

Week #4: Wednesday, February 4th 2015

What's covered in today's lecture?

- Gentrification benefits some, not all
 - Benefits wealthy people (opens up space within city for wealth to relocate)
 - The poor/low income people are penalized
 - Gradually displaced (not forcefully) from their homes
 - Will find that they don't have affordable services
 - Targets: high income & retailers
- We're looking at gentrification at a different perspective: gender
 - Do women feel threatened or appreciated?
 - Role of media around issues of society
 - Manipulated by urbanists

Condo Development in Toronto

- Today, over 40% of people buying condos are women
- Women viewed as target market to advertisers
- Present city living as liberating for women
- Post WWII
 - Wealthy use to live in city to suburbs (dirty, new immigrants)
 - Suburbs provided bigger homes
 - Women got penalized; men were bread winners (meaning they could travel to the city)
 - Worse time to live in suburbs: 50s to 60s
- Argument: city with diversity gives women liberation and empower them to do as they wish
- Target market:
 - White
 - Able bodied
 - Heterogeneous
 - Middle to Upper Class

Advertisements

- Downtown living/liberation is false
 - Attract men
 - Treat women as possessive

Women in the City

- Post, space is risky & threatening
- Pleasure vs risk
 - Homeless brings city alive
 - Enjoy risk as long as it stops when they go home (ie. People don't mind seeing homeless people on the street, as long as they don't enter the condo building)

Conclusion

- Emphasis on women liberation is not reality
 - Ability to buy condo
 - Not liberating to all women; only to those who can afford it
- Objectify women's bodies in promotion of revitalization
 - Use women's bodies in ads
 - Women are not commodities to be bought or sold!
 - Assumption that once a man can afford a condo in downtown, women will think highly of them