With regards to the Harvey reading, I am most interested in how Harvey defines place. One of the central points of his essay is that capitalism leads to competition between spaces as they jockey to attract surplus capital investment and consumers. However, in order for there to be competition between spaces, each space must be a clearly defined, separate entity. I feel that this is not often the case. As *Ghetto at the Center of the World* illustrates, the borders of places are often vague and nebulous, potentially crossing states and continents alongside the development of social networks. While Chungking Mansions might be a unique case in terms of its international nature, I can also think of several overlapping and conflicting place identities in Fort Macleod, the small Canadian town I grew up in: Fort Macleodian, Southern Albertan, Albertan, First Nations, Canadian, and North American, among others. Sometimes these identities complement each other, leading to cooperation and conciliation, while at other times they come into conflict. As such, I’m not sure that Harvey goes into enough depth about interplace competition.

 For example, in a competition between places, which place identities take precendence? In any city, neighborhoods compete for investment, but also must cooperate in order to attract investment to the city as a whole. Likewise, cities compete with each other, but also cooperate to attract investment and residents to the wider region or country. Which of these place conceptions is a ‘place’ in Harvey’s view? And if they are both places, why doesn’t Harvey speak more about the interplace cooperation and collaboration that occurs within larger superordinate places?

 While this specific essay may not have been the place for it, I would have also liked to hear more about competition *within* places to define a place. While Harvey briefly mentions that “the historical geography of place construction is full of examples of struggles fought for socially just reinvestment;... for the development of community;... or against deindustrialization,” (p. 8) he does not mention how this internal competition might affect competition between places.

 Finally, I’ll quickly discuss some thoughts that arose from *Ghetto at the Center of the Earth.* First, I was especially struck by his analysis of the juxtaposition between modern, wealthy Hong Kong, and the almost ‘Third World’ – in both ethnic composition and living standards – Chungking Mansions. One quote that particularly interested me was “The biggest reason that so many people in Hong Kong and in the developed world are terrified of Chungking Mansions is that they are afraid of the developing world and the masses of poor people who come to the developed world for some of the crumbs of its wealth” (p. 15). This quote neatly articulates that it is not poverty itself that we are afraid of; it is poverty in a place where it should not belong according to our personal conception of place. For example, while tour companies in Nairobi and Kolkata can make a lot of money running ‘slum tours’ that show Western tourists some of the most impoverished places of the world, tour companies in New York could never run a lucrative business offering tours of the ghettos of the Bronx or outer Brooklyn. We embrace poverty in the developing world because we expect it; we fear it in the developed world because we don’t.