

Integrated Education

Desegregation in Seattle
and Portland

James A. G. Thompson
George F. Thompson



Volume XVII, Nos. 1-2

reach as it sometimes appears. It goes almost without saying that we need to raise more questions pertaining to the consequences of demands and their absence in the classroom, but we also need to investigate the possibility that urban school systems have reached such a state of internal contradiction that only those administrators who can work around the system's edges can keep it moving in the direction of its nominal goals.

Finally, there may be broader implications in the consistent similarity between teacher and student

misbehavior. It often seems that we allow differences in status to obscure fundamental similarities in behavior; indeed, we normally attach different labels to such behavior. Here, the teachers and students seem very much alike in the critical sense that both got by with what they could, despite coming to the school to fulfill different functions and bringing with them dissimilar racial heritages and cultural backgrounds. We may want to become more sensitive to the possibility that the actors have more in common than the roles suggest.

Housing and School Segregation in Indianapolis

Karl E. Taeuber

I have been asked by counsel for the plaintiffs to express my opinion, as an expert, on two issues:

- I. Are the segregated housing patterns that exist in Indianapolis and Marion County explainable on grounds of racial discrimination in which government participated?
- II. Have *de jure* school practices engaged in by the Indianapolis school board influenced the development of segregated housing patterns?

I. Causes of Segregated Housing Patterns

Many scholars writing on the causes of housing segregation have accepted the lead of Gunnar Myrdal, Nobel Laureate in Economics, who wrote in his classic study of American race relations, *An American Dilemma* (Harper, 1944), that there are three general types of causes: economic factors, personal attitudes, and policies and practices of racial discrimination.

1. Economic factors.

It is simply not the case that all black families are poorer than all white families. There are poor, middle income, and rich of both races. If income were the main determinant of where people live, we should find white families who are poor living in areas of expensive housing interspersed among poor black families. Similarly, we should find little racial residential segregation among middle-income families. The

relatively small number of rich black families should, strictly on the basis of economic factors, be scattered throughout the expensive residential areas of the city and suburbs.

The reality is totally different. Nearly all black families, whatever their income level, live in the central predominantly black areas of Indianapolis, within the geographic area of the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS).

Thus, it is obvious that economic factors are not a sufficient or even primary explanation for racial residential segregation. To document this point in a simple statistical fashion, a "segregation index" may be used. The segregation index is an objective measure calculated from census data, of whether the two racial groups reside in the same areas or in different areas. If all residential areas (census tracts) are uniracial, the index takes the maximum value, 100. If the two groups are perfectly interspersed, so that each area has exactly the same racial composition as every other area, the index takes the value, 0. Index values of 70 or 80 or 90 are commonly found for large American cities, documenting their high degree of racial residential segregation.

To use this kind of segregation index in an examination of economic influences on residential segregation, I shall consider three income groups (as reported in the 1970 census). For low income, consider families with incomes of \$4,000-5,000; for middle income, \$8,000-9,000; and for high income,

APR-22-98 12:52 From: H & H 12W-109

T-721 P 04/07 Job-403

\$15,000-25,000. The residential distribution of white low-income families may be compared with the residential distribution of black low-income families. The segregation index for this income level is 84, indicating a high degree of segregation. For the middle income families, the racial segregation index is also 84, and for the high income families the index is 86.

In my published work, particularly in the book, *Negroes in Cities* (Aldine, 1965), I have reported on a variety of statistical examinations of the role of economic factors in explaining racial residential segregation. The more careful and elaborate the technique used, the less the demonstrated influence of economic factors. This earlier work did not pertain specifically to Indianapolis, so in the previous paragraph I cited some measures to show that the Indianapolis urban area is not different from the other cities I have studied. These measures were provided to me by Professor Reynolds Farley. . . .

Some economists claim that blacks tend to be concentrated in central cities to minimize commuting costs to their jobs. I believe the whole history of metropolitan expansion during the last 35 years demonstrates that commuting trips of 30-45 minutes are quite tolerable to most Americans, at all income levels. Certainly, the location of one's job affects one's choice of residential location (and vice versa), but clearly most blacks could live anywhere in the city or close-in suburbs and still have convenient access to their jobs. Further, not all jobs that are held by blacks (or that could be held by blacks in the absence of job discrimination) are located in or adjoining the ghetto, just as not all suburban whites work in the suburbs.

If economic factors such as income levels and commuting constraints were statistically associated with black/white residential segregation to a significant degree, there would still be a need to interpret the statistical association in light of the long history of economic discrimination against blacks by employers, including all levels of government as well as private employers. Furthermore, some of the economic disadvantages of blacks can be traced to the educational deprivation experienced in the public educational system in earlier years.

For these reasons, I conclude that economic factors of all types can explain very little of the actual racial residential segregation in the Indianapolis urban area.

2. Personal Attitudes.

The general notion that birds of a feather flock together is often observed in human behavior. Persons who speak a language other than English, or who share a common national origin, or who are of a particular racial background or religious heritage, may prefer the company of others like themselves, particularly for intimate social relations. Some commentators jump from this common behavioral pattern to an assertion that blacks prefer to live "among their

own kind," and that this preference leads black families to choose to live in all-black neighborhoods.

My own studies have led me to the conclusion that the overwhelming choice of black families is to live in harmonious racially-mixed neighborhoods. National polls have revealed this preference continuously for decades. Not even the black separatist movements have made much dent in the pervasive black preference for integration. Nearly all the major black civic and political organizations have long fought for freedom of choice in housing.

Black families of higher incomes have sought escape from the core of the ghetto, just as white families of higher incomes have sought escape from older, less desirable neighborhoods. But racial steering has restricted the range of choice of most blacks to housing near the ghetto, and has determined that once a significant number of blacks move in, all subsequent vacancies will be put on the Negro housing market and the area will become all black. This process is obviously not the product of a freely exercised black preference. It reflects a combination of channelling of white demand away from such areas and a restriction of effective black demand to such areas.

In my studies of other large cities I have contrasted the residential patterns of Negroes with those of various European origin groups. To be sure, during the heyday of immigration there was a marked concentration of newly-arrived persons from a particular country. But it has also been the case that from the beginning, some of the new arrivals, greater numbers of the longer-resident first generation, and many of the second and third generations as they reached adulthood, sought housing away from the core ethnic areas. The core areas persisted to some extent, often for decades, but there was a simultaneous dispersal of many of those who shared the ethnic origin. Some of those persons maintained their ties to the group, returning to the core area for religious observances and family dinners. But many others broke their ties to the group and to a large degree "melted" into the basic native white population.

For the last forty years, blacks in large cities have been more residentially segregated than any of the European ethnic groups ever were. Few blacks have had the opportunity to disperse into other residential areas, whatever their incomes, and even fewer have been able to "melt" ("pass") into the white population.

In various surveys conducted of black opinion about housing preferences and preferred racial composition of their residential area, a considerable range of answers is reported. Some blacks do express a preference for all-black areas. Many blacks seem to prefer areas that are about half black and half white. From surveys that go beyond the simple public-opinion type of question, we learn that many blacks are hesitant or even fearful about being among the first few black families to move into "a white neighborhood." To understand this hesitancy, it is

helpful to take a historical view. It is only eleven years ago that the nation's first modern law granting blacks the right to purchase and rent housing was enacted. There is in the Indianapolis area a history of legislative actions and administrative policies designed to separate the races residentially, and a history of private intimidation against blacks who ventured to break these white-imposed rules. Most blacks are only being rational when they express some preference for living with other blacks, but even so the vast majority want integration if they can get it without sacrificing the well-being of their families.

My conclusion with respect to black attitudes as a cause of racial residential segregation is that black preferences would promote integration if they could be acted on, and that black attitudes would be even more pro-integrative if there had not been a history of systematic discrimination in law, in governmental practices, and in private actions.

I shall comment briefly about the attitudes of white persons toward having blacks as neighbors. It is evident that if whites have racial antipathies and seek to express those in collective action, then it is the choice of whites that is the very cause of the discrimination against blacks. Some writers recently have tried to claim that racial residential segregation can be interpreted as arising from voluntary private action by blacks and whites, each seeking to avoid neighborhoods that are predominantly of the other race. Because whites in Marion County have historically, and until at least the time the school desegregation suit was filed, implemented their preferences with the aid of state action, I would find such a claim bizarre if it were made for the Indianapolis area.

There is a further aspect of white attitudes that may be of help in understanding racial turnover in housing and in schools. Whites are not all the same; in public opinion polls on racial attitudes, most whites now agree with the proposition that blacks are entitled to equal rights in housing. Increasing percentages of whites have also indicated that it would not bother them if a black family of appropriate income level were to live close by. There is a great deal of white tolerance of, and even yearning for, racially harmonious neighborhoods.

Many whites, like many blacks, are hesitant and even fearful about residential integration. They have been taught by the example of law and state action as well as by the practices of the real estate industry that residential segregation is appropriate. The segregationist attitudes of many whites can only be understood in this historical context.

In considering the rigidity or malleability of such racial attitudes, whether of whites or of blacks, I think it is instructive to keep in mind the situation with respect to public accommodations in the southern and border states twenty years ago. Both whites and blacks tolerated segregation, but when

laws changed and behavior changed, attitudes followed right along.

I conclude that the racial attitudes of whites are not an insuperable barrier to substantial residential desegregation, given appropriate public leadership and administrative action.

3. Racial Discrimination.

The history of pervasive racial discrimination and intentional segregation in Indiana and in the Indianapolis urban area has already been noted by this Court (and recently summarized in the July 11, 1978 Memorandum of Decision). Particular attention has been given to actions of the Housing Authority of the City of Indianapolis and the Metropolitan Development Commission of Marion County with respect to the location of public housing projects.

Certain facets of housing discrimination have not been emphasized in the materials on Marion County that were made available to me, but have been important in most large cities. The discriminatory practices in the administration of Federal Housing Administration and Veterans Administration mortgage programs and the redlining practices of many financial institutions are particularly worth noting here. Such policies and practices did not simply function to exclude blacks from residences outside the established ghetto or its immediate periphery. They also acted to make it economically difficult and unattractive for white residents to live in "racially changing" neighborhoods. Slum clearance projects, highway clearance projects, and other demolition projects, with their associated inadequate and discriminatory relocation policies and practices, have similarly served to keep whites out of certain areas as well as to keep blacks in.

The racial composition of a city block or census tract emerges from the joint operation of supply and demand. In city neighborhoods, particularly among rental housing, there is a high rate of movement. Thus, there is usually a steady supply of vacancies, and over a period of several years most of the housing comes on the market. Whether a neighborhood is presently black, white, or mixed, there will likely be substantial turnover among the residents. There will be an opportunity for substantial racial change, contingent on who moves into the units that come on the market. For this reason, I give greater attention to housing demand than to housing supply (vacancies) as a determinant of racial composition. I give less weight than many writers to so-called white flight and to tipping points. Whatever the rate at which housing units come on the market, and whatever the racial composition of those moving out, the future racial composition depends on who is moving in. Practices of racial steering that keep whites from moving into a neighborhood are crucial in making and sustaining a black neighborhood, just as practices of racial steering that ensure that few, if any, blacks move in suffice to

sustain a white neighborhood. These practices include the full range of practices and policies by the real estate industry and the associated financial institutions, as well as practices of any other agencies that influence the designation of areas as uniraical. Actions of the Indianapolis Public Schools thus become implicated in the residential process. I shall elaborate on this aspect in my answer to the second question given me.

I conclude that policies and practices of racial discrimination and intentional segregation are the principal cause of racially segregation housing patterns in Marion County and the Indianapolis urban area. Neither economic factors nor the personal preferences of blacks is as important a cause. To the extent that economic factors and personal preferences have tended to perpetuate racial housing segregation, a historical view reveals that such causal influence is itself also linked to earlier policies and practices of racial discrimination that pervaded social, economic, and governmental actions.

To this point my conclusion is in agreement with the opinions on this subject already expressed by this court and approved by the Court of Appeals. In developing my conclusion I have given somewhat greater emphasis than indicated in the specific language of the Court to the processes of discriminatory exclusion of whites. Segregation is a bi-racial process. Designation of areas as black is simultaneously a process of containment of blacks and exclusion of whites. Designation of areas as white is simultaneously a process of containment of whites and exclusion of blacks. The policies and practices of the MDC and HACL, as described in the judicial decisions of this case, served not only to contain blacks in a contiguous ghetto within the IPS territory, but also served to keep many whites out of IPS territory. As both the black and white population of the Indianapolis metropolitan area increased, the actions of these governmental agencies contributed to the outward sprawl of white residential areas by containing blacks and excluding whites from large portions of the IPS territory.

II. Influence of De Jure School Practices on Segregated Housing Patterns

De jure school segregation has a large effect on the racial attitudes of school children, and the effect persists to some extent throughout life. Thus, entire generations of persons were taught by direct example in the schools that racial segregation was lawful and desirable. Data from the 1970 census show that more than half the adult population living in Indianapolis had been born in Indiana (and nearly all presumably attended school in Indiana). Even among the black population of Indianapolis, more than one-fourth of adults at all ages were born in Indiana, and among young adult blacks a majority were natives of the

state. Thus, many of the racial attitudes referred to in the previous section, and much of the racism underlying the many types of discrimination referred to, were influenced and sustained by the practice of *de jure* school segregation.

More specific influences of school practices on housing patterns can be traced by considering each of the major types of school segregation practiced in recent years: the gerrymandering of school attendance zones, the segregation of faculty, the use of optional attendance zones among the schools, and the pattern of school construction and placement.

1. Gerrymandering of attendance zones.

The effect of gerrymandering was to delineate sharp boundaries between white schools and black schools. This had the result of identifying schools as uniraical and reducing racial mixture in schools. The public school is typically the most visible single racial identifier of a residential neighborhood. The attendance zone boundaries of schools are also the single most important and meaningful identifiers of the boundaries of residential neighborhoods. Changes in attendance zone boundaries affect the behavior of the real estate industry and of the public concerned with real estate in the vicinity. To change an area formerly identified as being part of a white school to being part of the attendance zone for a black school is to signal that the area is open to blacks and closed to whites. The school decision may have been made on the basis of a prediction of racial residential change, but that prediction becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy through its influence on racial steering by all parts of the real estate industry (including FHA, VA, and other governmental agencies).

2. Segregation of faculty.

To most employers, the appropriate labor market from which to recruit employees is the metropolitan area. One aspect of the segregation of faculty is the failure of nearly all school districts in Marion County, except IPS, to employ any Negro faculty. If the other districts had hired Negroes, and if IPS had assigned its teachers without regard to race, then every part of the urban area would have had some Negro professionals working there. Some of these teachers might have chosen to live closer to their workplace, if they found a genuine acceptance in the school. Other black families choosing a residential location might have had more incentive to overcome their hesitations and fears about living in predominantly white areas if the local school had a black teacher (and even more so if all of the local governmental agencies had racially mixed staffs at all levels). If a few black families had been living in each part of the urban area many years ago, and if some black families had been attracted to each of the newly developing areas during the rapid postwar suburban

boom, there might have been a cumulatively large impact on housing patterns. More whites would have learned that black neighbors were entirely tolerable. Hence white demand for housing in areas to which blacks were moving might not have dried up so completely. Black demand for housing might have been scattered more widely, rather than steered into so few areas that black demand dominated. These are speculations, as are all reconstructions of history, but I believe they are plausible.

The actual pattern of assignment of black teachers within IPS had the immediate effect of racially identifying schools. As described in my discussion of the effects of gerrymandering, the racial identification of schools has a reciprocal impact on the racial composition of demand for housing, as steered or channelled by the governmental and private agencies in the real estate industry.

3. Use of Optional Attendance Zones.

The immediate impact of the imposition of an optional attendance zone in a racially changing area might at first glance seem to be to promote residential integration. By allowing a few white families to stay put residentially, and to send their children to a white school, these families are encouraged to remain longer than otherwise in the neighborhood. But the greater immediate effect is to label the area as undesirable for whites, and thereby to dry up future white demand for housing. However long the present white residents remain, as they move their places are taken by blacks. The use of optional attendance zones has the same effects on steering white and black demand already noted for gerrymandering and teacher segregation.

By minimizing the likelihood that white families will learn for themselves the advantages and disadvantages of attending racially mixed or predominantly black schools, the use of optional attendance zones encourages all whites to act upon their racist attitudes rather than their equalitarian attitudes. By catering to one set of attitudes, the school system thereby enhances the influence of racist attitudes on behavior and misses out on the opportunity to teach, by example, that racial democracy and harmony are possible.

4. School Construction and Placement.

Every residential land developer knows the influence of school location, character, and quality, on the demand for housing. The IPS facilitated the spread of residential segregation during the recent decades of rapid black and white population growth. It avoided opportunities to promote school and residential integration. It avoided opportunities to make central schools more attractive to whites and outlying schools more attractive to blacks. The reciprocal effect of these school policies on housing practices has already been noted by this Court.

I conclude that the racially discriminatory and intentionally segregatory actions of the IPS have promoted racial housing segregation throughout the City of Indianapolis, Marion County, and the outlying suburbs. By promoting and enhancing the racial identifiability of schools, the IPS influenced the racial composition of the demand for housing within the various school attendance zones. These practices were continued over a long period of time. Their effect has been substantial and extensive. The blacks who were steered to schools and housing within certain portions of the IPS territory were thereby deprived of the opportunity to reside elsewhere in the city and the metropolitan area. The whites who were steered away from schools and housing within the expanding black area of the IPS territory were thereby compelled to reside elsewhere in the city and the metropolitan area.

It is impossible to say what the residential patterns would have been if the IPS had not engaged in the practices described (and if the other school districts had, minimally, engaged in racially open employment practices). I have speculated that the patterns might have developed quite differently and in a less segregated fashion.

It is possible to reach a firm judgment on the influence of the discriminatory practices actually pursued by the IPS. I conclude that the *de jure* school practices engaged in by the Indianapolis school board have had a substantial influence on the development of segregated housing patterns. The influence has been to disperse whites from and confine blacks to selected areas of the IPS territory. Racial segregation throughout Marion County was thereby increased.