MIT Libraries | DSpace@MIT

MIT Open Access Articles

Sociology, Segregation, and the Fair Housing Act

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. ***Please share*** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: Steil, Justin P. and Camille Z. Charles. "Sociology, Segregation, and the Fair Housing Act." Perspectives on Fair Housing, edited by Vincent J. Reina, Wendell E. Pritchett, and Susan M. Wachter, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020.

As Published: https://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/book/toc/16149_toc.html

Publisher: University of Pennsylvania Press

Persistent URL: https://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/128260

Version: Author's final manuscript: final author's manuscript post peer review, without publisher's formatting or copy editing

Terms of use: Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Sociology, Segregation, and the Fair Housing Act
Justin P. Steil and Camille Z. Charles[1]

In
Vincent J. Reina, Wendell E. Pritchett, and Susan M. Wachter (Eds.), *Perspectives on Fair Housing* (2020): 45. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Introduction

The sociological study of urban life in the United States over the past century and the study of residential segregation are inextricably intertwined. From W. E. B. Du Bois (1903) to St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton (1945), efforts to understand the causes and consequences of segregation were central to urban sociology in the first half of the Twentieth Century. These authors challenged contemporaneous sociological and legal arguments about the naturalness of segregation and established that segregation was not just an example of physical separation in dwelling places, but actually part of a systemic structure of racial subordination. At the same time, Drake and Cayton noted that Black Chicagoans took pride in "*their* city within a city" and "remain ambivalent about residential segregation: they see a gain in political strength and group solidarity, but they resent being compelled to live in a Black Belt" (1945: 115). This sociological research on segregation helped lay an academic foundation for the civil rights struggles that ultimately led to the passage of the Fair Housing Act in 1968. In this chapter, we review this stream of sociological scholarship and add contemporary assessments of the Fair Housing Act's contributions. More than a century of sociological scholarship has repeatedly found that residential segregation is one mechanism through which socio-economic inequalities are reproduced. Although the Fair Housing Act has made progress towards the elimination of intentional discrimination in access to housing, it has been much less effective in achieving the broader reformation of the institutions and practices that reproduce the subordinate social status of historically oppressed groups through unequal access to place-based opportunities. At the same time, conceptions of fair housing as defined primarily by the fight to access high-income suburban neighborhoods are becoming outdated as investment and jobs flow again into many central cities. In low-income communities of color within high-cost cities, displacement and resegregation are emerging as the most pressing concerns as the struggle for urban space intensifies.

W. E. B. Du Bois and the Sociology of Segregation

The first rigorous, empirical sociological studies in the United States were conducted by W. E. B. Du Bois in the late 1890s and early 1900s (see Morris 2015). From careful inductive analysis of the social life of Black residents of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and then Atlanta, Georgia, Du Bois began to formulate a theory of social stratification and organization, with attention to the role that race plays in the social order of the United States. In Philadelphia in 1896, Du Bois went from house to house in the city's Seventh Ward to conduct more than 2,500 surveys and supplemented those surveys with interviews and participant observation. In *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899), Du Bois painstakingly described the complexity of the African-

[1] The authors thank Mary Pattillo, Wendell Pritchett, Vincent Reina, and Susan Wachter for their helpful comments.

American community in Philadelphia, analyzing the geographical distribution, daily life, organizations, and social relations of Philadelphia's Black residents. He critiqued in particular the segregation that so many at the time took for granted. He writes:

> Here is a large group of people—perhaps forty-five thousand, a city within a city--who do not form an integral part of the larger social group. This in itself is not altogether unusual; . . . and yet in the case of the Negroes the segregation is more conspicuous, more patent to the eye, and so intertwined with a long historic evolution, with peculiarly pressing social problems of poverty, ignorance, crime and labor, that the Negro problem far surpasses in scientific interest and social gravity most of the other race or class questions. (1899: 5)

Du Bois points out that the segregation of African Americans is related to the segregation of other groups in the city, and yet is distinct, shaped by the unique history of slavery, emancipation, and a rigid white supremacist caste system. In an article for the *Annals of the Association of Political and Social Science*, Du Bois (1898: 8) similarly notes how the challenges of poverty faced by African Americans are universal ones and yet distinct because of the "peculiar environment" in cities in the United States characterized by "a widespread conviction among Americans that no persons of Negro descent should become constituent members of the social body." It is this experience of the "definitely segregated mass of eight millions of Americans [who] do not wholly share the national life of the people" and "the points at which they fail to be incorporated into this group life" that constitute social problems, Du Bois argued (1898: 7). In both of these turn of the century writings, Du Bois set a penetrating agenda for sociological research in the United States at the time—to understand the broad processes of social stratification through the experiences of African Americans. Central to that stratification, Du Bois recognized, were the lines of residential segregation that were being drawn ever more starkly at the moment he was writing.

In *The Souls of Black Folk,* just a few years later, Du Bois started by famously pronouncing that "the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line." He noted the significance of patterning in "dwelling-places, the way in which neighborhoods group themselves" and described the ease with which a physical color-line can be drawn on the map, "on the one side of which whites dwell and on the other Negroes" (Du Bois 1903). Du Bois (1903) wrote that an observer in the South finds that:

> the world about flows by him in two great streams: they ripple on in the same sunshine, they approach and mingle their waters in seeming carelessness—then they divide and flow wide apart. It is done quietly; no mistakes are made, or if one occurs, the swift arm of the law and of public opinion swings down….

Even as Du Bois analogized the separate lives of Black and white residents of the South to the waters in two flowing streams, he emphasized how this was all set in motion and enforced by human action and institutions, in particular state and collective action to enforce white supremacist norms through the arm of the law and the through norms of social control (Muhammad 2011). He continued: "between these two worlds, despite much physical contact and daily intermingling, there is almost no community of intellectual life or point of transference where the thoughts and feelings of one race can come into direct contact and sympathy with the

thoughts and feelings of the other" (Du Bois 1903). Du Bois here succinctly identified segregation as an effective mechanism for enforcing social distance and, as a result, racial inequality. As profoundly, he highlighted the dangers that a lack of a shared intellectual life create for a divided society.

From these works, Du Bois (1905/2000) moved to consider the direction of the field of sociology as a whole in investigating "the vast and bewildering activities of men and lines of rhythm that coordinate certain of these actions." Du Bois in 1903 alluded to ways in which the field of sociology was implicated in racializing and sexualizing poverty and inequality, writing in *The Souls of Black Folk* (p. 9), "while sociologists gleefully count his bastards and his prostitutes, the very soul of the toiling, sweating black man is darkened by the shadow of a vast despair." One can see Du Bois in this turn of the century scholarship challenging other sociologists to use this new social science to understand how the social order subjugates African Americans and privilege whites, as a specific example of broader processes of stratification in which "a combination of social problems is far more than a matter of mere addition" (Du Bois 1899: 385). The color-line that residential segregation made visible was for Du Bois so problematic because it was a cornerstone in the creation of durable racial inequality.

Segregation was so pernicious not because of the mere fact of separation but because of the discrimination it represented and the inequality it created. As Du Bois later wrote, "theoretically, the Negro needs neither segregated schools nor mixed schools. What he needs is Education" (Du Bois 1935: 335). He continued: "Other things being equal, the mixed school is the broader, more natural basis for the education of all youth. . . . But other things seldom are equal" and being "treated like human beings . . . is infinitely better than making our boys and girls doormats to be spit and trampled upon and lied to" by white classmates, teachers, and administrators in integrated schools (Du Bois 1935: 335). Du Bois's leadership in the Niagara Movement and the National Association for Colored People in the following decades made segregation a central target of African-American collective action, particularly resistance to the municipal segregation ordinances and white supremacist collective violence that spread through U.S. cities in the first decades of the Twentieth Century. "The opposition to segregation," he wrote, "is not or should not be any distaste or unwillingness of colored people to work with each other, to live with each other. The opposition to segregation is an opposition to discrimination. The experience in the United States has been that usually when there is racial segregation, there is also racial discrimination" (Du Bois 1934: 20).

The Chicago School of Urban Sociology

Despite Du Bois's groundbreaking scholarship, the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago is often seen as the foundation of sociology in the United States and, in particular, of urban sociology. Robert Park's 1915 article, "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment," described the city as an institution that manifests "the habits and customs of the people who inhabit it" (578) and Park proposed conceiving of "the city as a laboratory or clinic in which human nature and social processes may be most conveniently and profitably studied" (612). Park had studied with John Dewey, William James, and Georg Simmel and worked with Booker T. Washington at the Tuskegee Institute before joining the University of Chicago in 1914. Park was particularly interested in neighborhoods, processes of segregation, and "the forces which tend to break up the tensions, interests, and sentiments which give neighborhoods their individual character" (1915: 581).

Perhaps the best-known publication of the Chicago School was Ernest Burgess's 1924 essay theorizing the growth of a city in terms of a model of concentric zones. This model conceptualized urban growth through an analogy to processes of invasion and succession borrowed from plant ecology, and it conceived of the incorporation of individuals into communities through an analogy to "the anabolic and katabolic processes of metabolism" borrowed from human biology (1924: 51). Relying on these analogies to the natural sciences, Burgess suggested that "a process of distribution takes place which sifts and sorts and relocates individuals and groups by residence" (1924: 54) and that this "differentiation into natural economic and cultural groupings gives form and character to the city…[f]or segregation offers the group, and thereby the individuals who compose the group, a place and a role in the total organization of city life" (1924: 56). "The life of the community," Park (1926: 5) later wrote, "involves a kind of metabolism . . . constantly assimilating new individuals, and just as steadily, by death or otherwise, eliminating older ones."

Park's and Burgess's analyses of urban neighborhoods and processes of segregation was flawed in many ways, but perhaps most importantly by naturalizing processes of segregation as part of inevitable, almost biological processes of invasion, succession, and assimilation. It also conceived of the inequality so visible in Chicago as a largely temporary condition for all, with little attention to the processes of racialization and the institutional structures that made inequality, especially Black-white inequality so durable.

At the same time, Park and the Chicago School documented a foundational insight into the relationship between social and spatial stratification. Park began exploring the concept of social distance in the context of racial prejudice (1924) and then developed a theory of the intertwining of social and spatial distance (1926) in the concept of "position." Park (1926: 1, 9) noted that "changes in social and economic status and degrees of personal success or failure are registered in changes of location of residence" and that "location, position, and mobility" are fundamental to understanding social phenomena (see also, extensive subsequent scholarship about spatial assimilation and place stratification, e.g. Charles 2003; Tienda and Fuentes 2014). Sociology cannot be reduced to laws of physics or geometry, Park observed, because the foundation of social life is communication, and transformation of the individual as a result of that communication. Thus, spatial distance is significant for sociology because it defines the "conditions under which communication and social life are actually maintained" (Park 1926: 11).

With this emphasis on the interrelationship between social and spatial distance, the Chicago School educated generations of urban sociologists. One of its early graduates was Charles S. Johnson, who studied under Robert Park and received his Ph.D. in 1917. After Chicago's infamous "race riot" in July of 1919, Johnson was named as the principal researcher for the Chicago Commission on Race Relations and published in 1922 *The Negro in Chicago* which emphasized the poor housing conditions faced by Chicago's African-American residents and the resistance to the denial of social, political, and economic opportunity they faced. The community self-survey that Johnson led was one of many ethnographic studies of various occupational roles, groups, and neighborhoods that the Chicago School inspired and supported. One of the most influential of those ethnographies was St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton's 1945 masterwork of social research, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*.

Black Metropolis

In *Black Metropolis*, Drake and Cayton asked "To what degree is the Negro subordinated and excluded in relation to white people in society, what are the mechanisms by which the

system is maintained, and how do the lives of Negroes reflect this subordination and exclusion?" (1945: 776). To answer these questions, they coordinated more than 200 researchers conducting studies of Black businesses, churches, unions, newspapers, and other aspects of African-American life in Chicago. Drake and Cayton (1945: 101) focused in large part on the "color-line which marks Negroes off as a segregated group deemed undesirable for free association with white people in many types of relationships." They noted that "[t]he color-line . . . serves to subordinate Negroes by denying them the right to compete as individuals, on equal terms with white people for economic and political power" (101).

Drake and Cayton carefully documented the ways in which segregation in Chicago was not the product of any organic process of city growth, but was instead produced by private violence, institutional policies, political decisions, and state action. They documented the white violence, the refusal of services, and the police action used to keep beaches, parks, restaurants, and other public accommodations racially segregated. They also clarified the way in which racially restrictive property covenants both segregated and subordinated Black Chicagoans into the most rundown areas of the city. They squarely placed the responsibility for this subordination on white racism. "Segregation," Drake and Cayton wrote, "is fundamentally a reaction against the specter of social equality," combined with a white "economic interest that results in the concentration of Negroes within the Black Belt" (1945: 127-128).

But Drake and Cayton simultaneously recognized the agency of Black Chicagoans in transforming a "Black Ghetto" into a "Black Metropolis," in forging a vibrant community in the face of pervasive discrimination (see also Pattillo 2015). Chronicling the strength of Black newspapers, churches, unions, and other institutions, Drake and Cayton noted that Black Chicagoans took pride in "*their* city within a city" and "remain ambivalent about residential segregation: they see a gain in political strength and group solidarity, but they resent being compelled to live in a Black Belt" (1945: 115).

Ultimately, Drake and Cayton argued, like Du Bois, that racial segregation and subordination was not just a local or regional issue but one of national and global importance:

> the fate of the people of Black Metropolis—whether they will remain the marginal workers to be called in only at times of great economic activity, or will become an integral part of the American economy and thus lay the basis for complete social and political integration—depends not so much on what happens locally as on what happens in America and the world.
> (Drake and Cayton 1945: 767)

The Road to the Fair Housing Act

In the two decades following the initial publication of *Black Metropolis*, Black migration to Northern and Western cities continued, while the construction of federal highways and the mortgage assistance provided by the G.I. Bill spurred white suburbanization. African-American homeseekers were largely shut out of these federal housing benefits because of racially restrictive covenants and redlining. Many new suburbs used racially restrictive covenants, encouraged by the Federal Housing Administration, to bar sales to Black homebuyers (Satter 2010; Brooks and Rose 2013). Even without these covenants, federally encouraged race-based grading of neighborhoods for mortgage underwriting meant that residents of predominantly non-white and racially integrated neighborhoods would have to pay significantly more for private mortgage financing, if they could obtain it at all (Jackson 1987; Sugrue 1996; Rothstein 2017).

Even as the U.S. economy grew rapidly, those gains were not evenly distributed and as the Civil Rights Movement gained momentum in the South, Black residents of increasingly segregated and disinvested inner cities began to revolt against racial subordination.

The NAACP continued to challenge policies enforcing residential segregation, especially the racially restrictive covenants that had become so common. At a 1945 NAACP conference in Chicago, Charles Hamilton Houston described the strategy of using "the court as a forum for the purpose of educating the public on the question of restrictive covenants because, after all, the covenants reflect a community pattern" (Vose 1959: 60). As part of that education, Houston proposed always beginning litigation by challenging accepted conceptions of race altogether, by "deny[ing] that the plaintiffs are white and the defendants are Negroes. . . . Every time you drag these plaintiffs in and deny that they are white, you begin to make them think about it" (Vose 1959: 61). Just as the NAACP lawyers could challenge conceptions of race itself, so too could they challenge conceptions of segregation. "Play whites on their own prejudices," Houston suggested—"what degree of penetration changes a neighborhood from white to colored? One drop makes you colored, but one family in a block doesn't make the block colored?" (Vose 1959: 61). A crucial part of the NAACP's strategy for using these segregation cases as a form of public education was the incorporation of sociological and psychological research on the effects of segregation, as in the well-known Kenneth and Mamie Clark (1950) study of the "Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development" and Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (1944) (see also Ralph Ellison's (1964a) contemporaneous review) that the Supreme Court referenced in the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954).

Consistent with this emphasis on more quantitative analyses of segregation, scholars from the Chicago School continued to study segregation extensively, but moved in a demographic direction, rather than the more ethnographic one that Drake and Cayton represented (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1964; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965). Karl Taeuber, a well-known sociological scholar of segregation at the time, together with his co-authors Alma Taeuber, Evelyn Kitagawa, and others played a central role in popularizing commonly used measures of segregation in sociology operationalized as measures of population dispersion (Duncan and Duncan 1955; Kitagawa and Taeuber 1963; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1976; James and Taeuber 1985; Massey and Denton 1988). These and other sociological studies played an important role in measuring and documenting segregation and continuing to set the stage for civil rights legislation like the Fair Housing Act.

After the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference turned their focus to housing segregation in Northern cities. In January of 1966, they announced a partnership with the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations and launched the Chicago Freedom Campaign to "eradicate a vicious system" of housing discrimination and residential segregation "which seeks to further colonize thousands of Negroes within a slum environment" (King 1966a). The struggle to create truly equal access to housing and to neighborhoods was one of the most complex and challenging of all the difficult struggles that King faced (Ralph 1993).

At a march near Marquette Park on August 5, 1966, white residents hurled rocks, bottles, and firecrackers at the marchers. King was struck in the head by a rock and knocked to the ground. Catching his breath, he said, "I have seen many demonstrations in the South, but I have never seen anything so hostile and so hateful as I've seen here today" (King 1966b). Against this hostility to neighborhood integration, however, King had little concrete progress to show even after seven months of marches, protests, and meetings. King and the campaign struggled to

effectively organize Chicago's culturally and economically diverse Black residents and faced mounting opposition from many white residents. King eventually moved on to the Poor People's Campaign.

The Black Power movement simultaneously began to question whether integration was a worthwhile goal at all. Stokely Carmichael in a 1966 speech argued that "we were never fighting for the right to integrate, we were fighting against white supremacy" (Carmichael, 1966: 6). With Charles Hamilton, Carmichael articulated the Black Power call for "black people in this country to unite, to recognize their heritage, to build a sense of community. It is a call for black people to begin to define their own goals, to lead their own organizations and to support those organizations" (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967: 44). Carmichael and Hamilton (1967: 55) challenged a conception of integration "based on complete acceptance of the fact that in order to have a decent house or education, black people must move into a white neighborhood or send their children to a white school." They described how this emphasis on integration "reinforces, among both black and white, the idea that 'white' is automatically superior and 'black' is by definition inferior" (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967: 55). "Integration," they argued, then, "is a subterfuge for the maintenance of white supremacy" (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967: 55).

Urban uprisings across the country in 1967 led President Johnson to convene a commission to study civil disorders, led by Illinois Governor Kerner. In language not dissimilar to that of Du Bois and of Drake and Cayton, the Kerner Commission's report, released in February of 1968, stated that "what white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it" (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968: 1) The Commission famously described the nation as "moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal" (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968: 1).

The report recommended, among other prescriptions, that the federal government "enact a comprehensive and enforceable open housing law to cover the sale or rental of all housing," and that it "reorient federal housing programs to place more low and moderate income housing outside of ghetto areas" (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, p. 28). Whether the highly publicized report would actually lead to legislative change was unclear, however. Civil rights legislation that included anti-discrimination provisions in housing had failed repeatedly even as bills regarding voting rights and segregation in public accommodations had passed. As Senator Mondale noted, the focus on housing nationwide, instead of Southern segregation, "was civil rights getting personal" for Northern voters and their representatives (in Hannah-Jones 2015).

Then, on April 4, 1968, Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated, and the threat of racial conflict consumed the country. One week after King's assassination, in the midst of continuing unrest, Congress finally passed the Fair Housing Act, "to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States" (42 U.S.C. § 3601 (1988)). Speaking in support of the Act, Senator Javits cautioned that "the crisis of the cities…is equal to the crisis which we face in Vietnam" (1968: 2703). Senator Mondale warned that "our failure to abolish the ghetto will reinforce the growing alienation of white and black America. It will ensure two separate Americas constantly at war with one another" (1968: 2274). He emphasized that citywide problems are "directly traceable to the existing patterns of racially segregated housing" (1968: 2276). The Fair Housing Act therefore aimed, in Mondale's words, to replace segregated ghettos with "truly integrated neighborhoods" (1968: 3422). The primary operative provisions of

the act prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, religion, national origin, or sex, in the sale, rental, or financing of a home. The Fair Housing Act also required that federal housing and community development funding "affirmatively further" fair housing, but, as discussed below, this provision was largely ignored for nearly a half century. The Fair Housing Act was amended in 1988 to, among other things, prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability or family status.

Sociology and Segregation After the Fair Housing Act

Despite the protections of the Fair Housing Act, discrimination in the rental, sale, and financing of homes persisted. Community organizers and civil rights activists pressed for additional protections against pervasive lending discrimination and succeeded in winning the passage of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act in 1974, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act in 1975, and the Community Reinvestment Act in 1977 (Squires 2003). Combined with the Fair Housing Act, these laws provided some middle-class Black families greater choice in their housing and financing options.

Economic Restructuring and Enduring Segregation

But as these laws were raising the costs of discrimination, economic shifts were undermining hopes of social mobility for many urban Black residents. As William Julius Wilson documented (1987, 1996), the process of deindustrialization—the shift from a goods-producing to a service-producing economy—beginning in the late 1960s precipitated a dramatic decline in the number of decently-paid manufacturing jobs available to non-college-educated urban jobseekers. Those job sectors that were growing were often characterized by a mismatch in either skills or location for poor and working-class inner-city residents. As jobs left, some Black middle class households also departed central city neighborhoods, intensifying the social isolation, concentration of poverty, and lack of access to job networks for all who remained in inner-city communities.

In *American Apartheid*, Douglass Massey and Nancy Denton (1993) emphasized the central role of residential segregation in making the declining access to jobs that Wilson had chronicled so significant. Massey and Denton (1993: 8) argued that structural changes in the economy "would not have produced the disastrous social and economic outcomes observed in inner cities" if not for "segregation that confined the increased deprivation to a small number of densely settled, tightly packed, and geographically isolated areas." Documenting the public and private actions that contributed to the rise in residential segregation by race during the first half of the twentieth century and its persistence in the second half, Massey and Denton (1993: 7) focused in depth on the role that residential segregation has played in "mediating, exacerbating, and ultimately amplifying the harmful economic and social processes" associated with the shift from a manufacturing to a service economy and the shift in the location of production to suburbs, the Sunbelt, and offshore.

Numerous other scholars have extended upon and innovated from this work, focusing on the intersection of race, class, and residential segregation (South and Crowder 1998; Iceland and Wilkes, 2006); on multi-ethnic dimensions of segregation (Frey and Farley 1996; Charles 2003; Iceland 2004; South, Crowder, and Pais 2008); on the segregation of immigrants (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008); on the significance of metropolitan level characteristics (South, Crowder, and Pais 2011); and on change in segregation over time (Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004), among other topics. Other scholars, such as Rhonda Williams (2004), have used extensive qualitative interviews and archival research to document Black women's interactions with public housing

and their politicization and activism in relation to the neighborhood transformations that public policy changes and economic restructuring wreaked on their communities.

Neighborhood Effects

Attention to both differences in neighborhood characteristics and the effects that neighborhoods might have on outcomes grew significantly in the 1990s and 2000s (see, e.g., Ellen and Turner 1997; Sharkey and Faber 2014). One branch of that scholarship focused on the stability of neighborhood inequality and how that differentiation by residential location is part of "a durable spatial logic [that] organizes or mediates social life" (Sampson 2012: 21). Indeed many of the social problems on which sociologists often focus, from educational attainment to crime to mortality, have persistent spatial arrangements despite relatively high levels of individual geographic mobility. In that context, Robert Sampson investigated "how residential mobility, organizational ties, and elite social networks differentially connect neighborhoods to the cross-cutting institutions and resources that organize much of contemporary economic, political, and social life" (Sampson 2012: 61). This attention to neighborhood differences and the effects of those differences is intertwined with segregation by both race and class.

Relatedly, scholars such as Mario Small highlighted the heterogeneity of poor, Black neighborhoods and the complexity of contemporary Black residential patterns (Small 2008). Small observed that while Black households' locational decisions were not wholly predetermined, they continue to be shaped by constrained choice sets and made in a context in which local governments are increasingly significant for the lives of poor and working-class households as federal economic and social supports are diminished (Small 2008; Small and McDermott 2006). This attention by Sampson, Small and others to neighborhood differences and their effects illustrates how residential segregation has become both an object of study in sociology, for example research on what drives household locational decisions and continuing segregation, and simultaneously a tool for understanding social stratification more broadly, for example research on what differences in neighborhood characteristics most powerfully affect individual outcomes.

The spatial dynamics of intergenerational socioeconomic mobility have become a focus of more recent research in both sociology and economics. Scholars such as Patrick Sharkey have suggested that racial inequality can be accurately understood only from a multigenerational perspective and that the neighborhood must be conceptualized as an independent dimension of that stratification—in other words, that we should examine the "trajectories of individual families in combination with the trajectories of the places they occupy" (Sharkey 2013: 6). Sharkey writes that "to understand why the children of the civil rights era have made such minimal progress toward racial equality, we need to consider what has happened to the communities and cities in which they have lived over the past four decades" (Sharkey 2013: 5). He chronicles changes in predominantly African-American neighborhoods characterized by "severe disinvestment and persistent, rigid segregation; where the employment base that supported a middle-class urban population has migrated away, contracted, or collapsed; and where the impact of punitive criminal justice policies has been concentrated" (Sharkey 2013: 6).

Racially segregated residential patterns continue to be associated with unequal access by race to basic goods and services, such as the provision of financial services (Faber 2013, 2019) or health care (Figueroa 2019), and the targeting of predominantly Black and Latino neighborhoods for high-cost, high-risk products (Hwang, Hankinson, and Brown 2014; Steil, Albright, Rugh and Massey 2018) that strip these communities of already limited assets. Like wealth, "neighborhood environments, along with all of the advantages and disadvantages that go

with them, tend to be passed on from parents to children" and "African Americans have remained tied to places where poverty has become increasingly concentrated, where opportunities for economic advancement have declined, and where the risk of going to prison has become more prevalent than the hope of going to college" (Sharkey 2013: 44, 49). Sharkey identifies effects of neighborhood disadvantage experienced during childhood that continue to have an impact into adulthood and that cumulate over generations. This work has taken place as scholars in economics have noted similar trends, including the significance of metropolitan areas in shaping intergenerational socio-economic mobility (Chetty et al. 2014) and the negative effects of childhood exposure to higher neighborhood poverty rates on future college graduation and earnings (Chetty et al. 2015).

While much of the literature on segregation focused on the effects of neighborhood characteristics on the Black poor (e.g. Wilson 1987) or "underclass" (e.g. Massey and Denton 1993), segregated living patterns continued to characterize the experience of much of the Black middle class as well (Pattillo 2005; Sharkey 2014). Evoking Drake and Cayton's *Black Metropolis*, Mary Pattillo (1999: 4) notes that "the black middle class has not outmigrated to unnamed neighborhoods outside of the black community" but instead "are an overlooked population still rooted in the contemporary 'Black Belts' of cities across the country." Pattillo's rich ethnography explores how continuing racial segregation meant that Black middle-class neighborhoods "are characterized by more poverty, higher crime, worse schools, and fewer services than white middle-class neighborhoods," contributing to economic fragility and downward economic mobility (1999: 3). Indeed, the average African-American or Latino household with an income of over $75,000 lives in a census tract with a higher poverty rate than the average white household that earns less than $40,000 (Logan 2011).

Although African Americans have historically been far more segregated than other non-white groups, Latino-white and Black-white segregation levels converged between 1980 and 2010 (Iceland and Nelson 2008).[2] The growth of the U.S. Latino population is provoking a transformation in 21st Century metropolitan areas similar to the Great Migration of the 20th Century (Tienda and Fuentes 2014). As the Latino population continues to grow, Latinos are inheriting the segregated urban structures still experienced by African Americans. Although there is substantial heterogeneity among Latino groups of different ancestry, residential segregation is associated on average with significant negative educational and employment outcomes for native-born Latino young adults (De la Roca, Ellen, and Steil 2018). These negative effects for Latinos are as, or more, significant than the negative effects of segregation for African-American young adults.

Drivers of Continuing Segregation

Although there is increasing recognition of the significance of residential location for access to opportunity (De la Roca et al. 2017), whites' preferences for living in predominantly white neighborhoods continues to reinforce residential segregation by race today. Whites tend to favor predominately white neighborhoods (estimated at less than 20 percent Black) and are often reluctant to move into neighborhoods with more than a few non-white households (Charles

[2] Black-white dissimilarity declined consistently between 1980 and 2010 (from 0.73 to 0.60), while Latino-white (0.52 in 1980 and 0.50 in 2010) and Asian-white dissimilarity (0.41 in 1980 and 0.42 in 2010) remained relatively steady (De la Roca, Ellen and O'Regan 2014). Although Latino isolation (that is, the share of Latino residents in the neighborhood where the average Latino lives) has risen less rapidly than Latinos' quickly rising share of the population, average levels of Latino isolation have still risen substantially and matched average levels of African American isolation in 2010. Over this time period, African American isolation declined from 0.61 to 0.46 while Latino isolation rose from 0.38 to 0.46 (De la Roca, Ellen and O'Regan 2014).

2008). Black homeseekers, however, prefer significantly more integrated neighborhoods (Krysan and Farley 2002). Research on neighborhood preferences has also found the existence of a racial hierarchy in preferred neighborhood composition, with whites as the most-preferred "out-group"—a race different from the homeseeker—and Blacks consistently the least preferred of out-group neighbors, and Asians and Latinos usually in the middle of the hierarchy (Charles 2000).

The strongest evidence that racial composition matters independently of class or other neighborhood characteristics when whites make housing decisions comes from studies employing experimental methods to test the independent effects of race and class characteristics on neighborhood preference. For example, in one study, researchers showed a video of the exact same neighborhood scene but changed the race of visible neighborhood residents or the class valence of their activities. White homeseekers consistently rated all-white neighborhoods as the most desirable. The effect of race was smaller for Black homeseekers, who identified racially mixed neighborhoods as the most desirable (Krysan et al. 2009).

In addition to differences by race in preferred neighborhood racial composition and neighborhood perception, segregation is exacerbated by the "mismatch" between whites' desired neighborhood racial composition and the composition of neighborhoods in which they perform their housing search. While Black and Latino homeseekers conduct their search in neighborhoods that correspond to their stated preferences, whites search in neighborhoods with even higher percentages of whites than they say they would prefer (Havekes, Bader, and Krysan 2016).

Schelling (1971) demonstrated that the interactive dynamics of discriminatory individual choices mean that extreme segregation can arise from relatively small differences in preferences. The interactions between individual choices can generate a non-linear response, such that when the share non-white in a neighborhood passes a certain tipping point, white flight or white avoidance quickly leads to near-total isolation (Krysan and Crowder 2018). Given both Schelling's insights and the reality that society continues to be structured by substantial divergence in preferred neighborhood composition, it is not surprising that residential segregation continues to be so pervasive (Charles 2006; Card, Mas, and Rothstein 2008; Krysan, Carter, and van Londen 2017).

Residential segregation is also enabled in part by the decentralized structure of government in the United States that leaves the provision of many goods and services, and the raising of a substantial share of government revenue, to municipal governments (Briffault 1990; Frug 2001; Massey and Hajnal 1995). This metropolitan fragmentation facilitates processes that sociologist Charles Tilly (1998) and others have called opportunity hoarding (Reeves 2017). Tilly suggests that durable inequalities, such as racial inequalities, arise "because people who control access to value-producing resources solve pressing organizational problems by means of categorical distinctions" (1998: 7-8). The structure of local governance in the United States is predicated upon competition and inequality among local governments, upon some municipalities touting their high property values, low tax rates, and high-performing school systems to attract wealthy businesses and residents and to differentiate themselves from municipalities with lower property values, higher tax rates, and schools with lower test scores. In metropolitan areas in the United States, valuable resources, such as access to high performing schools, well-maintained parks, and other amenities have been and continue to be valuable resources guarded by wealthier, whiter households against those seen as threatening or encroaching upon them (Oliver and Shapiro 2006; Conley 1999). Through these processes of opportunity hoarding and the

intergenerational transfer of unequally resourced neighborhoods, residential segregation serves as the "structural linchpin" of racial stratification (Massey 2016; Pettigrew 1979; Bobo 1989).

Gentrification and Displacement

Despite most whites' preferences for living in predominantly white neighborhoods, there is growing public concern about the extent and significance of neighborhood change through gentrification. Cities in the United States have become increasingly popular for young professionals over the past two decades and housing costs, especially median rents, have increased faster than median incomes for renters in many cities. Many historically Black and Latino neighborhoods near the centers of growing cities have witnessed the displacement or departure of poor and working class Black and Latino households and their replacement by higher income, often white, households. Looking across the past half-century, Lawrence Vale (2013: xiii) has described how urban development policies, as political acts operationalized through urban design, created "twice-cleared communities"—working class neighborhoods razed once to construct public housing and again to demolish it, repeatedly purging "the poorest citizens from suddenly desirable land," often driven by racial or ethnic prejudice. While some have suggested that these recent neighborhood changes could lead to more racially and economically integrated neighborhoods (Byrne 2002; Godsil 2013), it seems more likely that these shifts will drive a process of resegregation in which Black and Latino households are dispossessed of desirable neighborhood locations (powell and Spencer 2002).

Scholars have debated the extent to which gentrification causes displacement directly and the extent to which it leads to neighborhood demographic change (e.g. Freeman and Braconi 2004; Freeman 2005; Newman and Wyly 2006; Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008; Ellen and O'Regan 2011; Hwang 2016). In theory, an increasing tax base and residents with more political and economic power could help improve neighborhood infrastructure and amenities (such as schools or parks) for all residents. Mary Pattillo suggests, however, that "in practice such a redistribution of resources often takes a backseat to feeding the demands of the new gentry for more public art, smoother streets, and support for more high-end housing, recreational, and commercial activity" (Pattillo 2007: 107). Gentrification may also further subordinate non-white or non-wealthy residents in spaces that were once seen as their own (Chaskin and Joseph 2013). For example, new middle-class residents often attempt to control the use of public spaces by low-income neighbors, sometimes through the "progressive criminalization of 'quality of life issues'" Mary Pattillo (2007: 264). Lance Freeman (2006) gives the example of drinking outside in gentrifying neighborhoods: "certain activities, such as drinking in public, are proscribed unless they conform to the gentry's idea of what is acceptable. . . . [W]hat difference should it make whether someone is standing on a corner or sitting behind a restaurant cordon?" (Freeman 2006: 107). The stability of multiracial, mixed-income neighborhoods created through gentrification is precarious as pressures for shorter commutes and rising rents can lead to rapid changes in neighborhood residents in some highly-valued locations, even as investment and upgrading seem as distant as ever in others (Hwang and Sampson 2014; Edlund, Macahado, Sviatschi 2015).

Conclusion

Through more than a century of sociological scholarship, research has suggested that residential segregation is one mechanism through which socio-economic inequalities are reproduced. Levels of Black-white residential segregation have decreased from their 1968 levels, but remain high and levels of Latino-white segregation have remained relatively consistent over the same period. Research suggests that residential segregation by race continues to produce

separate and unequal access to resources, such as schools or jobs, and exposure to hazards, such as violence or environmental risks (Steil, Ellen, and De la Roca 2015).

The Fair Housing Act has been a crucial tool in the fight against discrimination in housing. Enforcement has been limited, however, by a combination of lack of awareness by victims of discrimination, low levels of enforcement by the government agencies empowered to implement the Act, and relatively weak penalties for law-breakers (Schill 2006). Nevertheless, audit studies have suggested that explicit discrimination in housing has decreased and taken somewhat more subtle forms, such as non-white homeseekers being shown fewer units or offered fewer financing options (Turner et al. 2013; Pager 2008). More fundamentally, however, the Fair Housing Act has been less effective in reducing segregation overall because the structures that encourage and perpetuate segregation are entrenched in our local government boundaries and home ownership structures (Steil 2011). Continuing asymmetrical preferences for neighborhood racial composition combine with metropolitan fragmentation, exclusionary zoning, and regressive local financing structures to generate neighborhoods that remain separate and unequal. As Du Bois, Drake and Cayton, and others noted a century ago, the intersection of residential segregation and neighborhood inequality continue to generate racial disparities in educational outcomes, wealth, health, and well-being while obscuring their causes. Continuing segregation also decreases the likelihood of being able to shift racial attitudes.

Data from the General Social Survey on changing attitudes is illuminating. In the 1976 General Social Survey, 63 percent of white respondents nationwide, or nearly two out of every three, believed that homeowners should be allowed to discriminate on the basis of race when selling their home (Smith, Marsden, Hout, and Kim 2017). In 2016, that share had fallen dramatically, but still included more than 14 percent of white respondents, or nearly one out of every seven (Smith, Marsden, Hout, and Kim 2017). These results suggest that a sizable minority of white Americans today still openly oppose the protections enshrined in the Fair Housing Act. There have been sweeping changes in white attitudes regarding de jure segregation, mixed-race marriages, and the categorical inferiority of non-whites (Bobo et al. 2012). Yet, despite growing acceptance of the general principle of integration in social life, whites still express strong preferences for social distance from non-whites, particularly African Americans (Bobo et al. 2012). Support for government action to reduce both segregation and inequality remains limited among whites, and is declining among African Americans (Bobo et al. 2012). While whites have moved away from biological explanations of racial inequality, they have moved toward cultural ones, and African Americans have moved from structural explanations towards cultural explanations as well (Bobo et al. 2012; see also O'Connor 2001). This naturalization of inequality through cultural narratives is consistent with the ways in which segregation reinforces inequality by making its origins less visible. These shifts in attitudes among both whites and African Americans towards cultural explanations and African American shifts away from support for government intervention present challenges for the future of fair housing.

Simultaneously, conceptions of fair housing as defined primarily by the fight to access high-income suburban neighborhoods are becoming outdated as investment and jobs flow again into many central cities. In low-income communities of color within high-cost cities, displacement and resegregation seem to be the most pressing concerns as the struggle for urban space intensifies. The suburbanization of poverty generally makes crucial supports, such as employment services or affordable housing programs, harder for lower income households in suburbs to access than they were in cities, where there is a greater density of supportive

institutions (Allard 2009). The dispersal of low-income households and of communities of color may also make political organizing and electoral power more challenging to mobilize. Beyond the tangible effect of further isolating low-income households from growing central city resources, gentrification also sometimes has the less tangible consequence of cultural dispossession, again marking African Americans as the "displaced persons" of American democracy (Ellison 1964b: 287, 300; Rhodes-Pitts 2011: 117).

Concerns about displacement are consistent with the Fair Housing Act's priorities of confronting the durable structural inequalities embedded in our metropolitan areas. Addressing the ways in which our local governance structures and housing policies continue to recreate inequality will require innovative policymaking focused simultaneously on affordability and equity. Tackling the fragmented and exclusionary structures of local government is essential, if vexingly challenging. Some potential approaches could include creating financial incentives for inclusionary zoning changes and affordable housing development through federal block grant programs or through allowing affordable housing developers whose planning and zoning permits are denied by local governments to appeal to state courts if that locality does not already have some set percentage of units designated as affordable (see, e.g. Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40(b)). A revitalized Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule that requires state and local governments to create their own locally tailored plans to address racial disparities in access to opportunity will also be crucial for the Fair Housing Act's promise to be realized (Steil and Kelly 2019a; Steil and Kelly 2019b; O'Regan 2018).

Basic steps, such as fully funding the Housing Choice Voucher Program to eliminate its long waiting lists and requiring housing authorities to calculate Small Area Fair Market Rents would help households escape crushing rent burdens and have broader sets of choices about where to live. Investing in the nation's public housing stock as part of comprehensive community investments is an essential part of preserving valuable islands of affordability for future generations, especially in high-cost cities (Lens and Reina 2016). Federal financial support for local efforts to make housing in resource-rich neighborhoods permanently affordable by removing it from the speculative market through community land trusts are one way to address affordability and homeownership simultaneously. Congress should also update the Fair Housing Act and related civil rights protections to reflect the societal developments of the past 50 years. Amending the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of source of income as well as sexual orientation and gender identity would update the Act to meet contemporary policy challenges and values.

If the goal of the Fair Housing Act is the elimination of intentional discrimination, audit studies suggest the Fair Housing Act has made progress, even if intentional segregation does continue (Turner et al. 2013; Freiberg 2013). If the goal of the Fair Housing Act is the broader reformation of the institutions and practices that reproduce the subordinate social status of historically oppressed groups through unequal access to place based opportunities (Steil and Delgado 2018), however, the Fair Housing Act has not been nearly as effective and needs amendments to both widen and strengthen its protections. In terms of creating real housing choice and meaningful equality of neighborhood resources, the distance remaining is large.

As the geographer Katherine McKittrick (2011: 948) has written, white supremacy in the United States has repeatedly "marked black working bodies as those 'without'—without legible-Eurocentric history narratives, without land or home, without ownership of self—as this system forcibly secured black peoples to the geographic mechanics" of the plantation economy or other modes of accumulation. In order to change this representation, fair housing and civil rights

advocates must take a clear-eyed view of the long-term consequences of gentrification for racial equity. Across all potential policy innovations, policymakers should adopt an antisubordination approach that foregrounds attention to disparities in access to opportunity across durable categories of inequality, that recognizes institutionalized asymmetries of power and unconscious biases that perpetuate those disparities, and that prioritizes policies that reduce inequality even if they may have higher costs than policies that exacerbate it (Steil 2018).

References

Allard, Scott W. *Out of reach: Place, poverty, and the new American welfare state*. Yale University Press, 2009.

Bobo, Lawrence D. "Keeping the Linchpin in Place: Testing the Multiple Sources of Opposition to Residential Integration." *International Review of Social Psychology* 2, no. 3 (1989): 305–23.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Camille Z. Charles, Maria Krysan, and Alicia Simmons. "The Real Record on Racial Attitudes." In *Social Trends in American Life: Findings from the General Social Survey since 1972*, edited by Peter V. Marsden, 38–93. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Briffault, Richard. "Our Localism: Part I--The Structure of Local Government Law." *Columbia Law Review* 90, no. 1 (1990): 1–115.

Brooks, Richard R. W., and Carol M. Rose. Saving the Neighborhood: Racially Restrictive Covenants, Law, and Social Norms. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Burgess, Ernest Watson. "The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project." In *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*, edited by Robert Ezra Park, Ernest Watson Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie. The Heritage of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Byrne, J. Peter. "Two Cheers for Gentrification Urban Poverty & Gentrification: An Exchange." *Howard Law Journal* 46 (2002): 405–32.

Card, David, Alexandre Mas, and Jesse Rothstein. "Tipping and the Dynamics of Segregation." Quarterly Journal of Economics 123, no. 1 (February 2008): 177–218.

Carmichael, Stokely. "Black Power" Speech, October 29, 1966. Available at: http://voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/carmichael-black-power-speech-text/

Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29, no. 1 (August 2003): 167–207.

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. *Won't You Be My Neighbor? Race, Class, and Residence in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006.

Chaskin, Robert J., and Mark L. Joseph. "'Positive'Gentrification, Social Control and the 'Right to the City'in Mixed-Income Communities: Uses and Expectations of Space and Place." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 37.2 (2013): 480-502.

Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, and Emmanuel Saez. "Where Is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129, no. 4 (November 2014): 1553–1623.

Clark, Kenneth B. “Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development.” Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth (1950).
Conley, Dalton. *Being Black, Living in the Red: Race, Wealth, and Social Policy in America*. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1999.
De la Roca, Jorge, Ingrid Gould Ellen, and Katherine M. O’Regan. “Race and Neighborhoods in the 21st Century: What Does Segregation Mean Today?” *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, SI: Tribute to John Quigley, 47 (July 2014): 138–51.
De la Roca, Jorge, Ingrid Gould Ellen, and Justin Steil. “Does Segregation Matter for Latinos?” *Journal of Housing Economics*, November 1, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhe.2017.10.003.
Drake, St Clair, and Horace R. Cayton. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2015.
Du Bois, William Edward Burghardt. “The Study of the Negro Problems.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 11 (1898): 1–23.
———. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1899.
———. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Dover, 1903.
———. “Segregation.” *The Crisis* 41(1), Jan. 1934.
———. “Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?” *The Journal of Negro Education* 4, no. 3 (1935): 328-35.
———. “Sociology Hesitant.” *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture* 27, no. 3 (2000): 37–44.
Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Beverly Duncan. “A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes.” *American Sociological Review* 20, no. 2 (1955): 210–17.
Edlund, Lena, Cecilia Machado, and Maria Micaela Sviatschi. “Bright Minds, Big Rent: Gentrification and the Rising Returns to Skill.” Working Paper. National Bureau of Economic Research, November 2015.
Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Katherine M. O’Regan. “How Low Income Neighborhoods Change: Entry, Exit, and Enhancement.” *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 41, no. 2 (March 2011): 89–97.
Ellen, Ingrid Gould, Justin P. Steil, and Jorge De la Roca. “The Significance of Segregation in the 21st Century.” City & Community 15, no. 1 (March 1, 2016): 8–13.
Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Margery Austin Turner. “Does Neighborhood Matter? Assessing Recent Evidence.” *Housing Policy Debate* 8, no. 4 (January 1, 1997): 833–66.
Ellison, Ralph. “An American Dilemma: A Review” in *Shadow and Act.* New York: Random House, 1964a, pp. 303-317.
Ellison, Ralph. “Harlem is Nowhere” in *Shadow and Act.* New York: Random House, 1964b, pp. 294-302.
Faber, Jacob W. “Racial Dynamics of Subprime Mortgage Lending at the Peak.” *Housing Policy Debate* 23, no. 2 (April 1, 2013): 328–49.
Faber, Jacob W. “Segregation and the Cost of Money: Race, Poverty, and the Prevalence of Alternative Financial Institutions.” *Social Forces*, (2019).
Figueroa, Jose. “Segregated Health Systems.” In Ingrid Gould Ellen and Justin Peter Steil, eds. *The Dream Revisited: Contemporary Debates about Housing, Segregation, and Opportunity*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.

Freeman, Lance. “Displacement or Succession?: Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods.” *Urban Affairs Review* 40, no. 4 (March 1, 2005): 463–91.

Freeman, Lance, and Frank Braconi. “Gentrification and Displacement New York City in the 1990s.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70, no. 1 (March 31, 2004): 39–52.

Freiberg, Fred. 2013. “Ground Truths About Housing Discrimination.” *Poverty and Race* Vol. 22, no. 5 (September, 2013): 1-16.

Frey, William H., and Reynolds Farley. “Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Are Multiethnic Metros Different.” *Demography* 33, no. 1 (February 1, 1996): 35–50.

Frug, Gerald E. *City Making: Building Communities without Building Walls*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Godsil, Rachel D. “The Gentrification Trigger: Autonomy, Mobility, and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Symposium: Post-Zoning: Alternative Forms of Public Land Use Controls.” *Brooklyn Law Review* 78 (2013 2012): 319–38.

Hannah-Jones, Nikole. “Living Apart: How the Government Betrayed a Landmark Civil Rights Law.” *Probpublica*: https://www.propublica.org/article/living-apart-how-the-government-betrayed-a-landmark-civil-rights-law

Havekes, Esther, Michael Bader, and Maria Krysan. “Realizing Racial and Ethnic Neighborhood Preferences? Exploring the Mismatches Between What People Want, Where They Search, and Where They Live.” *Population Research and Policy Review* 35, no. 1 (February 1, 2016): 101–26.

Hwang, Jackelyn. “Pioneers of Gentrification: Transformation in Global Neighborhoods in Urban America in the Late Twentieth Century.” *Demography* 53, no. 1 (February 1, 2016): 189–213.

Hwang, Jackelyn, Michael Hankinson, and Kreg Steven Brown. "Racial and spatial targeting: Segregation and subprime lending within and across metropolitan areas." *Social Forces* 93.3 (2014): 1081-1108.

Hwang, Jackelyn, and Robert J. Sampson. "Divergent pathways of gentrification: Racial inequality and the social order of renewal in Chicago neighborhoods." *American Sociological Review* 79.4 (2014): 726-751.

Iceland, John. “Beyond Black and White: Metropolitan Residential Segregation in Multi-Ethnic America.” *Social Science Research* 33, no. 2 (June 1, 2004): 248–71.

Iceland, John, and Kyle Anne Nelson. “Hispanic Segregation in Metropolitan America: Exploring the Multiple Forms of Spatial Assimilation.” *American Sociological Review* 73, no. 5 (October 1, 2008): 741–65.

Iceland, John, and Melissa Scopilliti. “Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990–2000.” *Demography* 45, no. 1 (February 1, 2008): 79–94.

Iceland, John, and Rima Wilkes. “Does Socioeconomic Status Matter? Race, Class, and Residential Segregation.” *Social Problems* 53, no. 2 (February 1, 2006): 248–73.

Jackson, Kenneth T. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

James, David R., and Karl E. Taeuber. “Measures of Segregation.” *Sociological Methodology* 15 (1985): 1–32.

King, Martin Luther. “King Encyclopedia,” March 18, 1966. http://mlk-kpp01.stanford.edu/index.php/encyclopedia/encyclopedia/enc_chicago_campaign.

———. “King Encyclopedia,” August 5, 1966. http://mlk-kpp01.stanford.edu/index.php/encyclopedia/encyclopedia/enc_chicago_campaign.

Kitagawa, Evelyn Mae, and Karl E. Taeuber, eds. *Local Community Fact Book: Chicago Metropolitan Area*. Chicago Community Inventory,. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1963.

Krysan, Maria, Courtney Carter, and Marieke van Londen. “The Diversity of Integration in a Multiethnic Metropolis: Exploring What Whites, African Americans, and Latinos Imagine.” *Du Bois Review* 14, no. 1 (2017): 35-71.

Krysan, Maria, Mick P. Couper, Reynolds Farley, and Tyrone Forman. “Does Race Matter in Neighborhood Preferences? Results from a Video Experiment.” *American Journal of Sociology* 115, no. 2 (September 2009): 527–59.

Krysan, Maria and Kyle Crowder. Cycle of Segregation. New York: Russell Sage, 2018.

Lees, Loretta, Tom Slater, and Elvin K. Wyly. *Gentrification*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Lens, Michael C. and Vincent Reina. 2016. Preserving Neighborhood Opportunity: Where Federal Housing Subsidies Expire. *Housing Policy Debate*. 26:4-5, 714-732.

Lewis, Valerie A., Michael O. Emerson, and Stephen L. Klineberg. “Who We’ll Live With: Neighborhood Racial Composition Preferences of Whites, Blacks and Latinos.” *Social Forces* 89, no. 4 (June 1, 2011): 1385–1407.

Logan, John R., Brian J. Stults, and Reynolds Farley. “Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change.” *Demography* 41, no. 1 (February 1, 2004): 1–22.

Massey, Douglas S. “Residential Segregation Is the Linchpin of Racial Stratification.” *City & Community* 15, no. 1 (March 1, 2016): 4–7.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. “The Dimensions of Residential Segregation.” *Social Forces* 67, no. 2 (December 1, 1988): 281–315.

———. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Harvard University Press, 1993.

Massey, Douglas S. and Zoltan J. Hajnal. “The Changing Geographic Structure of Black-White Segregation in the United States.” Social Science Quarterly (1995).

McKittrick, Katherine. 2011. On Plantations, Prisons, and a Black Sense of Place. *Social & Cultural Geography* 12(8): 947-963.

Morris, Aldon D. *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2015.

Muhammad, Khalil Gibran. 2011. The Condemnation of Blackness: Race, Crime, and the Making of Modern Urban America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1944.

Newman, Kathe, and Elvin K. Wyly. “The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City.” *Urban Studies* 43, no. 1 (January 1, 2006): 23–57.

Oates, Stephen B. *Let the Trumpet Sound: The Life of Martin Luther King, Jr*. New York: Mentor, 1985.

O’Connor, Alice. *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth-Century U.S. History*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. Black Wealth, White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality. Taylor & Francis, 2006.

Pager, Devah, and Hana Shepherd. “The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 34, no. 1 (2008): 181–209.
Park, Robert E. “The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment.” *American Journal of Sociology* 20, no. 5 (1915): 577–612.
———. “The Concept of Social Distance As Applied to the Study of Racial Attitudes and Racial Relations.” *Journal of Applied Sociology* 8 (1924): 339-344.
———. “The Concept of Position in Sociology.” *Papers and Proceedings of the American Sociological Society*, 20 (1926): 1-14
Pattillo, Mary. “Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods.” Annual Review of Sociology 31, no. 1 (2005): 305–29
———. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
———. *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
———. Foreword. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2015.
powell, john a., and Marguerite L. Spencer. “Giving Them the Old One-Two: Gentrification and the K.O. of Impoverished Urban Dwellers of Color Urban Poverty & Gentrification: An Exchange.” *Howard Law Journal* 46 (2003 2002): 433–90.
Ralph, James R. *Northern Protest: Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993.
Reeves, Richard V. Dream Hoarders How the American Upper Middle Class Is Leaving Everyone Else in the Dust, Why That Is a Problem, and What to Do About It. Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 2017.
Rhodes-Pitts, Sharifa. *Harlem is Nowhere: A Journey to the Mecca of Black America*. New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 2011.
Rothstein, Richard. *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2017.
“Rock Thrown from Crowd Hits Dr. King.” The Baltimore Sun, August 6, 1966, sec. A.
Sampson, Robert J. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago, Ill.: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2012.
Satter, Beryl. *Family Properties: Race, Real Estate, and the Exploitation of Black Urban America*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2009.
Schelling, Thomas C. “Dynamic Models of Segregation.” *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 1, no. 2 (July 1971): 143–86.
Schill, Michael H. “Implementing the Federal Fair Housing Act: The Adjudication of Complaints.” In *Fragile Rights Within Cities: Government, Housing, and Fairness*, edited by John M. Goering, 143–76. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
Sharkey, Patrick. “Spatial Segmentation and the Black Middle Class.” *American Journal of Sociology* 119, no. 4 (January 1, 2014): 903–54.
Sharkey, Patrick. *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress toward Racial Equality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.
Sharkey, Patrick, and Jacob W. Faber. “Where, When, Why, and For Whom Do Residential Contexts Matter? Moving Away from the Dichotomous Understanding of Neighborhood Effects.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 40, no. 1 (2014): 559–79.

Small, Mario Luis. “Four reasons to abandon the idea of “The Ghetto”.” *City and Community* 7.4 (2008): 389.
Small, Mario Luis, and Monica McDermott. “The presence of organizational resources in poor urban neighborhoods: An analysis of average and contextual effects.” *Social Forces* 84.3 (2006): 1697-1724.
Smith, Tom, Peter Marsden, Michael Hout, and Jibum Kim. “General Social Surveys, 1972-2016 [Machine-Readable Data File].” NORC at the University of Chicago, 2017.
South, Scott J., and Kyle D. Crowder. “Leaving the ’Hood: Residential Mobility between Black, White, and Integrated Neighborhoods.” *American Sociological Review* 63, no. 1 (1998): 17–26.
South, Scott J., Kyle Crowder, and Jeremy Pais. “Inter-Neighborhood Migration and Spatial Assimilation in a Multi-Ethnic World: Comparing Latinos, Blacks and Anglos.” *Social Forces* 87, no. 1 (September 1, 2008): 415–43.
———. “Metropolitan Structure and Neighborhood Attainment: Exploring Intermetropolitan Variation in Racial Residential Segregation.” *Demography* 48, no. 4 (November 1, 2011): 1263–92.
Squires, Gregory. *Organizing Access to Capital: Advocacy and the Democratization of Financial Institutions*. Temple University Press, 2011.
Steil, Justin. “Innovative Responses to Foreclosures: Paths to Neighborhood Stability and Housing Opportunity.” *Columbia Journal of Race & Law* 1, no. 1 (December 30, 2010): 63–117.
Steil, Justin. “Antisubordination Planning.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* (2018): 0739456X18815739.
Steil, Justin and Laura Humm Delgado. “*Limits of diversity: Jane Jacobs, the Just City, and anti-subordination*.” Cities (2018).
Steil, Justin, Len Albright, Jacob S. Rugh & Douglas S. Massey. “The Social Structure of Mortgage Discrimination,” *Housing Studies*, 33:5 (2018): 759-776.
Steil, Justin, Jorge De la Roca, and Ingrid Gould Ellen. “Desvinculado y Desigual: Is Segregation Harmful to Latinos?” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 660, no. 1 (July 1, 2015): 57–76.
Steil, Justin, and Nicholas Kelly. "The fairest of them all: Analyzing Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing compliance." Housing Policy Debate 29.1 (2019a): 85-105.
Steil, Justin P., and Nicholas Kelly. "Survival of the fairest: Examining HUD reviews of assessments of fair housing." Housing Policy Debate (2019b): 1-16.
Sugrue, Thomas J. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
Taeuber, Karl E., and Alma F. Taeuber. “A Practitioner’s Perspective on the Index of Dissimilarity.” *American Sociological Review* 41, no. 5 (1976): 884–89.
———. *Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change*. London: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
———. “The Negro as an Immigrant Group: Recent Trends in Racial and Ethnic Segregation in Chicago.” *American Journal of Sociology* 69, no. 4 (January 1, 1964): 374–82.
The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Report of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968.
Tienda, Marta, and Norma Fuentes. “Hispanics in Metropolitan America: New Realities and Old Debates.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 40, no. 1 (2014): 499–520.

Tilly, Charles. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
Turner, Margery Austin, Rob Santos, Diane Levy, Doug Wissoker, Claudia Aranda, and Rob Pitingolo. "Housing and Discrimination Against Racial and Ethnic Minorities 2012." The Urban Institute, 2013.
Vale, Lawrence. 2013. Purging the Poorest: Public Housing and the Design Politics of Twice-Cleared Communities. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Vose, Clement E. *Caucasians Only: The Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Restrictive Covenant Cases*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
Williams, Rhonda Y. The Politics of Public Housing: Black Women's Struggles Against Urban Inequality. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
Wilson, William J. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
———. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. Knopf, 1996.