neighborhood characterized by eclecticism and diversity, these inhabitants *must* be included. And this is precisely the legacy of NHS *practice* in historic Coronado, of urban *bricolage*—space for difference. Without big boundaries, in-fill, and cultivation of aesthetic openness prior to historic designation, there would have been no room for eclecticism (Figure 33). Coronado resident Tyler Olson put it this way on the neighborhood association listserve:

> Aside from the portions of our neighborhood that have Historic Overlay restrictions, we have pretty much free rein over how we "decorate" or "accessorize" our properties. That is what makes Coronado, “Coronado,” and not some central city Ahwatukee-Foothills HOA nightmare. You may not like the graffiti. I may not like the bold, primary colors which make that section of McDowell look like 'Toontown'—but the owners of those properties DO like it (or- GASP! Say it's not so!—they believe it makes their properties MORE valuable), and it is their right to paint it as they wish. What does this say to prospective buyers? Exactly what I would hope it says: "If you embrace diversity, join us!" (Tyler Olson, listserve post, 6/8/2009).

There is no formula for the making of socially and aesthetically diverse historic neighborhoods; each instance is unique. Overreliance on techniques of the engineer, such as architectural taxonomies, archival documentation, and linear histories stifles the creativity inhering in the making of historic districts. The cultivation of stylistic difference and dynamism as integral to historic aesthetics requires other modes of assembly. It is in the details, the pragmatic acquisition of seemingly “useless” or incompatible urban pieces and their creative ordering, where the *bricoleur* excels. In collapsing the binary between the *bricoleur* and *engineer*, Levi-Strauss’ mythopoetics dissolve their differences, reminding us that we are all, ultimately *bricoleurs*, thinking
and making with borrowed ideas, words, and things; nothing “original” exists. Derrida (2001) reminds us that the engineer himself is a myth, dreamed by the *bricoleur*.

Rethinking residential historic preservation as urban *bricolage*, as an inventive practice of everyday life, might liberate the institution from the burden of pretending otherwise.

Figure 33. A composite of Coronado’s urban *bricolage*: one Greater Coronado neighborhood boundary, with three historic districts; twenty-four homes of NHS in-fill (sixteen John F. Long homes, of the purported twenty-one and eight MORE houses); and twenty-one years worth of houses open on Coronado’s home tour (assembled from the surviving home tour brochures). Map made by Brian Pompeii, 2013.
Chapter 4

HOME TOUR AS HOSPITABLE URBANISM

Welcome

Home, it would seem, should increasingly embody the sociality, multiplicity, and fluidity of the contemporary moment. Movement reigns. Personal information is shared at an excessive, if not alarming rate. We turn to the Real Housewives of somewhere to see how other people live. Even the classic divide, homemaking and paid work, has dissolved into the rhythmic continuum of multi-tasking. Yet, when it comes to home, dualisms endure. Private/public. Home/away. Mine/yours. Amidst an overabundance of information, communication, and interconnectedness we still want a picket fence—and to peek over it.

One entrée into the unsettling of home in the contemporary era is being carried out across the country under pitched roofs and coved archways: domestic voyeurism. The home tour, once reserved for viewing elite residences, has become an annual event in many residential historic districts celebrating the architectural distinctiveness of ordinary historic residences. As “tourists,” move through modest-sized historic homes, bodies and features of the house collide, memories erupt, and conversations about cabinet refinishing arise. Unlike mediated voyeurism—distanced and often experienced alone—the home tour is an embodied, social encounter in other people’s intimate spaces of inhabitation. In the space between public and private home is made in gestures, utterances, and expressions.

With 35 residential historic districts dispersed throughout downtown and central Phoenix, preservation has become a defining strategy in urban revitalization in the
nation’s 6th largest city. The rising popularity of home tours has rendered home tour “season” a significant urban practice cum performance. Moreover, this residential landscape of ‘historic’ socio-built environs does more than simply demonstrate Phoenix has “history,” it evidences the City’s knack for perpetual rebirth, for making history. A sense of possibility, future tense, tinged everything here, even the “past.” Oft perceived as a conservative, elitist enterprise, residential historic preservation in Phoenix demonstrates otherwise. Beginning in 1982, Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) of Phoenix welcomed the public into 14 soon-to-be-historic homes in the Coronado neighborhood, each newly renovated through high-risk, revolving NHS rehab loans. At a time when the urban core was suffering from the blight of abandonment and disinvestment, “NHS’s Gift to Phoenix,” as it was advertised, might have been the first hospitable gesture in a generative, contagious chain that would re-shape history in place.

Repeated annually in Coronado, the invitation to enact the topsy-turvy private-public realms embodied in residential historic preservation generates affective encounters. Home touring opens doors to other pasts and presents, other lives. Rather than simply “freezing” time and meanings of domesticity in place, historic home touring affords the taking-place of urban hospitality. In performing the roles and relations of “host” and “guest” bodies enter into fleeting, visceral exchanges—and part—affected. I make the case that home touring is a social practice demonstrative of a feminist hospitality, an opening of self and neighborhood toward other bodies critical in the making of viable, ethical urban communities. To do so, I draw on a suite of qualitative, ethnographic research conducted from 2007 to 2011 in the Coronado neighborhood such as immersive participant observation, formal and informal interviews, collaborative
visual methods and a mail survey. The visual contributions of Mark Klett, Bryon Darby, Katie Lehman, Daniel Cavnaugh, and Phoenix Transect, the long-term visual research project at Arizona State University were particularly influential (http://www.phoenixtransect.org/). Drawing on the legacy of Derrida (2000, 2004) and Levinas (1969) in theorizing hospitality, I consider Maurice Hamington’s (2010a) characteristics of a feminist hospitality in thinking home tour as hospitable urban practice.

Following an introduction to the eventfulness of home tour, I review the notion of “home” in the making of American spaces, values and historic preservation. I then turn to the practices of residential historic preservation and home tour and review their twinned origins and legacy, first within the Coronado historic district, and second, the nation at large. Finally, I situate Coronado home tour as hospitable urban practice in four sections, each addressing feminist concerns of identity, inclusivity, reciprocity, and vulnerability in domestic hospitality.

**Touring Home, History, and Place**

For six hours on an early day in spring, a dozen modest-sized homes in the Coronado neighborhood open their doors to neighbors, strangers, and the public at large. Under the guise of celebrating the “architectural diversity” of the Coronado historic neighborhood, several hundred people meander through homes, looking, sensing, and gleaning much more than architectural detail (Figure 34). The bodily act of touring a neighbor’s domestic space facilitates both intimacy and distance from daily home practices. The hue, grain, and tedium of everyday become worthy of note. In Cinderella-
like fashion, the ordinary becomes extraordinary; private becomes public, neighbors become tourists, hosts become guests.

The allure, and act of “looking” en-home-tour-route is sensate more than purely optical. Looking with and through shifting auditory, olfactory, haptic memories tourgoers peek, scan, touch, get closer and enjoyably encounter the familiar, or at times, the new. Libratory potential is found in spectral spaces; the absence of garages, presence of built-in nooks, cozy atmospherics, enchantments with doorknobs. The spectrum of materiality on display includes original architectural features (1920s coved ceilings), additions and modifications from previous owners (1940s kitchen cabinets, 1980s track-lighting), and the renovations and furnishings showcased by the current inhabitants (new bathroom tile that looks old, a claw foot tub that is old but not original to the house).
Time here is out-of-joint.

The enactment of alternating host-guest relations proffers repeated opportunities for exchange, for unsettling static notions of home and domesticity. Hospitable home tour encounters occur within an idealized domestic sphere—largely free from dirty dishes, laundry, unopened mail, and laden with scented candles, fresh flowers, and dusted surfaces. But, as real homes, not for sale, not magazine-cover material, not owned by the elite or famous, home tour in Coronado maintains an atmosphere of approachability, accessibility, and familiarity. Unlike other urban spaces of spontaneous hospitable exchanges, the city sidewalk, grocery store parking lots, home touring primes participants to let their guards down, to indulge in domestic bliss manifest in coved ceilings and built-in niches.

Unlike the show home or the carefully arranged tableaux of the interior design catalogue, the lived-in house blends into the background, moulds itself seamlessly around our bodies, gestures, activities and thoughts. These cumulative remnants of habitual experience are what is so conspicuously absent form the impenetrable concrete façade [of the show-house] (Moran 2006, 39).

The façade of effortless domesticity is quickly dismantled by tourgoers who peek and probe, inquiring about the origins, cost, and know-how of everything. Other homes put labor on display through the display of unfinished projects, before-and-after renovation photographs, or stacks of business cards for those who did the cleaning, designing, restoring, building, or repair.

These historic homes are appreciated precisely for their status as remainders. As the City’s first suburbs, what was once mass-produced, now conveys an “aura”—paradoxically—of an original, of authenticity. Critical faculties succumb to nostalgic impulses, “factual diversity” is appreciated, and a bricolage of pastness prevails. History
is encountered affectively, in things and stories. The snug arrangement of historic features and furnishings communicate a sense of comfort and care, a feeling of being at home. Through the display, assemblage, and circulation of remnants, the past is enacted, *comes to be*, as part of the unfolding present. The interior of these petite homes, where home and history have been made for 70 years, escapes the regulatory domain of local preservation zoning. Though the facades, stoic and weary alike, are largely protected from stuccoed whimsy and other architectural insult to historic codes, they give little indication to life inside. In the interior spaces of an ordinary 1930s single-family dwelling, creative domesticity and historicity await discovery.

**Private Dreams, Public Heritage**

The notion of home has always existed in temporal purgatory, simultaneously nostalgic and futuristic (Hayden 1995, 2004). As a prospective yearning for “how things ought to be” (Rybczynski 1986, 11, original emphasis), *home* is built on imaginings and re-memberings that never were. It is precisely because visions and practices of home vacillate between an imagined past and utopian future that domestic practices are necessarily inventive, inherently creative (Hayden 1995). As such, everyday practices and things branded “nostalgic” or “kitsch” do not (always) elicit canned responses, freezing meaning and experience in place. Rather, the meaning and meaningfulness of domesticity is mobile, fluxing, sticking, dissolving, forming anew.

In the United States, nation building is one of the enduring aims and outcomes of home making, including, suburbanization. Practices of home ownership and domestic consumption, since 1820, have been central in engendering notions of progress, modernity, individuality, time-management, and citizenship (Hayden 2004). Through
conflating democracy and home ownership, white, hetero-normative privilege is literally built into the suburban landscape; carved out of prairies, fields, deserts, and flood plains. Private home building is both means and end of the American Dream. “Unlike every other affluent civilization,” writes Dolores Hayden, “Americans have idealized the house and yard rather than the model neighborhood or ideal town” (2004, 5-6). Through the drudgery of housework and inventiveness of homemaking, the private house—as home—is the site of experimentation in the making of American citizens (Young 1997; Hayden 2002, 2004).

With nation-building efforts directed toward the home’s interior, America’s public realm arose primarily as byproduct of the domestic sphere’s widening circumference. Thanks to the premier domestic annex, the automobile, our most popular and iconic public spaces are extensions of the private home: drive-in theaters, freeways, shopping malls (Colomina 2004). Established in 1916 to protect our natural heritage, the National Park Service (NPS) would become a defining force democratizing our natural and cultural heritage through domestication. Post World War I, the National Park Service adopted suburban values in making the out-of-doors experience auto-centric. Crafted around the individualist leisure pursuits for white, middle-class nuclear families, scenic windshield views, cul-de-sac campgrounds, and paved trails for the high-heeled hiker engendered our national heritage (Kim 2004).

The 1966 Historic Preservation Act, housed under the purview of the National Park Service, extended the conformity and conservatism of post-war suburbia (Synder 2004) to the past. Architects, historians, and other preservation professionals were tasked with the responsibility of selecting and preserving America’s built heritage for present
and future generations (National Trust for Historic Preservation 1999). Early decades of editing “significant” structures out of the vast cultural landscape opened preservation institutions to critiques of elitism, exclusive homes and histories preserved by, and for, an elite class (Page and Mason 2004). More frequently, complaints are directed at the ways complicated people, events, and structures are simplified—tamed—through historic preservation. Architectural modifications made by generations of inhabitants are removed in restoring structures to their significant moment—what might have been in this place at one time. Inconsistencies, unknowns, and pluralities are suppressed or smoothed in conveying the significance of a single site to the nation at large (Murtagh 2006). But “historic” structures can only ever exist in a strange state between fact and fiction. As a form of national homemaking, historic preservation practices are necessarily tinged by nostalgia (Young 1997).

Yet, historic preservation’s aim in the 1960s was much grander than merely domesticating the built past, the movement aspired to restore the balance between private dreams and public heritage. “What we want to conserve, therefore is the evidence of individual talent and tradition, liberty and union,” writes Sidney Hyman in the hugely influential 1966 publication With Heritage So Rich (National Trust for Historic Preservation 1999, 23). Preservationists sought to reclaim meaningful structures through public ownership and oversight, subtle affronts to the mid-century individualist American psyche. Federally subsidized construction frenzy at this time, in the form of suburban infrastructure and urban renewal, was literally paving over the urban public realm en route to the new privatized suburban geography. “The dream house” writes Hayden, “replaced the ideal city as the spatial representation of American hopes for the good life”
The American Dream of private home ownership was, by design, exclusionary. While the early years of preservation may have perpetuated this impulse, later decades complicated it.

**Serving and Preserving Urban Neighborhoods**

By the 1980s, historic preservation reconnected with its democratic aspirations by becoming a *community* strategy with an emphasis on preserving *ordinary* homes and structures (Heuer 2007). In some preservation circles, the residential subdivision began to receive recognition as the building block of American residential life (Ames and McClelland, 2002). While the first regulatory historic district was established in 1931 in Charleston, South Carolina, the practice was not widely employed until after the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act. In the last decades of the twentieth-century, municipalities across the country adopted local zoning ordinances to preserve ordinary historic homes not as single sites, but as a community, the sum of its parts (Lovelady 2008). Unlike memorials, monuments, and other historic environs preserved and interpreted by professionals, the onus of residential historic preservation lies with untrained residents. With the guidance of historic guidelines, homeowners “preserve” historic homes through *inhabitation*. No longer the sole domain of professionals concerned with elite or famous structures, historic preservation broadened its scope to preserving neighborhoods, ethnic communities, and landscapes (Alanen and Melnick 2000). At a time of booming freeway construction, local preservation ordinances became a critical urban neighborhood survival strategy.

In Phoenix, like many Western cities without a history of historic preservation, transportation construction and development pressures inspired action (Johnson 2007).
In 1974-75 the construction of Interstate 10, through the heart of central Phoenix, resulted in the destruction of 600 older homes. Controversy surrounding the fundamental organization and character of many urban neighborhoods resulted in the 1985 Phoenix Historic Preservation Ordinance, establishing the Historic Preservation Commission and local preservation guidelines (Boer 2004). In 1986, the first two residential historic districts were created in the Coronado and Roosevelt neighborhoods. Just ten years later, in 1996, Phoenix had designated 40% of its eligible building stock as historic (structures at least 50 years old), the highest percentage of any large American city at the time (Kossan 1988; cited in Boer 2004).

The designation of the Coronado historic district was a culminating product of the ongoing urban revitalization efforts of the federally supported non-profit organization, Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS). To mitigate the effects of white flight, redlining, and urban disinvestment, NHS was charged with leveraging community, business, and municipal partnerships toward reinvestment in selected urban neighborhoods across the country. In 1975, NHS chose the Coronado neighborhood as the site of their pilot program in Phoenix. Originally one of Phoenix’s first working-class streetcar suburbs, built between 1907-1942, Coronado transitioned to a central city urban neighborhood in less than 30 years. Deteriorating housing stock, abandonment, blight, and a declining population of homeowners had already rendered the community unstable, but not beyond the point of re-investment. By 1978, NHS had achieved two major accomplishments in Coronado through strategic partnerships between residents, financial lenders, and the City of Phoenix; the creation of a high-risk revolving rehab loan fund and the City’s first in-fill development. NHS made affordable homeownership and home
improvement in Coronado possible for families with limited access to credit, including low-income, ethnic minority, and single-parent households (Collins 2005). In extending the provision of home loans to families who would have otherwise been excluded in a neighborhood already suffering from lack of investment, NHS deployed home ownership for both private and public gains.

![Figure 35. First annual Coronado home tour, 1982. Front and back cover of the tour brochure. (Courtesy of the Coronado Neighborhood Association).](image)

In 1982, after seven years of service provision and investment in the Coronado neighborhood, NHS presented a collection of restored homes to the City of Phoenix via the first annual Coronado home tour, calling this “NHS’s Gift to Phoenix” (Figure 35). As the title intimates, home touring in Coronado (then and now), is a performative
gesture of welcome, a showcase in collective home making, a City-wide invitation to see *first hand* that this is a place worth saving, of living and investing in. While neighborhood “pride” is oft cited as an outcome of residential historic preservation, in Coronado, *hospitality* is the means by which this identity is (per)formed. For 30 years, Coronado home tour has re-enacted NHS’s Gift to Phoenix, proffering opportunity for hospitable urban encounters, their repetition and contagion.

### A Brief History of Home Touring

![Figure 36. Domestic hospitality. Coronado home tour, 2010. Photographs by Katie Lehman, 2010.](image)

From its earliest enactments, and long before the 1966 Historic Preservation Act, home tour has served as an effective tactic of socialization, nationalization, *and* historic preservation. Women around the country strategically leveraged the art and craft of domesticity for the preservation and betterment of urban environs, local communities,
and the Public. Yet unlike the conserving, exclusionary legacy of other patriotic domestic practices—monuments, home ownership, historic preservation—home tour is a gesture of welcome (Figure 36). As such, home touring transmits openness in the making of home and nation. Or, at least the very premise of the practice, is predisposed to do so. Two influential moments in the largely unnoticed history of the “house tour” are tethered to one of the nation’s founding fathers, George Washington, and founding places, Virginia and Washington D.C.

The Garden Club of Virginia, in partnership with the Kenmore Association, is attributed with hosting the first Historic Home tour the last week of April in 1929 (Davidson 1997). Planned and executed by women statewide, the event was designed to raise money for the rescue and restoration of Kenmore, the home and gardens of George Washington’s sister Betty, in Fredericksburg, Virginia. Slated to be torn-down and subdivided, the property—a piece of women’s history—was saved through the home tour funds raised. Accessible by the state’s new highways, the largest, most beautiful, and notable privately owned historic gardens and homes of Virginia were showcased on tour. “Celebrated homes open,” proclaims the Washington Post on April 30th 1929 (4). With an estimated sixty thousand people in attendance paying 50 cents per garden or home, Historic Garden Week quickly became an annual fundraiser and tourist destination (Brown 1930). This year, 2013, marks the event’s 80th anniversary.

In the 1930s and 40s, women’s garden clubs throughout the South followed suit, planning house tours as historic preservation strategy. “This was a Southern phenomenon,” says Mimi Miller, the former director of the Historic Natchez Foundation in Mississippi, “After the Civil War they [the South] had no present and no future; all
they could do was worship the past” (Davidson 1997, 24). But home touring and preservation are creative endeavors, less about retaining a past and more about creating one. And women were leading the charge in this arena, one house museum, garden restoration, and home tour at a time (Murtagh 2006). This path had already been blazed by the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union, the initiator of the first concerted nationwide preservation effort to purchase and preserve George Washington’s house on the Potomac River in 1853 (Eyring 2003). But unlike the historic house museum or site, overproduced and highly managed experiences with controlled, conservative interpretation privileging the master of the house (West 2003), the act of opening private homes to the public, muddling class and gender boundaries, challenged conceptions of who has the right to offer hospitality. Home tour, despite its origins in elite homes and social circles, was a gesture of something new. “Part of the creative and moral task of preservation,” says Young, “is to reconstruct the connection of the past to the present in light of new events, relationships, and political understandings” (1997, 154).

A second moment in home touring history carried the social practice to greater democratizing heights. While many in the South and East were exposed to historic home touring in the first half of the twentieth century, the rest of the country—or at least one-third of it—viewed Mrs. John F. Kennedy conduct a television tour of the nation’s home, the White House, on February 14th 1962. This nationally televised, mediated home tour displayed the First Lady’s extensive and rigorous interior restoration and historic preservation efforts (Galop 2006). The effects of this home tour resonated in bodies across the country through its monumental scope and effects. An estimated 80 million viewers, 60 years worth of in-person tourists (Wolff 1962), gathered around living room
TV sets to glimpse the intimate spaces, storied objects, and newly redecorated furnishings of our nation’s first public building and presidential home. During its construction, George Washington steered the White House design and construction toward modesty, but the following decades of inhabitation gave rise to additions, expansions, renovations, and the accumulation of art, gifts, and lavish furnishings—all made available for viewing on Jacqueline Kennedy’s home tour. This single event simultaneously exposed the American public to the history of the White House, the concept of historic preservation, and the practice of historic home touring. It was also the first of several milestones in the history of historic preservation initiated by the First Lady (Galop 2006). viii

In his illustrated book titled, A Tour of the White House with Mrs. John F. Kennedy, Perry Wolff (1962, 9) speaks to the magic, drama, and national significance of being welcomed to tour the nation’s house, the President’s home. “It is sometimes true that by examining the small, the large becomes clearer. Or, in dramatic terms, people don’t believe things unless they see them acted out before them.”

One woman talked and something profound emerged out of simplicity. The past stirred. Fact invited nuance; a hint became an overture; a word summoned up an era. A frame of wood and a bit of cloth became a chair, and a chair summoned up a past President and a passage in American history. As the accretion of detail went on, the magic moment of the theater took place. What was happening onstage was far greater than the words being spoken and the women speaking them. The mystery of drama can never be explained. The aesthetic experience is incapable of reconstruction… A woman spoke for an hour and the White House once more became the central symbol of America (Wolff 1962, 10).

As both private residence and public property, the White House is demonstrative of our domestic American ideals. House and home. Liberty and union. But, as Wolff intimates, to know such things we must first be invited. And to embody such ethics we must serve in the capacity of guest and host.
NHS’s Gift To Phoenix

To extend or receive a welcome is to enter into a relation, an exchange. Hospitality is the ultimate domestic gesture, a matter of ethics par excellence. Not only do the identities of both host and guest coalesce through acts of hospitality—there must be an “I” to welcome “you”—they are contingent upon each other (Hamington 2010a). Hospitality is a relational exchange between self and other, an encounter through which openness, vulnerability, and hostility are necessarily negotiated. An offer, welcome, or invitation must be proffered, enacted. Hospitality is performative (Hamington 2004, 2010a); a processural event—always in the making, always with the potential of being otherwise (Thrift 2008).

Acts of hospitality necessarily and paradoxically unsettle notions of home (Figure 37). Mine becomes yours. Mi casa es su casa. As an interruption between self and other, Derrida contends, “hospitality is the deconstruction of the at-home; deconstruction is hospitality to the other” (2004, 364; cited in Westmoreland 2008, 4). As the phrase “to feel at home” intimates, home as sense of self and physical place are coterminous (Derrida 2000). Derrida’s “unconditional” hospitality poses unconditional risk. The ultimate violence of hospitality occurs when hierarchical host-guest relations are completely upended the “master” of the house becomes hostage; the guest’s demands come at the expense of the host’s comfort, power, and even life. While such unconditional hospitality cannot be actualized, the threat of hostility is embodied in hospitality, what Derrida terms “hostipitality” (2004, 356).
In “conditional” hospitality, Derrida’s attainable counterpoint, relationships are concerned with juridical rights, duties, and obligations that seek to preserve the host’s position of power over the guest. Western hospitality has always been conditional, argues Derrida, a legacy derived from Greco-Roman birthright citizenship and the making of state through territory-based inclusion and exclusion; citizens and foreigners, hosts and guests (Westmoreland 2008). The host’s welcome is conditional, necessarily imposing restrictions, limitations, and demands upon the guest. Absent in Derrida’s framing is serious consideration of the peril and promise of domestic hospitality. Pilardi (2010) contends that Derrida’s failure to take seriously the contours of both oppressive and liberatory potential in the private home ignores or devalues women’s roles as hosts. Already subjected to a legacy of male authority within the home, and often a provisional
role as host, Derrida’s unconditional hospitality presupposes that she also surrender her sense of self, security, and home to the stranger. “Too often,” says Hamington, “women have been unwilling hosts and unwelcome guests” (2010a, 22).

A feminist hospitality seeks to rework the lived, hierarchical dimensions of conditional hospitality toward mutual exchange and an ethics of care, the enactment of virtues such as attentiveness, responsibility, and compassion (Hamington 2010a, 2010b; Tronto 1993). Integral to this approach has been emphasis on theorizing domestic hospitality, hospitality of home life, as critical and consequential practices in generating lived community (Pilardi 2010; Hamington 2010b). Historic home touring in Phoenix, I contend, is a hospitable, feminist practice, an ethical enactment engendering openness and care. Thanks to the legacy of women’s work in historic preservation and domestic life, home touring unsettles gendered and property-tethered notions of who has the right to offer hospitality. Host-guest identities arise in a relational exchange and, at times, they alternate. Home touring in the Coronado neighborhood has implications for people and place that exceed neighborhood boundaries. As an ongoing collective experiment, homemaking, as nation building, generates the very domestic ideals displayed on home tour. In turn, what takes place at the site of the body in home touring, reverberates at the city scale and beyond. In the four sections that follow, I consider the concerns and aspirations of a feminist hospitality outlined by Hamington (2010a) as they pertain to historic Coronado.
Between Owning and Care

Historically the right of men alone, home ownership has tethered acts of hospitality to private property, an exclusionary (patriarchal) precondition. The (male) master of the house, not its caretakers, bear the right to welcome. A feminist hospitality aims to subvert such hierarchical, property-tethered notions of host-guest relations. Hamington advocates, “a rethinking of the host’s relationship to property—not necessarily a negation of property rights, but perhaps a mitigated sense of ownership” (2010a, 25, emphasis added). Through diminishing the private property rights of historic homeowners for the public good (present and future), the practice of residential historic preservation is entrée to a feminist hospitality. If historic homes and neighborhoods are constitutionally a public good, as the Supreme Court has ruled in several high profile cases (Cavarello 1995; Murtagh 2006), then the purchasers of a historic home inhabit the house first and foremost as guests, as caretakers for the public at large and future generations. Care ethics, most basically, include acts of engagement with, or attending to
humans, as well as, objects and environments (Figure 38) (Tonto 1993). Among active Coronado residents, those who organize or attend neighborhood activities, the identity of custodian prevails.

There should be a reason why you want to live in a historic home when it’s not something that you inherited or grew up in or something like that, there should be a real clear reason why you live there and to me it’s in many ways because I want to protect it, I want to make sure that it’s there, and it’s taken care of. They’re a real pain sometimes (Donna, interview, 12/10/08).

Old homes bear silent testimony to the ephemeral nature of all that has passed before and is now gone. When I am dead I enjoy thinking someone else will live here :) (Dominic, survey respondent, 2010).

I actually feel closer to this home than I would a brand new home. I’ve done a lot, I’ve replaced the windows, and I’ve painted it inside and out….so I know this house pretty well, not as well as I need to, but I think about the house and its future needs. So I feel like I’m the caretaker of this home and that I do want to keep it standing, because it’s been standing for 80 years, that’s a long time. And not always has it been taken care of. I can tell by when I bought it….So I do feel like I’m the caretaker of this old girl…This feels like home to me (Doreen, interview 12/15/08).

Yet, during their tenure as homeowners, these “guests” also bear the legal protections of private property owners, the traditional role as hosts. And in this capacity as owner and caretaker, host and guest, ambivalence toward historic guidelines, rules versus care, ensues. Muddling these domains further, enforceable historic codes only officially extend to the house’s exterior, what is visible from the street. Heated debates ensue over the repair and replacement of windows—whether to adhere to historic guidelines and costly materials or not—precisely because they are a liminal zone between interior and exterior, public and private. This dual role generates a tension, making mundane (private) domestic decisions in residential historic neighborhoods consequential.
and open to public scrutiny and debate. The social contract, between individual rights and the collective good, is in constant, fruitful negotiation.

Figure 39. Inter-acting on the Coronado home tour, 2011. Photographs by Daniel Cavenaugh, 2011.

Home tour enacts the blurred public-private, guest-host boundaries defining historic homes, creating a temporary but fertile space of exchange (Figure 39). Tour hosts, those who open their homes on tour day, become guests themselves upon touring their neighbor’s homes. Neighbors become tourists, guests in their own community. Tourgoers who live elsewhere are presented with opportunities to share architectural, historical, or personal experience while inside someone else’s home, making them the authority. Additionally, the familiarity of furniture, furnishings, and floor plans engenders tourgoers with a sense of ownership, they feel like it is their couch, their former dining set, the paint color of their childhood home.
In Coronado, the home tour further dissolves the traditional ties between hospitality and property ownership. Unlike many wealthy historic districts, the home tour is not the exclusive domain of homeowners; renters occasionally participate in the planning of home tour and often serve as hosts, opening their residences to the public. House sitters, volunteers who help direct and guide tourgoers through the homes, further complicate these roles. Serving in the capacity of a house sitter, neighbors, strangers, family and friends, all perform the role of hosts. For the tourgoer, discerning between such an array of relations is difficult, and it often remains unclear which host is *the* host. Hospitality *is* exchange—alternation—in host-guest relations.

Without formal rules, the basis of the home tour social compact is solidified in one of two ways. To enter the homes, one must exchange either volunteer time (prior to or during tour) or a fee ($15 day of or $12.50 advance purchase). Profits raised by home tour, after expenses such as insurance, city permits, and advertising are paid, contribute to the Coronado Neighborhood Association’s general funds that support neighborhood infrastructure improvement (pocket-park improvement), crime and graffiti mitigation, and neighborhood programs such as Block Watch, Coronado community garden, and Coronado Cats (feral cat spay-neuter efforts). Importantly, in making a charitable donation to the neighborhood, tourgoers, as “guests,” also extend care by monetary means. Thus, the sharing of “property” in home tour hospitality is no longer the *proprietary* role of “hosts.” Indebted to the same Latin word—proper—meaning “one’s own,” property and proprietary are both notions of delimiting self from other. In home touring, when property is mutually shared and genuine gratitude extended by host *and* guest, the conditions of a feminist hospitality are met (Snow 2010). Of course, in home
touring, each exchange is fleeting, and the intentions and genuineness of hospitality are
difficult to discern. A smile upon entry, social niceties among strangers in a closet, or
whispered criticism upon exit can extend openness or foreclose it.

The Art and Labor of Historic Homemaking

A feminist hospitality is concerned with issues of inclusion and value. Who is
welcomed? Who does the work of welcoming? To what degree is the labor of hospitality
valued? Feminists have long drawn attention to the high number of women and
minorities employed in the paid and unpaid labor of hospitality and the fact that this
work—emotional and physical caretaking—receives relatively little monetary and social
rewards (Hamington 2010a). Likewise, the field of historic preservation in the U.S. is
haunted by a gender paradox; women have been critical in developing the institution of
historic preservation, but women’s history in the built environs is both omitted and
unpreserved (Dubrow and Goodman, 2003). In preserving ordinary domestic places,
residential historic preservation acknowledges the critical role of everyday domestic
practices in the making of the nation. In elevating the status of domesticity to a venerable
tourist destination, home tour in Coronado celebrates the art and labor of homemaking,
past and present. By featuring the full array of businesses, government services, and
non-profit organizations that make historic neighborhoods possible, Coronado home tour
showcases the neighborhood more so than house.
A stroll through the home tour street fair proffers quick typology of the venerated services supporting and supported by historic Coronado living (Figure 40). A bounty of interior and exterior home-related businesses are on hand, such as gardening and lawn care providers, realtors who specialize in historic homes, and DIY home repair including, for example, Dunn Edwards (paint) and Tomboy Tools (a provider of education and pink tools for women). With the self-proclaimed highest concentration of local artists, architects, and designers in Phoenix, Coronado’s artistic wares abound. Neighborhood service institutions are integral, including city recycling services, spay and neuter non-
profit organizations (a Coronado favorite), local public schools, campaigning politicians, other historic districts, and after 30 years—Neighborhood Housing Services. The plethora of religious and social service organizations located in Coronado are frequently featured as “points of interest,” and opened for tour. The 2011 tour included Caregiver House, a senior living facility and Calle 16, a nonprofit organization supporting youth murals and Latino art. While the 2010 tour featured Arizona’s largest African American church, the Church of God in Christ, whose state headquarters is housed in a former Church of Latter Day Saints head quarters built in 1947. And, in a final example of the inclusivity of home tour, invitations to sponsor home tour (through the purchase of tour brochure ad space, a vendor spot, or in-kind donation) were extended to Coronado’s local strip club, Band-Aids, and Sunshine Market, purveyors of “groceries, beer, wine, Lotto, & liquor.” While the former declined to participate, the latter was featured as a point of interest on the home tour (and in the brochure). In a stuccoed corner store, amidst the packs of gum and a rotating hotdog wheel, the generous proprietor Salem (a neighborhood fixture since 1990) held the official home tour wine tasting event.

Inclusive definitions of both guest and host, of who has the right to offer and receive, are key in feminist hospitality (Hamington 2010a, 2010b). Urban inclusivity is contingent upon the facilitation of diversity through the comingling, but not homogenization, of difference. Arising from its earliest enactments, the Coronado home tour has celebrated modest houses of diverse architecture, inhabited by diverse residents and businesses. This legacy is attributed to many of the conditions of the neighborhood’s construction. Distance from Central Avenue lowered property values to affordable levels. Small homes were constructed to house a working-class population. Uniqueness
in home construction resulted from both piecemeal development and resident input in architectural design. The 10th Street trolley created commercial opportunities within the neighborhood, including small businesses operated by Chinese immigrants; this live-work legacy persists for immigrants and natives alike. And, during the Great Depression, many homeowners retrofitted and then relocated to their barns and stand-alone rear garages so the main house could generate rental income. Eighty years later, these “Granny flats” provide an array of affordable housing options for diverse household configurations.

Today, when asked what they love about the Coronado neighborhood, the most common response is its diversity in architectural style and composition of inhabitants (race/ethnicity, religion, income, profession, age, sexuality, politics, etc.). “We’re similar in that we’re attracted to old homes, and this living,” says Diane Brennan, a realtor and former Coronado Neighborhood Association President, “but it’s our diversity that keeps us together. Because we are a totally culturally, racially, educationally, professionally, diverse area” (interview, 12/12/08). While the demographic composition of Coronado mirrors that of Phoenix overall, home touring attracts English-speaking, and predominately white attendees, or what has been referred to as the “NPR tote bag crowd”—middle-aged women and gay men (Pela 2009). The homes on tour each year in Coronado usually display some combination of the touted architectural and social diversity. The 2010 home tour, for example, took place entirely on one block; of the 12 homes on tour, Tudors certainly comprised an architectural majority, but none housed the suburban social norm (i.e. white, heterosexual nuclear family). Varied household compositions prevail on home tour owing to the diverse household configurations of
Coronado’s residents, and because homes on tour are chosen by the historic character and integrity of the exterior, not by who resides inside.

Despite undeniable eclecticism, a something-for-everyone sensibility that cannot be anything other than welcoming, historic status in Coronado does contain an exclusionary edge. This contradictory tension emerges in a single conversation with Cindy, an active Coronado resident who opened her home on the 2010 tour.

This area is so eclectic—with the Hispanic men pushing the ice cream cart—do you get that over in your area [of Coronado]? …it’s really different—I really like this area. I like the people that are here…you have a wide range of people, and the people here seem to be very working class, very normal, there’s not a lot of pretentiousness. How could it be? These areas are good because there’s not pretentiousness (Cindy, interview, 4/17/10).

I like the cachet of being able to say I have a historic home. Kind of snobby. I like to be able to say I live in a historic home, a historic neighborhood and then to be able to have another group of people that I connect with on a different level. So now I’m—oh I’m a Baptist, I can go to a Baptist church, but now I live in a historic home I have something else in common with more people. And there’s not very many people that can say they live in a historic home. So it makes me feel special. Yeah, so it’s all about snobbery (Cindy, interview, 4/17/10).

Exclusionary sentiments inhering in historic status are either comically contradictory (as in Cindy’s case) or must be delivered tongue-in-cheek, “historic with a lowercase h,” as one resident put it. Significant because of its working-class ordinariness in the first place, historic is broadly interpreted in Coronado. On par with the cachet of being a Baptist, at best, “lite” social status is garnered. In addition to homes registered on national, state, and local historic registers, any old home located in proximity to the urban corridor can reasonably stake claim to historic status. Contrary to the seemingly rigid rules of historic preservation, the legacy of built and social diversity engenders historic Coronado with a much more open ethical stance. Residents who bemoan minor aesthetic
infractions on the Coronado list-serve, such as parking on the wrong side of the street, feeding the flock of unsanctioned peacocks, or commissioning graffiti-style murals on historic structures, usually receive reminder that tolerance, care over rule, is practiced here. Tyler’s list-serve post is characteristic of such sentiments.

Aside from the portions of our neighborhood that have Historic Overlay restrictions, we have pretty much free rein over how we "decorate" or "accessorize" our properties. That is what makes Coronado, “Coronado,” and not some central city Ahwatukee-Foothills HOA nightmare. You may not like the graffiti. I may not like the bold, primary colors which make that section of McDowell look like "Toontown"—but the owners of those properties DO like it (or- GASP! Say it's not so!—they believe it makes their properties MORE valuable), and it is their right to paint it as they wish. What does this say to prospective buyers? Exactly what I would hope it says: "If you embrace diversity, join us!" (Tyler Olson, list-serve post, 6/8/2009).

“Hospitality operates at the border of membership,” says Hamington, “but it is precisely at the border where learning takes place—learning about self and Others through confronting difference” (2010a, 28). Debates over private aesthetic decisions and their public effects unfold on the neighborhood list-serve, in meetings, on home tour. Does tolerance always rein in Coronado? Certainly not. But such a plastic sense of historic in Coronado inculcates a traditionally conservative enterprise with openness. Even the seemingly immutable facets of historic urban environs (e.g. Coronado’s history as an early suburb) have the potential for being re-imagined (i.e. as an sustainable urban living).
A feminist hospitality seeks to supplant perceptions of hierarchical structure (host gives, guest receives) in hospitality by identifying host-guest relations through multidirectional *reciprocity*. This hospitality, in this approach, is characterized by *symbiosis*; an ethics of care supersedes contractual obligation. Drawing on the argument that practices of care inform practices of democratic citizenship (Tronto 1993), Hamington frames the mutual benefits of democracy, individuals relinquish private rights for public protection, as the basis for hospitality (2010a). For many Coronado residents, *historic* living is rejection of post-WWII suburban values and proclamation of more global ones. Privatized and individualized concerns are weighed against the wellbeing of the
collective as Earth citizens. The premise of residential historic preservation—limited private property rights for the public good—is considered beyond the scope of the neighborhood. No longer the sole aim, historic preservation becomes means through which ethical imperatives are lived. Rallying against the privatopias of generations past and exurban present, the restoration, repair, and habitation of historic homes are re-imagined as quest for livable urban communities (Figure 41).

Phoenix defines urban sprawl! Living vanilla lives and driving—newer homes carry this to an extreme. Subdivisions are [getting] further out, the homes all look the same, there is no quality in the work. Coronado is the antithesis of this—character, location, quality are present in every home here (Chris, interview, 4/24/2010).

There are those people who are looking to kind of go back to their childhood and there’s us who in some way is looking to go back to what we perceive—maybe rightly or wrongly—as a like, you can say simpler, less morally fraught time in history, which of course is completely ridiculous for two gay men to even want to do that—but when you get into you know, the cheapness of the way things are made, things made in China, the way things are consumed now, the ginormous amount of space, to just the vapid emptiness you feel when you drive through certain suburban areas, and strip mall after strip mall, chain after chain, and the houses all look the same. Whatever you want to call it that’s what you know we, in our generation, our trying to avoid. ‘Historic’ becomes code [for this] (Jason, interview, 12/10/08).

What we have all in common is that you know we didn’t want to live in these new suburbs…I mean the fact that you look at the prices of houses here, you could afforded a house probably three times the size…the fact that you chose not to do that in and of itself suggests that there is a commonality of like philosophy there, that philosophy…of against that bigger is better mentality…this actually is a neighborhood that has sidewalks…you’ve chosen not to buy into the American expansion (Ralph, interview 12/10/08).

I am definitely committed to living downtown and living in a neighborhood. I DO NOT want to live out in a suburb, I’ve never wanted to live out in a suburb and I’ve NEVER wanted to live in a gated community, if I want to live in a gated community I’ll go to prison! (Dianne, interview, 4/26/2010).
Lobbed from the front porch of a single-family dwelling in one of the City’s first suburbs, such critiques speak to ambivalence of the contemporary moment, not the nuances of suburban history and its integral legacy in “urban” Coronado. The absence of garages, in many of these pre-WWII homes, is seen as fostering neighborhood sociality. The presence of small closets and limited storage space are perceived as contributing to the reduction of needless consumption. Quality building materials, real brick, stone, and wood, and craftsmanship in construction (coved ceilings, built-in-niches) are situated as a commitment to enduring neighborhoods and consideration of quality-of-life. Among active Coronado residents such “re-urbanist” sentiments have come to characterize historic living. Echoing New Urbanist appeals, the features of pre-WWII historic homes are re-imagined as contributing toward a more livable city, nation, and ultimately, planet Earth (e.g. Duany, Plater-Zyberk, Speck 2001). New suburbs, in contrast, are couched as spaces of consumption, an unsustainable urban form that cannot be adopted everywhere if resources and quality of life are to be made available to everyone.

Many have made the case that the uses of heritage are demonstrative of the needs of the present (Hamer 1989; Lowenthal 1996). In this moment, with a suite of global environmental concerns at the fore and greater social connectivity than ever before, Coronado’s historic environs are reconsidered from a cosmopolitan vantage. A sensibility of global connectedness, empathy, and ethical responsibility, that don’t always align with local rule and law, define the outlook of this new cosmopolitanism (e.g. Benhabib 2006; Heise 2008; Beck 2009; Rifkin 2009). For many Coronado residents, present and future generations of Phoenicians are not the only beneficiaries of residential historic preservation. All citizens, not just those who reside in Coronado, the argument
goes, ultimately benefit from reduced resource consumption embodied in historic communities. Old homes, especially those in working-class historic neighborhoods, are smaller than their contemporary counterparts, with less space for consumer goods and smaller energy-use demands. And unlike newly constructed homes, the reuse of homes, building materials, and furnishings, extends the use-life of the raw materials and prevents further extraction and consumption. Such aspirations are, of course, fraught with contradictions, obstacles, and trade-offs. A small home accompanied with an affluent lifestyle, for example, undoubtedly generates a sizeable ecological footprint. A historic home with poor insulation and other inefficiencies can easily have higher energy demands than its new equivalent. While the efficacy of resident’s sustainability efforts may be crucial in sustaining cosmopolitan hospitality, the concern here is that their integration in historic living characterizes a new moment in neighborhood preservation; the scope of care is broadened beyond the house and the neighborhood.

The uses of residential historic preservation have evolved over time, in accord with the needs of different moments and places, evidencing both the adaptive capacity of the institution and the value in its core aims. In Coronado and cities across the country, the residential historic preservation efforts of the 1970-80s were largely seen as defensive strategies against urban renewal projects, freeway construction, and new development (Hamer 1989). To save their houses and neighborhoods from immediate erasure, residents used their local history for neighborhood protection. The threat of bulldozers subsided in the subsequent decades of residential historic preservation but old homes faced a new threat—decay, rot, and blight. People from elsewhere, with the financial means to undertake renovations and a desire to preserve the architectural character and
ambiance, arrived to rescue fixer-uppers in urban neighborhoods. Gentrification became the defining force defining residential preservation in the 1980-90s, and concerns were raised over the effects of rising property values for local residents and the “superficial” sense of local heritage held by the newcomers (Hamer 2000; Boer 2004). Many of the “Coronado gentrifiers” (Kukino 1983) became influential participants in NHS projects and the formation of the Coronado Neighborhood Association.

Residential historic preservation has always been twinned with other community concerns and aspirations being played out at across the nation. Today, neighborhood needs and those of humanity at large are coalescing around sustainability, and historic living is rising to the challenge nationally (Lovelady 2008) and in Coronado. For example, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has proclaimed support for Smart Growth (National Trust 2013) and alongside historic architectural features, the last five Coronado home tours (2008-2012) have featured the full array of sustainable amenities: green architectural rehabs, urban gardens and permaculture, chicken coops, compost bins, solar panels, and greywater systems. The brochure for the 2011 home and garden tour titled “Back to the Bungalow” attunes tourgoers to such features.

Notice the clapboard gables over the comfy front porch of this classic bungalow as you head to the garden in the back. Be sure to peek in the double-hung one-over-one windows, too. Shana & Goody won’t mind. This year, it’s the outside living space that is featured: a relaxing deck, outside dining, and custom storage, gates and planters made by metal artist Goody (owner of Swiss Metal Works). Don’t miss the organic vegetable garden around the south side, which is amended with Shana’s own compost.

Practices of caretaking strive toward the lived reciprocity of a feminist hospitality, as concern for house and community, domestic and global citizenship, present and future generations. In Coronado, home tour remains a key mechanism by which
historic practices evolve to suit these changing, and more expansive conceptions of “community.” “To conserve the past is never enough,” asserts Lowenthal, “good caretaking involves continual creation” (2004, 40). In these ways, home touring accords with a broad understanding of hospitality as practices of care that “maintain, continue, and repair our world so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, our selves, and our environment” (Fisher and Tronto 1991, 40; cited in Tronto 1993, 103; cited in Sander-Staudt 2010, 22).

Renewing Urban Trust

To welcome is to extend openness, a gesture of vulnerability and exposure. Inhering in even the smallest act of hospitality, the threat of rejection, resentment, and violation lurks (Derrida 2000, 2004). Yet risk—something to lose or gain—is precisely what makes hospitality such a powerful and affirmative embodied ethics of care. Extending hospitality, opening oneself to risk, is simultaneously a gesture of forgiveness—for past wrongdoings, and trust in the honest intentions of host and guest. In a feminist domestic hospitality, risk and vulnerability are negotiated through the two-way enactment of caring virtues including attention, response, and respect (Sander-Staudt 2010; Hamington 2004).

To begin, the virtue of attention suggests that guests ought to strive to be sensitively aware of the needs of those who welcome them, assuring in the first place that as guests they are authentically invited and welcomed. A posture of attention minimally requires an absence of a blatant intention to conquer or harm the embedded relations from which hospitality emerges and a willingness to establish trust, tell the truth, and honor difference. Attentive participants in hospitable exchanges practice a kind of mutual adjustment, and sympathetic knowledge that transforms unknown others into known others (Sander-Staudt 2010, 31).
While such a conscious caring comportment is integral to the development of hospitable relations, equally integral to embodied ethics are the unreflexive and spontaneous responses acquired through everyday bodily coping (Hamington 2004, 2010a; Dreyfus and Dreyfus 2004). “Habits of hospitality,” argues Hamington, “are not rote repetitions of muscle movements, but imaginative and open-ended responses to strangers and environments on a trajectory of hospitality” (2010a, 32). Habitual bodily comportment, both reflective and corporal, is critical in the enactment of ethics.

Figure 42. Public-private looking. Photographs by Bryon Darby, 2011.

Ambiguity in preconceived identities (who is the host?) and embodied social protocol (cupboard opening, acceptable or no?) lends a palpable atmosphere of openness, intrigue, and delight to home touring. How, exactly, is one supposed to conduct a group “tour” of a stranger’s bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen pantry? A cursory glance may
express disinterest while a lengthy look might convey too much. A cacophony of things compete for attention; from innocuous objects commanding obligatory observation—the original hardwood floor, an antique stove, wall art—to the most intimate things that quietly call for a second glance (Figure 42)—carefully arranged family photos, dressers chockablock with intimate mementos, handwritten grocery lists, and bedside books. Akin to the childhood feeling of being home alone, with the weight of parental oversight lifted, a voyeuristic delight bubbles to the surface.

Strangers standing in intimate spaces, in the case of home tour, partake in ephemeral moments of domestic delirium, proffering unusual opportunities for hospitable exchange. Sometimes, without spoken words, tourgoers congregated in a child’s bedroom arrive at the appropriate course of action for this encounter. Without written rules or formal codes of conduct, spontaneous collective practices in negotiating public-private balance emerge. Despite standing in someone’s closet, privacy is maintained by embodied comportment through just the right amount of looking, reserved composure, appropriate tone of voice. Other times, the propriety of tourgoers is affronted in encountering private things, such as carefully arranged vases full of naked Ken dolls, a dirty litter box, or framed portraits of the homeowners—in the buff. Or, in some instances collective tourgoer decisions nudge the public-private boundary a bit; seemingly reserved tourgoers open kitchen cabinets and closet doors with abandon and crowd teeny bathrooms en mass to inspect tile, tubs, and toilets without shame. There is undeniable public pleasure in the looking at private things. And in this fleeting public-private space-time, poking-and-proding is forgiven. Closet-peeking and price tag inquires are tolerated. And more times than not, the freedom to see what is ordinarily off
limits is tempered by the responsibility of such power, such trust. The requisite
formalities of host and guest are simultaneously maintained and breached, but ultimately,
in most instances, trust is not. In this fertile liminal zone, without written rule, the ethical
imperative unfolds.

In opening their homes to hundreds or even thousands of strangers, the
vulnerabilities of home tour hosts have long been palpable. Writing on Virginia’s home
tour, Davidson observes, “the idea of allowing perfect strangers to enter one’s house,
perhaps to track dirt on the carpet, assess the owner’s taste in wallpaper and art, and—
God forbid—pocket a small curio on the way out the door had always struck me as
slightly outlandish” (1997, 24). Or worse, the unsettling thought that you’ve unwittingly
invited a burglar to case your home, might linger long after the last tourgoer has gone.
Friends and family make certain that those considering serving in the capacity of tour
host consider the full array of risks, physical and psychological. And it is in this process,
of contending with and ultimately overcoming fear—of stereotypes, the unknown, the
other—that forgiveness and trust ensues. Phoenix historic district resident, Robert Pela,
whose home was on the 2009 F.Q. Story tour, speaks to this process.

We’re not especially brave people, and we’re unusually fond of our things, so we
found [a friend’s burglar warning] briefly troubling. But then we remembered
that most of what we own is worthless; our television is 15 years old; our laptops
are ancient. We figured thieves who came back to steal our old appliances would
be doing us a favor, as these items are insured. The rest of our things—the stuff
that really matters to us, like my record collection and my spouses’ many boxes of
vintage greeting cards—are valueless and would only be tempting to other
deranged homosexuals, not housebreakers (Pela 2009).

In addition to minor violations to privacy, pride, and property, the greatest risk of
opening one’s self and home is, in a Derridian sense, losing it. In succumbing to vague
urban fears, distrust of one’s neighbors, of ordinary citizens, the ability to feel at home—in one’s skin, home, neighborhood, and nation—is dismantled. Host becomes hostage (Derrida 2000). In offering domestic hospitality, making others feel at-home, the tour host risks, in a very real way, forgoing their own sense of security and comfort. But in taking a risk, in unsettling one’s at-homeness, forgiveness and trust is also built. On the 2011 home tour, held entirely on 2 blocks of Mitchell Street, Brent, a middle-aged male police officer, and Barbara, a single-woman in her 70s, both raised the aforementioned safety and property concerns; Brent opted out of home tour, while Barbara threw her doors open to 1300 guests. Down a few houses from Barbara, Maria and Kim, a lesbian couple, contended with, and ultimately overcame, the very real possibility of encountering homophobic hostility on tour. None such events occurred. Every year, for the last three decades, a dozen Coronado households have each weighed personal risk against public gain, and chosen the latter.

Forgiveness, for the failures of the suburban dream and disappointments in the urban present, is necessary for Coronado—for Phoenix—to be imagined anew. Humility, strength, and hope are needed for a community to dust off, and try again. And each spring, home tour proffers the opportunity to try again. Sara, a new Coronado resident whose home was open on the 2010 tour, expresses one such moment of disappointment, forgiveness, and subsequently, gratitude, toward the failings of her home.

All of just the frustrations of a historic home, I just couldn’t handle it, I didn’t know how to take [it]—like cracks in the floor—oh my God…But after the home tour, and all of the energy and the sweat, and a few tears that I put into the house I just absolutely love and adore every single crappy-ass feature everyone would think it was. Like, I want to keep the cracks in the floor and I love that this is unfinished and you know what I mean? So that’s what I got out of the home tour (Sara, interview 4/19/10).
Hospitality is enacted in *striving* toward openness, generosity, attentiveness, and tolerance, not the perfect execution (Hamington 2010b). In minor, yet not insignificant ways, the practice of home tour enacts a welcoming countenance, the acceptance of imperfection, of difference. Consider, for example, that Coronado’s annual pre-tour street clean-up is carried out by the collaborative efforts of neighbors and parolees from the Coronado adult probation community center. And the neighborhood’s high school students, from North High, earn service hours volunteering as home tour house sitters. Two populations normally excluded from the extension of forgiveness and trust, parolees and teenagers, are invited to participate, and in some small, way, made to feel at home.

**Toward Hospitable Urbanism**

Figure 43. Hospitality performed, 2011 home tour. Photographs by Bryon Darby, 2011.
Preservation, in name and practice, connotes conserving efforts, those that foreclose dynamism in built environs. As a celebration of domesticity and historic preservation, homemaking and nation building, home touring engenders historic communities with openness (Figure 43). The roles, of host and guest, private and public are opened, blurred, exchanged. Despite the event’s fragile and provisional sociality, the act of extending hospitality to strangers necessitates their consideration in the first place. Thanks to Neighborhood Housing Services in Coronado, historic home touring has become an annual enactment of hospitable urbanism for thirty years. Historic practices in Coronado are demonstrative of service to, rather than rigid preservation of, urban communities. This, I contend, is the basis for feminist hospitality, an urban ethics of welcome and care.

The magic of home touring lies in its ambiguity, at once, sub-and-urban, private and public, quotidian and extraordinary, structured and spontaneous. The American Dream, of effortless domestic comfort and perfection, is performed on home tour, but so is the labor of historic restoration, repair, and maintenance. Simultaneously exhibited, are the products of domestic delirium and drudgery—pleasure and pain, freedom and obligation. And this is what people come to experience, not the sterility and perfection of house museums or show homes, but homemaking. Without purview of an overarching institution, without formal rules or codes, home tour is unlike most other preservation-related endeavors. Yet, home tour is an institution. Its annual repetition socializes participants in the manners, protocol, and norms, and ethics of home touring and historic habitation. The sense of formality and prescribed behavior frequently felt on home tour, attests to the embodied social negotiation of public-private boundaries despite the
absence of written rules. While this socializing impulse cultivates aesthetic repetition and mimicry, diversity in architecture and inhabitants wards against stylistic hegemony and homogenization.

Code-based preservation ethics alone are insufficient in achieving the full democratizing aspirations of historic preservation, liberty and union. Without the enactment of openness, vulnerability, and inclusion on home tour, residential historic communities risk becoming shuttered, sterile, and disconnected from public life. The opening private historic homes to the public in home touring, performs the mitigated sense ownership embodied in historic preservation values. As an unofficial preservation practice celebrating past and present homemaking, initiated and largely carried out by and for women, home touring has, unsurprisingly, received little recognition or legitimacy. It has been the aim here to elevate the long-standing and influential role of home touring in generating the welcoming urban countenance of the Coronado historic neighborhood.

The celebration of historic habitation via home touring contributes toward hospitable urbanism through elevating the art and labor of residential caretaking to a tourist destination and rethinking who has the right to offer hospitality. The identification as caretaker, rather than homeowner, becomes the position from which hospitality is proffered in Coronado. Additionally, the event of home tour serves as reminder, historic home or not, that we are all custodians of urban life, of the built and social environs we inherit and bequeath. “All heritage,” says Lowenthal, “is in any case ours for only a brief spell, before we in turn pass it on to no less myriad heirs” (2004, 37). A twenty-first century cosmopolitan agenda requires the adoption of identity and habits as
Earth citizens that resonates between bodily and planetary scales. While domestic hospitality carries connotations of a prolonged, intimate, face-to-face exchange, such encounters will not suffice as the sole expression of welcome in a socially networked, digital world.

Home tour’s ephemeral temporality is one hospitable practice engendering what Pilardi terms, “a community of the event” (2010, 77). Welcome, vulnerability, forgiveness, and trust are extended in fleeting, face-to-face moments and through the cultivation of an overarching atmosphere. Historic homes alone cannot achieve such aims. “The future,” assets Lowenthal, “may be better served by inheriting from us not specific material relics but knowledge of traditional creative skills, institutions in good working order, and habits of resilience in coping with the uncertain vicissitudes of existence” (2004, 40). As an enduring hospitable practice of welcome and care, home tour is a gift to Phoenix.
Chapter 5

MAKING SENSE

It is no longer the presence of the past that speaks to us, but its pastness.
- David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, 1985, xvii

In thinking with the sensibilities and materialities of historic habitation, this dissertation contributes to the body of literature rethinking the materiality of the urban. While many aspects of the city and everyday life have been attended to in this manner, including notions of heritage, memory, ruins, and historic preservation, few have considered the practices, performances, and material relations of residential historic preservation. Not only is historic habitation one of the prevailing means by which ordinary people contend with the past on a day-to-day basis, its proliferation in cities throughout the U. S. attests to its meaningfulness. “In few areas of modern life,” says Hamer (1998, vii), “is history being applied in such a direct way.” But the “application” of history, as criticisms of residential historic preservation evidence, is not straightforward, it is sideways and closely, in accordance with the imperatives of things (Lingis 1998). The past is not represented in historic districts, it comes to be through everyday enactments, aesthetic practices (Anderson 2004a).

Historic habitation is the lived practice of “sticky entanglement” (Highmore 2010): deeds, death certificates, and building-permits, bodily memories, domestic dreams, aesthetic juxtapositions, mundane chores and magical doorknobs, home touring, faux features, blight and abandonment. Preservation discourse avoids the messy lived materiality of historic habitation despite the fact that visitors and residents of historic sites repeatedly assert desires for nostalgic encounters, numinous experience, and sensual
delight. Instead, calls to “put the history back” into residential historic preservation prevail. This dissertation contributes to the residential historic preservation literature as a call to rethink the practice from a materialist vantage point, as a form of sensual urbanism.

The aesthetic dimensions of historic preservation are frequently belittled as vacuous, for presenting a fabulist account of the past, or criticized as exclusionary, for institutionalizing elitist styles. I point toward the unique historic aesthetic in Coronado as demonstrating otherwise. I show that historic preservation in Coronado matters, just not in the way the nomenclature intimates. The implications of Coronado’s aesthetic practices presented in this dissertation are ethical. Everyday bodily dispositions—habits, practices, styles—are the site of ethical enactments (Connolly 2002, 2010). Rules of conduct alone do not give rise to ethical subjectivities. “In addition to rules of behavior,” argues Bennett (2001, 29), “one needs an aesthetic disposition hospitable to them.” Residential historic preservation guidelines are at once detailed and vague, clear-cut and contradictory. And when the peculiar circumstances of any given historic home and financial limitations are considered, historic habitation is rife with indecisions. It is precisely the liminal zone of lived practice where embodied ethics takes place.

This dissertation has argued that material relations in historic Coronado engender aesthetic sensibilities beyond rule-based codes, toward the ethical consideration of other, different bodies. Nostalgic enchantment in Coronado inculcates habits and ethics of care toward other kinds of matter through the inhabitation of and caretaking for remnants. Such an enchanted urbanism destabilizes fantasies of human mastery, affirming the “ethical insufficiency of the intellect” in creating meaningful places (Bennett 2001, 139).
The celebration of historic habitation via the embodied practice of home touring contributes toward hospitable urbanism. Welcome, vulnerability, forgiveness, and trust are extended in fleeting, face-to-face moments and through the cultivation of an overarching atmosphere. The institutional practices of urban *bricolage* initiated by Neighborhood Housing Services in the 1970s and 80s, characterized by inclusivity, diversity, and neighborliness, are enacted in the bodies of current residents. In identifying Coronado’s distinctive historic identity as eclectic and diverse, residents enact tolerance of difference, a space for other habits, practices, and styles to ensue.

The ethical-aesthetic sensibilities and practices of historic habitation in Coronado point toward the significance of residential historic preservation as an *urban* practice. Popular depictions of Phoenix as an ahistorical city are waning only due to the City’s recent notoriety for zealous bigotry, hostility, and exclusion. At a time like this, Phoenix is in dire need of Coronado’s hospitable urbanism. “The aesthetic,” assert Latham and McCormack (2009, 260-1), “is not some representational veneer laid over the real materiality of urban life. The aesthetic is part of the generative, distributed expressiveness of the city.” Seemingly minor ethical-aesthetic practices imbuing a swath of the urban core with caretaking, openness, and diversity are not insignificant. The habitual, too familiar, and taken-for-granted practices and performances of everyday life are the only way a body, neighborhood, or city becomes ethical. Ethical sensibilities or “arts of the self” fostering openness, modesty, generosity, and gratitude must be *cultivated* (Connolly 2002).
Sensual Urbanisms

This dissertation contributes to rethinking the urban as sensual, enchanted, and hospitable. The sensual affordances of “historic” materiality, I argue, generate moments of attunement, of worldly attachment necessary for generosity to occur. A sensual urbanism attends to the surfaces of everyday life, the seemingly superficial practices that attune the senses one way or another. The cleaving of such minor and mundane attunements this way or that, are consequential.

The politics of ordinary affect can be anything from the split second when police decide to shoot someone because he’s black and standing in a dark doorway and has something in his hand, to a moment when someone falls in love with someone else who’s just come into view. Obviously the differences matter (K. Stewart 2007, 15).

Nostalgic practices, such as historic preservation and home touring can generate any number of outcomes—for better or worse. Nostalgic enchantment necessarily hovers between the mindful and mindless. Domestic hospitality is always precariously poised between generosity and hostility. It is imperative we attend to instances when everyday practices open ethical potential and extend the duration of their resonance. Which is why the two affects explored here, enchantment and hospitality, have purchase beyond historic preservation and outside the Coronado neighborhood. Everyday encounters of enchantment and hospitality are routes toward worldly apprehension, sensual urbanism. Written codes and laws fail in creating equitable, safe, livable communities precisely because they must be lived—repeatedly enacted. Spontaneous and unconscious actions arise from sensory knowledge. A body’s capacity to sense influences what is sensed. From one vantage point, sensual, enchanted, and hospitable urbanisms seem woefully unprepared to combat urban injustices. But, from another perspective, these
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comportments are necessary for proffering openness, which, in some form or another, is requisite in preventing despair and hate from foreclosing ethical attachments.

Through words and images, hyperbole and charm, I have attempted, in this dissertation, to seduce rather than convince. This is an enchanted comportment. Bennett (2001) presents enchantment as a weak ontology, a form of affirmative theorizing aiming to inflect a positive political and ethical vision.

[Enchantment] offers an account of the world that highlights its capacity for inspiring wonder, and its sometimes fanciful descriptions aspire to augment our actual attachments to the world. The fanciful and the real, the virtual and the actual, are all incestuous partners—and we have no choice about them being connected; what counts is how we mobilize the connections. These connections do not assume the form of a tight argument, and they have contingency built into them. They are affective affinities that move from wonder to attachment and attachment to generosity (Bennett 2001, 162).

This dissertation is performative, necessarily provisional and meant to resonate through infrasensible registers. As such, this mode of inquiry is vulnerable, subject to criticisms of naïvete. By definition this approach is speculative, contested, and only part of ethical life. While the ideas presented here have relevance in other contexts, this demonstration is tethered to a particular material composition and thus, necessarily limited in its scope and applicability.

For example, this dissertation attends to the residents and things that actively participate and find purchase in Coronado’s aesthetic sensibilities and practices. I encountered Coronado residents through neighborhood events, home tours, the Dispatch survey, online listserves, and as their neighbor. Few of these residents resided in Coronado east and most of them were primarily English-speakers. The intrigue surrounding Coronado east is ripe for future research. The sensory lives of residents and
things in Coronado east have not been adequately attended to in this dissertation. The diverging historical circumstances between east and west would be the first priority in any future Coronado inquiry. Also, the houses peppered on each block that visibly display no interest in house or neighborhood care, pose numerous questions regarding their experience of historic Coronado.

Additionally, this dissertation is a case study in Coronado’s present-day materiality. The manifold historical circumstances and events of happenstance that gave rise to Coronado’s present-day aesthetic cannot be fully known, nor are these conditions repeatable. The contours and confluence of events in historic Coronado are undoubtedly unique. And while the aesthetic practices and performances this dissertation brings to the fore manifest in varied shapes and forms in many other places, both in and out of historic districts, the specific context, the particular array of matter, matters greatly.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that performative, experience/experiment research relies heavily on the author’s material imagination and sensory life. Such an approach risks foreclosing rather than disclosing affective expressions. To temper my own subjective stance I employ a suite of collaborative methods. Working with and learning from the aesthetic sensibilities of Kevin McHugh, Mark Klett, Katie Lehman, Bryon Darby, and Jason Roehner has imbued this dissertation with distributed authorship. As such, this dissertation is more than subjective but less than objective (Bennett 2001). Visual research in this dissertation, carried out through participation in Phoenix Transect, has been integral in the production of new information and a critical strategy in its presentation. Ambivalence and tension between words and images, the ways they align and diverge, has imbued this work with openness—the affective state integral to
enchantment and hospitality. It is my hope that the aesthetic sensibilities presented here will resonate in sensory registers, generating a moment of openness, hospitality to “whatever happens; to whosoever or whatever arrives” (Dewsbury et al. 2002, 438).
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To our delight, we discovered Woodyer and Geoghegan’s (2012) review of enchantment in geography upon completion of this chapter.

An excerpt from content posted on their realty website in 2010. The text has since been removed. Accessed January 22 2013. [http://www.historicphoenix.com](http://www.historicphoenix.com).

This alternate map eschews cartographic coloring conventions to performatively convey Coronado’s hodge-podge construction and non-linear temporality. Map made by Brian Pompeii (2013) against his better judgment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied Units</th>
<th>Renter Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Phoenix</th>
<th>Coronado</th>
<th>Coronado East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander/2 or more races/other race</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey.

vi With 35 historic districts in the urban core Phoenix has embraced historic preservation as a neighborhood development technique for the last 30 years, until Prop. 207. Funded by libertarian groups outside the state, the “private property rights protection act,” requires city and state government to reimburse property owners for any new acts of ‘eminent domain,’ such as historic ordinances, the result in a decrease in their property value. Despite the fact that historic zoning almost universally increases property values, fear over lawsuits ensues. Cities such as Tempe and Flagstaff, however, are experimenting with property owner waivers to their Prop. 207 rights, as a means to pursue residential historic designation.

vii The eight MORE homes can be located at: 2214 North 10th Street, 2530 North Dayton, 2520 North Dayton, 2536 North 12th Street, 2535 North Mitchell, 1430 East Sheridan, 1431 East Yale, 1435 East Yale.

viii In addition to the White House restoration and tour, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis spearheaded the preservation of Lafayette Square in Washington D.C. and was critical in the preservation campaigns of Grand Central Station and St. Bartholomew’s Church in New York City. Her preservation efforts are widely cited as influential in the passage of the Historic Preservation Act in 1966. See Galop, 2006.

ix As a newly arrived renter to the neighborhood, with no previous home tour experience, my own anecdotal account accords with the openness of home touring in Coronado. Over the four-year period of my involvement, I began volunteering in the capacity of “house sitter” (2008 and 2009), then as “volunteer coordinator” on the home tour planning committee (2010), and finally, as co-chair of the entire tour (2011). At no point did a lack of property ownership or duration of tenure preclude me from serving in the capacities of Coronado host and guest. Self-identification as a Coronado neighborhood custodian appears to be the only qualification needed.
To: Kevin McHugh  
School of

From:  
Mark Roosa, Chair  
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 02/22/2010

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 02/22/2010

IRB Protocol #: 1002004783

Study Title: Dwelling on Nostalgia: Place-Making in the Coronado Residential Historic District

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2).

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that it disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.
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INTERVIEW LETTER
Interview Consent Form
Coronado Historic District Study

INTRODUCTION
The purposes of this form are to provide you (as a prospective research study participant) information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research and to record the consent of those who agree to be involved in the study.

RESEARCHERS
Kevin McHugh, Associate Professor, and Jennifer Kitson, PhD student, from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning at Arizona State University have invited your participation in a research study.

STUDY PURPOSE
The purpose of the research is to explore the meaningfulness of residing in the Coronado residential historic district. What is meaningful about living in a historic home, a historic neighborhood? What has been your experience living in the Coronado? How does “preservation” matter?

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH STUDY
If you decide to participate, you will join a study involving research on the meaningfulness of historic preservation and the associated practices of residing in a historic home. If you say YES, then your participation will last for approximately one hour at a location of your choice, preferable your home. You will be asked to answer questions related to your experience living in the Coronado. Approximately 30 Coronado residents will be participating in this study.

We would like to audiotape the interview. If you give permission to be audiotaped, you have the right to ask for the recording to be stopped. At any time participants can skip questions and/or decide to participate without any negative consequences. The recordings will be transcribed and also stored in electronic format.

We would also like to photograph you and your home. You can choose to participate in the study without being photographed. If you give permission to be photographed you can ask for the photography to be stopped at any time.

RISKS
There are no known risks from taking part in this study, but in any research, there is some possibility that you may be subject to risks that have not yet been identified.

BENEFITS
The possible benefits of your participation in the research include: contribution to research about place-making, memory, and historic preservation; insight into the meaningful aspects of the Coronado that should be fostered and supported;
recommendations to the Phoenix Historic Preservation Office; distinctive photographs of your home and/or yourself; historical information about your own home.

CONFIDENTIALITY
If you agree to be photographed, we cannot guarantee anonymity as the image identifies your participation in the study. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be known unless you give permission. If you agree to be interviewed, but not photographed, you will remain anonymous. Pseudonyms will be used in reporting results of this study. Identifying information will be stored separately from the collected data. All data will remain confidential.

WITHDRAWAL PRIVILEGE
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is ok for you to say no. Even if you say yes now, you are free to say no later, and withdraw from the study at any time. Any audio recordings or other data collected from you will be destroyed upon withdrawal of the study.

COSTS AND PAYMENTS
There is no payment for your participation in the study.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT
Any questions you have concerning the research study or your participation in the study, before or after your consent, will be answered by Kevin McHugh (School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning, Coor Hall 5590, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, 85287-5302, (480) 965-3510, kmchugh@asu.edu) or Jennifer Kitson (2210 N. 10th St. Phoenix, AZ, 85006, (323) 702-8774, jennifer.l.kitson@asu.edu).

If you have questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk; you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965 6788.

This form explains the nature, demands, benefits and any risk of the project. By signing this form you agree knowingly to assume any risks involved. Remember, your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without. In signing this consent form, you are not waiving any legal claims, rights, or remedies. A copy of this consent form will be offered to you.
Your signature below indicates that you consent to participate in the above study.

___________________________  ___________________________  ____________  
Subject's Signature           Printed Name                   Date                    

By signing below you are granting to the researchers the right to use recorded tapes of
you, for presenting or publishing this research.

___________________________  ___________________________  ____________  
Subject's Signature           Printed Name                   Date                    

By signing below you are granting to the researchers the right to use photos taken of you,
for presenting or publishing this research.

___________________________  ___________________________  ____________  
Subject's Signature           Printed Name                   Date                    

INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT
"I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the
potential benefits and possible risks associated with participation in this research study,
have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above
signature. These elements of Informed Consent conform to the Assurance given by
Arizona State University to the Office for Human Research Protections to protect the
rights of human subjects. I have provided (offered) the subject/participant a copy of this
signed consent document."

Signature of Investigator______________________________________
Date_____________

Signature of Investigator______________________________________
Date_____________
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Interview Questions
Coronado Historic District Study

1. Can you share with us your personal journey that led you to the Coronado neighborhood? (Where did you grow up? Where did you live before? What motivated you to move here?)

2. What was the Coronado like when you first moved here?

3. How did you become part of the movement to designate the Coronado as an official neighborhood and later as a historic district?

4. What motivated you to participate in and lead this neighborhood movement? What was your vision of the neighborhood then?

5. What was meaningful to you about living in the Coronado at the time of your arrival to the neighborhood? What is meaningful now?

6. In what ways has the neighborhood changed? Stayed the same?

7. What has it been like to live with other “Coronado pioneers” in the neighborhood you made together?

8. Have your thoughts on the idea of “history” or “preservation” changed? If so, in what ways?

9. Why do you think residential historic districts have been so successful in Phoenix?

10. Does the experience of living in the Coronado relate with memories of other places you’ve lived or wished you had lived?

11. Have you lived in other historic districts? Old homes? New homes?

12. How did you end up in this particular house?

13. What kind of relationship do you have with your house? What do you love about it?

14. What do you think of the way realtors and residents alike often describe residential historic districts as nostalgic places where you can relive your childhood?

15. Did you help introduce home tours into the Coronado? How did home tours become a phenomenon in Phoenix residential historic districts?

16. What is your take on the state of the Coronado, and other historic districts today?
hey, neighbor!

It's Jen, Coronado resident and graduate student in the School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning at Arizona State University. For my dissertation research, I'm exploring placemaking in the Coronado residential historic district. What is meaningful about living in a historic home, a historic neighborhood? How does "preservation" matter?

I'm asking for your participation by taking a few minutes to answer the survey below. Upon completion, simply cut out this page, fold to standard letter size, tape, affix a stamp and drop in the mail or hand deliver to the posted address. You can also complete the survey on-line at http://coronado1.questionpro.com.

Thank you for participating!

Participation is voluntary, information will remain strictly confidential, and your anonymity in all reports from this study will be maintained. Please contact me with any concerns, questions, or if you're willing to answer additional questions about living in Coronado at jennifer.l.kitsos@asu.edu or (323) 702-8774.

What year did you move to Coronado?

Is your house located in a designated historic area?

If so, which one?

What is your occupation?

What is your approximate household income?

What is your gender?

What is your age?

What is your race or ethnicity?

What is the nearest intersection to your house? &

How many adults (including yourself) live in your household? How many children?

Are you a homeowner? Renter? Owner of a rental property in Coronado?

What is meaningful to you about living in Coronado?

Does the experience of living in Coronado relate with memories of other places you've lived or wish you had lived? Please explain.

If you'd be willing to talk with me more about living in Coronado, please provide contact info below. I'll be in touch.

Name: ____________________________

Phone: ___________________________

Email: ___________________________

Mail to: Jen Kitsos

2210 N. 10th Street

Phoenix, AZ 85006
APPENDIX E

ARIZONA STATE ARCHIVES IMAGE CONSENT
Request for Permission to Use Pictorial Images
For Publication

The photograph collections held by the History and Archives Division contain photographs that were 1) created by government agencies and are therefore public records or 2) are in private collections and are therefore subject to copyright laws. See §ARS 39-121 for commercial use of public records.

History and Archives Division
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records
1901 West Madison
Phoenix, AZ 85009
602.926.3720 FAX 602.256.7982

To: Director, Archives Division
From: Jennifer Kitson
Street address: 334 W. Medlock Dr. Unit D203
City, State, ZIP: Phoenix, AZ 85013
Local Telephone/email: 602-702-8774 jkitson@asu.edu

1. Permission: All requests to reproduce photographic images from the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (hereinafter the “Agency”) must be submitted on this application. The applicant agrees to abide by all terms, conditions and provisions of this agreement.

Permission for reproduction is granted only when this application is countersigned by an authorized representative of the Agency. Permission for reproduction is limited to the applicant and is non-transferable and only for the expressed purpose described in this application. This permission is non-exclusive; the Agency reserves the right to reproduce the image and to allow others to reproduce the image.

The Agency reserves the right to limit reproduction of its pictorial images and to impose such conditions as is required by donor agreement or law, or if original material is too fragile for reproduction.

2. Description of this publishing project:

Author(s)/creator(s): Jennifer Kitson
Title or description: Dissertation - "Mater and Matterings in Historic Habitats"
Place of publication: Tempe, AZ
Publisher or sponsor: Arizona State University
Date of publication: June 2013

[Signature]
Date: [Signature]
Date: [Signature]
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## Image Request

Request to reproduce images in the Photograph Collection of the History and Archives Division of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records. Payment must be made by cash, check or money order. Please remember you must pay both an image fee and a use fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image # or Digital Identifier</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description of Image</th>
<th>Size or jpg or TIFF and dpi</th>
<th>Image Fee + Use Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98-3281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1954 civil works admin road construction on 16th St.</td>
<td>35 mb JPG</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-3276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;looking west from 16th St.&quot;</td>
<td>25 mb JPG</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-3282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;looking west from Granada Dr.&quot;</td>
<td>25 mb JPG</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CD (additional $5) [ ] Yes [x] No

Date 4/19/2011  Total $30
Image Charges

Digital files (may be sent via email) $12
CD $5

***Negative charge is an additional $15 per image. Please verify if a negative is required.
Scanning fees are $10 per scan. Large/oversized items may require more than one scan.
These charges are in addition to applicable use fees.

Endorsements:
Date: _______________________

By signing this application, I accept personally and on behalf of

__________________________________________
Publisher

__________________________________________
Publisher's Representative

Department of Library, Archives and Public Records

Date ___________ 2012
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ARIZONA REPUBLIC IMAGE CONSENT
If you agree to this amount, please provide your payment information, sign this contract and return to Reprints.
Credit Card: Visa Mastercard Discover (we do not accept American Express)
Credit Card #:
Exp. Date: 
Check #:
If paying by credit card, please return this signed contract to Reprints, Fax 602-444-8135 or mail to The Arizona Republic Library – Li-18, 200 E Van Buren, Phoenix, AZ 85004
If paying by check please return this signed contract with check to: The Arizona Republic, Library Li-18, 200 E Van Buren, Phoenix, AZ 85004
Signature required to process order.
By signing and returning this contract you agree to the stated billing amount.

All Conditions of this order, as stated above and in the attached Conditions governing the use of materials from Phoenix Newspapers, Inc. are approved and agreed to this
30th day of May, 2013

By Jan Koes Title PhD student

Approved by Jani E. Gershman Date June 1, 2012
Phoenix Newspapers, Inc. retains all rights to refuse or grant permission for reproduction
June 17, 2013

I attest that all research collaborators have granted permission for the publication of their contributions in this dissertation. They include Kevin McHugh, co-author of Chapter 2: Urban Enchantments—Materializing Nostalgia, and members of Phoenix Transect who have contributed photographs throughout this dissertation: Mark Klett, Katie Lehman, Bryon Darby, Jason Roehner, and Daniel Cavenaugh.

Jennifer Kitson