DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 077 CG 008 183

AUTHOR Helper, Rose
TITLE White People's Reactions to Having Black People as Neighbors: Current Patterns.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Caucasians; Community Organizations; Educational Background; Ethnic Groups; *Housing Patterns; *Negroes; *Neighborhood Integration; *Social Attitudes; Socioeconomic Background
IDENTIFIERS California; Colorado; Denver; Los Angeles; New York City; New York State; Seattle; Washington State

ABSTRACT

Through an analysis of recent research, this study attempts to arrive at an overview of white peoples' reactions to having black people as neighbors, and discovers several patterns which depend on the composition of the neighborhood. Stable white areas, black areas, mixed areas, private residential developments, blue collar areas, suburbs, and ethnic neighborhoods are all discussed. The study also examines community-wide organizations in four metropolitan areas which use extensive networks of communication to advance black-white integration. The report concludes that increasing evidence points to low socioeconomic level and low educational level as major factors in white resistance to having black neighbors, but other factors such as fear of intermarriage, fear of lowered property value, and fear of crime still operate. The report does not find a distinct pattern of interaction in black-white integration but rather a variety of degrees and kinds of interaction. (Author/LAA)

White People's Reactions to Having Black People as Neighbors: Current Patterns

by

Rose Helper, Ph.D.

The University of Toledo

Toledo, Ohio

Introduction

In this paper an attempt is made through an analysis of recent research to arrive at an overview of white people's reactions to having black people as neighbors. Although the word, "reactions," refers primarily and directly to white people's actions, it implies their perceptions, conceptions and images, beliefs, feelings, and wishes with respect to black people that underlie and result in their actions. Hence the term, "reactions," is here considered to include white people's actions and their verbalized perceptions, conceptions and images, beliefs, feelings, and wishes in regard to black people. Since the subject is complex and many-sided, and since the research is quite varied as to particular focus and is to some degree tangential, a choice was made at times, and some investigations were omitted. In certain aspects of the subject, research is meagre or lacking. For the most part, research and analyses based on research from 1960 on were considered, with emphasis on studies emerging in the last seven years. In the search, it is highly possible that some projects remained unnoticed. From the studies that were taken into account, a varied picture emerges showing several patterns.

White People Move Away

The first pattern is the resistance of white people in various forms and degrees to having Negroes enter their residential areas and, as Negroes enter, the moving away of white people by and large in cities of the United States until the area has changed from white occupancy to one that is all or almost entire black (Duncan and Duncan, 1957; Lee, 1961; Tilly, 1965; Suttles, 1968; National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968; Binzen, 1970; Holmgren, 1971), while black people continue to fill the housing left vacant by the white people. Holmgren, as executive director of the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities writes in answer to a query about Chicago

> With regard to your second question on white response of all classes to the advent of black entry, I would say that there is at least as much movement out following the black entry today as there was ten years ago. This obtains in blue collar and most middle income neighborhoods of the city.

As a result of the exodus, the core of the city becomes rented, occupied, and to some extent owned by black people. This widespread and continuing pattern, observed particularly in many cities of the North, has given rise to serious political and economic problems (Grodzins, 1958; Norton, 1972).

One, Two, or Three Black Families in Area

The second pattern involves the moving of one or two or three black families into a white residential area without incident or fanfare. Their residence remains inconspicuous. There may or may not have been resistance, but the white people go on living there as before. There is no white exodus. This pattern has existed for many years. Hoyt (1939) made a study of mixed neighborhoods based on 1934 data. Using a sample of blacks in 64 cities in all parts of the country, he was able to show that in Northern and Southern cities a sizeable number of nonwhites were living in blocks containing less than 10 per cent nonwhite. In some cases--the older cases in the South largely --there was a clearly indicated status difference between white and black families (employer and servant); in others, they were just neighbors. Hoyt found the lowest segregation scores in the smaller cities of under 100,000 (but he found a few small cities with high scores) and found a decided correlation between degree of segregation and the relative size of the nonwhite population. In most of these cities, there was also a small Negro "ghetto" and one or two areas of lesser concentration.

Rose (1951), Atelsek, and McDonald carried out a study in eight neighborhoods of Minneapolis chosen because they had only one Negro family (in one case, two Negro families) living in what was otherwise a white residential neighborhood. In four of the neighborhoods the same Negro family had been resident for at least ten years, while in the other four the Negro family had been living less than two years. In each group of four neighborhoods, two were chosen as lower income areas, and the other two as middle income areas. The neighborhood was defined in terms of distance from the Negro's home and divided into a primary and secondary zone in order to establish the pattern for interviews. A total of 545 were obtained. The first finding was that those white

people who live close to the Negro neighbors have more contact with them and are more favorable to them and to interracial association generally than those who live farther away. This was especially true in neighborhoods where Negroes had been living for a long time. The overall finding was that where a single Negro family lives in an otherwise white neighborhood there is a tendency to accept or to accommodate to the Negro as a neighbor. They go so far as to say

> if the residential pattern of Northern cities takes the form of a scattering of Negro families living in predominantly white areas, the prognosis is that this would tend to increase the acceptance and accommodation of Negroes by whites.

This conclusion has not been challenged.

In Duluth, in 1950, Turbeville (1952) found that virtually all Negroes lived in neighborhoods that were predominantly white. He reported that "over 83 per cent of the heads of households stated that they had not been victims of neighborhood discrimination because of their race."

Northwood and Barth (1965) made a study of how the process of "pioneering" had occurred in 15 neighborhoods of Seattle, Washington, with stress on "successful pioneering." They found that there had been little violence and vandalism, and that most neighborhoods had accepted their first Negro family with little stress. In most instances, the first Negro family remained the only Negro family. The pioneer neighborhoods vary in certain ways, but "in almost every case they are single-family residential areas, where home ownership and median family income are higher than in the city as a whole." Also the Negro and interracial families in the sample were "well-educated, with stable high incomes and a backlog of experience in interracial living." The authors (1965:66, 116) refer to similar findings reported in studies made in Pittsburgh, Kalamazoo, New Haven, and elsewhere.

Glazer and Moynihan (1970:66) point out that even in Brooklyn, the Bronx, and Queens, in addition to the all-Negro areas, many individual Negro

families are found scattered through middle-class neighborhoods. Teachers, social workers, and other white collar and professional people live on pleasant streets with friendly neighbors.

In Toledo, Ohio, in a white, middle to upper middle class neighborhood near The University of Toledo, there are three black families living. The head of one of these families is vice-president of student affairs at the University. He, his wife, and three children moved into the area eight years ago. A second black family with three children moved in seven years ago. Its head is Chairman of the Department of Mathematics at the University. The third family with two children moved into the area four years ago. He is a manager in a pharmaceutical firm. The situation in the area has remained quiet, stable, and peaceful.

Community Organizations Strive to Maintain Integration

A third pattern appears in the desperate attempt and, in some cases, fairly successful effort of a community or neighborhood organization to keep the neighborhood mixed and to that extent integrated. Included here are organizations that are formed in neighborhoods or "communities" within large cities and the single organization that is formed in a suburb or small city. Many neighborhood organizations started out as white associations (Mikva, 1951) whose purpose was to improve the neighborhood. When Negroes approached, the major emphasis fell on keeping them out. When this was seen to be impossible, the goal changed to keeping the area mixed. Before long, the membership and boards of such organizations became mixed. To keep the area mixed, the association undertakes to prevent panic-selling and to keep the white residents from moving, to try to bring into the area other white people of the same socio-economic standing as that of those who have moved away, and to prevent or correct housing neglect. It will also try to have black families of suitable social level take up residence, but the great need is to maintain white occupancy (Abrahamson, 1959; Leacock et al, 1964, Helper, 1965; Damerell, 1968; Wolf and Lebeaux, 1967, 1969; Kusner, 1969). To achieve its goal, the organization sets up committees, develops block clubs, holds meetings and social gatherings, spreads information, and tries in every way it can to keep up the morale and cohesion of the residents and to enhance the neighborhood.

The organization encounters great difficulties. One is the inattention of municipal departments when violations in the neighborhood are reported, and the leniency of some judges with housing code violators. It took the Winneconna Lakes Area Improvement Association in Chicago (Helper, 1965:20) two years to get a landlord, guilty of serious violations, to court. He was fined twenty-five dollars and the fine was suspended. A second difficulty is the purposes

and activities of real estate brokers which run counter to the goal of the organization. In an area that most brokers look upon as a "changing" one, a great deal of solicitation in various forms takes place. Also the brokers are given to "racial steering," that is, they are likely, except for a few, to direct prospective black buyers to "changing" or Negro areas and prospective white buyers to white areas. To prevent tension, panic, move-outs, and eventually a Negro segregated area, the Women of the Old West End Housing Committee have proposed an ordinance to the city council of Toledo, Ohio, to prohibit phone-calls, mailings, or personal solicitations, and the use of for sale signs at the home of a resident in an integrated area of the city. According to the ordinance, a census tract or portion of it in Toledo wherein at least ten per cent of the residents are of a different race or races than the majority of residents living within the census tract boundaries will be considered to be an integrated area. Similar ordinances have been passed in Dayton, St. Louis, Cleveland Heights, Philadelphia, and Irvington, New Jersey. Less strict measures have been or are in the process of being adopted by Detroit, New York, Gary, and Inglewood, California (Kusner, 1972). The city of Shaker Heights, Ohio, is contemplating anti-steering legislation in regard to real estate brokers (Freedheim, 1973).

A third difficulty encountered by the community organization is how to help buyers get loans from lending agencies when the property is in a "changing" area. Lending agencies are loth to make loans to black or white in such areas (Helper, 1969:167-168). An organization may set up its own agency with mortgage money, but this is rare. Some community organizations have been formed expressly for the purpose of dealing with problems of integration as black people have been entering and are living in their neighborhood. Ludlow Community Association is such a one. Ludlow is a middle class area in Shaker

Heights, a suburb of Cleveland. When this neighborhood began to be integrated, banks stopped lending mortgage money. The Association went to work. The community responded. An agency was set up with available mortgage money, and Ludlow went on to become a successfully integrated area (Freedheim, 1971:1).

The fourth difficulty is how to carry on a buyer-seller referral service without the facilities and equipment of a real estate office. For most community organizations, if undertaken, it becomes an overwhelming operation. The Ludlow Community Association was able to do it. To keep more Negroes from moving into Shaker Heights, it took over the selling of Ludlow homes. Prospective white buyers were invited to small cocktail parties and taken on informal tours of homes for sale in the community. In 1964, the Association was handling 24 of the 27 homes for sale (Berton, 1964:8). It strove to keep the area attractive to white people, while gently persuading Negroes to consider other white communities. Other community associations have also striven but their success is not as assured. Wolf and Lebeaux write of the Bagley Community Council in Detroit (1969:96).

> The Bagley Community Council pursued a vigorous program to enhance the holding power of the area and to enable the area to continue to be attractive to white households, although upholding the principle of open occupancy and working for its implementation.

But they also write

> Confidence in the neighborhood's ability to achieve bi-racial stability was never great and tended to decline over time. The greatest single factor contributing to this seemed to be the residents' observation that most new buyers were Negroes.

This holds for other associations as well. They persist in their efforts, but as more black families than white continue to move into the area, the remaining white residents' sense of security is lessened and the outcome is in doubt.

By and large, neighborhood organizations have not been able by themselves to carry out the task of keeping an area integrated. They need the

cooperation of other community organizations and of the municipal government, and the opening up of other areas to Negro buyers and renters. The city-wide organizations are better able to answer this need.

Privately Developed
Interracial Housing

A fourth pattern appears in the interracial housing developments begun by private builders. Here willingness of white and black people to have one another as neighbors seems clearly indicated. Grier and Grier (1960) surveyed 50 such projects, including only those with at least ten per cent of white residents. Six per cent of the developments were found to be in New England, 40 per cent in the Middle Atlantic area, 18 per cent in the North Central states, 34 per cent on the West Coast with all except a few in California, 2 per cent in the Border South, and three small cooperatives with nondiscriminatory policies in the Deep South. The developments varied widely in size. Forty per cent contained less than 25 units, but 36 per cent had 100 units or more in each with 1,600 units in the largest. These developments varied in price from a low of $5,500 per unit to a high of $60,000, but most fell within the moderate price range of $9,500 to $14,000 and $76 to $96 per month in rental. Half the developments were built for individual ownership, 32 per cent for cooperative ownership, and 18 per cent for rental. In 31 of the 50 projects, Negroes made up half or fewer of the occupants. In 68 per cent of the developments, under 60 per cent of the units were occupied by nonwhites, in 24 per cent from 60 to 90 per cent of the units were so occupied, and for six per cent the percentage of nonwhite occupancy was unknown. Developments over 90 per cent nonwhite-occupied were excluded from the study. The projects were either interracial from the beginning or later became so. They were found in both large and small cities. Grier and Grier (1960:33-57) discovered that some interracial developments were planned to supply low-cost housing for Negroes, but became interracial because of their attractiveness to whites as well. Other projects were built with the goal of social reform or from religious motivation or other ideological principle. In all, more than one factor

entered into the choice of the open occupancy pattern, and in well over half the goal of monetary gain was present.

More recently, Grier and Grier (1966:71-72) found that at least several hundred and possible more than a thousand interracial communities have been developed privately. They appear to be stable and "successful from both a social and a financial standpoint." These racially mixed private housing developments in most cases have not started racial changes in the neighborhoods surrounding them, "nor have they produced a decline in neighboring property values." There have been several cases of marked resistance to such developments. These will be introduced below.

Here and there a particularly strong belief in the rightness of interracial housing manifests itself in the persistent endeavors of some individual. Morris Milgram is such a one (Grier and Grier, 1960:44-48; Balk, 1965:94-99). He developed Concord Park with 139 single homes and Greenbelt Knolls with 19 homes in suburban Philadelphia. He has been recognized as the most dedicated builder of interracial projects. With others' cooperation, he built two more such projects in Princeton, New Jersey. However, in 1959, in Deerfield, Illinois, an all-white suburb of Chicago, the land he had bought was condemned for public parks when it became known that he intended to build for open occupancy. A long series of court battles ended in defeat (Rosen and Rosen, 1962). Milgram had another setback in Waterbury, Connecticut. Then, shifting his emphasis, he successfully organized M-REIT (Mutual Real Estate Investment Trust), "a real estate trust" which purchases apartment houses far from Negro ghettos and then slowly builds up Negro occupancy to a responsible minority" (Hecht, 1970:68). By 1970, "almost ten thousand investors had subscribed over ten million dollars," M-REIT already owned 17 properties in five states, a total of 3,000 units, and was in the process of purchasing more.

Joseph L. Eichler and his son, Edward P. Eichler, are successful home-builders and are known as pioneers in selling on an open occupancy basis. Their policy works well. They will buy back a home from a white family that feels it will not be happy living next door to Negroes. Edward Eichler strongly believes as a result of their experience that race is not nearly as important a factor in home buying as is class. Since his homes are rather expensive, they draw whites who are likely to be well-educated and probably less prejudiced, and the Negroes who buy are likely to be upper middle class. He also finds it best to move the Negro family in as soon as possible so that the community is faced with a fait accompli and is less likely to react in extreme ways. Public awareness of his selling policy also seems to act as a deterrent of extreme acts. White owners who have bought from him know his policy and will not react with panic when a Negro appears. Also, there has never been any trouble with lending agencies or local officials as a result of the open occupancy policy. However, the root of success here seems to lie in the expensiveness of the Eichler homes. Buying by middle or upper income people is assured and there are white people, many or most possibly, who are not opposed to having black people of that social level as neighbors.

Spring Hill, one of Pittsburgh's many hillside neighborhoods, is peopled largely by families of German and Austrian background whose roots in the locality go back three or four generations (Cunningham, 1965:87-94). In 1949, a Negro family attempted to move in and was stoned out. In 1957, Action-Housing, Inc., the civic organization working to increase the supply of moderate income housing and rejuvenate aging neighborhoods, initiated a plan for new apartments there. At several meetings with members of the community, the Action-Housing director explained that new government housing must be open to all and that the goal was no more than two or three Negro families in each building of 11 apartments with careful screening of every applicant. Although

people were concerned, all went well and the goal of two or three Negro families per building was maintained. A month after the apartments opened, Pittsburgh's new fair housing law went into effect. The next year, 1960, two qualified Negro applicants for apartments filed complaints with the Commission on Human Relations because they were asked to postpone their move-in date until the established balance could be maintained. Fortunately two apartments became available before public hearing time. The president of the Spring Hill Gardens nonprofit corporation stated at that time in a speech to the National Urban League (Cunningham, 1965:93-94)

> We have been able to comply with these orders without upsetting or typing the development. But we know our community, and we know Pittsburgh. If this law is to be used to force us to accept more and more Negro tenants until the percentage reaches forty or more, then Spring Hill Gardens will be on the way to becoming a segregated development; a panicking neighborhood will result; and the cause of race relations, housing, and urban renewal will all be considerably harmed.

It seems that, if integration is not to give way to a segregated situation, a certain racial proportion must be maintained.

Some housing developments were definitely intended to be white only, but were forced to integrate. The three Levittowns built by William Levitt as white communities have all been integrated against his will. In 1957, William Myers, Jr., a black, college-educated refrigeration engineer and his family took up residence in Levittown, Pennsylvania. His entry brought a crowd of about 500 around his home, two incidents of stone-throwing at his home, and the throwing of stones at a police sergeant. The unequivocal actions of the Governor and the Attorney-General, and the use of the State Police prevented further violence. The Myers family remained and more Negro families have since moved to Levittown. Planning and preparation eased integration in the case of Levittown, New Jersey, and Levittown, Long Island, New York. Although William Levitt was opposed, he had to yield to the law (Bressler, 1960:126-142; Gans, 1967:371-384).

Recently, the Columbus Apartment Association in Columbus, Ohio, (The Blade, 1971:13) adopted a seven-point code abolishing all discrimination in apartment rentals. The Columbus organization became the first in Ohio and among the first in the country to take such a strong public stand. Adoption came after pressure from two major apartment developers, one of whom said he would pull out if such a code were not adopted, and another who maintained that he would not join until the code was adopted. The vice-president of the 20,000 member National Apartment Association said adoption of the code would make it easier for the national body to adopt a comparable one but that does not seem to have happened yet. The adoption does, however, bespeak a recognition on the part of apartment builders that there are enough white people who will accept Negro neighbors to make apartment building on an open occupancy basis a safe investment. Here again it is likely that the apartments would be expensive enough to draw people of at least middle and more likely upper middle income.

The question of black-white proportions and occupancy control arises for the developer of interracial housing. The question, "What is the best ratio?" has brought the observation that many white people who are willing to accept interracial occupancy will not buy or rent if the white people are definitely or likely to be a minority. There has been fear of isolation also on the part of prospective black buyers or renters. Morris Milgram found that he had to establish a ratio of 55 per cent white and 45 per cent Negro in Concord Park and "two thirds white, one third Negro" in Greenbelt Knolls (Cohen, 1959: 3, 7). He, like other professional builders, had found that there is "a tip point" (Grodzins, 1958:6) in integrated housing--that is, whites will move out when the Negro percentage exceeds a certain figure because they conclude that the integrated development is becoming an all-Negro one and that the school

system will be affected. Milgram's experience showed that the quota system worked. Charles Abrams (1955:311-312) in summarizing the experiences gained from 15 years of operation of public housing projects stated that the best project is one in which there are no striking disproportions of black and white. Six to 30 per cent Negro representation generally made a project a successful one. Grier and Grier (1960:60) in interviewing many workers in intergroup relations and housing often heard the figure, 20 to 25 per cent, with an occasional worker mentioning 30 per cent. A number of the respondents in my study of real estate brokers (Helper, 1969:296) in Chicago thought a neighborhood could become 15 to 25 per cent Negro before the white people would judge that the neighborhood was going Negro.

Questions have, however, been raised about the quota suggestion, and certain criticisms have been made against the idea. The Ludlow Community Association was able to discourage prospective Negro buyers from seeking homes in Ludlow without incurring expressions of criticism or worse. In fact, Lee Berton, a Negro, (1964:8), who writes about the Ludlow association, was strongly in favor of its stand. In several communities, black residents themselves have taken steps to discourage Negro buyers from looking for homes in their neighborhoods and to encourage them to look for homes in white, unintegrated neighborhoods (Helper, 1969:298-299). The Bagley Community Council was held back by considerations that are often advanced. Wolf and Lebeaux (1969:86) write

> From time to time, someone would raise the question of controlling the entrance of Negro households by fixing a quota of Negro entrants through consultation with "the Negro Community." But too many obstacles immediately emerged: Who was the Negro community--for this purpose--and did any spokesman for it have such authority? How could such an understanding be implemented, if arrived at? Was it not, regardless of its presumed goal, a violation of existing antidiscrimination codes of the state? Was it morally (or legally) defensible to deny a family the free choice of a house because of others' decision as to what was the

proper racial mixture for the Bagley neighborhood? These problems seemed so impossible that there was never any serious discussion of a quota system.

The questions posed in the Bagley Community Council are valid ones, but the outcome of the Council's program for the Bagley area is that its remaining an integrated area is in doubt.

Blue Collar Areas

There is said to be particular resistance to the entry of black people in blue collar areas. "The ghetto poor are restricted by white neighborhoods generally," say Piven and Cloward (1966:19), "but the most furious opposition comes from the white working-class neighborhoods--the very ones with housing many Negroes might be able to afford." Actions against open housing such as the disturbances in Milwaukee in the summer of 1967 create a strong impression of blue collar hostility to black people although the facts of the case may not warrant it. This opposition has been attributed to prejudice, but there are other answers as well.

It is claimed that part of the reason for this resistance is a desire to protect social status, especially if the working people believe they have improved their position by moving to a different community (Bressler, 1960: 126-142) or if they have pride in their neighborhood, feel at home in it, and wish to preserve it at its level (Binzen, 1970). Berger's research (1960:80-90) reveals a consciousnes of class status among workers, albeit with particular meaning for terms used according to Berger's interpretation. Among his subjects, auto workers who had moved to a suburb with the relocation of the plant, the largest group of respondents classified themselves as "working class." However, almost as large a group identified themselves as "middle," "average," or "medium" class. Most of these respondents had, to be sure, identified themselves similarly in the previous community before the move, but the respondents generally claimed many new friends, an increased interest in politics, a new feeling of respectability, and a new feeling of well-being. These workers who were homeowners before moving to the suburb, the better educated, the young, the foremen, and the skilled showed a greater tendency to designate themselves as middle class. In Levittown, Pennsylvania, the opponents of the first Negro

family to settle there were almost all members of the relatively uneducated urban working people edging their way into a higher social class. Their insecurity and anxiety could be relieved by borrowing prestige from the community, but the threat to the social status of the community itself by the presence of a Negro family was likely to and did produce much apprehension and opposition among these newcomers to the middle class.

There are, however, more fundamental and more immediate reasons for blue collar opposition. Ransford (1972:333-346) finds blue collar workers to be more uniformly high in antagonism toward student protest and black protest regardless of educational level than white collar workers. And there is good reason, for the protest methods and demands of students and blacks run strongly counter to the values, outlooks, and economic fears of the working class person. He respects authority and conformity which they flaunt. He believes in the American Dream--the open class system where hard work counts--and is hostile toward black demands for quotas and preferential job treatment. He is angry because it seems to him that he is being asked to pay the most for "social justice." If special opportunities are granted to black workers, he faces the greatest threat of being laid off. Black militants have reached power centers and have forced institutional changes that seem to him unjust or threatening and that he is powerless to stop. The government is preoccupied with the problems of the blacks, and white workers' needs are neglected. His anger is not prejudice but rather a reaction to a perceived social situation, says Ransford, "a rational response to tangible strains, independent of personal bigotry." The immediate reasons for blue collar opposition come into sharp focus in the study of Kensington in Philadelphia (Binzen, 1970). In this working class area the determination to keep Negroes out reaches an extreme. "Kensington's intolerance is so savage," says Binzen, "because its

people are so insecure." The huge, black North Philadelphia ghetto is slowly, inexorably inching toward them. They know what the conditions are in the ghetto and fear integration above all else. Many are poor and cannot move. With the black man moving up all seems to be at stake--job security, value of home, education, political influence and more. "They're convinced that the press . . . unfairly dismisses tham all as racists, bigots, and ignoramuses without digging into the real issues to see what makes them react as they do." Rossi (1970:289-293) and Hamilton (1971:130-131) both call attention to the position of the white working class. They both point out that the costs of producing racial equality will be borne more heavily by the white working class than by any other group. "The working class," says Rossi, "will have to share jobs, schools, neighborhoods, political posts, influence in city hall, and so on with Blacks--types of sharing which come close to where people really live, in their families, jobs, and neighborhoods." The government pays more attention to the blacks and caters to their demands while the white workers' jobs, his schools, and his neighborhoods are being threatened by black take-over. "We don't mind a few blacks," says an electrician's wife, "All we're trying to prevent is a take-over, where we're the minority" (Wille, 1970:6; see also Meyers, 1969; Sviridoff, 1969). In the South, even more than in the North, the white working class will have to bear more than its share of the costs of integration.

Hamilton (1971:132-142) brings forward some evidence which challenges the assertion that intolerance is greatest among the poorer working class whites and that tolerance is greatest in the upper middle and upper classes. He used data from the 1968 election study of the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center. Four categories--operative, laborer, service as one, skilled, lower middle, and upper middle--were examined on civil rights attitudes for non-South whites. There were four questions asking about the rights

of blacks. Three probed into the topics of job rights, schooling, and public facilities, asking whether the federal government ought to guarantee equal treatment. The fourth asked about the principle of equal housing opportunities ("Negroes have a right to live wherever they can afford to."). The percent in favor for the fourth question was as follows for the four classes, keeping the same order as given above: 82, 88, 85, 82. It is clear that the less skilled class was just as favorable as the upper middle class, and the skilled class was more favorable. For Southern whites, the less skilled (or poor whites) were more approving than the upper middle class only for the first question on government intervention to support Negro job equality. For the question on housing equality, the percentages in favor were 55 for the less skilled and 67 for the upper middle class. The North-South difference requires further examination, but the point to be emphasized here is the discrepancy between the favorable position on civil rights issues, especially housing, of the blue collar group of the North in the study and the behavior in word and deed of blue collar workers in various instances. One explanation may be that blue collar workers like other citizens want equality for all, not special treatment for some, and many would probably not mind having some Negroes in their neighborhood as long as they could be sure there would be no take-over.

Blue collar workers did not do as well in voting on open housing referenda. Blume (1971-1972) sought to find out more about persons who support open housing by comparing referenda in five cities: Toledo, Ohio, and Jackson, Flint, Birmingham, and Saginaw, Michigan. The open housing ordinances in Toledo and Jackson were defeated, while those in Flint, Birmingham, and Saginaw were passed. The patterns of relationship he found in Toledo were to a large extent also present in the other cities. Except for the city of Birmingham, an upper middle class suburban residential community, all are

industrial cities with similar demographic characteristics. Blume found low positive correlations between the "yes" vote and (1) support for the Democratic party, (2) education of eight grades or less, (3) family income of $5,000 or less, and (4) blue-collar employment. Race and social status were the only variables positively related to the vote for the ordinance. In Jackson and Flint little or no relationship was found between the "yes" vote and preference for the Democratic party, low level of education, family income of less than $5,000, blue collar employment, youth, and home ownership. Higher social status seemed to be more strongly related to the "yes" vote than in Toledo. In Birmingham, an all-white city except for one Negro family, upper social class was found to be the only parameter positively related to the "yes" vote. On the basis of his findings, Blume thinks it appropriate to stress the statement made by Brink and Harris that "the support for open housing must come from the better educated, the more privileged, the affluent white or it would never come."

Suburbs

What has become a sixth pattern is the slow movement of Negroes into the suburbs against strong resistance. This has been reported in many parts of the country. A recent study of 69 suburbs of Chicago (Leadership Council, 1970) indicated that the movement of black people into well over two-thirds of them was still only token. The high cost of housing in the well-to-do residential suburb keeps most black people out. Holmgren (1971) writes that there are now approximately 30 suburbs which have small black percentages. A few like Park Forest, have as much as three per cent black population and well integrated. He also states about Chicago suburbs

> In these suburbs where black ghettoes have existed for some time, a pattern of flight, as in the cities, has emerged in the past ten years, i.e., in Maywood, Chicago Heights, Harvey, Waukegan and Evanston. On the other hand, there has been no corresponding panic and flight of whites where blacks have moved into a non-ghetto suburban area.

While this report may indicate a very slight improvement, there is no improvement in the lot of low income black families. The resistance of the suburbs is principally against them (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968b:38). Perhaps the most publicized case is that of Forest Hills, New York, explained by Glazer (1972). The people who are resisting are not bigots, he says. It is a matter of wanting to preserve a way of life. A "dangerous but understandable" confusion has developed in the minds of people; the presence of blacks has come to mean lack of safety, crime. This misconception is furthered by the attempts of black activists to justify their criminal acts as political protest and the insistence of civil rights leaders that any attempt to escape from crime is racist.

Suburbs are resisting attempts on the part of municipal or other governmental bodies to have low-cost public housing built in their midst. Warren,

Michigan is a prime example (U. S. News and World Report, 1970b:23-24). To prevent such housing or even moderate income housing if it is to be integrated, suburbs prolong racial segregation by passing zoning laws, or condemning land for parks (de Vise, 1967:90-91; Rosen and Rosen, 1962). The dispersal of industry to outlying parts of metropolitan areas and the zoning ordinances of suburbs preventing low income black workers from residing in these suburbs have resulted in a separation between Negro residential areas and jobs, which brings about shortages of unskilled labor in those communities and leaves many workers unemployed. Blackjack, Missouri, a suburb of St. Louis, was incorporated on August 6, 1970, as an independent municipality, and on October 19, 1970, the Blackjack City Council adopted a zoning ordinance which had the effect of preventing the construction of a limited income, racially integrated development on a site that previously had been zoned to permit multiple-family occupancy. A lawsuit is underway with the United States of America as plaintiff against the City of Blackjack as defendant on the grounds that the zoning ordinances of the defendant violate plaintiff's rights. The trial was scheduled for March 19 (Reed, 1973).

There are some bright spots in the picture too, although in nine suburbs ringing Minneapolis homogeneity based upon color was largely viewed as one of the most important mechanisms of community cohesion (Tillman, 1964). The suburbs of Minneapolis had increased in population by 114.8 per cent in an eight year period, 1956-1964, but Negroes with isolated exceptions had been unable to participate in this growth. The rental situation for Negroes was even worse than that for purchasing. However, events in Morningside, an incorporated village of 600 and a near suburb of the metropolis, had a better outcome. Here too homogeneity based on color was seen as the central mechanism of cohesion, but when a Negro family moved into the village, there were

enough people of different mind to keep the community from condemning their land for some public purpose. The Negro family continued to live in Morningside among friends.

In Teaneck, New Jersey, (Damerell, 1968) "the first town in the nation to vote for integrated schools," a great struggle took place for quality integrated education and, with the success of that struggle, the ghetto, caused by panic-selling, was broken by white people buying back into it.

Ham held interviews with 103 white families and 29 Negro families in 27 suburban-type neighborhoods, some of which were in Pittsburgh and others in nearby suburbs. He found that the integration of suburban-type neighborhoods is proceeding through the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. With rare exceptions, the neighborhoods studied were adjusting quietly to the fact of integration. A few hostile families had moved out, but many more white families had moved in. The Negro families are a "pioneering" group with a higher socio-economic status than their white neighbors. There was no indication of trends toward all-Negro neighborhoods except for one case. However, the number of Negro families in the suburbs is still small. The Negro respondents reported that their neighbors were friendly and that they had the opportunity to do as much visiting as they wished.

In suburbs of Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cleveland, and other cities much has been achieved in integration by fair housing groups. In Pittsburgh, CHOOSE (Clearing House of Open Occupancy Selection) helped Negro families find and obtain better housing. In Buffalo, HOME (Housing Opportunities Made Equal) has accomplished a great deal, it seems. In the Buffalo metropolitan area, as elsewhere, there is still racial residential segregation, but some black families have moved into six important suburbs of considerable size. In the spring of 1965, 24 Negro families who had lived in the suburbs between four

months and 17 years were interviewed by HOME. No family had had a bad experience and almost all expressed surprise at the "amount of friendliness" they found. Difficulties in the sale of homes have been almost eliminated in Buffalo and the suburbs, according to Dan Acker, president of HOME (1971). The problem, he added, lies in renting. There is much misrepresentation in renting. The moving away of white people has been reduced. HOME works on many fronts. "The fact that 10 brokers lost their license had an impact." HOME has helped about 1,000 blacks buy homes in suburban areas.

Cleveland Heights, a suburb of Cleveland, is an integrated community of about 60,000. Its black population is at least five per cent but not yet ten per cent of the total population. The Human Relations Department of the city is carrying on a very active program to keep panic from spreading among white residents because of the moving of black families into their neighborhoods. This agency had taken the initiative in organizing block clubs and meetings so that white residents may be informed about the importance of "staying put." The Human Relations agency is a channel of communication not only for home owners and tenants but for real estate brokers as well. It tries to inform them so as to get them to stop steering black prospective buyers into black areas and white buyers into white areas. It seems that the agency has succeeded in stopping the panic-selling and moving among the white residents. It has brought to the attention of the people the idea that to keep a community integrated, you must work at it. People who were formerly "racist" in their actions are now working at integration because they do not want to have to move and some cannot afford to move. The main goal, as it is in all such situations, is to keep the white people from moving.

The present program of the agency represents a change in tactics. Before it had taken the legal route and had tried to prove in court that certain

brokers were practising discrimination, but this approach was ineffective because the discrimination was so subtle that it was difficult to prove. The agency then decided it must use positive citizen pressure against real estate brokers.

There are large Jewish and Catholic populations in Cleveland Heights, each with its own power structure. Leaders of the two groups working together spearheaded the forming of an interorganizational council to maintain viability in every facet of the community. Merchant associations have sprung up to modernize the business districts. The Jewish Community Federstion has funded a Cleveland Heights Housing Project to be administered by an Orthodox rabbi. The purpose is to keep Jewish residents in Cleveland Heights. The hope is that these measures will keep the white people from running away (Freedheim, 1973).

White Families Buy Homes in Areas
Where Black Families Are Living

It has been a common belief especially among most real estate brokers (Helper, 1969:74-75) that a white family will not buy a house for personal residence in an area where black families are living. Rapkin and Grigsby (1960) undertook to ascertain the demand for housing in racially mixed areas in Philadelphia, hardly expecting to find any white purchasers in the four mixed areas they selected for their study. They found that in 1955 there were in these areas 2017 bona fide transfers of ownership of residential property for owner-occupancy. Of this group of home purchasers, 443 were white and 1,574 were Negro. This finding, they say, "sheds doubt on the premise that once Negroes enter a neighborhood, no white will purchase in the area thereafter." The previous place of residence of some of the white purchasers had also been in a mixed area. In one of the two study areas where the housing was of good quality but the change was slow, the white buyers outnumbered the Negroes by two to one. For all four areas, the ratio of Negro to white purchasers was three to one (Rapkin and Grigsby, 1960:17). It was also learned, contrary to research findings (Rose et al., 1953), that almost three-quarters of the white purchasers had children under 18 years old and half had children of school age. Further investigation revealed some unawareness of the presence of Negroes in the area, some dissatisfaction, and a tendency to buy a house away from a Negro-occupied one. However, the fact still remains that almost three-quarters of the white families bought homes on or adjacent to mixed blocks, and that one-fourth bought on mixed street fronts, but "less than a handful" purchased a home next to a Negro residence.

The authors point out that, if it is true that white people will not buy a home next door to a Negro, then the occupancy of a Negro family of a single dwelling-unit on a block must eventually result in an all-Negro block.

However, the hypothesis can be shown to be untrue, at least in the experience of one real estate firm in Chicago. Several real estate brokers (Helper, 1969: 94) refused to take it for granted that they could not sell to white people in an area where Negroes were living and had actually sold property, although at low prices, to white buyers for residences. One of these brokers said

> From a sale of perhaps 1 or 2 houses a year in this neighborhood, we have gone to 12 to 14 sales per year to white families in an area where Negroes are living frequently next door, between, or across the street. It has been our experience that a significant number of white people are willing and even eager to live in a coracial neighborhood providing it remains in all other respects a pleasant place in which to live.

Sales to white people in areas where Negroes are living have been reported by other researchers. Northwood and Barth (1965:37) state that in most of the neighborhoods they studied, they interviewed some white residents who had moved there after the Negro entry. In the study of Pittsburgh suburbs by Ham (1966:V-2), at least 33 of the 103 white families interviewed or 32 per cent moved in after a Negro family had moved into the area. Closer examination showed that the 33 families were generally similar to other white families in the study. Other impressive reports but of a less systematic type also tell of white people's moving into mixed areas (Newsweek, 1971:63; Stalvey, 1963; Rosen, 1959). In at least three good residential areas of Toledo where some Negroes are living, a number of white families have bought homes for personal use. One of the black residents in one of these areas told me that several white families had moved into the same block and right next door to her.

Ethnic Groups

Some observers point out that ethnic groups in the United States have retained their identity and much of their former culture in their communities (Parenti, 1967; Glazer and Moynihan, 1970; Suttles, 1968:99-152; Binzen, 1970: 81, 93). This has been the case throughout their life in this country right up to the present. The ethnic groups are not "melting," say the observers. As an indication, one may note that in the Greater Cleveland area there are still over 2,000 identifiable nationality organizations (Cunningham, 1970:21). Ethnic groups have more than once put one of their own leaders into political office in a show of ethnic solidarity (Cunningham, 1970:20-33, 79).

However, in recent years there seems to have taken place a marked resurgence or increase of interest (Glazer and Moynihan, 1970:xxxi-xlii). It seems that certain ethnic groups have been aroused to a greater sense of identity and pursuit of rights by the black movement. The Black Studies programs have stimulated a similar goal in the white ethnic groups. On August 6, 1971, the Senate voted its approval of the "Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1971," sponsored by Senator Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa.) (Congressional Record: Aug. 6, 1971). The bill authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to non-profit educational institutions and organizations for "planning, developing, establishing, and operating ethnic heritage studies centers." The bill became section 504 or S659, the Education Amendments of 1972. Senate Report 92-346, on S. 659 contains the following

> Many have become critical of the commonly held "melting pot" theory, whereby persons from every background would join together in one homogeneous, harmonized American culture. To the contrary, individuals from the various ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural groups that make up our country, have not joined together, and have maintained their own respective subcultures.

"The House on June 8 by a 218-180 roll-call vote, cleared for the President's signature the House-Senate compromise on S. 659, the Higher Education

Amendments of 1972, which contained controversial school anti-busing provisions (Congressional Quarterly, June 10, 1972:1371). Thus section 504 calling for Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers has become law.

Ethnic neighborhoods are most often blue collar neighborhoods. It becomes well-nigh impossible to separate blue collar from ethnic group and ethnic community. That some white ethnic groups have not been eager to see black people coming into their neighborhoods has been revealed in their resistance, by violence if necessary (Binzen, 1970), and in their moving, if Negroes manage to enter. Few studies have been made, however, on ethnic groups' relations with black people especially in the area of residence. Warren, Michigan, many of whose residents are of Polish background, has become known for its resistance to the entry of black people (Forman, 1971:164). In Toledo, I asked two long-time residents of Polish background who know the Polish community and its organizations well and have been active in it for years, "Is it true that Polish Americans do not want to have Negroes enter their residential areas?" Independently of one another, both said that the statement is true, and one added, "That way of expressing it is an understatement--a very polite way of expressing it."

There is evidence that Italian Americans are second only to Polish Americans in their dislike of blacks (Greeley, 1969:46). In a Catholic survey of 1963, Greeley found scores "high on racism" in the following order: Poles, 61 per cent; Italians, 54 per cent; French, 51 per cent; Germans, 46 per cent; and Irish, 44 per cent. Of all white ethnics, Italians seem the least favorably disposed to political militancy. They are "on the front lines of the blue-collar revolt against radical rhetoric, black-power demands, and crime in the streets" (Levy and Kramer, 1972:161, 173, 175).

In some reports, white ethnic groups have revealed themselves, however, as not being as racist in their views as WASPS (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant). Greeley reports that, on a Pro-Integration Scale, among those with less than a high school education, WASPS were less favorable than Irish and Germans. Among those with a high school education, WASPS were more favorable than Slavs, but less favorable than Jews, Irish, German Catholics, German Protestants, Scandinavians, and Italians (Greeley, 1972:218).

Apart from the complaints made by the white ethnic working people themselves that Negroes are getting whatever they ask for and that the white ethnic workers are paying for it, voices have been raised in their defense. These voices speak for blue collar worker and white ethnic worker in one breath. Journalistic reports by Wille (1970) and Meyers (1969) highlight claimed injustices. Hamilton (1971:131) and Rossi (1970:289-293) include the white ethnic working class when they explain that the working class will have to bear the major costs of integration. Rossi says, ". . . there seems to me to be nothing particularly ethnic about race prejudice: it's as American as apple pie and violence." The solution he suggests is that the costs of ending discrimination have to be borne by all elements of the population in a more equitable fashion (Rossi, 1970:292).

Understanding of the importance of the neighborhood to the ethnic working person has been expressed. Racism is seen as too simple an explanation of his attitude toward Negroes. His reaction is seen as welling up from a deeper, much more meaningful level--"the perception of a threat to familiar, secure, and comfortable ways. " It is a threat to a person's home, to a way of life. Resistance to this threat focuses on the neighborhood to keep it segregated (Shostak, 1969:110). The people of ethnic neighborhoods watch the black approach with fear and with determination to keep out the intruders (Binzen, 1970:110-112, 142).

Two positions seem to crystallize. On the one hand, there is the position of competition. White blue collar workers and white ethnic blue collar workers see themselves as locked in competition with blacks and possibly losing jobs, neighborhoods, schools, political control to them (van den Berghe, 1967:29-30). According to the other position, whites and blacks share the same problems and should work together to solve them. Taylor (1971:273-275) holds forth this plan of unification. He invites the white working class to join the "blacks in a common thrust." It is assumed here that "white working class" is meant to be all inclusive. At the meetings of the National Conference on Ethnicity held in Cleveland, May 11-13, 1972, the theme of black-white unification to work in a common effort on common problems came up repeatedly in the speeches and discussions. At least 30 ethnic groups were represented at the conference. An indication of an attempt to bring Poles and blacks together to make a common effort appears in Behavior Today (February, 1972) on a page entitled "ethnics." A paragraph on Detroit carries the following under the caption, "Working with Ethnics:"

> "In the eyes of the liberal community white ethnic workers are bigots," says community organizer Jerry Ernst. "Well, the Poles I worked with in Detroit don't believe the image is accurate, and they want to get rid of it." Ernst, under aegis of Catholic Conference's Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, helped build politically effective black-Polish alliance in Detroit. "Ours is not a race relations program," he explains, "but a community action project that concerns both races." Main thrust of program is to strengthen white ethnic city neighborhoods in North and Midwest. Center has $500,000 from Ford Foundation to revitalize generally ignored ethnic communities, sensitive public and private institutions to ethnic needs.

In the recent National Opinion Research Center study (Bradburn, Sudman and Gockel, 1970:146-149), an analysis of the relation between ethnicity and neighborhood type brings forth an unexpected result. Newspaper reports usually stress the conflicts between Negroes and the most recently arrived ethnic groups--Italians, French, Polish, etc.--rather than the WASPS. Yet, in the table on ethnicity and neighborhood type, the percentage of households

from the most recently arrived ethnic groups is higher in integrated than in segregated neighborhoods. Also by region there is a higher percentage of households with English and Scottish backgrounds in segregated than in integrated neighborhoods. The authors suggest that public conflict between the newer ethnic groups and Negroes exists because they are in competition for the same housing as well as for economic and political power. In some neighborhoods, especially the substantially integrated ones, this competition has resulted in a stable situation, regardless of the integration attitudes of the white residents. In other areas, the conflicts have led to changing neighborhoods. Extrapolating their results into the future, the authors conclude that it would seem to be more likely "that Negroes will be living with Poles and Italians than with Englishmen and Scots."

City-Wide Organizations for Open Housing

The most impressive programs in city-wide organizations have been in New York, Denver, Los Angeles, and Seattle.

Operation Open City began in New York in 1964 as a pilot volunteer project of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing with the express purpose of developing effective methods for achieving greater dispersion of minorities throughout the five boroughs of New York City. It is funded and operates in two directions. It makes available to minorities information on dwelling units for sale or rent, on the characteristics of the communities involved, and on good homeseeking practices. It also identifies and involves residents of white or almost white neighborhoods in all sections of the city who favor integration. Operation Open City promotes the formation of local fair housing groups among those residents who then provide all needed information on their communities for home-seekers and also support the homeseeker in his effort (Saltman, 1971:115). Between 1966 and 1971 about 15,000 have been helped to get better and desegregated housing. However, although Operation Open City has developed into an excellent placement service, it has not affected housing outlook and opportunities on the whole in the New York area.

Residential discrimination and segregation in the Denver metropolitan area led to the formation of the Metro Denver Fair Housing Center. Starting as a volunteer organization in 1965, it soon became the most amply funded open housing program in the country. It not only aims at the goal of complete freedom of choice but also to keep integrated neighborhoods from becoming resegregated. It has helped 3000 families a year find better housing and most of it is integrated. Yet, the Denver Center is still not more than a placement agency on a large scale.

In the fall of 1968, the Metropolitan Fair Housing Center in Los Angeles was expanded into Housing Opportunities Center of Greater Los Angeles with a one year demonstration grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Of its three divisions, the Metropolitan Fair Housing Center Division is the most active. It operates a referral service for minority families who seek housing outside ghetto or rapidly changing areas. It also carries on an area-wide educational program to promote open housing. It has other related activities. Yet this work was endangered by HUD. The Division was advised that HUD would no longer fund Fair Housing programs since it was believed that "Fair Housing is passé" (Saltman, 1971:122).

In Seattle, Operation Equality was established after volunteers from two earlier organizations were able to secure funds to match a Ford Foundation grant. Its goal is "to reverse the trend toward increasingly segregated housing in Seattle" and to provide a free choice of housing for everyone. Its program showed flexibility and change.

Operation Equality at first continued the activities of the volunteer period; they secured listings, matched them with minority clients and tried to educate the community. However, after six months, the limited ability of available applicants to pay the price of listings became apparent. A program change was made. The new program stressed the development of low and moderate-income housing through rehabilitation or the building of new units.

The director paved the way for the change in program by mobilizing support for open housing ordinances in Seattle and nearby communities and in many other innovative ways. Within the three years prior to 1971, Operation Equality placed over 600 families in new or rehabilitated homes, about 520 people were planning to buy homes made available by Operation Equality, and 126 were seeking rentals in 1971. It was serving over 1500 families with counsel on

finances, home maintenance, and legal problems. The staff grew from six to 35 and from a budget of $138,000 to $450,000.

Unfortunately Los Angeles and New York lost the funding (Office of Economic Opportunity) for their open housing programs (Saltman, 1971:128).

Of the four cities, Seattle's Operation Equality showed the greatest potential for systemic change. The Operation Equality provided placements but also built and renovated the houses used in its placements. To do this an effective director brought about changes in the legal system, housing industry, and governmental system. In Los Angeles, the Fair Housing Division's achievements were due to the development of a large network of localized volunteer open housing groups. Referrals could be made from the funded central office to the local groups, freeing the staff for broader institutional work. With funding gone, the 60 volunteer groups would lack a central coordination.

Socio-Economic Level and Educational Level as Major Factors in White Resistance

Studies reveal that an increasing emphasis is falling on socio-economic level and on educational level as factors in white resistance to having black neighbors. In Levittown, fear of loss of status appeared basic to the opposition that developed against the Myers family (Bressler, 1960:133).

In the Minneapolis study (Tillman, 1964:80-86), about half of the white residents in an area to be cleared for a freeway were interviewed. The final sample was 278. Some parts of the area were all-white and some racially mixed. When asked about racially mixed neighborhoods, 74 per cent indicated they preferred an all-white neighborhood and 6 per cent a predominantly white neighborhood. Fear of depreciation of land values, "don't like Negroes," and possibility of intermarriage were the reasons given by respondents for their preference for an all-white neighborhood. Thirty-two per cent felt that living in a racially mixed neighborhood hurts a white person's social status, and 35 per cent were concerned with possible consequences of their children's playing with Negro youngsters.

A study of the Rockaway Peninsula, Long Island, by Davies (1966:30-71) reveals that an influx of Negroes caused much fear, tension, anguish, and hostility. To many of the residents the Negroes were probably a symbol of the central city with its overcrowding, vice, and dirt, from which they were trying to escape. To the Chamber of Commerce they represented a threat to property values.

In Kalamazoo, Michigan, (Mack, 1968:243-253) most residents define the housing problem primarily in class terms, "although acknowledging that the situation is manifestly worse for low-income people who are Negro." A community leader said "the purchase and rental of housing for middle and upper-middle income Negroes is generally unrestricted."

On the West Side of Chicago, the proportion of Negroes has been steadily increasing, writes Suttles (1968:119-137), and the other ethnic groups "have retreated from them." The "lowly status" of the Negro makes him "a portentous enemy" because everyone fears stigma in being associated with him. An attitude survey of Chicago suburbs (Holmgren, 1967:11-12) found that resistance to integration is a "class" matter largely. Respondents were asked to indicate how they felt about this statement "The main issue in housing integration is the type of Negro who moves in." Four out of five whites agreed that this statement is largely or completely true. This was true whether the respondent lived in an integrated or an all-white neighborhood. About six out of ten opposed a Negro household of low income, low education level moving in, but only about three out of ten opposed a Negro household of similar background moving in.

Pointe Place, a suburb of Toledo, has been resisting the building of low cost public housing units in its midst through the activities of a local citizens' group. An assistant high school principal of Pointe Place expressed emphatically to me the idea that she and other residents have no objection to educated Negroes of high social standards but do not want the uneducated ill-mannered slum dweller.

Integrated Neighborhoods and Social Interaction

In their earlier investigation of privately developed interracial housing, Grier and Grier (1960:28-29, 199-204, 236-240) found, by on-site study and interviews with residents of over two dozen interracial communities, that most residents were on the whole satisfied with their neighbors of different race. There was no evidence in any community of a split among residents along racial lines. The general character of social relations among residents of different communities varied from very close with much community activity in some (especially in cooperatives), to aloof, with only casual neighborly contacts in other developments. In many communities there were active social clubs and neighborhood-improvement associations with interracial participation. In nearly all communities with children, interaction was reported between children of different race, whether or not their parents had much contact. In the case of Hillview in a California city, what has been looked upon as an "irreversible" trend was reversed. Hillview was once occupied entirely by Negroes and later under new, resourceful, and energetic management, developed a substantial majority of white tenants. In time a Women's Club was formed which was reported in 1956 to be expanding and thriving with a large list of activities including baby showers, birthday parties, "game nights," and group suppers. All these activities were interracial. Some of the reasons cited for the financial and social success of the reversal are the more aggressive management practices with a strong and determined appeal to white people, the high mobility of the city's population, and the small size of the local nonwhite population--only six per cent of the total. With the availability of other kinds of housing, it seems that many of this population were unable or unwilling to pay the rents required of Hillview tenants.

In their more recent study, Grier and Grier (1966:71, 72) report that most of the new interracial developments have been successful both socially and financially. However, as they point out, most of these private developments are beyond the reach of lower-income Negro families living in urban slums and thus can do little to end segregation.

Another study made prior to 1960 by Chester Hunt in Kalamazoo, Michigan, deal partly with patterns of social interaction and was based on interviews with the housewives in 46 Negro families and 133 of their white neighbors. The Negro families had moved into predominantly white neighborhoods. Negroes comprised less than four per cent of the city's population. A specific neighboring scale was set up to measure the interaction between next-door neighbors, white as well as Negro. The result seemed to indicate that "people who have a high degree of sociability in general tend to interact with those around them regardless of race," and that white neighbors maintained a higher degree of interaction with Negro neighbors than they had with other white neighbors. The score indicating the greatest possible amount of "neighboring" was 76. The score was based on such activities as visiting, calling in homes, borrowing or lending tools and household supplies, talking informally, etc. The highest score was 53.6 for "Whites with Negro neighbors." However, neither specific items nor the overall scale revealed neighboring to the extent of indicating close friendships. Visits to the home of a member of the other race were reported by 32 (70 per cent) of the Negroes and by 33 (25 per cent) of the whites, but 14 (30 per cent) of the Negroes reported no home visits, perhaps indicating some hesitancy on the part of both groups about such involvement. People with higher education tended to participate more in neighboring interaction both within the race and across racial lines. Thirty-eight per cent of the college educated white housewives but only 17 per cent of the white

housewives with a grade school education had made visits to the homes of Negro neighbors. The white families who moved into the neighborhood after the Negro entry revealed twice the proportion of acceptance of mixed housing as those who were living there before Negroes entered.

Hunt concludes on the basis of a statistically significant result that his study tends to support the thesis that an increase in interracial contacts is accompanied by a greater willingness to accept integrated situations. However, he recognizes community norms as the principal factor since even in the group that had the greatest amount of interracial contact, 42 per cent took the general community attitude of neutrality toward integrated housing.

The main question at this point of the paper is the nature of the social relations that held between black and white residents of integrated neighborhoods. However, it should be recognized that there have been and there are social relations of considerable solidarity between black and white residents in areas that are obviously "changing," that is, areas from which white people are moving and where black people are filling the vacancies. These are often areas in which community organizations are struggling to keep the white people from moving, to bring in other white people to take the places of those who leave, and to keep up the neighborhood so that it will hold its good residents and attract others. The Winneconna Lakes Area (Helper, 1962:63) in Chicago presented this situation. By 1961, it was 50 to 60 per cent Negro, but white and black were still working together assiduously in the Winneconna Lakes Area Improvement Association to keep the area mixed and a good place to live. There were a number of interracial community activities. In 1962, before Easter, a bake sale was held. White and black bought goods from white and black. No one asked whether white or Negro had baked the cake or the cookies. There was also a July 4 picnic held as a community affair, with refreshments and games

for the children. All went well and all worked well together. Black and white residents cooperated well and put forth great effort for the common goal of maintaining an integrated area. The lack of success was not their fault. It was to a large extent, if not mostly, the fault of the city government in its neglect of the needs of a residential neighborhood, the fault of real estate brokers, and the fault of unscrupulous landlords.

Since 1970, the most comprehensive study of integrated neighborhoods in the United States is that of the National Opinion Research Center by Bradburn, Sudman, and Gockel (1970). They develop a definition of "an integrated neighborhood" which stresses "process" within the neighborhood, that is, the openness of the neighborhood to both white and Negro potential residents, rather than "state" of the neighborhood expressed as a certain proportion of Negroes in the neighborhood. Their definition then is as follows:

> An integrated neighborhood is one into which both Negroes and whites can and are currently moving into housing of comparable value (1970:7).

They consider a stable integrated neighborhood "to be one that neighborhood informants believed would still have both Negroes and whites moving in during the next five years." They subdivided integrated neighborhoods into five types based primarily on the proportion Negro. These five are (1970:462):

1. Open--with two or more Negro households, but less than 1 per cent Negro;
2. Moderately integrated--with 1-10 per cent Negro families;
3. Substantially integrated--with more than 10 per cent Negro families;
4. Integrated in localities with very few Negroes-- . . . proportion of Negroes is less than 2 per cent . . . no segregated Negro neighborhoods; and
5. Integrated rural areas--primarily in the South . . .

Using their definition, they estimated that there were a total of 8,716 integrated neighborhoods and 36,884 segregated neighborhoods. Of the integrated

neighborhoods, the number of each type from 1. to 5. is as follows: 1,494, 1,493, 1,830, 1,376 and 2,523 (1970:65). They also estimated that 36 million Americans, or 19 per cent of the population, lived in racially integrated neighborhoods in the spring of 1967. The total number of households in integrated neighborhoods was estimated at 11 million with considerable regional variation percentagewise (32, Northeast; 26, West; 13, North Central; 11, South) (1970:14). However, almost one-third of all households in integrated neighborhoods were found to be located in the suburbs of metropolitan areas. Almost one half of this third are open neighborhoods. Substantially integrated neighborhoods predominate in central cities rather than in suburbs. Although a large number of integrated neighborhoods was found, the number of Negroes living in such neighborhoods is small when compared with the number of whites. "Of the estimated 11 million households found in integrated neighborhoods, only about 760,000, or about 7 per cent, are Negro" (1970:15).

The fact that a residential community area is integrated does not insure that there will be neighborly relations between white and black residents. Bradburn, Sudman, and Gockel (1970:393-426) were interested to know how much white and Negro families socialize with one another as neighbors both between races and within their own race. Thus they considered two aspects of neighboring--interracial and general. They were interested in "primary relations," that is, "face-to-face, noninstrumental, informal, personalized interaction." Six statements were used to measure neighborhood social integration. These six adult statements ranged from casual contact in public to more intimate contact. There were also questions for child contact. Whites report general stopping and talking "when we met" five times as often as with Negroes. Thirteen times as many whites chat informally "in their home or our home" with neighbors as have chats with Negro neighbors. Thirty-three per cent of whites

report having dinner or a party together with neighbors, but only one per cent report doing either with Negro neighbors. The paucity of interracial contacts becomes even more apparent when it is noticed that eighty-one per cent of whites in integrated neighborhoods report that neither they nor any member of their family has stopped and talked with a Negro neighbor in the preceding few months and 95 per cent report no equal-status interracial contact in the home or at parties, movies, or neighboring meetings. The authors point out that, as 81 per cent of the population live in segregated neighborhoods, the absence of equal-status interracial contacts becomes even more pronounced.

A criticism may, however, be offered here. According to the authors' definition, any neighborhood that informants thought would change "so that in five years only Negroes would be moving in" was classified as segregated, even if some whites were moving in at the time. In such a neighborhood, there may be and sometimes are equal-status interracial contacts that are pleasing to both white and Negro residents, as in the case of the Winneconna Lakes Area in Chicago. The authors do not seem to have taken into account such contacts in "changing" neighborhoods. Their adoption of the informants' view as a principal criterion by which to judge an area as integrated or segregated can also be subject to question.

As the number of Negroes in a neighborhood increases, interracial neighboring also increases. However, as the percentage of Negroes rises, "there is a decline in the rate at which interracial neighboring increases." The absolute amount of interracial neighboring is low--"strikingly lower" than general neighboring. For the first three types of integrated neighborhoods, interracial neighboring is more extensive for families who have children in an integrated neighborhood public elementary school than for those who do not. The authors find that whites living in the North and West are more neighborly to Negroes

than are southern whites. In the North and West, education is positively correlated with interracial neighboring, but in the South it is not. Income, on the other hand, is associated with neighboring in all parts of the country. In the North and West, whites in substantially integrated neighborhoods are less neighborly than whites in any other type of neighborhood. This seems particularly true of homeowners. When neighborhood type is controlled, homeowners are found, in general, to be more neighborly than renters in all sections of the country. "The rich, the more highly educated, and the homeowners are more neighborly than those less fortunate." Interracial neighborhood sociability is positively associated with pro-integration attitudes in all regions of the country.

A number of mixed residential communities have been observed more or less thoroughly. Some answer to the NORC definition quite well. One such area has shown and continues to show great success in social integration. The criteria being used by which to judge such success are satisfaction of residents with living in the neighborhood, a sense of responsibility for the neighborhood among residents and identification with it shown in persistent efforts in the upkeep and improvement of the neighborhood and one's own property, cooperation among residents, especially white and black, in a collective effort to implement the common goal, friendliness and helpfulness toward neighbors.

Jackson Park Highlands is a part of South Shore, an area on the South Side of Chicago which has undergone a large influx of Negroes in recent years. However, the Jackson Park Highlands area is a stable integrated area. It came into being in 1905 as an 80-acre subdivision. It was and is zoned for single family homes. It has no alleys and all utilities are underground. It was planned that way. It and two other areas in Chicago were planned as demonstration areas. The houses are made only of brick and stone with roofs of tile or

slate. The area includes 16 square blocks. The Highlands takes its name from the fact that it was constructed on a ridge of land overlooking the surrounding area. There are 277 houses in the area. Fifty-four of these homes are occupied by university professors, 64 by medical doctors, a large percentage by ministers, lawyers, teachers, artists, businessmen and civil rights leaders. There are many graduate and undergraduate students (some of whom own homes) in the community. The racial proportions are now 30 to 40 per cent black and 60 to 70 per cent white.

The Jackson Park Highlands Association was incorporated in 1947. In 1972 it celebrated its 25th anniversary. It claims to have a 70 per cent membership in the neighborhood. In June, 1972, the second edition of its community directory was completed. The residents both individually and through the many committees of the Association give their attention to every aspect of neighborhood care. Residents claim to have a feeling of security in their island of calm in the midst of ghetto areas that surround them. There is little crime or vandalism. There is good police protection. "I would call it eternal vigilance," the secretary-treasurer of the Association has said. Watch-thy-neighbor policy has several times uncovered clandestine multiple-family situations in this strictly enforced single family area. On one occasion a real estate firm was caught putting up "Sold" signs on property long ago sold and was stopped. Any irregularity observed in the area is at once investigated and corrected. The secretary-treasurer, a University of Chicago professor, spends 15 hours a week doing volunteer work for the community. There is little moving from the area, and white and black continue to move into the area when there are vacancies. The houses are inexpensive compared to similar homes in other areas. The only drawback in the neighborhood is the public schools. They are overcrowded and considered to be not good by the residents. Most send

their children to the University of Chicago Laboratory School, which includes elementary and secondary education, or to other private schools. The secretary-treasurer, a resident of long standing, reported that there is a good deal of neighboring between black and white residents. They invite a family of the other race to their homes for dinner. One black resident who is fond of music invites friends to her home to hear this or that artist. There is a mixed play-reading group. Like the membership, the officers of the Association are a mixed group. All work together. Once each summer the Association holds the Highland Fling, a kind of community festival. A street area is cordoned off, there is police protection, and residents come with their families to dance, play games, and show paintings and other works of art. Foods made by people of different ethnic backgrounds give enjoyment and a good time is had by all. Here there is indeed equal-status contact, cooperation, and good fellowship between black and white. The people here have a stake in the community. There is dedication, pride, loyalty.

Molotsch (1969:878, 890) in his study of the South Shore area seems completely unaware of the existence of the Jackson Park Highlands neighborbood, an area that does indeed have what he refers to as "transracial solidarity." In 1954, the Highlands helped sponsor the South Shore Commission, which Molotsch takes pains to discuss, by contributing $300, and has made yearly contributions since then (Moon, 1973, Directory, 4).

Moore and McKeown also fail to recognize Jackson Park Highlands as a well integrated area in their rejection of the South Shore area as a slowly changing neighborhood. Yet the Highlands area meets their definition which stipulates an area "inhabited both by Negroes and whites, and into which whites as well as Negroes have moved since the first Negro moved in" (1968:2). For their study of "Integrated Living in Chicago" they go on to select three areas:

Marynook, a neighborhood of 425 single homes on the far south side of Chicago, Lake Meadows, a high rise apartment complex of approximately 960 dwelling units on the near south side of Chicago, and a section of eight adjacent blocks in Evanston, a city immediately north of the Chicago city limits and still called its suburb. At the time of the study, Negroes constituted a little over 50 per cent of the population of Marynook. Both white and Negro families have been moving into the area, but the number of Negroes has surpassed the number of whites. Lake Meadows, unlike Marynook, was integrated from the beginning. About one third of the units are occupied by whites. Many of its tenants are employed in the nearby Illinois Institute of Technology and Michael Reese Hospital. In the Evanston area, which contains about 200 units, mostly single homes, whites outnumber Negroes two to one. It is a family neighborhood. In this study, only what respondents would do, not what they do do, is revealed. Most of the respondents of both races, more than three in four, said they would trust their neighbors of another race with the key to their house. Their answers ranged from almost unanimity in Marynook to a two in three margin in Evanston. The Negroes were slightly more trusting than the whites in Marynook, the reverse was true in Lake Meadows, and both races were almost even in Evanston. The whites were more hesitant about interracial babysitting than with the house key, although 62.6 per cent said they would trust a Negro girl to babysit for them. About one-third of both white and Negro respondents claimed to find some racial differences in life styles. When asked, "If you ever move from here, would you move into another neighborhood like this one in which both white and Negro families live?" only 44.7 per cent of the whites said that they would definitely do so, whereas 82.7 per cent of the Negroes said they would. For the whites, 21.3 per cent said they definitely would not want to have the present experience again. This leaves 34 per cent with qualified

approbation for residential integration--a large area that seems well worth further study. In their "Implications for the Future," the authors point out that residential integration exists with considerable success and peace "where the people are willing to have it so," that white and black people are living together, and that it does work. They stress two conditions for successful residential integration: that white and Negro be reasonably similar in certain social and economic characteristics, and that "the white residents be more than ordinarily sympathetic to the interests of their Negro fellow citizens and that they have a certain commitment to making integration work." The authors are tempted to conclude that successful integration requires similarity in having a good education, in being well-employed, and in having an adequate family income (1968:57-58).

Other integrated areas in Chicago have been studied--those that Moore and McKeown found out of line with their conception of an integrated area. A present problem is the lack of a uniform definition of "integrated area." Other students of race relations look upon Hyde Park-Kenwood on the south side of Chicago as an integrated area (Abrahamson, 1959; Cunningham, 1965; Eley and Casstevens, 1968). After a great struggle put forth by the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference and the powerful intercession of the University of Chicago, the area underwent a fairly drastic urban renewal transformation so that it could go on as a mixed area. It has about equal numbers of black and white residents. There are all Negro sections, all white sections, white-occupied apartment buildings, and interracial apartment buildings and blocks. The biracial character of the area is a reality and seems assured. The cooperation between white and black in the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference is of long standing and continues today.

The future of Austin, a community area on the far west side of Chicago, is not as assured. In recent years, Negroes began to enter. Austinites are predominantly white-collar and skilled blue-collar families of middle-income living in single family homes, two-flats, or duplexes. In this study also we learn what Austinites think about the future of their neighborhood and about their own actions in the future. Nearly two-thirds (62 per cent) of those sampled expected their neighborhoods to be racially integrated within five years. Six out of ten (58 per cent) felt that their neighborhood would definitely be a worse place to live in the future. The Austinites living on integrated blocks are opposed to the presence of Negroes. A substantial 41 per cent are neither "in favor of nor opposed to Negroes living on their blocks." Of the large number of Austinites living on all white blocks, 61 per cent described themselves as being in between the pro and con positions. It is not likely that the typical white Austinite will be moved to violence, but his attitude toward integration is decidedly less than favorable. Three-quarters of those living on all white blocks said it would make no difference if a Negro family with the same education and income moved into their block. The ambivalence toward integration seemed based on the expectation that the Negroes moving in would have different styles of life. There also seems to be the expectation that integration would soon become Negro invasion. Answers to questions revealed that if the block became 25 per cent Negro, over half of the whites would have moved or would be preparing to move away. At the time of the study, fear characterized a substantial minority of white Austin. (McKinlay and Shanas, 1968:16-23).

Social relations between black and white families are revealed in a study conducted in July, 1970, by the Housing Opportunity Centers operated by the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. Members of 47 black families--32 in

Louisville and 15 in Lexington--were interviewed. Most of these families had moved during the years 1968-1970, but others had had longer experience in living in mixed neighborhoods. An estimated 854 families have moved into mixed or white areas of the two cities. The moves have been into suburban subdivisions or peripheral neighborhoods. In answer to the question "How have you been treated by your neighbors?" the common answer was "Fine," but many said, "Beautiful" "Real friendly" and "They bent over backwards to make us feel welcome." A few spoke of casual relationships with their neighbors and of preferring it that way. "We speak," said one man, "and that's the way I like it. I prefer privacy." The majority had had no "bad incidents," although a few had had irritations like "some name calling at first" or "one crank letter." One woman was frightened by neighborhood children banging on her door. Most respondents had had good experiences. They told of favorable gestures from their white neighbors. They were welcomed and invited to coffee or cocktail parties. They exchanged babysitters and would watch each other's houses when one was away on vacation. One man said, "The guy downstairs helps me work on my car." One woman said, "Most of my friends are white." One black woman, a newcomer, organized a physical fitness class to which black and white women of the neighborhood came. When asked, "Would you recommend the move for others?" the majority said, "Yes." Some gave a qualified answer, "Yes, if they can afford it." A few thought it would depend on the individual. "If you have a chip on your shoulder and look for trouble, you'll have a hard time," one woman said. Another woman spoke even more pointedly, "If you are militant about race, you'll find prejudice," she said, "A lot of things happen in the normal course of living with others in a neighborhood that could be attributed to race if you are inclined to look for a racial connection. But if you aren't looking for that kind of thing, the little irritations are just a part of daily living."

Most who moved had gone to college, worked in professional occupations, earned an average of $12,000 a year, and owned a car or two. Still they were a fairly heterogeneous group--some older, some younger, some better educated, some with grown children, some with no children yet. The range in age was from 21 to 57, with most in their 20's. Most of the wives worked. Many were relieved and somewhat surprised to discover, after the experience of moving, that their race was not the obstacle that they might have expected it would be. Most of the Negroes who moved to live beside white people denied that they had moved in order to integrate. "I moved to find a place to meet my needs, not to integrate," was a typical reply. But others see the move as a good thing for all. "It helps whites realize that not all Negroes are bad," one black householder said.

In Cass County in southwestern Michigan, a study by Hesslink (1968) of a rural community reveals a stable, bi-racial situation. The schools are interracial both as to students and teachers. The Roman Catholic parish is truly integrated, the remaining churches being predominantly white. There are no Negro members in the one social club. Negroes claim they do not apply because they would feel "out of place," and the lack of applications removes the possibility of "an unpleasant situation." While Negroes and whites meet in daytime interaction for economic and other matters, nighttime contacts of a personal nature are less frequent. Yet there are bi-racial adult clubs, and neighbors of both races often play cards together. Interracial dating is infrequent and is discouraged as not "respectable behavior." Respondents were "negatively neutral" about intermarriage. They admitted that it took place but not very often." Although there is a substantial amount of integration in economic, political, and educational functions, there is still separation in the patterns of residential distribution as well as in social relations.

A rural area south of Mount Clemens, Michigan, Quinn area by name, had been a Negro area for at least 50 years. What brought whites to Quinn Street--a stretch of road about one and a third miles long through the countryside--was an 88-unit housing project that opened on urban renewal land in March, 1971 (Connolly, 1971:3). A 67 year old black woman who has owned a small home in the area since 1942 said, "People are just trying to live, that's all. We don't resent anybody. People got a right to live where they want." The superintendent was expecting a 70-30 ratio of whites to blacks when the units were fully occupied. At the time the event was reported, 45 units were already rented by whites and 18 by blacks. A white woman whose husband was an abstracter for an insurance company said, "I grew up with blacks and I just can't imagine anyone being bothered. I haven't had any trouble and I haven't talked to anyone who has." The Negro resident who had had a market on Quinn Street for 24 years thought integration was "one of the best things that's happened."

Summary and Conclusions

An attempt to ascertain how white people are reacting to having black people as neighbors reveals a varied scene. On the one hand, white people are continuing to move away, although not as fast as formerly, as Negroes enter a white area and as their numbers in it increase. On the other, in middle and upper class white areas, there seems to be no or very little of a problem when only two or three Negro families of similar socio-economic standing enter. The areas remain stable. However, in those areas where a number of white families have had to move or felt impelled to move because of the Negro presence, community organizations struggle to keep the area mixed, that is, to keep the white people from moving and to bring in other comparable white buyers or renters. Such an operation requires not only much organization, financial resources, and countless hours of volunteer work, but also and most importantly the cooperation and assistance of certain governmental agencies and effective action to counter certain practices of real estate people. It is still evident that real estate brokers' beliefs about the conceptions, feelings, and wishes of white people concerning Negroes, and their actions on the basis of these beliefs are continuing to promote segregation and the growth of the ghetto. Federal Civil Rights laws, especially Title VIII of the 1968 Act, have not been found adequate in a number of communities to do the job of protecting the white residents of mixed neighborhoods from the disturbing and upsetting practices of some real estate brokers. The outcome has been that in several municipalities additional ordinances have been passed or are being considered, proposed by neighborhood organizations working to maintain racial integration. In some cases a main part of the power structure in any area may for its own reasons work to establish racial integration on a firm basis via urban renewal. In other cases where forms of control cannot or will not be used, the outcome

is in doubt. In still other cases, nearby desirable employment opportunities, an attractive physical environment, or an important educational institution will keep white people in the neighborhood.

White people still have the same reasons as in the past for moving from an area that Negroes have entered--fear of the "bad element" and bodily harm, rape, assault and robbery, murder, fear of the decline of the neighborhood and of property values, fear of harm to their children at school or on the street, fear of the decline of the schools, fear of intermarriage, fear of loss of social status for the neighborhood and thus for the resident family, and fear of being "inundated"--surrounded entirely by Negroes. On the whole, white families with children, if they can, move away from and do not enter neighborhoods that blacks have entered. There have been exceptions, and perhaps more now than formerly.

Among white people's reasons for not welcoming black neighbors in their neighborhoods and for moving away, two seem to stand out in the actions and expressions of opinion of white residents. Both reflect the conceptions and stereotypes that white people entertain about Negroes--a central factor, if not the central factor in the whole question of white people's reactions to having black people as neighbors. One of these two reasons involves the socio-economic status of the Negroes entering the white neighborhood. There is evidence in the research of a growing emphasis on this factor. Recent studies have shown that a majority of the white people have little or no objection to having a Negro neighbor of about the same income and educational level. On the other hand, there is strong resistance to the building of low-income or even moderate-income public housing in middle and upper class white neighborhoods, for it is believed that this will bring in the urban poor, Negro and white, from slum neighborhoods with all the undesirable characteristics attributed to

them--a move seen as one sure to introduce a style of life radically at odds with and disruptive of the style of life of people of middle and upper class white neighborhoods.

Suburbs in particular are fighting the placing of interracial low- or moderate-income housing, public or private, in their midst. Some have been inhospitable even to Negroes of middle and upper class status, but many have not. Although black residence in suburbs is still hardly more than token, it is expanding, and there are some cases of peaceful and more than token integration. To prevent interracial housing developments from being established in their midst, a number of suburbs have taken to passing zoning laws which put to other uses the land on which such developments were to be built. This has given rise to some lawsuits.

The other reason for moving that seems to stand out is the fear of white people that they will become the minority in a neighborhood, that they will be surrounded by Negroes. This fear seems to be present in most neighborhoods but is especially marked in white blue collar areas and in communities of ethnic groups which are also mostly blue collar. There is fear of the loss of a home that people have worked for years to pay off and fear of the loss of a way of life that people have enjoyed with friends in the neighborhood over the years. There is resentment because of the special treatment blue collar workers see accorded to blacks, and there is insecurity as they see their jobs, neighborhoods, schools, recreational facilities, transportation means, political posts, shopping areas in danger of being taken over by blacks in their demands upon the government. As a result of the black movement, a stronger stress on their ethnic identity has arisen among ethnic groups.

If it is agreed that racial residential integration is beneficial to black and white alike, and in fact necessary in the light of the effects and

consequences of other alternatives, then the conclusion is drawn here that it is essential that the white people remain in the majority in a mixed area. This is essential if the white people are to be kept from running away. The effort to bring white buyers into a mixed neighborhood as well as black is imperative. There is a very great need to have white areas in the city and its suburbs opened to black buyers so that they can obtain the housing they require without all moving into an already mixed neighborhood and converting it into a Negro neighborhood.

Community organizations, in addition to their efforts to keep their neighborhood attractive to their residents, are trying to educate white and Negro citizens to the importance of maintaining a racially integrated area for their own good--of staying put, of doing all they can to enhance their neighborhood, and of doing all in their power to bring white people in to fill vacancies and to direct black prospective buyers and renters to other neighborhoods. Now in several communities blacks as well as whites are working hard to bring in white buyers in order to keep white families in the majority in the area so that other whites will not start leaving for fear of "inundation." There is the danger here that such community organizations will be accused of discrimination against Negroes, but it is for the benefit of black as well as white citizens that the growth of the ghetto should not be promoted. In these few communities, white and black have both realized that they must work for racial residential integration to save their own homes and they are working for it. If the growth of the ghetto and its attendant effects are to be stopped, an intensive program of education is a necessity everywhere. It is also necessary for the increase of our knowledge, to investigate the relation of the two reasons for white people's moving that have been prominent in the research to the other reasons expressed.

White families have for well nigh twenty years been reported to have bought homes in areas where Negroes live. Reports of such purchases have been increasing and most recently cases have been described in which whites bought homes next door to Negroes. Such events augur well for increasing racial residential integration. Also encouraging are the many interracial housing developments privately financed, owned, and managed.

It is suggested that the fair housing groups in the United States which number over 2,000, the neighborhood organizations, the city-wide organizations, and the regional planning groups, as well as such nation-wide organizations as the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, Sponsors of Open Housing Investment, and National Neighbors, all devoted to the extension of racial residential integration, are also expressions of white people's reactions to having Negroes as neighbors--positive expressions.

Another conclusion that may be drawn is the realization of the great variety revealed in the different communities regarding contexts and situations in which racial interaction takes place, and the variations in type of social interaction and in degree of involvement of such interaction. The variety of relationship ranges from close to casual to aloof both in integrated areas and in private interracial housing developments. The great variety that has been observed in the research tends to preclude generalizing statements beyond such well-worn findings as the one contained in Morton Grodzins' "the tip point."

Some disagreement is apparent in the research findings, and refinements of our knowledge are therefore necessary to arrive at a fuller understanding. For example, in public opinion polls and in individual studies, there has been observed a trend toward greater acceptance of open housing where similar socio-economic status of residents exists. But other researchers point to "the

widening color gap." The fact is that in the country at large the scene is a varied one. There are different kinds of relationships and responses in different situations in different groups in different communities. There are similarities too, and the eye of the viewer must encompass the whole scene. To stress only "the widening color gap" which in certain respects exists is to distort the manifold reality. An important part of this reality is the fact that racial residential integration exists and that it works even in the suburbs. This has been demonstrated in systematic research.

In this paper no claim is made that all recent relevant research has been covered and the search will continue. However, much research remains to be done in this area. There is relatively little on ethnic groups and on the relations between ethnic groups.

The paper had to be cut drastically in the interest of time and much detail was suppressed. It should be explained that this paper is the introduction to a study which I hope to make soon in an area of Toledo on the reactions of white people to having Negroes as neighbors.

REFERENCES

Abrahamson, Julia
1959 A Neighborhood Finds Itself. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Abrams, Charles
1955 Forbidden Neighbors: A Study of Prejudice in Housing. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Acker, Dan
1971 Interview, April 17, 1971, with Mr. Acker at his home, 26 Monticello Place, Buffalo, New York, 14214, about open housing in Buffalo and its suburbs.

Balk, Alfred
1965 "The Builder Who Makes Integration Pay," Harper's Magazine, 231, July, 94-99.

Berger, Bennett M.
1960 Working Class Suburb: A Study of Auto Workers in Suburbia. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Berton, Lee
1964 "Integration on Trial. Area in Cleveland Suburbs Struggles to Keep Racial Balance," The Wall Street Journal, Wednesday, September 2, p. 8.

Binzen, Peter
1970 Whitetown, U. S. A. New York: Random House.

Blume, Norman
1971-1972 "Open Housing Referenda," Public Opinion Quarterly, 35, Winter, 563-570.

Boggs, James
1970 Racism and the Class Struggle. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bradburn, Norman M., Seymour Sudman, and Galen L. Gockel
1970 Racial Integration in American Neighborhoods: A Comparative Survey. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

Bressler, Marvin
1960 "The Myers' Case: An Instance of Successful Racial Invasion," Social Problems, 8, No. 2, Fall, 126-142.

Campbell, Angus
1971 White Attitudes Toward Black People. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Chicago Daily News
1971 "Census Lists Black Gains in Suburbia," March 5. Newsclip.

Cohen, Oscar
1959 "The Benign Quota in Housing: The Case For and Against," ADL Bulletin (pub. by Anti-Defamation League of B'nai-B'rith), 16, No. 1, January, 3, 7.

Connolly, Patrick
1971 "Negro Area Welcomes New White Neighbors," The Toledo Times, July 13, page 3.

Cunningham, James V.
1965 The Resurgent Neighborhood, Chapter 5. Racial Integration: The Story of Spring Hill Gardens. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, Inc.

1970 Urban Leadership in the Sixties. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co.

Damerell, Reginald G.
1968 Triumph in a White Suburb. The Dramatic Story of Teaneck, N. J. The First Town in the Nation to Vote for Integrated Schools. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Davies, J. Clarence, III
1966 Neighborhood Groups and Urban Renewal. New York: Columbia University Press.

de Vise, Pierre
1967 Chicago's Widening Color Gap. Report No. 2, sponsored by the Interuniversity Research Committee. Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, December.

Doyle, James
1970 "Fund Cutoff for White Suburbs Eyed," The Sunday Star, Washington, D. C. August 30, A-6.

Duncan, Otis D. and Beverly Duncan
1957 The Negro Population of Chicago: A Study of Residential Succession. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eley, Lynn W. and Thomas W. Casstevens
1968 The Politics of Fair-Housing Legislation. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Forman, Robert E.
1971 Black Ghettos, White Ghettos, and Slums. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Freedheim, Gerda K.
1971 "A Decade of Open Housing Effort in Cleveland. Five pages mimeographed. Gerda Freedheim is Executive Director of Suburban Citizens for Open Housing. Also telephone conversation, March 1, 1973.

Gans, Herbert J.
1967 The Levittowners. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc.

Glazer, Nathan
1972 "When the Melting Pot Doesn't Melt," The New York Times Magazine, January 2, Sec. 6, pp. 12-13, 27, 28, 30, 31.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan
1970 Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press, Second Edition.

Greeley, Andrew M.
1969 Why Can't They Be Like Us? New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, The American Jewish Committee.

1972 "Political Attitudes Among American White Ethnics," Public Opinion Quarterly, 36, No. 2, Summer, 213-220.

Grier, Eunice and George Grier
1960 Privately Developed Interracial Housing. Berkeley: University of California.

1966 Equality and Beyond: Housing Segregation and the Goals of the Great Society. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Grodzins, Morton
1958 The Metropolitan Area as a Racial Problem. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.

*Ham, Clifford C.
1966 "Housing and Neighborhood Preferences." Unpublished manuscript, dittoed, November 1966.

Hamilton, Richard F.
1971 "Black Demands, White Reactions, and Liberal Alarms," in Sar A. Levitan, (ed.), Blue Collar Workers: A Symposium on Middle America. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 130-154.

Hecht, James L.
1970 Because It is Right: Integration in Housing. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Helper, Rose
1962 An Improvement Association Deals with Racial Invasion: A Case Study. Toledo: The University of Toledo, 80 pages.

1965 "Neighborhood Association 'Diary' Records History of Citizen Effort to Adapt to Racial Change." Journal of Housing, 22, No. 3, March, 136-140.

1969 Racial Policies and Practices of Real Estate Brokers. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hesslink, George K.
1968 Black Neighbors: Negroes in a Northern Rural Community. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Holmgren, Edward L.
1967 Attitudes Toward Integrated Housing--Before and After Project Good Neighbor. October 19. A Report to the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities (by Market Facts, Inc.).

1971 Executive Director, Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities. Chicago. Letter dated, May 24.

House and Home
1964 "How Eichler Sells Open Occupancy with No Fuss," 25, February, 132-136. Editorial reprint.

Hoyt, Homer
1939 The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities. Washington, D. C.: Federal Housing Administration.

Hunt, Chester L.
1959-1960 "Private Integrated Housing in a Medium Size Northern City," Social Problems, 7, No. 3, Winter, 196-209.

Kane, Frank
1971 "Dispersal of Public Housing into Suburbs Attempted in Dayton." The Blade (Toledo), Section B, Page 1, November 28.

Kusner, Chris
1972 "A Look at Toledo's Housing Situation and What Is Being Done About It," Insight, The Collegian, November 15, pp. 1-3. (U. of Toledo student paper).

Leacock, Eleanor Martin Deutsch, and Joshua A. Fishman
not dated Toward Integration in Suburban Housing. The Bridgeview Study. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith.

Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities
1970 "Black Families Living in Predominantly White Neighborhoods in Chicago Metropolitan Area." Chicago, Ill., January 1.

Lee, Frank F.
1961 Negro and White in Connecticut Town. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press.

Leggett, John C.
1968 Class, Race and Labor: Working-Class Consciousness in Detroit. New York: Oxford University Press.

Levy, Mark R. and Michael S. Kramer
1972 The Ethnic Factor: How America's Minorities Decide Elections. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lieberson, Stanley
1963 Ethnic Patterns in American Cities. The Free Press of Glencoe.

Mack, Raymond (ed.)
1968 Our Children's Burden. New York: Vintage Books. Pp. 245-248.

McKinlay, Richard and Ethyl Shanas
1968 Austin: Civil Rights and Integration in a Chicago Community. Report No. 3, sponsored by the Interuniversity Research Committee. Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, August 1.

Meer, Bernard and Edward Freedman
1966 "The Impact of Negro Neighbors on White Home Owners," Social Forces, 45, No. 1, September, 11-19.

Mikva, Zorita W.
1951 "The Neighborhood Improvement Association: A Counter-force to the Expansion of Chicago's Negro Population." Unpublished M. A. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, June.

Molotch, Harvey
1966 "Racial Integration in a Transition Community," American Sociological Review, 34, No. 6, December, 1966, 878-893.

Moon, Robert J.
1973 Interview with and printed materials obtained from on March 30 concerning Jackson Park Highlands and Jackson Park Highlands Association in Chicago. Robert Moon is Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

Moore, Maurice and James McKeown
1968 A Study of Integrated Living in Chicago. Report No. 4, sponsored by the Interuniversity Social Research Committee. Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, December 15.

Moyers, Bill
1969 "The Plight of the Not-So-Poor," Newsday, Long Island, May 24.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders
1968a Report, March 1. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

1968b Supplementary Report, July, p. 38. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing
1970a Special Report I--1970, 14, No. 4, "NCDH Wins Court Test of Lower-Income Zoning," 1, 3.

1970b "NCDH Zoning Drive Progress." Special Report II--1970, 14, No. 5, 1.

1972a "'Fair Share' Idea Begins to Spread--Dayton Plan Model for Other Areas," Trends in Housing, 16, No. 2, July-August, 1-3.

1972b "'Fair Share' Evolves. The 4 On-going Programs Differ in Concept, Method," Trends in Housing, 16, No. 3, Fall, 1-5.

Newsweek
1971a "The Battle of the Suburbs," November 15, 61-64, 69-70.

1971b "A Suburb That Struck a Truce," November 15, 63.

Northwood, L. K., and Ernest A. T. Barth
1965 Urban Desegregation: Negro Pioneers and Their White Neighbors. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Norton, Eleanor Holmes
1972 "The Most Irresponsible Industry in New York City." Integrated Education: A Report on Race and Schools 10(2):8-12.

Parenti, Michael
1967 "Ethnic Politics and the Persistence of Ethnic Identification," American Political Science Review, 61:717-726.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward
1966 "Desegregated Housing," The New Republic, 155, December, 17-22.

Ransford, Edward
1972 "Blue Collar Anger: Reactions to Student and Black Protest," American Sociological Review, 37, No. 3, June, 333-346.

Rapkin, Chester and William G. Grigsby
1960 The Demand for Housing in Racially Mixed Areas. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reed, Carolyn
1973 Telephone conversation to obtain information concerning trial in the lawsuit of The U. S. A. vs The City of Blackjack, Missouri, March 8.

Rose, Arnold M., Frank J. Atelsek and Lawrence R. McDonald
1953 "Neighborhood Reactions to Isolated Negro Residents: An Alternative to Invasion and Succession." American Sociological Review, 18, October, 495-507.

Rosen, Ellsworth E.
1959 "When a Negro Moves Next Door." The Saturday Evening Post, April 4, 4 pages (Reprint).

Rosen, Harry and David
1962 But Not Next Door. New York: Avon Book Division, Hearst Corporation.

Rossi, Peter H.
1970 "Alienation in the White Community" in Peter I. Rose, ed. Nation of Nations, The Ethnic Experience and The Racial Crisis. New York: Random House, Inc., 289-293.

Saltman, Juliet Z.
1971a "Open Housing as a Social Movement: A Sociological Study of Challenges, Conflict, and Change." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Case Western Reserve University.

1971b Open Housing as a Social Movement. Challenge, Conflict and Change. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

Shostak, Arthur B.
1969 Blue-Collar Life. New York: Random House, Inc.

Stalvey, Lois Mark
1963 "We Moved to an Integrated Neighborhood," The Sunday Bulletin Magazine, May 19, 2 pages (Reprint).

Sudman, Seymour, Norman M. Bradburn, and Galen L. Gockel
1969 The Extent and Characteristics of Racially Integrated Housing in the United States. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. (Reprint from The Journal of Business of the University of Chicago, 42, No. 1, January, 1969.)

Suttles, Gerald D.
1968 The Social Order of the Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sviridoff, Mitchell
1969 "A Perspective on the Seventies," November 28, 1969, pp. 17-22, in The Ford Foundation Annual Report 1969, October 1, 1968 to September 30, 1969, The Ford Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Taeuber, Karl E. and Alma F. Taeuber
1965 Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Taylor, Theodore
1971 "Race and Class in the Urban Ghetto: An Interpretation," in Rhoda L. Goldstein, ed., Black Life and Culture in the United States. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 263-279.

The Blade (Toledo)
1971 "Discrimination Banned by Columbus Owners in Rental Apartment Code," Thursday, June 3, Second Section, 13.

1970 "Increase in Negroes Living in Suburbs Called Illusion," Wednesday, December 9, 50.

Thompson, Mrs. Naomi
1973 Telephone conversation, Toledo, Ohio, February 4.

Tillman, James A.
1964 Not By Prayer Alone. A Report on the Greater Minneapolis Interfaith Fair Housing Program. Philadelphia: United Church Press.

Tilly, Charles, Wagner D. Jackson, and Barry Kay
1965 Race and Residence in Wilmington, Delaware. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.

Toledo-Lucas County Plan Commissions
1970 A Study of Negro Housing Patterns in Lucas County. 1970 Census Analysis. Toledo, Ohio.

Turbeville, Gus
1952 "The Negro population in Duluth, Minnesota, 1950." Sociology and Social Research. 36, March-April, 231-238.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights
1971 Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort. A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

U. S. News and World Report
1970a "Battle to Open the Suburbs: New Attack on Zoning Laws," 68, June 22, 39-40.

1970b "Furor Over a Drive to Integrate the Suburbs," 69, August 10, 23-24.

Wille, Lois
1970 "The Anxious Majority, Chicago's Working Class," The Chicago Daily News, May, 1970. Reprint, 15 pages.

Wolfe, Eleanor Paperno and Charles N. Lebeaux
1969 Change and Renewal in an Urban Community. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers.

---

*Ham, Clifford C.
1970 (1) New Negro Neighbors in Pittsburgh Suburbs: A Study of Negro Immigration Into Previously All-White Suburbs. (2) The Impact of Non-White Movement Into Previously White Suburban Residential Areas. Reported in Melvin M. Tumin, ed., Research Annual on Intergroup Relations--1970 as ongoing studies, No. 508, p. 176, and No. 495, p. 172 respectively.