

## Race, Housing, and Neighborhoods in the Metropolitan United States

Racial separation and conflict unfortunately are all too prevalent in the United States in the 1990s. Racial divisions continue to cause social, economic, and political tensions. Nowhere is this problem more pronounced than in housing. Housing and residential neighborhoods in the United States remain largely racially segregated. This pattern differs only by degree in different metropolitan areas and municipalities.

This book addresses housing segregation and efforts at housing integration in the suburbs of metropolitan areas. Its primary focus is Cleveland, Ohio, and the efforts over the past three decades (1963–1993) to reduce racial segregation and promote racial integration in housing in the suburbs of metropolitan Cleveland. Cleveland and its suburbs have long ranked as one of the most racially segregated metropolitan areas in the United States (Massey and Denton, 1987, 1988). Since the early 1960s, fair housing activists have sought to change this pattern. Fair housing programs and policies in suburban Cleveland and the fair housing movement in metropolitan Cleveland are compared herein to their counterparts in several other major metropolitan areas.

Changes in patterns of residential integration and segregation and data on racial discrimination in housing in the metropolitan United States over the past three decades are analyzed throughout

this book. Some progress toward greater racial diversity in housing and neighborhoods has been made during this period, but for the most part the movement for fair housing has not been able to overcome prevailing patterns of racial separatism. While the enactment and enforcement of fair housing legislation has reduced, but not eliminated, racial discrimination, this has not in itself resulted in significantly more racial integration.

What is the rationale for housing integration and neighborhood diversity? Those who have advocated the importance of achieving these goals, whether white, black, or of another minority group, have argued that racial barriers will be broken through contact in residential neighborhoods, in the workplace, and in schools and other public venues. Through social contact and participation in community life and organizations, racial stereotypes can be dispelled and race relations can be improved. Leola Spann, a black homeowner and housing counselor who lives in Chicago's northwest Austin neighborhood, adjacent to the suburb of Oak Park, expressed this well when interviewed by Studs Terkel (1992: 98): "I think the main thing—and this is sad to say in the nineties—is not knowing each other. That's the key. I think if we ever know each other, we could iron out all our problems." If this could be achieved, it certainly would go a long way toward reducing social tensions. If it were achieved in American suburbs, it would change the pattern of largely white, mostly affluent suburbs surrounding increasingly poor central cities that are populated increasingly by minorities.

To achieve the goal of community integration, affirmative housing policies are required. These include offering financial incentives to homebuyers, landlords, and homeowners for pro-integrative behavior. Such policies go beyond enforcement of antidiscrimination laws to involve promoting broader choices in housing, not imposing mandatory choices (as has occurred, for example, in the fields of education and employment). They are controversial, with whites and blacks both supportive of and opposed to them. Few suburban governments have taken such action voluntarily. Litigation against selected suburbs accused of exclusionary practices has not had the intended effect of persuading other suburbs to adopt affirmative policies to avoid similar legal problems or of leading to federal or statewide legislative action to mandate affirmative fair housing policies.

The lesson of the civil rights era and the subsequent period is that we cannot expect most individual suburbs, which are predominantly white, voluntarily to decide to take affirmative action to promote racial diversity. Rarely is there a political constituency for such a course. In view of the multiplicity of local governments in the United States, the "balkanization" of political power, the conflicting interests of more affluent and predominantly white suburbs and central cities like Cleveland that are increasingly populated by poorer minority residents, and the inadequacy of fair housing legislation to promote much greater racial diversity, it is critical that affirmative housing policies be initiated and implemented at the metropolitan level. Only at the metropolitan level can there be the possibility of forcing or persuading all suburbs, rather than a few, to eliminate barriers to a more open housing market and society.

Regional fair-share housing programs are one possible approach. During the 1970s, the federal government supported such an approach. The *Mt. Laurel* saga in New Jersey, which began in 1971, represents a sustained attempt to have the state courts and state legislatures mandate statewide fair-share housing allocation to counteract municipal exclusionary zoning (see Chapter 2). Efforts to provide more publicly subsidized housing and to promote "pro-integrative" home purchases through mortgage incentives in the suburbs are other key policies.

The central conclusion of this book is that a variety of affirmative race-conscious housing policies aimed at racial and economic integration in the suburbs is required if residential segregation is to be reduced significantly. If this is to be accomplished on a broad basis, then these policies must be adopted and implemented within metropolitan areas through either mandates or incentives that emanate from the federal and state governments. This means that there must be a much stronger political constituency for affirmative policies aimed at greater racial diversity.

The protracted political controversy over affirmative action and related civil rights policies, which has characterized political debate over race since the 1960s, also threatens the possibility for progress in housing. This has great bearing for the future prospects of developing a broader political coalition for fair housing and for the reduction of segregated housing. In a conservative political climate, affirmative

action policies have encountered great political and legal resistance. Yet, without such policies, there seems to be little likelihood of greater racial integration in American housing and neighborhoods.

Opponents of affirmative race-conscious fair housing policies claim that they violate the principle of freedom of choice. As exercised by most blacks and whites, however, freedom of choice in housing has all too often led to resegregation. This is explained in part by the historic pattern of whites choosing to live in all or predominantly white neighborhoods. Some have made this choice due to prejudice against racial minorities. Others make this choice without considering the racial composition of a community, while not challenging the segregated nature of such neighborhoods. Others choose their neighborhoods based on such factors as housing quality and price. Given the income differences between whites and racial minorities in the United States, the absence or underrepresentation of less affluent minorities in many suburban areas can be explained by their being unable to afford higher-priced single-family housing.

However, segregative patterns in housing cannot be explained only by the choices made by homebuyers and renters, whether they be whites or minorities. The policies of government at all levels, as well as those of realtors, financial institutions, and insurers, have had a tremendous impact on the racial patterns of housing and neighborhoods in suburbia. Long-standing discriminatory practices, including restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning and land use controls, racial steering, and mortgage and insurance "redlining," have combined to deny minorities access to most suburban communities (Darden, 1987).

To reverse these practices and promote pro-integrative behavior will require race-conscious policies affecting the private housing market that some will resist as undesirable, politically difficult, or illegal discrimination. Race-neutral nondiscrimination policies are not likely to change patterns of racial isolation and segregation in suburbia. This dilemma is the heart of this book.

### **Prevailing Patterns of Racial Segregation in Housing**

What is meant by "segregation"? Residential segregation indexes for metropolitan areas in the United States measure several factors,

including the "exposure" (i.e., probability of interaction) of racial minorities to nonminorities (e.g., blacks to whites) by residential blocks. If segregation were absolute (i.e., "apartheid"), the exposure of blacks to nonblacks would be zero. In contrast, if racial integration were total, each block (or census tract) would have a racial proportion that parallels that of the locality (city, county, or metropolitan region). A related index measures "dissimilarity," that is, the extent to which members of different racial groups are distributed unevenly within metropolitan areas (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965; Massey and Denton, 1987, 1988).

At the heart of the movement for residential integration and racial diversity in neighborhoods is the hope that interracial contacts will reduce racial conflict and discrimination. Residential neighborhoods are important social contact points for normal interaction. Where white and black neighbors are of the same social class, acceptance by whites of racially mixed neighborhoods is more likely (Helper, 1979).

Despite the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the passage of fair housing legislation (including the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968), and the emergence of an open housing movement fighting for an end to racial discrimination in housing and for greater racial diversity, the United States remains largely segregated in the 1990s. In an analysis of sixty metropolitan areas in 1980, sociologists Massey and Denton (1987) found little change in the pattern of racial segregation that prevailed in 1970. Blacks were twice as segregated as were the Hispanic and Asian minorities. Chicago was the most segregated metropolis in the United States, followed closely by Cleveland. In 1990, Cleveland remained second only to Chicago among the most racially isolated of fifty metropolitan areas (Gillmor and Doig, 1992).

### **The Evolution of Segregation in Housing and Neighborhoods**

Today's patterns of suburban segregation can be understood only within a historical context. The pattern of racial segregation in residential housing and neighborhoods took hold as the mass black migration from the South to northern cities occurred, during and after World War I. This was the era of the formation of black urban

ghettos in northern cities such as Chicago, Cleveland, and New York (a pattern later reinforced by the policies of the Federal Housing Administration [FHA]), the use of restrictive racial covenants, "steering" and "blockbusting" by realtors, and redlining by insurers and lenders (Abrams, 1955).

It was also the era of the formation of the first suburbs. Mostly upper-class bedroom communities for commuters, they were either exclusively restricted to white occupants (except for domestic servants) or were predominantly white, there being few black professionals able to afford the expensive homes even if they were allowed to purchase them. Examples of such suburbs include East Cleveland, Cleveland Heights, and Shaker Heights, Ohio (Teaford, 1986: 69-71).

This pattern of racial segregation in housing in American cities and suburbs was decried by those espousing the cause of black civil rights. Gunnar Myrdal (1944), for example, called attention to prevailing patterns of racial segregation, attributable to white prejudice, and to the educational and income disadvantages suffered by blacks. Social critics and civil rights groups were joined by housing reformers (e.g., Abrams, 1955), who called for interracial housing and an end to discriminatory practices. Racial covenants were outlawed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1948 (*Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 [1948]), but this had little effect on the evolving pattern of racial segregation of postwar private housing development in suburbia.

In addition, efforts to ensure racial integration in public housing encountered heavy opposition from the white neighborhoods of central cities, from their political representatives, and often from white public housing residents (Meyerson and Banfield, 1955). Federally subsidized low-income housing was almost entirely limited to central cities. Suburbs were not required to participate in the public housing program and rarely did.

Most postwar new construction occurred outside the central cities and their older neighborhoods. This was due to the availability of inexpensive undeveloped land at the urban fringe, federal housing and highway policies that promoted suburban growth, the redlining of older urban neighborhoods, and the amenities offered in suburban housing and communities (Jackson, 1985).

Whether on the scale of the Levittowns or small subdivisions, most newly built postwar suburban housing was marketed to and

sold to white homebuyers. The New Jersey Levittown was limited initially to whites, when it opened in 1958. Only after a lawsuit was filed to deny Levittown and its homebuyers FHA insurance, because of state antidiscrimination policy regarding government-supported housing, did Levitt reluctantly relent, and the first black purchaser moved into this Levittown in 1960. Although a hostile reception met black homebuyers, Levittown did gradually accept a small but growing number of black residents (Gans, 1967: 371-84).

For the most part, black "pioneers" in suburban housing were few in number, beginning their move to suburbia in the 1920s and continuing after World War II in the 1950s. All too often they either faced a hostile reception from prospective white neighbors or were socially ostracized.

### **The Metropolitanization of the United States**

Since World War II, the spatial and demographic patterns of metropolitan America have fundamentally changed. The overall population of central cities has generally declined, while the percentage of their inhabitants who belong to racial minorities in most cases has increased (see Table 1).

At the same time, suburbanization has dominated metropolitan development. The majority of the residents of metropolitan America lives in the suburbs, not the central cities, a pattern prevailing since 1970. In 1980, of the 172 million Americans living in metropolitan areas, 99 million lived outside central cities (Palen, 1987: 110, table 5-1). The 1990 census revealed that a majority (50.2 percent) of the population lives in the thirty-nine large metropolitan areas (with a population of 1 million or more) in the United States, which together contain nearly 125 million Americans (*New York Times*, Feb. 21, 1991, sec. A, p. 1).

This steady exodus to the suburbs has been caused by such factors as the search for newer and better housing, schools, and amenities and municipal services, as well as employment. Suburbs have generally offered all of these, whereas central cities, with the loss of much of their employment base and middle-class population, and with their increasing proportion of poor residents, have steadily declined. Motivated

**Table 1.** Black Population in Fourteen Central Cities, 1960–1990

	Black Population		Percent Black		Percent Change 1960– 1990
	1960	1990	1960	1990	
New York City	1,141,322	2,111,783	14	29	107
Chicago	837,656	1,117,753	23	38	65
Detroit	487,174	810,739	29	66	128
Philadelphia	535,033	689,424	26	40	54
Los Angeles	417,207	592,038	14	14	0
Washington, D.C.	418,693	399,604	54	66	22
Houston	217,672	465,433	23	28	22
Baltimore	328,416	446,732	35	58	66
New Orleans	234,931	310,342	37	60	62
Memphis	184,725	346,648	37	54	46
Atlanta	186,820	273,321	38	62	63
Dallas	131,211	314,963	19	26	37
Cleveland	253,108	235,405	29	47	62
St. Louis	216,022	240,644	29	40	38

Source: U.S. Census, 1960 and 1990

not only by suburbia's attractions, many whites have left the central city also because of their opposition to racial change in their former urban neighborhoods (Jackson, 1985). "White flight" accelerated in the wake of the urban race riots of the 1960s in many central cities.

In some cities (including Cleveland), court-ordered desegregation of the public schools added to the white exodus. Even with increasing black suburbanization, most American suburbs remain almost entirely white. The pattern of racial segregation spreading outward as urban areas continue to expand spatially has made the possibility of metropolitan desegregation of public schools very difficult to achieve. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled out court-imposed metropolitan interjurisdictional school desegregation unless suburban school districts are proven to have engaged in racially discriminatory policies (*Milliken v. Bradley*, 418 U.S. 717 [1974]). This decision was reinforced in the March 1992 decision in *Freeman v. Pitts*. In 1989 the U.S. Court of Appeals ordered DeKalb County, Atlanta's largest suburban county, to go beyond its voluntary desegregation efforts and engage in cross-county busing to over-



come racial resegregation due to white flight (Orfield and Ashkinaze, 1991: 144–45). Between 1969 (when DeKalb County's schools first came under review by the federal courts) and 1989, the black population of the schools grew from 5 to 60 percent. Due to white flight in the face of black suburbanization, more than half of the black students now attend schools in which 90 percent of the students are black. In 1992, writing for a six-to-three majority, Justice Anthony Kennedy overruled the appeals court because he concluded that the public schools were not responsible for residential segregation:

The District Court in this case heard evidence that racially stable neighborhoods are not likely to emerge because whites prefer a racial mix of 80% white and 20% black, while blacks prefer a 50%–50% mix. Where resegregation is a product not of state action but of private choices, it does not have constitutional implications. It is beyond the authority and beyond the practical ability of the federal courts to try to counteract these kinds of continuous and massive demographic shifts. . . . Residential housing choices and their attendant effects on the racial composition of schools present an ever-changing pattern, one difficult to address through judicial remedies. (118 L. Ed. 2d 108, 137)

With this decision, the nation's highest court said that, unless residential segregation in housing is reversed, resegregation of the suburban public schools is not illegal and the courts are powerless to intervene. This makes promoting racial diversity in suburban housing even more urgent, if integrated suburban public schools are to become a reality.

### **Black Suburbanization**

Black suburbanization has grown steadily since 1960 (see Table 2). Its patterns are not uniform. They vary by region and by types of suburbs available to blacks (Logan and Schneider, 1984; Stahura, 1988). In some metropolitan areas, there have been historic black suburban settlements to which blacks have gravitated. In the process of postwar suburbanization, blacks have most typically moved to

**Table 2.** Suburban Black Population in Fourteen Metropolitan Areas, 1990

	Black Population 1990	Percent Black 1990
New York City	138,243	12
Chicago	215,166	7
Detroit	132,740	4
Philadelphia	240,483	8
Los Angeles	400,936	9
Washington, D.C.	619,239	20
Houston	145,810	9
Baltimore	169,333	10
New Orleans	120,128	17
Memphis	52,363	15
Atlanta	462,832	19
Dallas	95,803	7
Cleveland	120,214	9
St. Louis	182,538	10

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

predominantly white suburbs. According to P. L. Clay (1979), the majority of new black suburbanites moved into formerly white neighborhoods in older inner-ring suburbs that were being vacated by whites moving into newer suburban areas.

Black suburbanization, whether it involves single pioneers or larger numbers, has encountered much resistance. As occurred during the racial transition of older inner-city neighborhoods, the changing racial composition of a neighborhood raised fears among many whites that the neighborhood would "tip" eventually to a substantial black minority or a black majority. Such fears and related concerns about potential depreciation of housing and real estate values have been exacerbated by racial blockbusting by unscrupulous realtors. Controversy continues over whether a "tipping point" exists and, if so, at what racial ratio. It has been argued that when the black population reaches 25 to 30 percent, racial resegregation is likely, if not inevitable. Andrew Hacker (1992) has gone even further. He argues that white flight begins when the black proportion of the population reaches somewhere between 10 and 20 percent, even when the blacks moving in have the same economic

and social standing as whites (Hacker, 1992: 37–38). Only when the white population is 92 percent or more and remains so does Hacker believe that stable racial diversity is possible (Hacker, 1992: 36). Except for the use of “benign” racial quotas, Hacker offers little hope for racial integration in housing.

Despite Hacker’s assertions, there is no conclusive evidence of “tipping” being an inevitable result of racial transition (Goering, 1978). However, fear of racial tipping and resegregation of neighborhoods has led to “integration maintenance” policies and even racial quotas in housing projects. These policies were designed to stabilize the racial proportions of the population in order to maintain racial diversity.

Very few suburban communities have dealt with racial transition and its attendant problems directly. With only a few exceptions throughout the United States (including the community case studies examined herein), most suburbs have not adopted affirmative open housing policies to foster racial integration. Instead, most suburbs have tried to avoid the issues of racial segregation and racial transition in housing. Historically, many have used exclusionary practices such as large-lot, single-family-only residential zoning, which inflates the price of housing to exclude racial minorities and low- and moderate-income households generally. Housing prices beyond their income, white hostility, and lack of access to employment have kept minorities out of many suburbs. However, black suburbanization has continued to increase. Many blacks have migrated to the few “magnet” suburbs considered to be receptive to minorities. These have often been suburbs immediately neighboring large urban black ghettos (Clay, 1979). Unfortunately, this process has all too often resulted in the resegregation of these suburban neighborhoods and, in a few cases, entire suburban cities. They have become predominantly black, with little or no further white demand for housing.

### **Antidiscrimination Legislation, Litigation, and Judicial Enforcement**

More than two decades after enactment of the 1968 federal Fair Housing Act, it and companion state and local laws have had little

effect on the overall pattern of racial segregation in most suburban housing (Logan and Schneider, 1984; Massey and Denton, 1988; Stahura, 1988). The failure to change these patterns reflects (1) the preference of a majority of white Americans for predominantly white neighborhoods; (2) the reluctance or refusal of the federal and state governments to attack systematically racially exclusionary local land use and residency patterns through either litigation or legislation; and (3) the persistence of discriminatory behavior in the housing market.

Most fair housing litigation during the past few decades has involved only individuals seeking judicial redress for racial discrimination in housing. Their legal victories, while having a deterrent effect on discriminatory practices by realtors, lenders, insurers, and landlords, have not resulted in significant changes to widespread patterns of housing segregation (Danielson, 1976).

Housing "audits" by "checkers" in the 1980s demonstrated the persistence of racial discrimination. Black homebuyers faced a one-in-five chance of racial bias and black renters a one-in-two chance (Galster, 1990a). The most recent data are found in an analysis of housing audits, conducted in 1989 in twenty-five urban areas with significant minority populations (including Chicago and Detroit but not Cleveland) and funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Overall, the study found that almost one-half (48.8 percent) of blacks seeking to purchase a home received unfavorable treatment in the private housing market, with housing availability, credit assistance, and sales effort being the key criteria. Black renters (45.7 percent) and Hispanic homebuyers (44.6 percent) and renters (42.7 percent) also received unfavorable treatment (HUD, 1991). In a 1989 national poll, 52 percent of blacks believed that blacks generally faced discrimination in housing, whereas only about 20 percent of whites held this view (Sigelman and Welch, 1991).

Relatively few housing discrimination cases have involved "patterns and practices" charges brought against municipalities or major developers under the federal law (Selig, 1984). Although a few such cases have gained notoriety, they have had little effect on the vast majority of mostly white suburbs and suburban housing developments whose policies have not been challenged in court. Even in the

few states (e.g., New Jersey) in which litigation and legislative efforts to promote broader municipal housing opportunities for moderate-income households have been the most pronounced and sustained, progress has been painstakingly slow.

Racially discriminatory practices and patterns continue despite the passage of laws (including the 1988 amendments to the federal Fair Housing Act), litigation, and public education efforts designed to eliminate racial discrimination in housing. Only a few suburbs have openly and voluntarily embraced racial integration in housing and neighborhoods as municipal policy. These include such suburbs as Oak Park and Park Forest, Illinois; Southfield, Michigan; and Cleveland Heights and Shaker Heights, Ohio.

### **Changing Attitudes toward Racially Diverse Housing**

Suburban housing segregation has persisted despite seemingly significant changes in white attitudes toward racially mixed housing and neighborhoods. For example, analysis of national opinion surveys reveals a growing white acceptance of the concept of the rights of blacks to live in neighborhoods of their choice. By 1976, 88 percent of whites supported blacks' rights to open housing, although this level of tolerance varied by region and the extent of white exposure to blacks in neighborhoods (Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo, 1985: 153-56). However, whites were less supportive of governmental implementation of residential integration through open housing legislation (Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo, 1985: 156-59). A similar trend is found in metropolitan Cleveland.

Despite the seeming improvement in white attitudes toward integration, the past quarter-century has been marred by numerous incidents of racial conflict and violence. White opposition to court-ordered school and housing integration continues. A 1990 national opinion survey revealed that white attitudes toward racial minorities, especially blacks, remain decidedly negative (Smith, 1990). Well-publicized racial confrontations in the 1990s in the neighborhoods of central cities (e.g., Los Angeles and New York), in some suburbs (e.g., Teaneck, New Jersey), and on many college campuses have reinforced the sense that the movement toward greater racial harmony that arose

during the 1960s civil rights movement may be losing its force in America. The importance of race of political campaigns, including the 1988 and 1992 presidential elections, confirms its persistence as a divisive issue. While greater racial diversity in housing is not guaranteed to end racism or eliminate altogether white fears of blacks, it can contribute significantly to improved racial harmony and understanding and to resolution of racial conflict.

### **Suburbia and Housing Integration**

While central cities seemingly have much more of an overall racial mix than suburbs have, racially integrated urban neighborhoods are still the exception, and integration in those neighborhoods has been very difficult to sustain (Molotch, 1972; Saltman, 1990). This is true in the city of Cleveland, whose east-side neighborhoods are predominantly black and west-side neighborhoods are predominantly white. With the majority of the U.S. population residing in suburbs, little prospect of massive white migration back to predominantly black inner-city neighborhoods (despite the "gentrification" of some low-income minority urban neighborhoods during the past two decades), and the continuation of both white and black metropolitan suburbanization, the best prospects for increased racial integration in housing and neighborhoods lie in the suburbs of metropolitan America.

Support for racial integration is more likely in those suburban cities whose residents seem generally sympathetic to this ideal. This book examines in detail racial integration efforts and policies in the suburbs of Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland is one of the most segregated metropolitan areas in the United States, as are its suburbs (Massey and Denton, 1987, 1988). Yet it is also the site of some of the most innovative and enduring efforts to promote sustained housing integration, at both the municipal and metropolitan levels.

#### Differing Concepts of Integration

What is meant by "integration" is itself a controversial question. Integration has different meanings for different racial groups, organ-

izations, and individuals. There are two basic approaches to defining neighborhood racial integration. The first is to measure the "state" of the residential racial mix according to the proportion of minorities to nonminorities.

There are differing views, including black versus white, as to what proportionately constitutes integration. Many whites view the entry of from only one to a small number of blacks in their "neighborhood" (block, street, or larger geographic area) as signifying that their neighborhood is racially integrated. Likewise, some blacks (and other racial minorities) consider that they live in a racially integrated neighborhood if there is at least a small number of whites.

Researchers have used different ratios to measure integration. For example, in their 1967 national survey of integrated neighborhoods, N. M. Bradburn, Seymour Sudman, and G. L. Gockel (1971: 8) defined neighborhoods by subdividing them into three basic categories:

1. Open: those with two or more Negro families but less than 1 percent Negro residents;
2. Moderately integrated: those with from 1 to 10 percent Negro families;
3. Substantially integrated: those with more than 10 percent Negro families.

In documenting the racial patterns of Cleveland and its suburbs, the Cuyahoga Plan (1987) employed the following six categories:

1. Segregated white (0 to 1 percent nonwhite);
2. Predominantly white (2 to 4 percent nonwhite);
3. Modestly (racially) diverse (5 to 9 percent nonwhite);
4. Racially diverse (10 to 39 percent nonwhite);
5. Potentially (racially) transitional (40 to 69 percent nonwhite);
6. Predominantly nonwhite (70 to 100 percent nonwhite).

Neighborhoods within categories 3 and 4 would generally be considered "integrated." Those within categories 2 and 5 might be considered integrated, depending on the actual racial ratios of the population.

Some argue that the ideal racial ratio would be a roughly equal proportion of white and nonwhite households in as many neighborhoods as possible. Another view is that the minority proportion of all or most neighborhoods should roughly approximate the minority proportion of the population of the larger political or geographical unit (city, county, or metropolitan region). Neither ideal is likely to be realized often in practice, even in those suburbs that are the most integrated. The racial proportions of neighborhoods will vary considerably even in such suburbs.

The second approach to the definition of integration in neighborhoods involves "process" rather than the racial proportional representation of the population. Bradburn, Sudman, and Gockel (1971: 5-6) consider those neighborhoods to which both whites and blacks can move and are moving as integrated. If access to a neighborhood is not denied to either group due to racial discrimination, they argue, then housing is "open" and the neighborhood is not segregated. This is not the same as the condition in neighborhoods undergoing racial transition that ultimately leads to resegregation (i.e., predominantly white neighborhoods that eventually resegregate into predominantly black neighborhoods). Stable racial diversity is a long-term pattern of neighborhood racial diversity, not a transitory phenomenon (Galster, 1990b; Saltman, 1990). According to this second approach, the critical factor is that both whites and blacks openly compete for housing in the same nondiscriminatory market.

#### Housing Integration in Suburban Cleveland

This book invokes both approaches to the definition of integration in analyzing the residential patterns of Cleveland suburbs during 1963-1993. The suburban cities of Shaker Heights and Cleveland Heights are the two best known in suburban Cleveland for their housing integration policies. In the case of Shaker Heights, the policies date from the mid-1960s; in Cleveland Heights, from the mid-1970s. The black population of Shaker Heights in 1990 was 30 percent and in Cleveland Heights, 37 percent. In contrast, the suburban cities of East Cleveland and Warrensville Heights, to which many blacks migrated from the mid-1960s on, failed to



manage this racial transition successfully and almost entirely re-segregated in the 1970s. In 1990 their black populations were 94 percent and 89 percent, respectively.

Most of the fifty-eight suburbs of Cleveland located within Cuyahoga County are predominantly white, and the majority do not have affirmative fair housing policies. These suburbs include Euclid and Maple Heights, which do have a growing black population (16 and 15 percent, respectively, in 1990). The city of Parma, Cleveland's largest suburb, has gained the most notoriety for resistance to black suburbanization. Since 1980 it has been under a federal remedial court order requiring it to promote fair housing (Cooper, 1988). Its black population remained at less than 1 percent in 1990.

The black population of Cuyahoga County in 1990 was 25 percent (Map 1). This includes the city of Cleveland, whose "minority" population was in the majority (50.1 percent) for the first time in its history. If the population of the city of Cleveland is not included, the 1990 black population of suburban Cuyahoga County was 12.7 percent.

#### Cleveland Fair Housing Organizations

In addition to analyzing the experience of several individual Cleveland suburbs with differing approaches to racial transition, this book also analyzes several organizations formed to promote housing integration in all or part of the metropolitan Cleveland area. These include the Urban League's Operation Equality (1966–1973); Fair Housing, Inc. (1963–1971); the Heights Community Congress (1972–present); the Cuyahoga Plan (1974–present); the Metropolitan Strategy Group (1985–present); and the East Suburban Council for Open Communities (ESCOC) (1985–1991). Similar metropolitan fair housing organizations in other metropolitan areas (e.g., Chicago, Detroit, and Milwaukee) are also discussed.

#### The Legal Controversy over Suburban Fair Housing

Suburban "integration maintenance" policies from their inception have been subject to criticism as being racially discriminatory. Such suburbs as Oak Park and Park Forest, Illinois, and Cleveland

Heights and Shaker Heights, Ohio, have openly sought to maintain and promote white demand for housing in neighborhoods that have disproportionately attracted blacks, using such tactics as providing mortgage incentives primarily to white homebuyers. Some black leaders and real estate brokers have attacked these policies as racially restrictive and demeaning to African Americans. Cleveland Heights, Park Forest, and Shaker Heights have all been the targets of legal challenges by opponents of their pro-integrative policies and programs.

In the 1980s, as the Reagan administration and the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Justice Department openly criticized and challenged many of the affirmative action policies that had been initiated in the 1960s in response to the civil rights movement's demands for racial equality; integration maintenance in housing became the subject of a continuing legal debate.

In the 1988 case involving Starrett City, a multiracial rental project in Brooklyn, New York, a federal appellate court ruled that racial "quotas" aimed at maintaining balanced racial integration were unconstitutional (Metcalf, 1988). This decision underscored the legal debate over the affirmative marketing policies, undertaken by suburban municipal housing offices and fair housing groups (including those in metropolitan Cleveland), which were aimed at maintaining racial integration in housing. However, these suburban integration policies have not been ruled illegal. In 1992 the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review a Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals decision upholding the right of pro-integrative suburbs to engage in race-conscious affirmative marketing programs, aimed at whites, to promote greater racial diversity in neighborhoods with a high percentage of black residents (*South-Suburban Housing Center v. Greater South-Suburban Board of Realtors*, 112 S. Ct. 971 [1992]).

#### The Debate over the Desirability of Housing Integration and Black Suburbanization

Legal issues were not the only obstacle to integration maintenance. Since the 1960s, there has not been agreement on the desirability of racial integration. The mainstream leadership of the civil rights and open housing movements has always supported the concept of

housing integration, although the main focus has been school desegregation and enforcement of legislation against racial discrimination in employment. However, some black leaders have challenged "integrationist" policies as both unattainable and undesirable. Instead they have championed self-help, separatist, and black nationalist policies (Downs, 1973: 81-83). This debate was particularly heated in the 1960s.

The debate over the desirability of housing integration is not new. Its historical roots can be traced back to philosophical differences between such early black leaders as Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois. The split within the civil rights movement of the 1960s over Black Power echoed this basic disagreement over how best to achieve black freedom within a predominantly white society. Some advocates of black liberation have feared that housing integration in the suburbs means the perpetuation of black minority status. Black support for living in integrated neighborhoods generally means a preference for racial parity (Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo, 1985; Leigh and McGhee, 1986).

Generally, the higher the income and social standing of blacks, the higher their rating of predominantly white neighborhoods compared to predominantly black neighborhoods (Clay, 1979). This is not always true, however. For example, many middle-class residents of predominantly black neighborhoods in suburban Prince Georges County, Maryland, outside of Washington, D.C., have expressed a preference for African-American neighborhoods (Dent, 1992). Overall, blacks comprised about half of the county's population in 1990, compared to only 14 percent in 1970 and 37 percent in 1980 (Gale, 1987: 185). According to Dent (1992: 25), "The decision to live in a black [suburban] community should not be equated with a desire to live in a one-race world. While many black Prince Georgians say integration shouldn't be a priority, they also say they wouldn't move away if more whites moved into the county."

The movement for black political power has been based in the central cities, as black majorities have emerged and participated in the election of black mayors in such large cities as Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. (Preston, Henderson, and Puryear, 1987). The black mayors have not favored the disper-

sion of the black population or metropolitan policies (e.g., metropolitan government) that would dilute their newly won political dominance in central cities, despite the many problems faced by these declining cities. Likewise, the much more affluent and predominantly white suburbs surrounding these central cities have shown no interest in addressing such urban ills as racially segregated public schools (including those under federal court-ordered desegregation), poverty, and slums (Orfield, 1981).

#### Black Suburban Dispersal versus Gilding the Ghetto

In the 1960s, it was the liberal civil rights movement that argued for the racial integration of suburban America. Interracial organizations such as National Neighbors (Saltman, 1971) and legal advocacy organizations such as the National Committee against Discrimination in Housing and Suburban Action (Shields and Spector, 1972) led the fight for open housing in the suburbs. The liberal argument for racial, economic, and social integration of the suburbs was based on the inequality between the central city and its minority poor and the suburbs and their more affluent white residents. This inequality was evidenced by such variables as education, income, occupation, and housing standards and prices.

One approach to eliminating this urban-suburban disparity was called "gilding the ghetto" (Fox, 1986: 174-75). Its advocates argued that the central city's slum and ghetto neighborhoods must be rebuilt for their minority poor residents, because those residents did not have either the social mobility necessary for suburbanization or the occupational skills that would assist them in gaining employment in the suburbs; and they would in addition, face racial discrimination limiting their options. The rebuilding of the present neighborhoods would also reinforce growing black political power in the inner city rather than dilute it, as would happen if blacks were to settle throughout the suburban metropolis, always remaining a minority. The gilded ghetto approach assumed massive federal urban aid, beyond that provided for the antipoverty, model cities, job training, and similar programs of the 1960s. Such programs were a response to urban poverty, ghettos, and race riots but received only marginal funding and won little political support (Katz, 1990).