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ABSTRACT

According to US Census data Hammond, IN – a midsized American City – and Chicago’s Uptown neighborhood both have census tracts that have been racially, ethnically and economically diverse over the past 20-30 years. Utilizing the engaged methodology of community-based research this project uses the voice of community leaders from both Hammond and Uptown to inform and illustrate what is happening behind the Census data. This includes the role of civic institutions, local government and local business. Through long form structured interviews individuals offered their perspectives, concerns and ideas about how this diversity came about and what challenges and opportunities Hammond and Uptown face in the present and in the future.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Racial, ethnic and economic diversity as well as its benefits and challenges have been part of academic inquiry, media reports and national policies for decades. While diversity is often celebrated as a contribution to a community and a strength to its character, the project of creating and sustaining diversity does not have a clear instruction manual that city planners, community leaders, and real estate brokers can follow in order to attain just the right mix or race, ethnicity and income. Larger issues of institutional racism and disjointed social polices often get in the way of easily creating and sustaining such a mix (Massey and Denton, 1993). Instead, these forms of diversity often find themselves created through longer histories or residential turnover and community upheaval of many different varieties (Burgess, 1928; Maly, 2005). By understanding these contexts and histories through the stories and memories of community leaders in conjunction with US Census data, we can begin to make sense of how diverse communities come into being and continue to thrive. No community shares the same story and no community can replicate another’s path. Yet through appreciating a community’s history and seeing similarities and difference in the stories of other diverse communities, we can learn how to encourage and maintain the racial, ethnic and economic diversity in our communities.

In conjunction with academic institutions across the United States, Loyola
University Chicago’s Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL) collected data in communities that have been stable racially, ethnically and economically for the past 30 years according to 1990-2000 US Census data. This data follows a study that was published in 1998 examining 14 diverse communities within nine cities across the United States and was published in Housing and Urban Development’s Journal, *Cityscape*. The Cityscape study examined neighborhoods within major US metropolises. What was not studied in as much detail is how smaller cities are creating stable and diverse communities as well. This study branches out to look at the larger Chicago Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) bringing in smaller cities and updating with the current US Census data. I compared two seemingly incongruent but sustained diverse communities within Chicago’s MSA in order to better understand what creates and what sustains these communities of diversity: the small city of Hammond, Indiana and Chicago, Illinois’ Uptown neighborhood.

The city of Hammond, Indiana is a small city of 80,830 people (US Census, 2010) located in the Northwest corner of Indiana along the border with Illinois and Lake Michigan. Hammond is historically known as a steel manufacturing and railroad town with strong unions and a blue collar ethnic European identity. Similar to many other blue collar communities Hammond faces the challenges and opportunities that the massive historic downsizing of manufacturing companies pose to cities that depended on industry tax revenue and job opportunities. This includes a shrinking, aging and changing population. The shifts Hammond has experienced over the past 50 years have led to it becoming one of the most diverse areas of Indiana but also one of the most diverse areas of the Chicago MSA. However, the diverse mix of Hammond seems to be dwindling
over the past 10 years as the population continues to shift. This offers an opportunity for researchers, elected officials and policy makers to better understand how this statistically diverse community came into being and how during the 1980s and 1990s the community sustained its diverse mix. It also bears the question of how over the past 10 years that mix has started to change yet again.

Uptown has a population of 56,362 (US Census, 2010) and is located along the lake on Chicago’s north side. Known for its diverse housing stock and ample public transportation it has been a port of entry for many ethnic groups and new populations into the city of Chicago. For the past 30 years many of its census tracts have been some of the most diverse census tracts in the city (Nyden et al. 2002). According to DePaul University’s 2008 study, Uptown was determined to be the most diverse neighborhood in the city of Chicago. Unlike Hammond, Chicago’s Uptown neighborhood is a community that has been diverse since the 1970s with a well-established community organization network that has worked to sustain diversity through creating a service and community infrastructure that celebrates and advocates for services and homes for all community members. This community is also well documented by urban Sociologists seeking to find what it is that creates and sustains diversity (Warren, 1979, Nyden et al., 1998:, Maly, 2005). While this community is well documented for its diversity, changes in political leadership suggest that policy shifts will be taking place that might pose challenges for Uptown’s sustained diversity moving forward.

Comparing these seemingly dissimilar communities offer insights into sustainable diversity. In many ways Hammond is new to the concept of a racially diverse community but very comfortable with an ethnically diverse community. However they are not yet
adept at thinking about how to sustain and foster the racial mix currently found in their city. Uptown on the other hand has put into place infrastructure through social services and local ordinances in the face of many cycles of neighborhood change in order to create a modicum of control over the diversity of their community. While a city neighborhood and an industrial city in a neighboring state share different stories, they face very similar challenges: improving schools, community safety, meeting the needs of the poor in their community and creating opportunities for their young people. While different histories will creative very different narratives, in the case of Hammond and Uptown, they create very similar opportunities and challenges. It is through examining the context of these two communities that we can continue to further understand how this project of community diversity can continue to be informed, encouraged and enhanced.

In this thesis I seek to answer the same question I asked each interviewee: what has produced and sustained this diversity. In order to answer this question within these communities this thesis will illustrate the research value of mixed methods approach. Both quantitative data and qualitative data are required in order to fully explicate the context in which diverse communities come into being and learn to sustain themselves. This includes looking not only at the infrastructure in place within these communities which takes the form of civic organizations and government entities but also the data collected through the US Census. It is by collecting qualitative data through in-depth structured interviews in addition to the quantitative measurements of these communities that we as researchers can best understand how the infrastructure is utilized, how participation influences the effectiveness of the infrastructure and what the census data means to leaders in these diverse communities. By understanding the context of diverse
communities from both a qualitative and quantitative stance, we have the best chance at identifying best practices for future work in public sociology. This study also hopes to advance not only the academic but also local discussions and understanding of what is at the core of the sustainability of these communities.

**Literature Review**

Stable racially, ethnically and economically diverse communities have in the past been perceived as an oxymoron. Prior to the emphasis and proof of sustainability, diverse, integrated communities in the United States were often perceived as mere snapshots in time that are temporary, fragile and prone to re-segregation. Massey and Denton (1993) argued that programs that work to encourage housing integration, especially for Black homeowners, as “schemes” that do not deal with the larger structural housing discrimination at work (227). Molotch held little hope for sustainable integration in his 1972 study on the housing market in the South Shore neighborhood of Chicago. He argued that re-segregation was an inevitable result of changing neighborhood racial housing patterns. Racial segregation has a long history in American housing patterns but one cannot argue that it was a natural process, rather it was the result of local and federal policies. This included restrictive covenants on the local level and nationwide policies on mortgage lending and public housing development These segregated housing patterns were solidified from the 1940s to the 1970s and was especially prevalent in the urban north as Black families in-migrated for manufacturing jobs. (Maly, 2005: 9-11). Racial segregation is still a prominent characteristic of many communities, even in the present day according to analysis of the 2010 Census data: “Declines in residential segregation between blacks and whites since 2000 continued at about the same pace as in the 1990s.
Segregation peaked around 1960 or 1970. Between 1980 and 2000 it declined at a very slow pace, but there were reasons to expect a potential breakthrough since then. The new data show another decade of steady but slow decline” (Logan & Stults, 2011). Only in the past 20-30 years has research focused on the exception to this rule: sustained diverse communities. Some of the most innovative research utilized engaged methods with an action orientation in order to better understand these communities. The conversation has shifted from inevitable re-segregation to the hope and challenge of integration and stable diversity.

Previous Understandings of Neighborhood Change

Given the frequency of segregated communities, many scholars have been more likely to see changing neighborhoods as a process of re-segregation. Ernest Burgess’ human ecology theory (1928) argued that changing neighborhoods shift in a pattern of “invasion and succession” in which a predominantly White neighborhood will be invaded by new Black residents. From this understanding of rapid succession comes a “tipping point” hypothesis: “racial transition moves gradually until the proportion of blacks reaches a threshold, the point (obviously variable) when whites no longer feel comfortable with integration or the presence of blacks in the neighborhood. Once this threshold is crossed, whites moves out (often rapidly) and fewer whites are interested in moving in; the result is re-segregation” (Maly, 2005: 15). These theories imply that re-segregation is inevitable and simply the natural outcome of neighborhood change.

Suttles’ Defended Neighborhood Theory manifests itself when, “the residential group which seals itself off through the efforts of delinquent gangs, by restrictive covenants, by sharp boundaries, or by a forbidding reputation—what I will call the
defended neighborhood—was for a time a major category in sociological analysis” (Suttles, 1972: 21) This theory is used by Kefalas (2003) to represent a southwest side neighborhood in the city of Chicago dealing with post industrialization and downward mobility in which neighbors for a multitude of reasons beyond simply race fought to stay in their homes and keep their identity as a neighborhood. This theory argues that integration can be blocked on some level through individual and collective action. Dramatic neighborhood change is not inevitable.

Current Definition of Sustainable Diversity

Definitions of integrated communities stemming from Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1969 have varied and mostly focused on proportions of Black and White homeowners in a neighborhood. This focus makes integration a state instead of a process according to Rich (2008). Citing Ellen (2000), she argues that there are not enough people of color to live in every American community. Consequently, Ellen defines integrated neighborhoods as “neighborhoods… in which the black population constitutes between 10 percent and 50 percent of the total population” (Ellen, 2000; 16). She goes on to state that in order to establish stability, the community cannot have lost 10 percentage points of Black residents within a 10 year period (19). This definition is insufficient because it only focuses on quantitative census data.

In contrast, Nyden et al’s 1998 study, funded by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development redefines stable diverse communities using both quantitative and qualitative data. The study analyzed sustainable diversity initially by means of tract level US Census data in 14 major US cities and in depth interviews with residents. Diversity was defined as stable if: “the majority of census tracts within a
socially recognized community area remained within the 10 percent of the tracts closest to the city racial/ethnic averages; the congruent neighborhood area was recognized as diverse by most of our informants; the area met these criteria in both 1980 and 1990” (Nyden et al., 1998: 6). This established a 20 year minimum for sustainability. Michael Maly takes this definition and expands it one step further and speaks to the interaction within a neighborhood necessary to consider it integrated: “Integrated in neighborhoods implies creating or sustaining interracial mixing in residential settings and, it is hoped, greater interracial interaction” (Maly, 2005: 6). Co-existing in the same neighborhood is not enough to define it as integrated. Interaction much also take place. Rich (2008) also uses this model to further investigate “social integration” in statistically stable diverse communities.

Types of Diverse Communities

Within this definition of stable diverse communities, Nyden et al. (1998) discusses two different means by which communities become diverse: diverse-by-direction and diverse-by-circumstance. Diverse-by-direction refers to communities which are intentionally diverse in their community organization structure and support; the efforts they put into celebrating and supporting those groups; and positive intergroup relationships are valued and celebrated (9). Community-based organizations are often focused on sustaining the diversity through advocating for fair housing and quality of life. Religious congregations promote pro-diversity values; community gathering places offer spaces for all groups in the community to come together; trusted relationships are established with realtors and bankers; leadership is developed and encouraged and biracial or bi-ethnic identity instead of multiracial or multi-ethnic identity as a
community are established (9-10). These communities were often born in the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.

Diverse-by-circumstance communities are slightly different and make up the vast majority of diverse communities that were studied. These communities came into being not by intention but usually by forces outside the control of the neighborhood including government policies and markets. These forces can include the following:

“influx of immigrant groups; a change in neighborhood composition as an aging White population dies and new residents take their place; and reinvestment in formerly rundown neighborhoods that bring a modest increase in White, Anglo, middle-income residents while a sluggish real estate market inhibits wholesale gentrification and re-segregation”

Common characteristics of diverse-by-circumstance include being composed of two or more racial groups; community organizations that focus on coalitions between immigrant groups; religious congregations acting as social bridges between groups; weaker representation of common gathering places; lower incomes; and substantial numbers of affordable housing units. (11-12)

Current Challenges

Beyond the challenge of anonymity that urbanism creates (Wirth, 1938) diverse communities face challenges of meaningful relationships. Maly (2005) argues that even if the components listed in the definitions of diverse communities including the census data and social infrastructure of community organizations are in place, this does not make a community integrated. True integration and truly sustainable diverse communities must consist of residents who know their neighbors: “the test of stable integration is not in the
percentages of groups, but in the community’s process to join different groups in such a way that there is respect and a sharing of power” (232). Challenges that diverse communities face beyond co-existence are often around quality schools, crime, negative stigma, and changing populations with a variety of needs (Nyden et al, 1998; Maly, 2005).

Two major shifts in housing patterns currently affect many sustained diverse communities: changing housing patterns of lower income residents out of cities which often includes families with Section 8 Housing Vouchers and an influx of middle and upper income homeowners back into the cities through gentrification. Sampson and Sharkey (2008) followed 4,000 Chicago families who were former public housing residents to see where they moved for up to seven years in order to see how racial inequality is reproduced in neighborhood choice. Using statistical models and controlling for life course they found that there is a racialized and economic pattern to where families move: “when blacks and Latinos leave Chicago, they continue to live in areas that are markedly less affluent than their white counterparts” (Sampson & Sharkey, 2008: 25). This often results in minority families moving to other predominantly minority and poor neighborhoods.

While Sharkey and Sampson study at Chicago families they do not look specifically at the movement of former residents of Chicago Housing Authority buildings. Little is known about where families moved after they were removed from the projects that were torn down as a result of HOPE VI, especially families who were not able to attain Section 8 Vouchers and no longer benefit from supportive housing (Popkin et al. 2004). This literature speaks broadly to how families have transitioned out of
Chicago. It frames other studies of broader scopes that look at the racial and economic trends of where poorer minority families tend to move and some of the responses of the communities they move into, especially those afraid of or seeking to celebrate diversity.

Another urban housing process that has the potential to upset the stability of neighborhoods is gentrification. Gentrification is the “process by which decline and disinvestments in inner-city neighborhoods is reversed” (Freeman, 2005, 463). While White flight moved people out to the suburbs and urban renewal moved people within the city, gentrification often functions to reverse both. It often can attract white, middle class, educated women from the suburbs to the city. Gentrifying neighborhoods also tend to attract gay men with disposable income (Lees et al, 2007: 212) and those who already live in the city but want to invest in up and coming neighborhoods. However, this process has a tendency to displace those of lower income and often residents of color (Nyden et al., 2006). For a period of time the process of a neighborhood gentrifying can work to diversify the neighborhood in income, race and lifestyle but this balance is not always sustainable. Freeman argues that this is not in fact the case and that while people do move while gentrification takes place there is only a modest statistical relationship between gentrification and displacement (Freeman, 2005: 480). Concerning the outcomes of studies on gentrification, there are often differences. Strictly quantitative data and mixed methods data often do not agree on the impact of gentrification on neighborhoods.

Public Sociology, Engaged Research

An important element of this study is the method by which the process to understand diverse communities was created. Nyden et al. (1998) framed the research
not only through an academic interest in diverse communities but also with the input, direction and vision of community members and organizations. The research was done with the intention to “not only summarize what we have found, but also to identify, present, and discuss the tools that can be used by community leaders, planners and policy makers to keep existing diverse neighborhoods stable and to develop other diverse neighborhoods” (13). This study builds off these foundations through its methods, interview questions and community relationships.

Burawoy in his 2004 Presidential Address places public sociology within the division of sociological labor which also includes professional sociology, critical sociology and policy sociology. Within Burawoy’s ideal vision for sociology, these four types will participate in “reciprocal interdependence” in which “energy, meaning and imagination” will stem from their interactions (Burawoy, 2004: 15). Yet there are even subtypes of public sociology itself: traditional and organic. Traditional public sociology often treats its public or its audience/group it studies as invisible, thin, passive and mainstream and ‘instigates discussions debates within or between publics, although he or she might not actually participate in them” (7). Organic on the other hand creates a space for sociologists to work closely with a “visible, thick, active, local and often counter public” (7). This type often creates more of a conversation with the sociologist and the publics themselves. Organic public sociology can also be considered community-based research; it participates with other disciplines and community-based groups to develop public knowledge through participatory action research. In the best case scenario, this research is done in collaboration with multiple publics, will have a higher probability of directly or indirectly affecting policy.
Through emphasizing the social change thread that runs through public sociology, Nyden et al (2012) clarify the opportunity public sociology creates to produce quality research that contributes positively to communities. While Burawoy (2004) defended the academic credentials of public sociology, Nyden focuses on the benefits public – more specifically organic sociology - can offer a community. Through collaborative efforts of academics, community leaders and activists, organic sociology addresses issues of social inequality by engaging with those closest to and most affected by the issue. This engaged research is done with the intention of palpable results and with positive social change (Ochocka, 2010: 2). This participation often takes place through movements and campaigns which create concrete changes oriented toward social justice. Stoecker (2005) views this engaged research action oriented as a form of an action. The communities involved in engaged methods are often groups that are left out of public decisions and many forms of information. Being involved also often causes a community to organize itself, collect its own information and create plans of what to do with that information. Through this community organizing, power relationships change and the research itself becomes part of the action orientation that sets apart engaged methods from traditional research (Stoecker, 2005: 149-150).

Collaboration is a key element of engaged research. As Nyden et al. (2012) writes, a fully collaborative research project that Loyola’s Center for Urban Research and Learning is a part of will involve faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, community members, and sometimes even elected officials. Bringing more voices and perspectives to the table to design and execute the research creates a rich opportunity for multiple perspectives and vantage points of academic and community wisdom to be
incorporated into the research process (Nyden et al., 2012: 22). The collaboration of university members and community members does not simply involve the planning process. In some cases it also involves the data collection process itself. In collaborative engaged methods data is collected by those students and—depending on time and community leadership resources—community members themselves. At times community members are also part of the data analysis and presentation of the data.

Engaged methods may be viewed as a research cycle. Ochocka (2010) frames the cycle as follows: pre-engagement; engagement; assessment, reflection and feedback; and ongoing maintenance (Ochocka, 2010: 3). Stoecker (2005) presents the cycle as follows: diagnosing, prescribing, implementing and evaluating (Stoecker, 2005: 66). Each of these models offer slightly different variations on the same theme of identifying an issue, collecting data, analyzing the data, presenting the issue in order to take action to then impact the issue itself. This is also a similar cycle that community organizers and activists use in their campaigns to impact social change on local and national levels. There is a constant cycle and dialectic of action and reflection.

Most importantly engaged methods is inherently value driven. Ochocka (2010) argues that one engaged method, Participatory Action Research (PAR), is “a research approach that consists of the maximum participation of stakeholders, those whose lives are affected by the problem under study, in the systematic collection and analysis of information for the purpose of taking action and making change” (Ochocka, 2010: 4). These values are rooted in democracy, power sharing and stand on the values of empowerment, supportive relationships, social justice, ongoing reciprocal education and the respect for diversity, equity and inclusion (4-5). Engaged research, specifically PAR,
is done with and not for people. Engaged methods often engages in the research projects with the underlying philosophy that the research processes is meant to share knowledge beyond the academy; especially with those most affected by the research issues.

This literature defines diverse communities, provides examples of previous studies and the framework within which action oriented research has taken place. By building on the previous studies of diverse communities, I hope to apply this literature to answer the questions of what creates, sustains and hinders diverse communities. This thesis does that uniquely by using engaged methods to study two communities who have not been compared before and offering an analysis of how they are similar and different in their experiences of sustainable diversity. Offering this new comparison contributes to further studies of diversity, especially newly emerging diverse areas within the MSA of larger cities.

Methods

Through the engaged methodology of community-based research this thesis uses the voice of community leaders to inform and illustrate what is happening behind US Census data in diverse communities. I used Census data from 1990, 2000 and 2010 to identify diverse communities with the help of CURL’s previous work and Census analysis. The diversity index used to initially identify diverse communities is taken from Nyden et al (1998). The researchers identified stable diverse communities using the following criteria which I adapted given the new Census years:

- The majority of census tracts within a socially recognized community area remained within the 15 percent (previously 10 percent in the 1998 study) of the
tracts closest to the city or Metropolitan Statically Area’s (MSA) racial/ethnic averages.

- In the case of a city neighborhood, use only the city averages.
- In the case of a suburban area, use the racial/ethnic averages of the larger MSA and subtract the city data.
- The congruent neighborhood area was recognized as diverse by most of my informants.
- The area met these criteria in both 1990 and 2000. In some areas this included 2010 also.

Based on this criteria as well as the data available, I selected both the city of Hammond and Chicago’s neighborhood, Uptown. Interviewees in both communities were asked the same questions from the same interview. These questions focused around the social, political and economic environment that sustains or challenges diverse stable communities.

Investigating Hammond began through Dr. Phil Nyden and Loyola University Chicago’s relationship with the Heartland Center, a “not-for-profit organization serving the people of Northwest Indiana through research on social issues, educational programs, leadership training, and community coalition building” (Idealist.org). With their help and initial tour of Hammond, I began interviewing 20 community leaders over the next two years. Through long form structured interviews that took about 45 minutes, individuals from Hammond offered their perspectives, concerns and ideas about how the racial diversity came about and what challenges and opportunities Hammond faces in the present and in the future. Most of these were in person and a few took place over the
phone. Each interviewee was recommended by a previous interviewee as an informed leader within the city - or in a few occasions - within the larger Northwest, Indiana region creating a snowball/convenience sample of leaders. Long form interviews offer in-depth and personal accounts of the city of Hammond. It is through this engaged method of community-based research that the census data will become a fuller picture of a small city with a distinctly American story.

This sample of 20 community leaders included two executive directors of non-profits, the current mayor, a former mayor, the current school superintendent, a state representative, a retired banker, four leaders within local non-profits, the current chief of police, a former police officer, one church leader, one former city council member, one current city council member, a local academic, a Catholic priest, a local realtor, and a former Hammond mayor. These individuals offered many different perspectives from City Hall, to Academia, to the world of non-profits, to banking, to serving the needs of the faithful and poor. The leaders were White, Black and Latino.

As in all data collection, this sample also offered its challenges. Two different leaders who were repeatedly recommended to me as interviewees declined to be interviewed. They instead recommended leaders within their organizations but did not believe that their voices best represented the city or their organization. While that is challenging in the data collection process, the dedication to letting leaders who do not hold organizational titles talk about their own community should be celebrated. On a whole, most individuals were willing and excited to participate and speak about a community that is very important to them. As an outside researcher who is neither a former nor current resident of Hammond I have done my best to accurately and
thoughtfully process what my informants told me through transcribing and coding the interviews in order to rigorously evaluate their perspectives on diversity as community leaders in a diverse community.

This study compares a small city adapting to a postindustrial identity compares with a denser urban neighborhood’s experience in sustained diversity. Uptown is also in the top 15% for diversity within the City of Chicago. However, unlike Hammond, Uptown is a community that has been thoroughly studied by academics, community groups, city sponsored reports and news media for decades. I have for the past seven years lived in Chicago’s Uptown neighborhood. Here I worked as a community organizer for two and a half years and also lived in a housing cooperative for an additional two years. Uptown and its rich diversity shaped my professional experience as an organizer and my personal experience as a community member. My appreciation for Uptown’s diversity as a community member and a researcher drew me to use this community as a comparison to Hammond, Indiana.

In Uptown I interviewed five community leaders: two executive directors of a youth organization and a Latino immigrant organization along with a pastor, the former alderman and a tenant leader. I had a professional relationship with two of the interviewees and I was directed to the three others through recommendations of a local community organizer. They were White, Black, Latino and Asian. The smaller sample size of interviews was intentional. As a community that has been well documented, I chose to interview a much smaller number of leaders in order to update the data that already existed about the story of Uptown’s diversity rather than the more comprehensive story that Hammond’s interviews represent.
In addition to US Census and interview data, I also used Housing and Urban Development (HUD) data to supplement stories from leaders regarding the use of HUD’s Section-8 Vouchers. In order to capture Uptown’s current political situation I also used current media stories along with some personal reflections.
CHAPTER THREE
HISTORIES OF HAMMOND AND UPTOWN

Hammond

Throughout the interviews, stories were told of what brought about the city’s
diversity, especially the history of the industry along the lake front. Hammond residents
identify themselves as members of a blue collar community that came about through a
strong manufacturing base in steel. This is also true of many other communities along
the Lake Michigan in Northwest Indiana. With steel was the railroad; all trains coming
from the northeastern US headed for Chicago had to pass through Hammond. The trains
along with the proximity to the lake created the opportunity for the steel industry, oil
refineries and many other manufacturing industries. Industry brought families through
both immigration and emigration to work in the mills. During the first half of the 20th
century immigrants from Eastern Europe came to Hammond, especially Polish, Serbians,
Croatians, Greeks and Irish (Bigott, 2005; Baretta, Interview). Later both Black and
White workers came from the Southern US to work in the mills. At Hammond’s
population peak of 112,000 in the 1950s, “more than 10,000 people were employed by
123 Hammond manufacturers in 1958. In 1960, 44 percent of the workers living in
Hammond worked there and another 25 percent in neighboring East Chicago (Chicago
Communities Fact Book, 1995). Residents still remember the wealth of jobs Hammond
residents had in the mills: “I can remember back in the 50s, 60s and 70s if you didn’t
have a job it was because you didn’t want one. You could quit a job in the morning and by the afternoon you could have another job” (Community Leader 2, Interview).

During the 1960s one company, Inland Steel in neighboring East Chicago employed as many as 26,000 employees many of whom were Hammond residents (Baretta, Interview). Manufacturing jobs were plentiful and while they required a certain skill set, there were entry level jobs that allowed high school graduates the opportunity to be trained. “You didn’t have to have an extensive education but a work ethic” (Belemy, Interview).

Hammond also used to pride itself on a bustling downtown full of department stores including Sears and Roebuck, Goldblatt’s, and J.C. Penny’s along with office blocks and movie palaces (Bigott, 2005; Belemy Interview). For 70 years up until the late 1960s, Hammond was a center for retail in the region (Bigott, 2005). It offered a place for people to congregate where people from all backgrounds and ethnicities could intermingle. In the 1960’s Interstate 94 was built and an exit was not added off of Homan Avenue thereby diverting traffic from Hammond and consequently helping put the shopping district out of business. Along with the establishment of a new town to the south, Merrillville, a shopping mall was built and downtown Hammond began to suffer economically. (Bigott, 2005; Lowery, Interview)

Manufacturing played a huge role in not only the employment of Hammond residents but also the racial and ethnic diversity of the residents. This diversity shaped Hammond’s neighborhood. The former mayor spoke of how the neighborhoods developed their identities:

The neighborhoods were created around the churches and people’s ethnicity. Including Slovaks, Pols, Germans, Irish, etc. You started with the ethnic groups built around the church and then as time went on those neighborhoods naturally would integrate and they’ve continued to do so to this day and because Hammond
had a strong neighborhood feel and the same people that have stayed there.  
(Dedelow, Interview).

Yet there is more to the story of race and ethnicity than simply the establishment of specific neighborhoods; there is a broader context that Hammond is a part of:

It’s almost impossible to look at Hammond separate from the experience of East Chicago and Gary. In many respects these were the old established cities. It’s hard to tell when you’re in one city. It’s like the western suburbs in Chicago; you never know which one you’re in. Gary is overwhelming African American; East Chicago is overwhelmingly Hispanic although it too has somewhat of a balance. East Chicago is the poorest community in the state of Indiana based on median income. Then you have Hammond which is a bit more stable because for many years it has been a city of neighborhoods so even though the city has good diversity, it tends to be focused in certain areas. So depending on your unit of analysis to say how diverse it really is. (Lowery, Interview)

It is also important to note that the neighborhoods were not always integrated nor was it always a natural process. Blacks used to only be allowed to live in East Hammond and were not welcome in other neighborhoods especially after dark (Alexander, Interview; Walker, Interview). Public housing in Hammond remained segregated until new leadership came into the Hammond Housing Authority during the 80’s and started enforcing federal nondiscrimination housing laws (Beccerra, Interview). In the early 80’s Blacks started to move into predominantly White communities. Since then, some of those White communities are now predominantly Black including Roberstdale neighborhood in north Hammond (Community Leader 2, Interview; Walker, Interview).

Hammond did not suffer the same White Flight during the 1960s and 1970s that Gary did. However, Hammond’s white population did decrease from the 1960s to today. In 1960 the city was 98% White. By 1990 the White population made up 85% and by 2000 the US Census reported 72% White population. Many interviewees spoke of white families remaining in Hammond during that time but as children grew up they moved out
of Hammond for college or for work and never returned as home owners. This corresponded with the growing trend in the 60s and 7’s of suburban sprawl that many urban centers experienced (Singer, 1978: 7). Additionally, some more affluent Whites did move to towns south of Hammond including Highland, Munster, Griffith and Dyer (Lowery, Interview).

Between 1960 and today, Hammond not only saw a change in the ethnic and racial makeup of its residents but it also saw a dramatic shift in its economy. During the 1960s and especially the 1970s, manufacturing in Hammond began to decline and by 1978 had lost more than 50 manufacturing firms (Singer, 1978: 7). In the 1970s in a combination of labor disagreements, plant relocations, changing industry needs and the national recession, many plants in the Region closed and thousands of jobs were lost. This included at least three major steel plants, the Erie Railroad facility and oil refineries (Trusty, 1984: 210). In Leslie Singer’s 1978 report “The American Middle-Sized City: Hammond, Indiana” it was predicted that if Hammond did not turn the tide of outmigration of skilled workers and its White ethnic community, more industry would leave as would the wealthier portion of the population. This is in effect what took place. In conjunction with the loss of well paying manufacturing jobs, Hammond lost many residents. After Hammond’s population peak in the 1950s with a population of 111,698, the 1960s and 1970s Hammond represented a loss in population of 18,000 residents. By 1990 it had dropped to 84, 236. As of 2010 the population count was 80,830. The loss of jobs, residents and tax revenue posed challenges for the city.

As White families passed away or moved out and did not return, housing became available and as interviewees noted and US Census data also confirms, more Black and
Latino families moved in while the overall population of the city decreased. As is consistent with US demographic shifts, the state of Indiana had an influx of Latinos beginning in the 1980s. In the 1990 Census the Latino made up about 12% of the city’s population. According to the 2010 Census, Latinos make up about 34% of the Hammond’s population. Blacks made up 9% of Hammond’s population in 1990 and 23% in 2010. Whites (including Hispanic) made up about 84% in 1990 and Whites (Non-Hispanic) 41% in 2010. This is how one interviewee described the change:

I have seen that happen in Hammond. It’s a completely different city than it was 25 years ago. And there’s ethnic and cultural people that are part of our community and different backgrounds. You see folks all the time whether you’re at the grocery store or like our community is much more diverse than it used to be and it’s something we just all accept whether it is your neighborhood or where you go to work or school or whatever (Lawson, Interview).

Figure 1. Hammond 2000 Census Population by Race
Interviewees spoke of a few reasons they felt Hammond had become a “majority minority’ city by the 2010 Census. One of these included the perceived influx of residents from the City of Chicago, especially after the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) Projects were torn down over the past 10 years. While Census data makes this difficult to track exactly where people who moved to Hammond came from, the Census Data along with stories within interviews make it clear that poverty has increased dramatically since the 1970s as Table 1 makes clear.

Table 1. Hammond Poverty Rate 1970-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hammond</strong></td>
<td>107,790</td>
<td>93,714</td>
<td>84,836</td>
<td>83,396</td>
<td>80,830</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Population</td>
<td>7,114</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>11,453</td>
<td>11,807</td>
<td>17,822</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Poverty</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>235%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It does not appear that a large portion of the new residents were necessarily former CHA residents but it does appear that the new residents are predominantly of lower income and often Black or Latino. This can be directly linked to the availability of affordable single family homes in the city of Hammond.

While the percentage of people living in poverty within the city has increased over the decades this has caused a strain on public revenue along with a dwindling economic tax base within the city, Hammond has become creative in its revenue sources. One key example of this is the city’s use of tax revenue derived from a casino boat that sits on its Lake Michigan shore since 1996:

Hammond has been very wise in a particular policy it has adopted and that is its use of casino revenues. We have a total of 5 casino boats that came into Indiana in the ’87-’88. They’ve adopted different strategies and a lot of people would argue that Hammond did a better job of managing those revenues that anyone else. So under Mayor Dwayne Dedelow, a Republican which was quite a surprise, a considerable amount of those casino’s revenues went not only into infrastructure but also went into the nonprofit community that serviced some of the more needy families in Hammond. The current mayor, Tom McDermott Jr. has a different strategy in many respects equally positive. What he did when he came into office about six years ago, they created a program called College Bound. What that program does is it provides a stipend to the child of any Hammond resident who owns a home for college attendance (Belmey, Interview).

Currently the Civil City of Hammond receives approximately $35 million in casino revenue (Northwest Times, 2/13/2013) that as stated above goes into city infrastructure and the College Bound program. Mayor McDermott specifically created this program in order to sell homes: “If more people are moving out than are moving in I’m doing something wrong. That’s what our job is: to sell homes and that’s what College Bound does” (McDermott, Interview). While this gaming revenue does not necessarily solve all of the city’s revenue problems it does create opportunities for the city to sustain itself as
it works to find and attract additional revenue sources, especially in the form of new
industry and new job opportunities.

**Uptown**

Like Hammond, Uptown’s history plays a huge role in the current demographic
profile of the community. Trains put it on the map with Chicago’s Elevated trains
arriving in Uptown at the turn of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century. However, entertainment, not industry
was the profit making venue in Uptown. In the 1920s three huge theaters were opened in
the center of the neighborhood attracting young singles and couples to live while higher
income earners frequented the neighborhood to enjoy its amenities (Chicago Fact Book,
2000: 44). Luxury apartment buildings and hotels were built to accommodate the
couples and singles along Winthrop and Kenmore Avenues while mansions were built
closer to the lake and many single family homes were built west of Broadway (Seligman,
2005).

Just as the building of the interstates bypassed important roads and hurt retail in
Hammond, Chicago’s extension of Lake Shore Drive to Foster in the 1930s similarly
depressed retail sales in Uptown along Broadway and cut the neighborhood off from the
lakefront (Chicago Fact Book, 2000: 44; Seligman, 2005). However, while retail never
fully recovered from this bypass, the housing market remained viable as workers came to
Chicago during WWII but new housing was not being built. Instead neighborhoods such
as Uptown became crowded due to its many affordable apartments. Landlords cut up
larger units into one and two room apartments sometimes ignoring building codes and
producing shoddy construction (Maly, 2005: 53). This was especially true along
Kenmore and Winthrop Avenues later dubbed the “Kenmore/Winthrop Corridor.”
After the war many of the White middle class couples and singles were incentivized to buy homes and move to the suburbs thereby also helping to alleviate the crowding. The apartments remained affordable in their smaller state. New migrants came to Uptown as it started to become known as a” port of entry”, many of whom were of lower income (Warren, 1979; Chicago Fact Book, 2000; Maly, 2005). In the 1960s thousands of White southerners from Appalachia moved to Uptown as the coal mines were mechanized and jobs were lost (Warren, 1979). At the same time due to changing federal policy, Native Americans were encouraged to move to cities to improve their quality of life (Warren, 1979; Chicago Fact Book, 2000). Maly (2005) argues that while this did not dramatically change the census data of the neighborhood at that time, it did begin to change its character (54). Uptown was becoming a poorer and more government depended population. As “Skid Row” was torn down on Madison Avenue on the west side of Chicago, many of the men came to Uptown during the 1960s and 1970s (Warren, 1979). These men were housed in the old hotels which previously housed tourists, vacationers and entertainment seekers.

Uptown also became an attractive space for subsidized housing. As the City of Chicago needed to fulfill federal requirements for low and moderate-income families, Uptown received more than its fair share of units compared with other neighborhoods within the city. While no high-rise projects were built in Uptown, this did increase the number of low income residents and again changed the character of the neighborhood (Maly, 2005: 54). Along with affordable housing federal money came money for more social services in Uptown. As the Great Society programs brought in revenue to the city it also continued to encourage the growth of social services. At one point Uptown had
11% of Chicago’s social service agencies but only about 2.3% of the city’s population (Warren, 1979). Uptown began to feel like a “dumping ground” and organizations such as the Uptown Chicago Commission were established to stem the tide of lower income arrivals. However, larger polices were at play. In 1968 Illinois deinstitutionalized its mental health institutions and in that year and in the following years between 5,000 and 13,000 formerly institutionalized patients were dropped off in Uptown (Warren, 1979: 8). While initially these individuals were also housed in old hotels, this influx of people led to well established homeless population in the neighborhood.

High rises came into Uptown along the lakefront as well as the beginning of condo ownership in the 1970s (Shiller, interview). Through a private-public partnership, high rises also were built not to house the wealthy but to create project based Section-8 Rentals for low income residents for the next 25 years. Private developers received low interest loans to build these buildings where 11,000 residents were housed (Nyden, 1996). Investment also happened on the side of the city with the building of Truman College over land that had formerly housed many of the Appalachian population in what had come to be known as the “New Skid Row” (Maly, 2005).

During the 1970s and 1980s Uptown became a port of entry not only for domestic migration but also international migration. As federal policies changed with the Immigration Act of 1965 Uptown also became a “port of entry” for refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos along with Mexican Americans, Japanese, and Russians (Chicago Fact Book, 2000). By 1980 Uptown’s white population declined by 44% since 1970 while the minority population had increased by 43%. In 1980 Hispanics were 23% of the population and Asians were 11%. The approximately 1.3% of the American
Indians in Uptown made up 21% of the city’s total population of American Indians. This thereby made Uptown the largest community in the city for both Asian and American Indian populations (Melaniphy & Associates, 1982).

By the 1980s the diversity of Uptown was established not only by race and ethnicity but also by income. During the 1980s the poverty rate was over 25%. Disparities in housing abounded with luxurious high rise dwellers along the lake, low income subsidized housing renters, new in-migrants, residents of nursing homes and the homeless (Melaniphy & Associates, 1982). In 1987 Helen Shiller was elected Alderman of the 46th Ward comprising most of Uptown. Shiller was known as one of the “lakefront liberals” and worked hard to establish balanced development of new residences and economic growth but always made sure to ensure affordable housing (Chicago Fact Book, 2000).

Figure 3. Uptown 2000 Census Population by Race
The racial, ethnic and class changes of Uptown during the 1960s through the 1980s stabilized by the 1990s and continues to remain one of the most diverse neighborhoods of Chicago (Maly, 2005). However, that balance is becoming increasingly challenged by new investment, new residents and changes in political leadership in the 2010s.
CHAPTER FOUR

POLITICAL CONTEXT, CIVIC PARTICIPATION,
AND COMMUNITY CULTURE

While spending time in both of these communities the interwoven threads of politics, civic organizations and community culture clearly play integral roles in the sustainability of Hammond and Uptown. The threads were not identical in the two communities nor were they woven in the same ways but both communities are held together through the interplay of these elements of civil society.

Hammond

In order to better understand the potential for Hammond’s maintainable diversity, it is important to look at the political context in which this city operates. Hammond, Indiana finds itself within the Northwest Indiana region. Many interviewees including residents, academics and law makers refer to this area simply as “The Region.” (Lowry, Interview; Rittenmyer, 2004) The region includes the counties of Lake, Porter and LaPorte. According to the Northwest Indiana Quality of Life Council’s 2008 report, this included a population of 762,469 and covered 1,761 square miles. It includes blue collar cities such as Hammond but also struggling cities such as Gary and East Chicago along with the wealthier suburban towns to the east and south of Hammond. While the region is much more diverse than the rest of Indiana, it is not as racially diverse as Hammond is as a city. The region’s population is made up of the following racial/ethnic proportions
69% White, non-Latino; 18% Black, non-Latino; 11% Latino; and 2% Other. The Region is not always a term used with affection. Many interviewees embraced the title with pride but had clear understanding that other Hoosiers use the term with derision. This was felt especially in the case of Indiana State politics. Interviewees attributed this to the Region being predominantly Democratic in a majority Republican state, elements of racism and greed for tax revenue coming from the steel mills and presently the casinos.

The Chief of Police told a story of his specific challenges as being understood only as “the Region” when asked if there was every tension with the legislators downstate:

Absolutely hates us, ignores us, actually, is very, very hostile and belligerent. And I can say that from firsthand experience. 20 years ago I went down to a police academy in Plainsfield, Indiana. And they would say, from all the state, except for Lake County. It’s all a big joke. Everything is, “they do everything that way except in the great state of Lake.” That was 20 years ago. Not 3 months ago I went downstate to speak in front of some senators and representatives from other communities in the state about our emergency 911 system that we’re consolidating. But, the problem being, that I gave this great grandiose speech, gave them all these statistics, a couple of the people from Lake County did too. We got done and the chairman of the committee kind of waved me up there, and we’re all done, we’re all just talking and I walk up, and he said ‘thank you very much,’ and he said nice things about me and then said, ‘but understand that, because you’re from Lake County, that this is not being well received and they will not listen to you unless you unless you pass this local option income tax, this that and the other thing…’ and I walked out there thinking, ‘how ridiculous, I came up here in all good intention, prepared all these statistics for you, you know, talked to you, I feel I talked intelligently and articulately, brought my point across, and basically what you’re saying is you’re ignoring it because I’m from Lake County.’ So does it exist, absolutely. And not only does it exist, it is healthy and thriving (Miller, Interview).

This tension described by the Chief of Police was expressed by many interviewees as a way that the city of Hammond and the Region as a whole felt as though they were not treated fairly by the state of Indiana. At the same time many were well aware that in certain ways the Region had rightfully earned a reputation of political corruption.

According to the Chicago Tribune, “In Lake County, Ind. — with a population one-tenth
the size of Cook County — federal prosecutors have sent nearly 50 public figures to prison since 2000, according to the U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Indiana” (Chicago Tribune, 8/26/2010). While writing this thesis, Hammond’s city council member Al Salinas pleaded guilty to two federal charges of accepting a bribe from Dave's Tree Service and failing to file a federal tax return. The same week a Gary city council member resigned her position and pleaded guilty to federal tax evasion (Northwest Times, 4/21/2013).

While tension exists with Hammond’s interaction with downstate legislators it also exists within the political structure of the city itself. There are two taxing entities with completely separate political power: the Civil City of Hammond and the School City of Hammond. A mayor and city council are elected to run the Civil City and a school board is elected to run the School City who appoints the Superintendent. Because of this separation of powers, there also is a diffused notion of accountability when it comes to the schools and tension around the use of the gaming tax revenue. No casino funds go to the public schools; the casino funds go strictly to the Civil City. Under the past two mayors that money has been invested in the infrastructure of the city including roads, bridges and street lights and was given to non-profits. Much of the revenue is currently being invested in the College Bound Program as mentioned earlier in the History of Hammond. When speaking with both the superintendent and the mayor it was clear that while the tax funded program College Bound is under the auspices of education it is actually a program to encourage middle class homeownership in the city of Hammond. The mayor emphasized that the responsibility of education falls on the School City while the superintendent emphasized the difficulty in operating with the need to levy taxes for
basic infrastructure. The effects of this tension within the governmental structure of the city of Hammond are not clear. However, the mayor, superintendent and almost every other interviewee emphasized that a strong school system with well-respected quality schools are very necessary to sustaining the diversity of the city. These hurdles for political cooperation whether it be with downstate legislators or within the city of Hammond itself leave an ambiguous effect on the sustainable diversity of Hammond.

Cooperative Spirit

Although there is clear political tension within the political structure of the city and its reputation with the state of Indiana, nearly every interviewee spoke of a “cooperative spirit” that exists among many of the residents of Hammond: “For the most part, the city of Hammond, we don’t like mess. We like peace and tranquility as much as possible and we like to think we are a city that can get along and find common ground to address any issue” (Blake-King, Interview). Other interviewees spoke of the commitment of a core group or residents to the city of Hammond that love the city want to see it improve. For others it was a connection that residents of Hammond all seem to have with one another suggesting that this is the culture of the city that comes with being a decent member of the community. Across the board, home owners emphasized the neighborliness of the community and that they were happy to have neighbors of any background as long as they kept up their property and were decent to one another.

As previously stated, the connection to one’s neighborhood also came up repeatedly in the interviews. Hammond is organized as a city of neighborhoods thereby allowing for infrastructure and social structure to lend itself to smaller communities within the city. Within these neighborhoods crime watch meetings are held. Most
mentioned that while these crime watch meetings are not brought about because of favorable circumstances, they help people in the neighborhood get to know each other and they help build a sense of security through interacting with neighbors. (Dent, Interview; Watkins, Interview; Baretta, Interview; Dedelow, Interview; Poland, Interview; Planer, Interviews). Granted this often does not involve the new “problem” residents who the more established residents are frustrated with, the interviewees made it clear that a positive sense of community is established within these meetings.

Civic Institutions

Churches were also cited as mainstays in the community that contributed to its stability. Some spoke of families staying in Hammond because of their congregation. They also mentioned that many of these congregations do to reach out to those in need within the community. While there was some reservation about the diversity within the congregations (many congregations are segregated by race or ethnicity) church goers as a whole makes up a diverse population of the city. Churches are also involved in a few different interfaith groups in the region. The Northwest Federation is an interfaith Gamaliel organizing groups that works on social justice issues in northwest Indiana. In the 1990’s there was a proposal to move the Federal Court House out of Hammond and into a wealthier town farther from the urban core. The Federation partnered with local business groups and organized about 2,000 people to march on downtown Hammond and met with the various politicians demanding that the courthouse remain in Hammond. They eventually won and a $6 million court house was built which caused more investment in downtown area (Orlinski, Interview; Community Leader 2 Interview).
However, at the present time the organization is struggling because of funding and losing dues paying member churches.

Within the city and the Region there are many non-profit and city sponsored groups that seek to directly or indirectly address issues around diversity:

There’s a lot of good people in Northwest Indiana that believe in diversity and want to support it and they exist within churches, within the businesses and all the different markets in Northwest Indiana. So I think that helps in doing that but there is no one specifically that sticks out as our champion of diversity in Northwest Indiana so I couldn’t point a finger to any one organization or institution that has caused it to survive and thrive (Martinez, Interview). This was a common response from many interviewees. Interviewees emphasized these organizations’ good work and their dedication to sustainability and diversity but many questioned their effectiveness and their impact, even leaders that worked within these institutions. Organizations were mentioned and praised for the work that they do but as Martinez stated, there is no overarching institution that is systemically fundamental in the Region’s diversity. Interviewees mentioned the city’s Human Relations Department is known for following up on discrimination complaints especially around issues of red lining and discrimination in the work place. The roles of additional organizations within the city play an ambiguous role. These organizations include the NAACP, Quality of Life Council, Hammond Hispanic Community Committee, Race Relations Council of Northwest Indiana, Northwest Indiana Urban League, Ophelia Steens Center, the Boys’ and Girls’ Club, League of Women Voters, Northwest Federation and United Way. The United Way was noted for attempting to fund organizations in a manner that would encourage collaboration but it is unclear if that strategy worked. An example of this lack of cooperation is captured here:

“Organizations promote diversity: two strongest community groups, they are not in contention with one another but they don’t work with one another and that’s the
NAACP and HHCC, Hammond Hispanic Community Committee. They are not at odds, but they are not coalesced in an organization in a community that is predominantly minority it work together to promote diversity. And each promotes quality of life but for their perspectives groups and not as the community as a whole, from my perspective. It’s like everyone is left to their own devices. It has not risen to the level of consciousness that we have a problem here and let’s address it (Watkins, Interview).

Hammond has the capacity and the preliminary interest in promoting and sustaining its racial diversity through government and through civic organizations but has not yet succeeded in creating and sustaining the infrastructure necessary for that diversity to intentionally thrive. Further research needs to be done around the strategies and effectiveness of these organizations.

Clash of Culture

With changing racial demographics in Hammond, there have also been changing economic demographics. Interviewees made it clear that if there was to be tension in the city it was more likely to be around income and poverty that it was to be around issues of race however, one change in Hammond leaves those two elements intertwined: a perceived increased use in Section 8 Housing Vouchers in Hammond. The perception began after many of the public housing projects were torn down in Chicago as a result of the federal policy of HOPE VI. Chicago initially used its HOPE VI funding to demolish high rises and depended on the Section-8 vouchers to house the displaced residents with virtually no funds initially going toward new construction to replace torn down housing with no repercussions (Hackworth, 2007: 58). Given this political reality, a Hammond realtor summarizes how many Hammond residents feel HOPE VI impacted them through this common perception:

We don’t see an influx of African Americans except for those coming in from Chicago for rentals. They are from a different culture. They are transient. Also,
they drain our resources. These folks go to Section 8 public housing then they go to North Township so they can go to get their Nipsco and rent paid. Then they pile up in a unit. They have all these cars around. Then there are some people who have been here for 100 years and they are angry because they can’t get out of their parking spot. This is causing anger and tension. (Blake-King, interview)

Others also suggested that while not all the newcomers are Section 8 voucher holders there is clearly an increase in Black renters from Chicago and according to many of these interviews, the perception is that many new renters are former residents of Chicago’s housing projects. In general this seems to be a negative perception while others acknowledge that the presence of more minority renters increases the diversity of Hammond which is a positive outcome. Still others see the influx of minority renters as changing the face of Hammond and swaying the demographics toward more Black and Brown residents thereby making Hammond less diverse as the older White population decreases. In general the change in the racial background of new residents did not seem to bother interviewees. It was rather the risk that the new residents seemed to bring with them:

We had a lot of elderly people on my street and when they passed away, their houses were available through their family to either sell or rent and there were a couple homes on my block that were rented. And I woke up one morning and I’m like, ‘I don’t know these people. Who are they?’ They moved in like overnight. And then I asked the neighbors across the street, I’m like, ‘do you know who—no I’ve never seen them before.’ Well, we started looking and watching and I saw a Hummer—no, no. Nobody’s going to move here and have a Hummer. I mean c’mon, please. You have thousands of places to go, no. And so then we just got on that there’s something going on that we don’t need here. It was obvious after a while. I would tell my neighbors and they would all say the same thing. We walk our block freely whenever we want and when we’re at work. Now we have to look like who are these people moving in here and why did they pick out this area to move into? And so it was a lot and we found out that they are from the South Side of Chicago and this was prime picking for them to start up a new location for whatever, but it wasn’t going to happen (Dent, Interview).

The school system also felt this influx of residents from Chicago:
When we talk about the change in our demographic, one of the things that we are very cognizant of is the fact that we are getting a significant influx of students from Chicago. I think when Mayor Daley decided to eradicate some of the major housing projects in Chicago I think a lot of people from those living areas moved into the city of Hammond. We are getting a large influx of students from Mexico. My own personal perception is because there is a huge Hispanic population on the south side of Chicago I think there’s some type of channeling of Hispanics through that community and then they branch over into northwest Indiana. (Watkins, Interview)

Each of these interviewees mention the movement of residents from Chicago because of Chicago’s and the federal government’s public housing policies and Hammond’s available and affordable rental properties. Communities such as Hammond which offer many amenities such as better public schools than parts of the impoverished south side of Chicago, a commuter rail back into the city, much cheaper housing and lower taxes, feel as though the less fortunate are being sent to their city against everyone’s will, current and new residents alike.

**Uptown**

Political structures and civic institutions

Though Uptown’s political and civic structure differs from Hammond, Uptown shares similar culture clashes between residents while just trying to get along. Uptown is a neighborhood and not its own municipal entity. Most of the neighborhood is located within the 46th Ward of the city of Chicago. An elected alderman represents the ward within the city council which is comprised of 50 aldermen and the mayor of Chicago. From from 1987-2011 Helen Shiller served as the 46th Ward alderman. She was a controversial figure at times but fought hard both within the ward and within the city council. She worked to enact ordinances that encouraged and sustained affordable
housing in Uptown not only to increase access to good housing but to sustain the racial and economic diversity of the community. Shiller describes her tenure in her own words:

Well I think I played a big role in terms of the last 24 years in the sense of making sure to be able that there is an infrastructure....We have a strong business associations which are somewhat diverse, I think I helped make sure they were more inclusive and we’ll see how that develops. I think they are honest people. We’ve built the foundation to stable affordable housing for a stronger and better educational outcome. We’ve built this foundation, the infrastructure foundation and support for homeless providers. For things like that for some of the arts institutions. We’ve done a lot of things like that, but a broad, strong unified support system for all of them doesn’t exist. (Shiller, Interview).

Within the last line, Alderman Shiller points out the future challenge for sustained diversity in the neighborhood: there is no unified support system for nonprofits in the face of changing political tides and priorities among elected officials. For years elected officials along the north lakefront have developed a reputation for nurturing the opportunities for diversity. A nonprofit leader describes the role of these elected officials as such:

The lakefront liberals. That had a role to playing it, right? Because as this was coming in, the government elected officials, were kind of at least if not in practice, but at least in rhetoric, more open to some of the changes and were tolerating lot of these changes so they weren’t reacting. “Oh we see a lot of people coming we need to get them out.” You know. They knew they were coming so they decided to create more infrastructure (Nunez, Interview).

The “infrastructure” that both mentioned refer to the cooperation and organization of the nonprofits within the neighborhood. As stated earlier, Uptown has had a long history of nonprofit service providers in a high concentration within the neighborhood. According to one leader this is also what created the infrastructure: “So when a lot of the dumping happened by policies of the city, an infrastructure and social services were created. All right, so they are the ones that are sort of that social network for this vulnerable population in the community, but that in itself creates a sort of glue for
sustainability so people remain here because the services are here” (Nunez, interview). Organizations like Organization of the NorthEast (ONE), and Uptown United bring together many service organizations including homeless shelters and youth organizations, schools, mutual aid society, ethnic organizations, religious congregations, banks, and other nonprofits around the neighborhood. Groups like ONE have over 80 member institutions that come together around issues that affect the neighborhood. Many have argued that by organizing these civic institutions that demands are recognized and met by elected officials (Fisher, 1994). Sampson also argued that civic participation can have a positive effect on neighborhoods. This can take the form of both collective efficacy often found in block clubs and crime watches or in collective civic action often found in more traditional nonprofits: “it is the totality of the institutional infrastructure that seems to matter in producing healthy communities” (Sampson, 2012: 209). Nyden et al. (1998) and Maly (2005) also emphasize the importance of community leadership and engagement via nonprofits and organizations to help support neighborhoods.

These quotes also demonstrate that in Uptown the political powers are heavily intertwined within the civic institutions, especially nonprofits. It is this interplay of civic organizations and political power that has created the foundations and infrastructure that allowed Uptown to thrive as a sustained diverse community for the past 30 years. As interviewees pointed out Uptown has had a long history of need and government support for service provided for new comers to the neighborhood, whether they are refugees seeking housing and new opportunities or the mentally ill seeking services and housing to young students looking for new adventures in the city; the uptown neighborhood has
more or less found a balance in which many people with a variety of backgrounds, languages and income levels are able to more or less peacefully coexist.

However, some leaders expressed concern about what is coming next for the neighborhood in respect to changing civic organizations and new political leadership along with new interest in investment in the community. ONE is not as powerful an organization and is not as nimble at organizing organizations and residents as it once was. One leader who has been part of a member institution for many years expressed the following: “ONE got away into programming instead of organizing and while it was good to have the organizing bent to the programming, really the focus for the last couple years because that’s where the money was focused has been Roger’s Park so there’s been very little that’s happened in Uptown” (Gall, Interview). The shift in priorities within the organization was seen as detrimental to the organization in its ability to hold elected officials accountable and build meaningful relationships across its member institutions in order to work well together to fight for common neighborhood interests. ONE is also currently going through a merger with an organizing group in the neighborhood just south due to financial constraints and leadership turnover. ONE was also perceived to be aligned with Alderman Shiller by many in the neighborhood. Both worked in concert to create and support policies that would nurture the nonprofit infrastructure within the neighborhood through city ordinances and zoning permits.

Since Helen Shiller retired and ONE is in a moment of flux, a new concern arises: a new alderman was elected in 2011 from a pool of eleven candidates. The current alderman is James Cappleman:

So a longtime Alderman, Schiller, has transitioned out, and now we have a new alderman Cappleman. And he has a very different view. And he comes from
social service. He’s a social worker, but he has a very different view of what diversity looks like and how we should treat those people here. So who knows what it looks like because he’s changing the mix. I mean a lot of longstanding organizations are having issues with him and his view of what his ward should look like (Nunez, interview).

More specifically, Alderman Cappleman recently made headlines in Chicago newspapers after informing a local chapter of the Salvation Army that they were no longer welcome to feed the homeless within the 46th ward. He also tried to pass a city ordinance to close down all the city’s cubical hotels (a form of low income housing) and another ordinance for an extremely steep $1,000 fine for feeding pigeons (Chicago Tribune, 3/9/2013).

Organization of the NorthEast rallied in front of the Alderman’s office in protest of the alderman attempting to stop the feeding of the homeless. Alderman Cappleman received additional bad press through the Chicago Sun Times. One writer wrote three consecutive columns to showcase the alderman’s actions to the whole city. However, the alderman’s proposed ordinance got the attention not only of the news media and the mayor but also of the Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law. The Shriver Center wrote a letter to the city of Chicago informing the mayor that an ordinance that shut down the city’s cubical hotels would “violate fair housing laws and jeopardize the city’s federal funding” (Sun Times, 3/6/2012). The mayor’s spokesperson stated, “We are reviewing the ordinance but do not support closing down these cubicle hotels unless and until we have a plan for where these individuals will go” (Sun Times, 3/6/2013).

Alderman Cappleman has stood by his position on these perceived threats to the nonprofit infrastructure and the availability of affordable housing in Uptown as simply an effort to hold nonprofits accountable to good practices proven through evidence based results. His website states the following about his philosophy on housing:
I promote the use of evidence-based, best practices when it comes to management of residential buildings. I want to make sure that residents in the 46th Ward feel safe in their homes, no matter where they live. Citywide, I want to create tax incentives to build more affordable housing in areas with lower rates of poverty. As studies have shown, mixed income housing creates a better community for everyone. (http://james46.org/initiatives/)

While the rhetoric presented by the alderman suggests an approach that seeks to support the nonprofits, that is not how the larger community is receiving his actions inside and outside the city council. Mark Brown in his Sun Times column wrote, “It’s plain to most everyone else at this point that the aldermen are really just trying to clear these places — and the folks who reside there — out of the neighborhood, for whatever reason, most likely related to real estate.” (Sun Times, 3/6/2013) Given the less welcoming stance of the new alderman toward the nonprofits that support the infrastructure of the diversity of the neighborhood, it is becoming clear that Uptown and its sustained diversity is perhaps less stable than it was with previous civic and political leadership.

Clash of Cultures

The current political stances of the new alderman also speak to a reoccurring theme in the history of Uptown: residents feel that they have been burdened disproportionately to the neighborhoods surrounding them with the neediest of the city’s population. Uptown has served as the city of Chicago’s “dumping ground” for years especially regarding those most in need of mental health services. This is a very similar narrative to Hammond’s current challenges with a perceived influx of Section 8 residents. However, this is a storm that Uptown has weathered for generations. Unlike Hammond, Uptown residents have found a middle ground of mutual coexistence.

We coexist. We agree to coexist. I don’t want to hear your problems. You don’t want to hear mine and that’s fine. But because there are services and there are things that bring us to the neighborhood, it draws us here. The fact that I’m living
next to you is not the reason that I’m here, but we ended up living next to each other anyway. So that’s what I’m saying. The diversity here is not intentional. Because of different things, it happened. And it can probably be replicated somewhere else, but it’s not necessarily an intentional diversity where you’re like “I want to live.” And there are people that are like, “I want to live in Uptown or I want to live in Rogers Park because of its diversity.” But I think that’s the minority. People tend to live there because social services are here, I can still afford it, my kid goes to school, kind of the majority of my population lives here so I have a social network that allows me to survive in this neighborhood.” Not because you have sort of the United Nations on your block that’s kind of like “eh.” (Nunez, Interview)

Yet this does not mean that there is not tension surrounding the current state of affairs and within the mutual agreement of coexistence. Among the Uptown interviewees there was a perception that there was a divide among renters and owners within the neighborhood. There is a perception that new home/condo owners are interested in raising their property value by kicking out those that are perceived to bring the value down, i.e. the poor and homeless while not being interested in the longtime residents of the community and helping address problems without displacement:

How can we maintain and sustain this community? How can we keep the drug dealers out of the neighborhood? The gangbangers? How can we improve our community? How can we keep this community the way that it is: full of diversity? I’ve heard people say, “this neighborhood is never going to change.” And I’ve heard people say “if you want to live in this neighborhood, this is what Uptown is about.” It’s about people. It’s not about your sexual preference, but this is what we are and this is what we do. We like it here. We’ve been living here for 20 or 30 years and some of these people have only been here for a year or two (Reed, Interview)

As this interviewee mentions, Uptown has its challenges regarding gang activity. However, the displacement of longtime, stable residents who happen to be poor people of color and live in one of many units of Uptown’s subsidized housing does not necessitate the removal of this stable segment of the community in the eyes of many of the
interviewees. With the election and actions of the current alderman, these fears seem to be on the edge of coming to fruition.

Summary

The interwoven nature of political context, civic institutions and community culture create a unique dynamism within both of these diverse communities. Neither of these communities experiences the mix in exactly the same way but both find themselves battling political and economic structures much bigger than themselves. Hammond finds itself within a strongly Democratic region of a staunchly Republican state and is in a constant battle for recognition and equitable resources from a seemingly begrudging state legislature. Additionally, Hammond is also at the mercy of shifting urban housing policies that attract a needier population to its homes than previous generations experienced. Within these complex relationships Hammond is still struggling to fully embrace its newly diverse identity while supporting the structures that will stabilize and support new residents through the cooperation of government and civic organizations. Even with a self-proclaimed “spirit of cooperation,” the new recognition and celebration of the city’s changing demographic is still a work in progress.

Uptown also finds itself caught in the tides of changing real estate markets and the threat of displacement of residents; especially the most vulnerable populations. Long time leaders have understood this threat to always be present but see this as a more powerful threat due to the weakening of established civic institutions and the new leadership in the ward. Uptown has learned to embrace its diversity through coexistence; a mantra of live and let live. However cyclical tension of homeowners and renters is
constantly bubbling to the surface and threatening the balance of sustained diversity that has characterized the identity of the neighborhood for generations.

As communities that self-identify as the “dumping grounds” for the city of Chicago, the importance of creating and maintaining a sustainable infrastructure that can weather the storms of shifting political priorities both locally and nationally along with the economic and social impacts that these storms create is of utmost importance. While Hammond is finding its footing within a changing population, Uptown is in a constant struggle that has more or less kept a stable population in the neighborhood. Both of these diverse communities found themselves diverse through circumstance and complex histories. If both do not develop leadership to fight to maintain the stability of their diversity through civic institutions and local policies, their racial diversity will through changing circumstances become simply another moment in their histories.
CHAPTER FIVE

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Though relatively stable, the diversity of these communities still requires a proper balance for it to thrive. Hammond and Uptown are both in moments of flux. Both are experiencing changes in their housing stock and misunderstandings with old and new residents. Both are also struggling with a tendency toward co-existence rather than a relationally based community. Yet both also possess opportunities to embrace their racially diverse identities and work to celebrate and support them.

Hammond

What Sustains Hammond’s Diversity?

While Hammond has structural challenges to sustaining its diversity regarding civic and political structures, it also has many other positive public spaces and programs in place within the community that help sustain and offer opportunities for Hammond to strengthen its stability. Some of these aspects are new and some are long established. These opportunities include Horseshoe Casino gaming money, the beginnings of organizational cooperation through crime watches, newly created and restored public spaces, and a focus on youth programming. Hammond residents also have a strong sense of neighborhood identity and pride. One of the key institutions that help sustain Hammond is the presence of the Horseshoe Casino within its city limits.
“The casinos have been a big help in the stability of the area right now. When the mills broke down the casinos came in and if they hadn’t I don’t know where we’d be. But they’ve played a big part in making money available for the use of streets and College Bound. That’s begun a good thing and with the mayor that’s been a good move for the city of Hammond” (Community Leader 2, Interview).

Every year the city of Hammond receives $36 million in taxes from the casino. Under Mayor Duane Dedelow, it was decided that the money would be put toward infrastructure such as roads but also to non-profits who serviced the poorer families in Hammond (Dedelow, Interview; Bellamy, Interviews). The current Mayor Tom McDermott Jr. has a different strategy, a program in its 8th year called College Bound. All 20 interviewees spoke of this program. There are qualifications, but generally speaking, if parents or guardians own a home in Hammond from the time their child is 12, the city will pay the equivalent of In State Tuition for any Indiana college for four years of that child’s college education (City of Hammond Website) While the mayor himself made it clear that this program is directed at supporting the middle class Hammond residents it has helped keep people who might have otherwise moved out of the community for better school districts inside the city limits so that when their children are old enough, they can benefit from this city program. (McDermott, interview) Casino dollars also go directly toward each council person and are usually used for additional police patrols within their districts.

The city also funds a home buyer’s assistance program which will assist you with $2,500 if you buy a home and $5,000 to build a new home. (McDermott, Interview; City of Hammond Website) It also helps with home loans and redevelopment. One branch involves buying foreclosed homes and helping people rehab them. Part of this money came through federal dollars but it was run by the city. The city also makes an effort to be strict code enforcers so that problem properties that are not well kept will not bring
down the value of neighboring properties and will also preserve the present housing stock in the city. One leader stressed the city’s hard work and the outcome:

[A]s buildings become vacant the city finds a way to acquire them and tear them down if they can’t save them. And they landscape the property if they can’t put something else on it. In any neighborhood you don’t pass by and see boarded up and run down building either residential or business. And that’s something I compliment the city of Hammond for (Community leader 2, Interview).

Many interviewees listed neighborhood parks and larger city parks as places where people intermingle and occasionally have deeper relationships. Interviewees with children lauded the youth sports leagues run by the YMCA and by the city parks. South Hammond baseball and soccer fields were rehabbed and the city now hosts tournaments including teams from outside Hammond. They also praised all the family programming that the city funds through the parks. “You could be busy every night in Hammond if you wanted to” (Poland, Interview).

What Challenges the Stability of the Community

When interviewees were asked about what the obstacles were threatened the sustainability of Hammond, there was a long, but consistent list. These included the low quality to schools; being a cross roads of crime; lack of well paying jobs; influx of Section 8 renters/problem rentals of lower income; lack of clear leadership from people and organizations in the city other than the mayor; the absence of meaningful dialogue about race backed up with funded action and few opportunities to attract young professionals.

Interviewees were very upset with the quality of Hammond schools, “Hammond Public schools are horrible. I wouldn’t recommend anyone sending their kids to public school” (Poland, Interview). While this was an especially strong response, others did not feel as harshly about it but still acknowledge the issue: “People have a tendency to leave
the urban core (and move south) especially when their kids hit middle school because that’s when the public school, kind of, you know, they’re not so good” (Crist, Interview). The first interviewee sent her kids to Montessori to avoid the public schools but still lives in the city. The second interviewee sent her kids to public elementary school and then transferred them to Catholic middle schools. Both had the income to do that and could choose to opt out of the public schools. Many others in Hammond do not have that option and the tendency is for those with the means to simply leave the city therefore threatening its stability. According to the superintendent of Hammond schools, the trend is that Hammond has become a majority minority school system from a previously predominantly White school system. While White children stay in the school system for grammar school, they are often do not attend middle school within Hammond Public Schools. However, Dr. Watkins also made clear that along with the change in racial demographics, the socioeconomic make up of the school system is also changing: over 80% of the students in the Hammond schools qualify for free and reduced lunch. In addition to low income students, there is also an increase of students with limited English proficiency. Over 2,000 special education students are also within the schools and there is a significant transience of the school population itself both within the school system and those coming in and out of the school system. After Watkins identified these challenges, he stated the following:

So I think that when you consider all those complexities, I think what we have to offer the schools that are in Hammond an excellent opportunity for good education. But because of all those complexities, my biggest frustration is that I can’t get achievement levels up. But I think it’s influenced by all those factors. I would argue that our schools are fairly good considering what we are working with. People that are involved in the schools, not just educators but our families and the community people that actually go into our schools and volunteer and they know we have good schools and offer good programs but my biggest
frustration in all that I do is that I can’t show the success that we have through test scores and that’s the litmus test we are all evaluated by now.

This perception of low success due to test scores and a complex population also clearly bothered many interviewees. Few interviewees had anything good to say about the system as a whole. Many mentioned that the elementary schools were good but the middle and high schools were not. However, Watkins points out that at one point many professionals – lawyers, teachers, and higher income parents – would send their kids to public elementary schools but, “weren’t sending their kids to the middle school because the elementary school was 95% Caucasian but when they got middle school it was a mix of Hispanics and AA and Caucasians because six schools fed into the middle school and at that point a lot of parents sent their kids to private schools.” While many pointed to school challenges because of issues of poverty, few explicitly mentioned it as an issue of race. However, looking at examples given by the superintendent, it does appear that race is connected to the negative perception of the school system.

While this did not illicit the same level of disapproval, interviewees were concerned about both actual levels of safety in the city and perceived levels of safety in the city: “Perception of safety is as important as the reality itself” (Crist, Interview). No interviewee shared any personal stories of crime however, many mentioned that they started to notice more break-ins reported in the news and were generally feeling that while crime watches were positive and helped, crime was still an issue. However interviewees spoke explicitly of both the crime that exists within the city and the crime that travels through the city. The police chief made it clear that Hammond does have its own crime but also must deal with the passing through crime due to its geographic location. The crossroads nature of Hammond that once lent itself to industry, commerce
and railroad traffic also lends itself to opportunistic crime over the Illinois/Indiana state line and the alleged passing through of crime between Chicago and Gary (Miller, Interview; Barretta, Interview).

Jobs were also on the minds of interviewees. Many spoke of the days of job abundance in the 1960s and into the 1970s. For years they have seen manufacturing jobs dry up and either be shipped overseas or become automated. While the casinos have helped fill a void in the job market, many still felt that there are not enough available living wage jobs in the area. Those that have jobs were beginning to feel the strain of increased costs of living without any wage increases. One interviewee saw connection between the crime and the jobs: “With the unemployment rate the way it is, with the crime rate, if you don’t have income you’re gonna need some kind of way whether it’s selling drugs or breaking in and stealing something you can later sell” (Community Leader 2, Interview).

Some interviewees connected crime and a lack of jobs with the influx of Section 8 residents. While there was some blaming of the residents themselves there was also blaming of absentee landlords that allow too many people to share a house simply to make more profit off of their rent. These new residents were also often linked to increased gang activity that was not perceived to be present in Hammond prior to the new arrivals. Some stated that the new residents are from the “Projects” that were demolished in Chicago, IL and that they came to Hammond because of abundance of affordable rental housing. Other interviewees appreciated the affordable housing in the area but simply wanted new residents to respect the property. Interviewees spoke of a the new residents as coming from a “completely different” culture which included a perceived
lack of manners, not using the sidewalk and playing music loud late into the night. This also included gang activity, drug activity, illegal weapon activity and retaliation for those that reported crimes (Dent, King, Interviews). The influx of low income individuals is also an influx of predominantly Black individuals. Interviewees specifically said that the issue was not about race but rather about the different culture that they brought with them inherently related to their low income status. Along with that also came disruption in the school system because many families move regularly and additional resources are needed since many of the students were behind academically. The new residents are perceived by some interviewees as a drain on city resources in housing, education and police expenses.

Another challenge that Hammond faces is its lack of diverse housing options and no new room to build. Most of Hammond’s stock is made up of modest single family homes with five rooms built before 1960 (US Census, 2010). Interviewees noted that this lack of housing diversity did not help to attract young professionals; very few condos exist in the city of Hammond. There is no clear blight in the city that would be torn down for such new housing. Rather there are occasional vacant lots. There is also no push toward gentrification that many residents would welcome. Instead the static housing stock fails to attract the young professionals that many interviewees craved to have come back to the city. Apart from housing, Hammond also does not have a lot of available land for large construction of new buildings, especially no new space to build schools. The superintendent spoke of looking for land to build a new high school and coming up only with land that was declared toxic and not suitable for a school. This lack of diversity in housing and no impetus to build new housing along with the lack of vacant
land is both a blessing and a curse for Hammond. The lack of blight speaks well to the community but it also stunts its opportunities to diversity the incomes of those attracted to their city.

Finally, concerns were raised that without good leaders in positions of power that the stability of the community could be threatened. As previously mentioned most interviewees were very satisfied with the mayor’s performance and leadership. However, others were concerned that there were not more leaders like him at organizations across the city working together to improve the city of Hammond and working to strategically think and take action around issues of race and ethnicity. Issues of race and racism are still part of the history of Northwestern Indiana and according to their Quality of Life Council racism in northwest Indiana is the regions “Achilles’ Heel” (Lowery, Interview). One leader explained the inability to address the issue in terms of ignoring a cost benefit analysis:

There is a lot of dialogue going on. There is still a lot of heavy lifting to do. This isn’t an easy topic and yeah there are a lot of people who understand the issue and are willing to confront and work on the issue but from an organizational stand point but if you look at the composite of all the individuals you have to deal with this isn’t one of those burning topics that people want to address as their primary issue. But unless we start addressing it… I don’t think people understand the economic consequence of our inability to get along. That’s one of my pet peeves that I’ve been trying to get people to understand and that’s that we don’t get people to talk about diversity in economic terms. We talk about it on a moral high ground. And we’ve got to get back into what does it cost me to live in the suburbs? My insurance rates, my car rates, my gas rates. What’s it costing me not to be diverse and not understand diversity as a value? (Lowery, Interview)

Many interviewees spoke of positive relationships among Hammond residents with occasional tensions along issues of race, ethnicity and income but the structural racism present in the school system or the potential structural racism present in the College
Bound program was not directly acknowledged. Policies were much improved from previous decades and many felt that there was a lot of positive momentum around issues of race. However, as the Quality of Life Council reported, it is clear that racism, while less overt, is still part of the history of Northwestern Indiana.

Factors with Ambiguous Affect

While many responses presented clear threats and strengths of Hammond’s diversity and stability, some were more ambiguous. A few interviewees voiced concern that the Census data simply reflected what they feared: that demographically Hammond is diverse but also that Hammond’s different populations are isolated and have limited meaningful interactions. They also feared that there might be a temporary and artificial nature to Hammond’s diversity. The towns to the south have ordinances that will not allow for larger apartment buildings and have more or less made affordable housing nonexistent in those communities, “So as a result poor Whites don’t have the option to leave Hammond. It’s incomplete to say they’ve (the city) done something right necessarily. It could be that they’ve had no other option that’s worth taking a look at” (Lowery, Interview). Others mentioned that while the casino revenue right now is still abundant, if the Governor of Illinois allows it, casinos might also be opening in Chicago thereby taking some of Horseshoe Casino’s revenue. They also mentioned that because casino revenue goes directly to the city, people in the community do not have to organize themselves and work together to brainstorm new ideas or plans of action to get the services they need and want. Rather, the mayor and city hall are given the discretion to do with the money (within certain guidelines) what they see fit. No one mentioned what might happen to programs such as College Bound casino revenues lessened.
Hammond, Indiana’s Potential

Hammond, Indiana while facing its strengths and its challenges is still full of hopeful people with many ideas for how to transform Hammond into a post manufacturing city. Hammond became a city based on industry because of its location; in the eyes of many interviewees this location is also what will enable Hammond’s transformation. First and foremost, people spoke of Hammond’s proximity to Chicago. While some said this helped stabilize the community and allowed some to commute and still live in Hammond it is also an attribute that many believe can transform the city. While Hammond is not in Illinois, it is much closer to Chicago than many of Chicago’s western suburbs. Hammond also has much lower taxes and is on Lake Michigan. If different aspects of the city, especially the school system and the perception of public safety can be improved, Hammond has the potential to attract higher income residents to further diversify income and hopefully continue to stabilize the community.

Along with Hammond’s proximity to Chicago people spoke of the ample transportation available to move about the region. While the bus system within the city has shut down there is the South Shore Commuter Rail which again is excellent transportation for Chicago commuters. Hammond is also surrounded by the Interstate 90 which is Indiana’s toll road and Interstate 80/94 which runs south of the city. Both of these roads lead to Chicago.

The final consideration for location is Hammond’s potential for a beautiful natural lake front. There is a plan that already has federal funding:

Our congressman Pete Visclosky has for 20 years got funding for the Marquette plan which is to reclaim 80% of the shore line from the IL line all the way over to Michigan City. It’s gotten a lot of federal funding. He was supported by Gov. Mitch Daniels who created something called; it’s a funding vehicle that’s a
Regional Development Authority (RDA) and they are pouring millions of dollars in to a 50 year effort to reclaim the shore line. Whiting has new parks being created, bike trails. The RDA funds come from the long-term lease of the Indiana toll road. And a portion of it also comes on a flow basis from the gaming boats. If all of this continues you are going to hit a certain point where all of the sudden you are going to have the potential of those arts communities in Whiting, in Miller, in North Hammond, perhaps (Lowery, Interview).

Along with the lake front of Lake Michigan, Hammond has the natural resource of Wolf Lake. There the city has built a pavilion for concerts and other entertainment to utilize. Many interviewees cited this as a public space shared by many of Hammond’s residents while also attracting residents from surrounding towns and cities to enjoy its space. Hammond hosts a “Festival of Lakes” at the pavilion every summer with a schedule of music, food and entertainment for five days in July.

Apart from location near the lake and near Chicago, interviewees are full of hope in their young people and the opportunities that organizations within the city offered them. For example, the mayor coaches his son’s little league baseball team and is extremely proud of the work he and the city did to redevelop an old school into a well utilized baseball complex:

I pulled into the parking lot last season, it’s like eight o’clock at night on a Wednesday or Thursday in the summer time. It’s 85 degrees outside and I get out of the car after finding a parking spot and I look at there are literally 500 people on this baseball field watching kids; kids playing in the swings, standing in line for the concession stand, kids skate boarding, kids riding their bikes, and I just sat there and thought, man this is cool. You know? Because when I took over this was an abandoned school and it was servicing no purpose whatsoever and we turned into a community hub and the thing about that isn’t a really nice complex so kids from all over the city go there to play and it’s very diverse. I was talking about my all-star team. You have to see it. It’s America at its best. It’s African American mingling with Hispanics mingling with Asians, people that are volunteering, we have people in the league whose kids have not played in the league in five years and they are still volunteering there (McDermott, Interview).
The mayor emphasized that the new ballpark serves as a social seam where families of all backgrounds come to spend time and it also serves as an opportunity for all members of the community to socially interact.

Interviewees do not have much hope that the current leaders or generations will be able to solve the tensions that come with racial and ethnic diversity. The interviewees feared that many adults are too stuck in their ways to learn to be more tolerant. However, it is not too late for the youth. An exemplary program outside of Hammond is a group called STAND:

Race Relations Council is working with a group called STAND out of Merrillville High School and wants to create these groups throughout the high schools of Northern Indiana and what they do is they work on Diversity. Students Together And Naturally Diverse so what they do is meeting and celebrate cultural celebrations thought the year to let people know what they are doing. And they look at diversity and demographics and stats and share that among themselves sand do study circle and what it means to be divers and when they get to understand it and believe it more they get to go to the grade schools and talk about diversity and those kinds of issues. And that has been a bench mark and a strong light of optimism in Northern Indiana that that is working. They’ve’ opened up secondary sites in Portage and Valparaiso and the hope of the Race Relations Council is to expand STAND throughout all the high schools in Northwest, IN (Martinez, Interview).

Leaders are currently working to have this program implemented in Hammond Public Schools.

**Uptown**

Uptown has for the past few decades been a neighborhood on the edge of being “the next up and coming” community area in the city of Chicago: ripe for new development, investment and change. In many ways this has also meant that it is on the edge of losing its sustained diverse population and poorer residents are pushed out due to un-affordability. While leaders often shared similar opinions of what might be viewed as
either an opportunity or a challenge in Hammond, Uptown’s historic internal battles make the differentiation between opportunities and challenges much more a matter of perspective and often lends itself to conflict and division. This paper however focuses on what opportunities will sustain and which obstacles will challenge the diversity of Uptown according to these interviews.

What Sustains Uptown’s Diversity

Leaders consistently spoke of a few components that worked to sustain Uptown; mostly around issues of social and physical infrastructure. Many of the social components were already discussed in the political and civic structure of the neighborhood. This included the network of nonprofits, the coordinated effort to impact policy to encourage and support affordable housing, the multitude of different organizations representing most segments of the community and the sustained political will to support these structures.

Parallel to the infrastructure of the nonprofits and the political will of the leadership comes the physical infrastructure of the housing stock itself. As it was mentioned in Uptown’s history, the neighborhood has many different housing opportunities. This includes single-family homes of modest, moderate and wealthy means, many rental units and a growing number of condo units. This often means that there is a wealth of options for families, couples and singles to find a home. The diversity of housing stock also caters to a diversity of incomes including the wealthiest and the some of the poorest and the homeless. The infrastructure that supports the poorest and the homeless include and number of homeless shelters and about 5,896 subsidized housing units which make up 18.2% of the total housing stock according to
data from 2002 (Nyden et al., 2002: 19). This includes scatter site Section 8 rental units and at least ten large building made up of unit based Section 8 housing (Nyden et al., 2002). While there is not necessarily high levels of racial diversity in the different types of housing - especially among the higher income housing - the diversity of housing options still helps support the sustained racial diversity of the neighborhood as a whole.

Another form of infrastructure that lends itself to stability is Uptown’s availability of public transportation, which caters to all segments of the population with easy transportation to the loop via bus or rail. Whether residents panhandle for their bus fare or purchase month passes, the accessibility to the Red Line and express buses to the Loop offer all residents the perks of Uptown’s prime public transportation location. Uptown’s proximity to Lake Michigan and Lake Shore Drive also offers residents with a vehicle an easy way to live in the neighborhood and work elsewhere. The lake and the park system that borders it also work to create a structure and an opportunity for a diverse group of people to enjoy the space: “Even if you’re not doing a structured activity there, you can just go there and sit under a tree in the summertime. If you have no money you can take your kids there” (Nunez, Interview).

The presence of activities and organizations that represent all segments of the population also serve to sustain Uptown’s diversity (Shiller, Interview). There is a constant diversity of activities going on whether it a rally around a housing policy, a music class at People’s Music School, a celebration of a specific ethnic heritage via a mutual aid association, a play at the Black Ensemble theater, a block club cookout or a religious gathering thus, there is a social or political niche for almost everyone in the community.
Another aspect of the community that contributes to its sustained diversity is the people themselves. A tenant leader when asked what sustains Uptown said the following:

I think the people. I think the people make a decision to move here and that included the wealthy people on Castlewood. Those people are not going anywhere. They had decided to stay in this community. It’s people. It’s not business. It’s the people. They wouldn’t want to go anywhere. They like it here. The rich like it here, the poor like it here, the homeless people like it here. (Reed, Interview).

With so many different types of people that like this community and feel ownership and responsibility for how it develops, Uptown has also built an internal culture of tension. Within Uptown’s history, many of it is residents, especially in the late 20th Century, found their way to Uptown because of displacement from some other community and found acceptance in Uptown, especially the poor and the disenfranchised (Shiller, interview). Tension is also part of the culture because so many different worlds coexist within Uptown (Nunez, interview). Today there are new residents moving into the neighborhood who are not familiar with its history. They simply see homeless people and a place ripe to be reshaped to fit the needs of the new comers (Nunez, interview). However it is this tension in the past that has caused the people of Uptown to organize and to fight for sustainable diversity. They fought through preservation of Section 8 HUD prepayments (Nyden et al., 1996; Shiller, Interview; Reed, Interview) and though the constant challenge of an urban housing market pushing for more and more condo conversions (Nyden et al., 2002). It is the tension that causes action which causes changes in policy which works to sustain Uptown’s affordable infrastructure.

What Challenges Uptown’s Diversity

As was made clear in the previous chapter, Uptown is in a moment of transition both politically and civically. These moments of flux put Uptown in a vulnerable
position and challenge its stability. The racial stability of the neighborhood is challenged by redevelopment of properties without strong advocates for affordable housing. This also results in the polarization of residents. The previous alderman Helen Shiller was a strong advocate for supporting and finding new ways to encourage not only the neighborhood but also the city to maintain and make available additional affordable housing across Chicago. She championed ordinances and worked closely with developers in order to find feasible solutions to ensure that there was housing available to everyone who needed it (Shiller, Nunez, Reed, Gall, Interviews). For years Shiller’s relationships and actions prioritized these policies. She found herself ever present in the tension that exists in Uptown around working to improve the community while also fighting for equal distribution of the benefits of the improvement: “I made sure that there was some segment in the housing stock for maybe the next 10-20 years - because everything has to be renewed or rehabbed or whatever - as stable and affordable. Whether that stays that way or other things come that way is entirely dependent on two dynamics: what people do and what happens in the market” (Shiller, Interview).

It is these two dynamics –people and the market- that are most likely to upset the stable diversity of Uptown. Shiller spoke of the challenges she often faced with property owners in the community and the common attitude many of them had: “I’m supposed to be able to move to a community; be able to benefit from its redevelopment so my property becomes more valuable and then therefore, I have a decent retirement, but I don’t have to worry about how that impacts other people” (Shiller, interview). It is the tendency towards and exclusive community that often comes with homeownership that Shiller sought to push back on. Without push back from political officials such as
herself, the market will more than likely work to push Uptown toward unaffordability and therefore inevitably resegregate though the housing displacement of the poor who typically in Uptown are residents of color. Without Helen Shiller working to stem the tide of the markets locally and citywide, Uptown’s diversity will be challenged by the larger housing market, its prime location and the attractiveness of the amenities that the area has to offer.

The tension around real estate values and displacement of long-term residents has led to polarization among renters and new homeowners which threatens the community’s stability. A lingering tension that one interviewee saw is the willful ignorance of newcomers:

People don’t understand and don’t want to understand that this neighborhood is a multi-ethnic diverse community. And they have a tendency to shun people that live in Section 8 buildings and things of that nature but they don’t even understand the dynamics of these programs… everyone is receiving some sort of subsidy program from the government (Reed, interview).

From within many of these new residents who do not want to understand the history and dynamics of the neighborhood, there is a vocal minority that fiercely opposed Helen Shiller and her efforts to support affordable housing. As a resident of Uptown and a community organizer during Chicago’s municipal elections in 2007 I saw the polarization that developed between those that supported Helen Shiller and those that opposed her. While Shiller won in 2007 she retired and did not run in the 2011 election. One could argue that the election of James Cappleman is a reaction to Helen Shiller’s affordable housing policies and being perceived as soft on crime. Those who support the unbridled housing market and welcomed gentrification viewed her as holding back Uptown’s real estate and investment potential. Those who supported her wanted to sustain affordable
housing and better services -especially for the poor- in Uptown and not just allow redevelopment by and for the wealthy. With the tendency toward reaction and polarization instead of healthy tension causing change and growth, Uptown yet again finds itself on a delicate balance of figuring out how the haves, the have nots and those somewhere in the middle can all live, thrive and benefit from what the neighborhood has to offer. Realizing the dream of many residents that Uptown can be invested in and improved without displacing the most vulnerable in the community is an ongoing challenge.

Factors of Ambiguous Effect

Uptown presently sits in the constant tension of existing as a sustained diverse community while flirting with the idea of gentrification. In many other Chicago neighborhoods, gentrification has lead to racial homogenization. Interviewees cited the gentrification of Lincoln Park as the direction that Uptown seemed to be headed. Therefore, the categorization of factors of ambiguous effect is much different than those faced by Hammond since Hammond’s diversity would benefit from some gentrification. While Hammond is working hard to attract middle class White homeowners to live within its city in order to preserve its sustained mix, Uptown’s sustained mix is potentially threatened by an influx of White homeowners while still thirsting for improved services and more reinvestment within the community. Factors that are clear challenges or clear opportunities in Hammond are not as clear in Uptown. These factors include new wealth, a potentially revitalized entertainment district, perceived levels of crime and the presence of the chronically homeless. Because the following factors are double-edged swords, they will be classified as ambiguous.
As stated earlier Uptown’s location next to the lake and transportation accessibility to downtown makes it an attractive place for new investment. The neighborhood could benefit from new investment with the revitalization of shopping areas and rehabbing residential and entertainment spaces to their original splendor. The fear that many interviewees mentioned with the new investment is the risk of rising costs of living thereby pushing people out of the neighborhood and threatening its diversity. Currently an investor, Flats Chicago, has bought rundown apartment buildings throughout the neighborhood and is currently gut-rehabbing them in order to rent them as luxury apartments. If this new wealth and new development become the new trend, the neighborhood’s retail value will definitely increase. However it will also become less affordable and thereby change the mix of the residents of the neighborhood. In order for a community to sustain itself, the infrastructure must be well maintained and updated. The ambiguous affect of the reinvestment is the question of who benefits and who pays the greater price.

Another ambiguous affect is the potential redevelopment of the entertainment district in the heart of the neighborhood. Three large theaters were built in the 1920s and while two are still open and serving as music venues, the third theater, the Uptown Theater, is in disrepair and has been shuttered since 1986. Mayor Rahm Emanuel released a plan in January to redevelop Uptown into the entertainment district which it once was. This again raised the suspicion of interviewees. While everyone thought it would be very exciting to have the theaters restored to their original splendor, the question again was asked,

“Are they seeing the neighborhood residents as just consumers of it or are they seeing stake holders? …It’s not about development. It’s about what you’re stake
in the development is. Are you making a decision?... so that it isn’t just some decision that got made by the mayor and it gets imposed on us and we have to live around it... it’s about can you engage us about it and we’ll give you feedback on what it needs to look like so that it meets your needs, but that it also meets our needs (Nunez, Interview).

How the city and the investors engage the larger community will have a huge impact on whether the development of an entertainment district helps sustain the neighborhood or threatens its stability.

The final two factors of ambiguous affect revolve around the negative perceptions of the neighborhood: high crime and the prevalence of the chronically homeless. Interviewees repeated again and again that they wanted to see Uptown become even safer than it is but stressed that often the that it is the perception of a lack of safety instead of actual crime rates that give Uptown a reputation as a dangerous area. The prevalence of homeless individuals was acknowledged as a reality that requires additional services. The ambiguous affect of the negative perception of Uptown is that its reputation might work to stave off rampant gentrification and therefore slow down the process of displacement and instability. Again, interviewees wanted to see services improve and crime rates drop without simply kicking people out of the neighborhood: “How can we maintain and sustain this community? How can we keep the drug dealers out of the neighborhood? The gangbangers? How can we improve our community? How can we keep this community the way it is; full of diversity?” (Reed, Interview).

Uptown’s Future

Uptown while it has been sustainably diverse for decades still finds itself on the edge of a new era. If the residents of Uptown of all socioeconomic backgrounds are able to come together to celebrate diversity and sustain the infrastructure including social
service agencies and affordable housing, Uptown might not immediately become the next Lincoln Park, a very affluent Chicago neighborhood. However, if community engagement stalls and powerbrokers in city government and real estate solely decide what reinvestment will look like in Uptown, its tenure as a sustained diverse community might be coming to an end.
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION

Hammond and Uptown find themselves at different ends of a pendulum swing in the challenges they face to maintain their stable racial diversity. Hammond is struggling to maintain a stable population that is experiencing an influx of low income people of color which has led to transience in schools, and a perception of increased crime. At the same time this is happening, many of the older generation of White residents are passing away and their children have not remained in the community. Hammond also faces the perpetual challenge it has faced since the 1970s: finding good paying jobs to replace those lost in post industrialization. Hammond residents often drive out of town for employment. Yet, the reverse is also true: Hammond city employees often live in neighboring towns because of better schools because they can afford it and drive into Hammond to work. This has led to a dwindling tax base going into the school system and further challenges in attracting new business and high income residents; especially young single professionals.

Uptown in contrast is facing an increase in higher income White residents with fewer children. This has led to the planned closure of public schools due to lower enrollment. Social service agencies are shutting their doors due to decreased funding. In the meantime, social service agency employees cannot afford to live in Uptown due to its rising rents, increased property values and a disappearing affordable housing
market. Uptown residents without subsidized rents are being pushed out as it becomes less affordable thereby increasing the gap between rich and poor.

While these communities find themselves on different ends of the pendulum with the challenges new residents bring to them they also find themselves in different structural contexts. Hammond has been for generations a city sustained by its manufacturing base. The homes are predominantly single family and most were built before 1960. The memories of many interviewees spoke of times of relative wealth and prosperity and an abundance of work to be done. Uptown’s structural context was initially a suburban oasis from the smoky city of Chicago. No manufacturing base exists but instead it was structured around huge entertainment venues, hotels and the lakefront. Because of these differences one cannot firmly argue that Hammond is in a different stage of sustained diversity than Uptown. Hammond and Uptown are rather on different tracks of sustained diversity. This does not exclude them from learning things from each other but it does not allow for a simple categorization of stages of racial integration.

One important similarity to note between the two communities is that both can be categorized as “diverse-by-circumstance.” Granted, these circumstances as previously noted are quite different from one another but they have produced similar racial mixes. Both represent multi-ethnic and multiracial populations, which came together through a combination of government policies and market forces. Both communities also have low-income residents and the availability of affordable housing. Each of these characteristics mirrors the findings and profiles of diverse communities discussed by Nyden et al. (1998).
Both communities have also seen the dwindling power of social institutions. Hammond now more than ever could benefit from its nonprofits, churches, schools and government agencies working together to address the new challenges that new residents have brought to the community. Without strong cooperation of these institutions and clear leadership from its members, Hammond will struggle to intentionally address many of the challenges that it currently faces. Hammond’s laissez faire attitude toward cooperation and toward celebrating, sustaining and cultivating its diversity, will potentially cause it to continue to struggle with its schools, crime and unfamiliar neighbors. Uptown who has a much longer history as a diverse community finds itself as a constant battle ground between the haves and the have nots. ONE and Alderman Shiller worked with lower income residents to create policies and establish safeguards against losing Uptown’s affordability and diversity. With both of those power players no longer holding places of influence, the battles in Uptown are going to be less balanced. With the funding being cut and new powers including the new alderman seemingly attacking nonprofits and refusing to work with established civic organizations, Uptown’s social service infrastructure is at risk. Without compromises that address the needs of both new comers and established residents and agencies, Uptown will lose rich cultural diversity that has come to define the community.

**Best Practices and Future Action**

While no community is the same, Uptown and Hammond both have best practices and lessons learned that can translate to many other communities. These suggestions for best practices and future action are not grandiose policy statements or intricate understanding of local economics, crime, schools or housing policies. Rather these
suggestions are offered as building blocks for sustainable relationships, which according to many of the interviewees is one of the key components to building a healthy, sustainable community.

**Beware of the Mythology of the Past**

An increase in racial diversity often comes because of a change in a community’s history. Interviewees often spoke of the “good ole’ days.” However while these days often offered communities the heights of their economic prosperity, they also usually offer the heights of their homogeneity. Both Hammond’s and Uptown’s glory days were predominantly enjoyed by White residents. Granted Hammond had many different ethnic European immigrants but the majority of the population was still predominantly racially White. This mythology and memory of the past forgets about the exclusion of people of color that was in place. It also has the potential to undercut the beauty of what a newly diverse community can offer.

**Beware of Vilifying the Poor**

Along with celebrating the mythology of the past, presently diverse communities often find themselves with new challenges of an increase in the number of lower income residents. The frustration that these challenges create can manifest itself in coded racism toward newcomers to who also often happen to be families of color. It can encourage stereotypes that all people of color in a community are poor or that the only poor in the community are the people of color. This causes an “us versus them” mentality and leads to a general breakdown in respect and communication in communities.
Celebrate, Embrace and Support Diversity.

Since diversity in many American communities is an anomaly, it is especially important that community members have an opportunity to celebrate the richness that comes with a diversity of backgrounds. One example includes ethnic festivals and events celebrating different heritages. This allows for community members to come together and potentially have meaningful interaction. It also offers the potential for education and the breaking down of “otherness” that can exist between unfamiliar cultures. Concerning economics and positive news, these events have the potential to attract residents from outside the community to spend time and money within these diverse communities thereby helping to break down the negative reputations that often surround these communities. These celebrations highlight the positive aspects and richness that diverse communities can uniquely contribute.

Another key aspect to embracing diversity is working to shift rhetoric so that newcomers to communities, even if they pose initial monetary challenges upon the community, are understood as offering a net gain to the community. Often population changes can be jarring and disconcerting at first. As this population shift happens, communities’ concept of self must shift with it. Diverse communities can reach their potential for cultural richness and breaking down of barriers if they are able to embrace their new identities. Claiming oneself as a diverse community with all the challenges and benefits that come with this identity is one of the first steps to building new and strong relationships among groups from all aspects of the community.

Supporting diversity can come about in a few different fashions. One of the most effective ways is often through community organizing. As it was made clear in Uptown,
organizing around issues of common interest not only helps to address an issue in the neighborhood but also builds relationships among people of different organizations who might not otherwise interact. Relational organizing as practiced by Organization of the NorthEast also worked to professionally connect service providers to work together not only to collectively fight for funding and additional services but also to streamline services. ONE in many ways helped create the infrastructure necessary to support social service agencies and therefore the stable diversity of the community.

Relational organizing also seeks to develop local leadership. Diverse communities cannot only depend upon government leaders to fight to support diversity; local civic leaders must also develop their skills in order to hold elected officials accountable and aware of the challenges faced by diverse communities. The Hammond Hispanic Community Committee has worked to develop leadership by sending its members to leadership trainings and have also worked to organize around issues in Hammond that affect the Latino community. Building these professional and social relationships through organizing can ideally also help organizations put aside the infighting and turf wars in order to come together around common concerns.

One final key element of supporting a diverse community is through the opportunities and education of its young people around issues of diversity. Over and over again interviewees stressed the importance of the next generation in fully embracing the diversity of changing communities. The STAND program, taking place in Merrillville is a prime example of a community embracing, celebrating and educating in order to support its diversity, especially through its young people.
Sociological Implications

Hammond and Uptown find themselves statistically similar in levels of relative racial diversity and find similar challenges in community cohesion, new residents and negative reputations. They also find themselves in different chapters of finding their identities as integrated communities and in different political, economic, civic and social contexts. These differences while at first might seem disparate and a poor fit for a comparison, it is the differences themselves that forward the sociological discussion of diverse communities. There is no set path for creating or sustaining a diverse community, rather we as researchers must routinely reinvestigate the dynamics, structures and practices that cause change or stagnation in integrated communities. There is a good chance that by the next census Hammond will no longer be in the top 15% most diverse census tracts in the Chicago MSA. Sustained diversity might be yet another closed chapter to its history as a city. Uptown might continue to be one of the most diverse communities in the United States for 20 more years. By comparing and contrasting them, we are able to see an even richer canvas of how diverse communities understand themselves and their context within larger cities and regions. Understanding the social ecology and ever-growing narratives of the individual communities will lend to further discussions and investigations of how we as action oriented academics can contribute to evaluating sustainable diversity.

This research is also relevant because of its focus on Hammond, a small postindustrial city who apart from losing many jobs also feels the impact of urban policy with an influx of former Chicago residents. The experience of the resident leaders in Hammond adds to the conversation of the experience of receiving communities of those
who can no longer afford the city or have the opportunity to move due to Section 8 vouchers. More research needs to be done to further investigate the impact of suburban communities but this research begins to shed light on the changing dynamics at play within such communities.

Research that will further enhance our understanding of diverse communities will be more in depth network analysis. By mapping the relationships between individuals, institutions and government agencies, communities will be able to visualize relationships. Further research and interviews aided by a network analysis will help identify leaders and institutions not represented by this snowball sample of research. This will either confirm or deny the notion of “co-existence” that many interviewees expressed as either a neutral part of a diverse community in a neighborhood like Uptown or as a relational loss in a formerly close-knit city like Hammond.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Questions for Phase Three and Phase Four Interviews with Community Leaders

1) We have selected your community from among hundreds of communities around the country because it has been a stable racially and ethnically diverse community over the past 20 years. What has produced this diversity and this stability? [probe on both aspects of the question]

2) Would you characterize the social relationships among different racial, ethnic, and or economic groups in the community as positive? Are there any tensions?

3) Are their particular organizations or institutions that have helped to produce diversity and stability in this community? What is the role of religious congregations? What is the role of realtors? What is the role of local government? Or local elected officials? Are there any particularly influential large employers?

4) Are there any distinctive characteristics of businesses in this area that have contributed to its diversity? Are there businesses that serve particular segments of the community? Are there businesses that serve all segments of the community?

5) How important is the quality of schools to the stability of this community?

6) How important are community safety issues to the stability of this community?

7) In some of our past work we discovered that there are "social seams" in many of the stable diverse communities. These are places where all groups comfortably intermingle in public or where there may be even more significant social interactions. These can be parks, business districts, or schools to name a few. Are there any such social seams in your community? Have they always been there? Do you think they will continue to exist in future years?

8) Are there particular organizations that have as their central purpose the promotion of diversity and positive relationships among the various groups in this community?

9) [To be asked in multi-racial, multi-ethnic communities] In some diverse communities studied, we found that because there were many different racial, ethnic and economic groups and not just one "dominant" group, different groups representing different racial or ethnic groups were more likely to work together for a common purpose to look out for overall community interests. Is that true here?

Specifically probe the role of:
- government
- religious congregations
- schools
- mutual aid societies
Some say that diverse communities are inherently unstable and will inevitably desegregate, do you think this is the case? Do you think your community is unstable?

What are the primary obstacles or challenges in sustaining a diverse community?

Thirty years from now do you think [COMMUNITY NAME] will look the same as it does today?

Are there things that you think local, state, or federal government should be doing to promote more stable, diverse communities?

What is the relationship between income, race, and ethnicity in this community? Are racial differences more relevant? Or income differences more relevant?

What are the top concerns today among residents in [COMMUNITY NAME]? [after initial answers, probe for community safety, schools]

Are there any other factors not already discussed that have contributed to the stable diversity of your community?

Probe for issues found in our earlier research:
- Attractive aspects of this community, e.g. nearby mountains, location along a waterway
- Stalled economic development
- Variety of housing stock (e.g. single-family homes and rental apartments)
- Proximity to a central business district
APPENDIX B

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Community Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAMMOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlotta King</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>1/21/2011</td>
<td>Diner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Lowery</td>
<td>St. Joseph Calumet College</td>
<td>3/28/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Rick Orlinski</td>
<td>St. John Bosco Church</td>
<td>4/4/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Dedelow</td>
<td>Catholic Charities/Former Mayor of Hammond</td>
<td>4/4/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Crist</td>
<td>Calumet College/Diocese of Gary</td>
<td>4/6/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Martinez</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>11/16/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Poland</td>
<td>Former City Council Member</td>
<td>12/7/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Becerra</td>
<td>Hammond Housing Authority</td>
<td>12/7/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Alexander</td>
<td>Hammond Housing Authority</td>
<td>12/5/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leader 2</td>
<td>United Federation</td>
<td>12/10/2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Lawson</td>
<td>Indiana State Representative &amp; Former Police Officer</td>
<td>7/8/2012</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Walter Watkins</td>
<td>Superintendent of Hammond Schools</td>
<td>10/5/2011</td>
<td>Hammond Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Walker</td>
<td>Ofelia Steen Center &amp; Former Police Officer</td>
<td>10/16/2012</td>
<td>Ofelia Steen Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas McDermott</td>
<td>Current Hammond Mayor</td>
<td>10/16/2012</td>
<td>Hammond Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertine Dent</td>
<td>Retired Hammond School Board</td>
<td>10/16/2012</td>
<td>Ofelia Steen Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Miller</td>
<td>Current Hammond Police Chief</td>
<td>12/5/2012</td>
<td>Hammond Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Barretta</td>
<td>Hammond Hispanic Community Committee</td>
<td>1/4/2013</td>
<td>Diner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Planer</td>
<td>Hammond Hispanic Community Committee</td>
<td>1/16/2013</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Hinojosa</td>
<td>Current City Council Member</td>
<td>12/23/2012</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPTOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Gall</td>
<td>Executive Director of Alternatives Inc.</td>
<td>12/20/2013</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Patti Nakai</td>
<td>Pastor of Buddist Temple of Chicago</td>
<td>12/5/2012</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Nunez</td>
<td>Executive Director of Centro Romero</td>
<td>12/13/2012</td>
<td>Centro Romero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Reed</td>
<td>Tenant Leader</td>
<td>1/17/2013</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Shiller</td>
<td>Former 46th Ward Alderman</td>
<td>1/18/2013</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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