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INTRODUCTION

Undoubtedly few would dispute the claim that among the most significant outbreaks of urban violence in recent years have been the riots which took place in and around the hundreds of black ghettos strewn across the fabric of urban America. Likewise few would reject the claim that urban riots developed as a result of the culminating pressing problems within the urban community, although it would be premature to accept the view that the apparent decline in urban rioting on the part of Black Americans also reflects a corresponding reduction in the seriousness of the problems. For example, many observers contend that there was a precipitous decline in urban rioting after 1967, the year during which massive rebellions broke out in the cities of Newark and Detroit. The central focus of this study is on urban riots – particularly those that occurred in Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland during the years 1965-1969.

It is the writer’s contention that there are existing weaknesses in the empirical literature on ghetto riots. One of the most serious weaknesses rests in the fact that many of the theories and/or assumptions put forth in attempts to explain aspects of urban rioting lack careful and rigorous empirical testing. An attempt will be
made to examine systematically research material in the area of urban riots for the purpose of clarifying and testing several commonplace theories and/or assumptions. In the final analysis, this study will attempt to answer three basic questions: What theories have been offered to explain the emergence and evolution of rioting? What is the relationship between the degree of riot severity and the level of black political representation? What did the riots accomplish for Black Americans?

The plan of the study is the following. Chapter One provides an analysis and description of racial violence in America from a historical perspective. The writer assumes that it would be premature to examine the significant outbreaks of urban violence that exploded in hundreds of American cities without first examining their historical underpinnings.

Secondly, an attempt will be made to examine what has been put forth as some probable underlying causes and characteristics of Communal Riots, Commodity Riots, and Sniping.

Chapter Two grapples with the problem of concept and concept formation in the social sciences. Specifically, this chapter examines how concepts function in general theories (in particular, how rioting as a political concept functions in a general theory of violence) to aid in our abilities to make scientific explanations and predictions. Moreover, an attempt will be made to "operationalize" the notion of rioting and to determine its theoretical and empirical import.
The second section of Chapter Two includes a review of a variety of popular and social science theories and explanations which have been utilized in examinations of urban violence. An attempt will also be made to offer some exploratory notes directed toward developing neglected areas in theorizing about urban violence.

Chapter Three sets forth the theory that guides the empirical research in this study. Moreover, it includes the purpose of the study, hypotheses generated, general background, demographic and economic trends in the cities under investigation, methodology and data sources utilized, findings, discussion, and an analysis and interpretation of the data.

Chapter Four embodies the basis thesis of the study: stability and change. The writer analyzes the co‐existence of the two and questions the virtues of stability if it stifles meaningful political change. Moreover, the writer examines the necessity of violence in a democratic pluralistic society. It is assumed throughout this study that violence is not an isolated act set apart from society's "normal" or "nonviolent" state, but rather an extension of it. Lastly, the writer assumes that the day to day manifestations of violence in America clearly illuminates the violent tradition ingrained in our democratic society.
CHAPTER ONE

RACIAL VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

White aggression against blacks has been so prevalent and common place that whites, and blacks who have been living with the "American Dilemma" since the 17th century, have come to accept it as a basic feature of the American way of life. If a dilemma is defined as a situation requiring a choice between two equally undesirable alternatives, one wonders if the contradiction between the equalitarian American Creed and oppression has not been solved—or—whether or not there has ever been an "American Dilemma" of which Gunnar Myrdal spoke. Indeed, Charles E. Silberman argues that there has never been an "American Dilemma," that whites are not torn and tortured by the plight of blacks. He concludes that Black Americans are offered two equally undesirable choices. On the one hand to acquiesce in slavery and caste would mean enduring misery and degradation, while to lash out against the status quo was to invite brutality and oppression. As Martin Luther King, Jr. notes, after centuries of struggle against the white power structure, blacks are outnumbered and have no access to the means of organized violence.
In a violent racial situation, the power structure has the local police, the state troopers, the national guard and finally the army to call on, all of which are predominantly white.... It is perfectly clear that a violent revolution on the part of American blacks would find no sympathy and support from the white population and very little from the majority of the Negroes themselves.

Black resistance to the status quo has historically provoked a violent white response. In this regard, King made the following observation:⁵

We do not need President Johnson to tell us this by reminding Negro rioters that they are outnumbered ten to one. The courageous efforts of our own insurrectionist brothers, such as Denmark Vesey and Nat Turner, should be eternal reminders to us that violent rebellion is doomed from the start. In violent warfare one must be prepared to face the fact that there will be casualties by the thousands. Anyone leading a violent rebellion must be willing to make an honest assessment regarding the possible casualties to a minority population confronting a well-armed, wealthy majority with a fanatical right wing that would delight in exterminating thousands of black men, women, and children.

As the Civil Rights Movement temporarily derailed the oppressive hand of McCarthyism during the 1950s, Black Americans would at long last sharpen the twin horns of the white dilemma, and thereby force its resolution. Whether it will be resolved in favor of the equalitarian creed is by no means certain, for it is possible that under extreme stress American society will choose security over freedom and order over justice - which translated may mean the extermination of Black Americans.⁶

The theme of stability and change is prevalent in American Politics. However, can the two co-exist? Have we stifled change
in our zest to maintain stability? The fact that we have lived nearly 200 years without a successful domestic revolution and more than 100 years without a serious attempt at rebellion reflects the stability of our political system. Martin Luther King, Jr. would argue that the moral weakness in the American political system lies in its rigidity and resistance to change. King sees the American political system as one unable to meet the changing needs of a complex society, a government serving the interests of the "haves" and being unresponsive to the needs of the "have-nots." Such rigidity and resistance have served to block access to effective decision-making channels for minority and/or powerless groups to such an extent that the motivation of these groups to resort to violence as a means of expressing their grievances will always be present. It is in the context of this pattern of rigidity and the absence of effective channels for including those outside of the formal decision-making process that we can best view racial riots in this century.

Racial Violence In The Twentieth Century

Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Gurr characterize the sequence of events of the 20th century as a transformation of the Black Americans response to oppression from a defensive to a retaliatory one. That is, "interracial riots in the early years of the century were essentially pogroms in which the Negroes were victims of white
aggression." In contrast to the earlier riots, the riots of the 1960s left fewer blacks dead, the focus of the 1960s riots was essentially on property rather than persons. Deaths occurred primarily as the result of conflict between police and black civilians, rather than between black and white civilians, as had been the case in the early 20th century. 

Morris Janowitz describes racial violence of the 20th century in three stages. "Communal" clashes characterized the first two decades of the century. During this time period, racial riots occurred on the boundaries of expanding black and white neighborhoods. In such circumstances, whites more often than blacks took offensive action. "Commodity riots" marked the second stage of racial violence in America, a stage that began in the pre-World War II years. This new type of racial violence occurred within the black community, not at the periphery. Often triggered by a police incident, the conflict resulted in violent confrontation between the local population and white policemen and property owners. These outbursts often involved assaults against property and retail establishments. Because the confrontation resulted in burning and widespread looting, they can further be described as commodity riots. Janowitz sees commodity riots as being on the decline by the summer of 1968 and being replaced by a more selective, terroristic use of force against whites (primarily the police) by small, organized groups of blacks with unsolidified ideological motives. According to Janowitz, each
stage is an expression of the inequality in the political structure of the United States and the position of the Afro-American in this political structure. 11

Racial Violence And Black Victimization

Before examining the source and nature of racial violence, it is necessary to note that in most instances of interracial violence, blacks have been the victims. 12 This has been the pattern of racial violence since the beginning of the international slave trade, a practice that left an estimated 80 to 100 million blacks dead. 13 During slavery, any type of violence could be used as a means of maintaining the slave system. There were few laws to protect a slave against the violence of a white person. Except for his value as organic capital, the slave could not generally escape acts of violence by white persons.

After the end of slavery, blacks were still subjected to white violence. In place of slavery, a caste system reduced blacks to the status of an oppressed nationality. In the last two decades of the 19th century, Jim Crow laws became prevalent. Blacks were segregated in every area of life— in schools, in restaurants, in trains, in hospitals, etc. Often these practices were enforced illegally. 14 In the South, such enforcement frequently took the form of lynching. Between 1890 and 1900, there were 1,217 recorded lynchings of black men as white society organized to "keep them in their place." 15 Moreover, Frederic Wertham tells us that "between 1882 and 1939 more
than 5,000 Negroes were lynched in the United States, more than 1,800 since the year 1900. These statistics are incomplete, inasmuch as they do not include the countless and unaccounted persons who have been lynched in a clandestine way and just disappeared without getting into the statistics."16

In the beginning of the 20th century, white aggression against blacks outside the South manifested itself in white-dominated race riots. Between 1865 and 1940, over 500 blacks were killed in race riots and organized massacres.17 It was not uncommon during this period to witness the entire white adult population of certain communities in the North and South collectively violate the law by attacking whole communities of blacks. White casualties in these disturbances were seldom, since the violence originated with and was controlled and directed by whites. The one-sided character of racial violence led Myrdal to point out that the so-called race riots were more a "one-way terrorization" than a two-way riot.18 White law officials not only failed to enforce the laws that were violated, but often joined white mobs in the brutal slayings of blacks.

Rayford W. Logan documents six major riots that occurred between 1900 and 1910: two in Springfield, Ohio, one in Greensburg, Indiana; one each in Atlanta, Georgia, and Brownsville, Texas; one in Springfield, Illinois. Logan concedes that the immediate cause of the riots are difficult to determine but points out that the concentration
of blacks in segregated ghettos was a recurring pattern in all of the cities involved in the riots. Thus, he concludes that the anatomy of these six riots charts the underlying causes.19

In Springfield, Ohio (1904), a black man shot and killed a white policeman. Who was the aggressor? Did the black man respond in self-defense? The white mob did not ponder over the immediate nor the legitimate causes. An intensive hatred of blacks led the white mob to hang the black man, riddle his body with bullets, and destroy the black section of Springfield. According to Logan, "Neither there nor in Greensburg, Indiana, 1906, did a judicial body determine the guilt of the accused prior to a similar attack on the Negro part of the town."20

The riot in Brownsville, Texas, August, 1906 involved the Black Twenty-Fifth Regiment, which had fought gallantly at El Caney, Cuba, during the Spanish American War. A fight broke out in the town between the soldiers and a mob of white residents. The melee that followed left one white resident dead by gun-shot wound. It was never determined which soldier had fired the shot. However, by the stroke of a pen, President Theodore Roosevelt dismissed the entire battalion stationed there without honor and disqualified its members for service in either the military or the civil service of the United States.21

The pattern of the anatomy of American race riots in the first decade of the 20th century had been established by 1908 in the
Springfield, Illinois riots. This pattern involved the alleged rape of a white woman by a black man. Logan points out that "the evidence did not matter; indeed, an admission by the woman before a special grand jury that the Negro who had been arrested had not attacked her, infuriated a mob. The state militia could not prevent the lynching of two Negroes and the destruction of many homes and buildings in the Negro section. Four white men were killed and more than seventy persons injured. The alleged leaders of the mob suffered no punishment."22

During this period, a black man had only to be accused of raping a white woman to be viciously murdered by a white mob without ever coming before a judge and jury. In March, 1906, a black man, Ed Johnson, was hanged in Chattanooga, Tennessee, on the charge of rape. The occasion was one of the few times that a black man ever received a trial. However, the trial court denied him the aid of counsel and a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The U.S. Supreme Court granted Johnson right of appeal and a stay of execution until the case could be reviewed. "On March 19, 1906, the sheriff and his deputy in Chattanooga left the jail unguarded; a mob seized Johnson and hanged him. The Supreme Court of the United States, on November, 1909, sentenced six members of the mob to short prison terms for contempt of the court." All records indicate that this was one of the few times that the Supreme Court of the U.S. punished whites for murdering a black person.23
Logan contends that the major newspapers during this time rarely published a detailed description of the lynching unless they were very brutal or contained some unusual element. The New York Times probably provided a public service when in 1903 it published the following graphic description of a black man lynched on the charge of rape in Belleville, Illinois:

The mob hanged Wyatt to a telephone pole in the public square. Even while his body was jerking in the throes of death from the strangulation, members of the mob began building a fire at the bottom of the pole. The flames flared up and licked at the feet of the victim, but this did not satisfy the mob, and another and larger fire was started.

When it had begun burning briskly, the Negro still half alive, was cut down, and after being covered with coal oil and cast into the fire. Moans of pain were heard from the half dead victim of the mob, and these served further to infuriate his torturers. They fell upon him with clubs and knives and cut and beat the burning body almost to pieces, and not until every sign of life had departed did they desist and permit the flames to devour the body.

In an half-hearted attempt to speak out against such inhuman acts of violence, the New York Times placed heaviest responsibility for the lynching on the local sheriffs. It called for an end to lynching—but pointed out that the prevention of lynching could best be achieved by a sheriff brave enough to defy cowardly mobs. "In 1906, the Times opposed federal intervention, but warned that, if conditions became much worse, some action would have to be taken. The Times reported the background of race riots and the spark which inflamed them; it pointed out that the police and troops usually sided with
whites by disarming Negroes and allowing whites to roam the streets beating and killing Negroes and burning their homes."²⁵

Logan characterizes the early part of the 20th century as being plagued by a preverted "sex psychosis." The appeal to the sex psychosis became a tactic of newspaper editors and play and film directors for deliberately provoking whites to attack blacks. John Temple Graves, editor of the Atlanta Georgian employed such tactics. However, much of the racial violence generated by these race-baiters had its source in a play that had attracted large crowds in Atlanta—a play based upon Thomas Dixon's inflammatory The Clansman. The play was subsequently made into a movie entitled "The Birth of a Nation," produced and directed by David W. Griffith.²⁶ In April 1915, Griffith's Birth of a Nation opened in Boston. William Monroe Trotter (considered by many to be the first black activist to employ tactics of group confrontation and group protest to achieve the race's aims) tried, to no avail, to get Mayor James M. Curley to ban the film. On the night of April 17, some five-hundred blacks with Trotter in the vanguard arrived at the Tremont Theatre and demanded to buy tickets. The management refused to sell the tickets and proceeded to call the police. "The upshot was the immediate arrest of a half-dozen people, including Trotter and a white activist named Joseph Gould. A few hours later nine other persons were arrested."²⁷ On the following day, under Trotter's leadership, more than a thousand blacks and a handful of prominent, sympathetic
whites marched through the streets of Boston and to the State House in protest. Relentlessly, the protest continued for the next month. Finally, in August the showing of the *Birth of a Nation* came to an end. Protest and rioting in other parts of the country proved to be less than successful. Brisbane charges that the formation of the "new hooded" order of the Klu Klux Klan in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1915 was influenced by the film the *Birth of a Nation*, which had opened up in the city.\(^\text{28}\)

Mob violence against blacks continued at an alarming rate and was rapidly becoming a national phenomenon. Between 1915 and 1919, 22 racial disturbances occurred in American cities. One of the worst, in Chicago in 1919, resulted in the deaths of fifteen whites and twenty-three blacks. The riot was preceded by two years of frequent bombing of black residences. Lynch-mob violence continued throughout the country, but was especially used against Southern blacks. Lynching and burning blacks became the common method of carrying out a murderous act. One such incident occurred in Waco, Texas (1916) while a white mob looked on with sadistic glee.\(^\text{29}\)

In contrast to the black rioters of the 1960s who looted and burned stores and only incidentally assaulted passers-by, the white rioters vented their hostility for the most part against people, not property. According to Robert M. Fogelson, the violence of the East Saint Louis riots of 1917 was characteristic:\(^\text{30}\)
Angered by the employment of black immigrants as strikebreakers, white mobs attacked blacks in downtown East Saint Louis. The rioters dragged their victims out of streetcars, stoning, clubbing, kicking and afterwards shooting and lynching them. They also burned houses and, with a deliberation which shocked reporters, shot black residents as they fled the flames. They killed them as they begged for mercy and even refused to allow them to brush away flies as they lay dying. The blacks, disarmed by the police and the militia after an earlier riot and defenseless in their wooden shanties, offered little resistance. And by the time the East Saint Louis massacre was over the rioters had murdered at least thirty-nine blacks, wounded hundreds more, and, in pursuit of their victims, damaged hundreds of buildings and destroyed about a million dollars of property.

In September of 1917, a riot in Houston, Texas, was much more serious than that in Brownsville in 1906. Men of the Twenty-fifth Infantry, after a riot with white civilians that left two blacks dead, seized weapons and killed seventeen whites. 31 "The troops, mostly Northerners, were avenging an incident which occurred earlier in the day, when a white policeman used force in arresting a Negro woman and then beat-up a Negro soldier attempting to intervene. Even before these events, the Negro soldiers nursed a hatred for Houston policemen, who had attempted to enforce streetcar segregation, frequently used the term 'nigger,' and officiously patrolled the Negro ghetto." 32 With only a mockery of a trial, thirteen blacks were hanged for murder and mutiny, forty-one were imprisoned for life, and forty others held for further investigation. The Houston Enquirer at first accepted reports that the troops were responsible for the riot, but further investigation revealed that they had been goaded into attacking the white civilians. 33
At the time of this violence at home, more than 350,000 black men were serving in the U.S. Army in segregated units—winning medals and giving their share of lives to make the world safe for democracy. "The Navy rejected Negroes except as menials. The Marine Corps rejected them altogether.... Mistreated at home and overseas, Negro combat units performed exceptionally well under French commanders, who refused to heed American warning that Negroes were inferior people."34

Fearful of the democratic treatment blacks were receiving overseas, President Woodrow Wilson sent Dr. Robert Russa Morton (Booker T. Washington's successor at Tuskegee) to France to issue warnings to black troops "that on their return home they must not expect in the U.S. the democracy they had experienced in France, that they must remain content with the same status they had before experiencing democracy abroad."35

Black soldiers returning home were mobbed for attempting to use facilities open to white soldiers. In the year after the war ended, 83 black men were lynched in the U.S. Some were in uniform. One such lynching took place in Omaha, Nebraska, in 1919:36

A white mob in this city demanded that the local authorities turn over to them a Negro soldier accused of raping a white woman. When the mayor refused, he was dragged at the end of a rope for half a city block. He was on the verge of being hanged from a trolley pole when the police cut the rope and rushed him to the hospital. The mob then moved to the jail, beating and stomping any
Negro who happened to be in the crowd. After seizing the accused Negro, the mob shot him, hanged him, burned his body, and hung it in the public square.

According to Brisbane, the summer of 1919 was the bloodiest and most brutal period of interracial disorder and violence in American history. Although the disorders of the so-called "long hot summer" of 1967 produced much greater property loss and social dislocation (in Newark and Detroit, a total of 83 people died), the 1967 disorders diminish in significance alongside the approximately 400 blacks and whites who were killed in 1919. 37

Brisbane contends that the "race war" of 1919 was marked by the naked aggressiveness and malevolence of white America. Perhaps, as suggested by the New Republic (1916), "the white mobs were driven by a will to lynch. If so, these were social orgies of cruelty in which certain classes in the community expressed their hatred of a race they considered to be inferior, their contempt for the law, and their sense of Anglo-Saxon superiority." 38

According to Arthur I. Waskow, the 1919 Chicago riot probably came the closest to being a clash between blacks and whites on an equal basis. "Approximately 15 whites and 23 blacks were killed; and the strong commitment of many Chicago blacks to meet white violence with counter-violence was evident." 39 Most of the 1919 riots were white dominated and were directed against black migrants from the South. Joe R. Feagin and Harlan Hahn consider the violent struggles between 1917-1919 to be the first sign of the Afro-Americans will to retaliate. 40
Historians list as many as twenty-five race riots in 1919. The seven largest and most violent ones occurred in Charleston, South Carolina; Longview, Texas; Knoxville, Tennessee; Omaha, Nebraska; Washington, D.C.; Chicago, Illinois; Phillips County Arkansas. The riots in Charleston and Longview mainly involved white attacks on blacks, with black casualties running much higher than those for whites. The essentially white-dominated riots in Washington and Chicago involved significantly more white casualties.41

Foremost among the causes of racial violence that flared-up in 1919 was the competition for jobs between black and white workers. According to Brisbane, there was ample evidence that big business was manipulating the white and black labor forces in such a manner as to keep the cost of labor at a minimum; that is, big business recruited tens of thousands of semi-skilled and unskilled black workers primarily from the South to be used as "scab-workers" and "strike-breakers" while discouraging their participation in white unions by encouraging a false sense of racial superiority among white workers.42 Moreover, William Tabb argues that blacks have been set aside as a cheap source of labor when needed by the economy and at the same time a group set apart which can be confined to certain types of work (low-paying, hard, and unpleasant jobs). Thus, blacks serve as a buffer pool (being used as scab-workers), keeping demeaning low-paying jobs in circulation, and, consequently, keeping labor cost from rising.43
Many historians have characterized blacks prior to World War I as having been spiritually crippled by the failures and disappointments of Reconstruction and to a large degree "tranquilized" by Booker T. Washington's philosophy. But the combination of the great migration and the entrance of the United States into World War I generated a new fighting spirit within the black community. As a result of being either a veteran of the battlefields of France or of the racial conflicts in the great metropolis, blacks had become comparatively more sophisticated and definitely more militant. From this point on, Black Americans would not panic in the face of a white mob—they would now stand and fight for their rights.

Moved by the battle cry of the young Claude McKay in mid-July of 1919, "If we must die, let it be not like hogs..." blacks realized that they could not expect protection from the federal government and that they had to defend themselves the best way they knew how. They had seen local governments capitulate to white lynch mobs. They witnessed the onslaught of the white press in its racist attacks. Indeed, one observer commented that probably never before in the history of the country had there been more distrust of whites by blacks than after World War I.

The despair felt by a race at ever obtaining justice in white America was amplified by W.E.B. DuBois in mid-1919 who called for a league of nations to curb the anti-black policy of the United States.
and South Africa. DuBois contended that unless such a supernatural power is created, "we are doomed eventually to fight for our rights."48

The black press became very instrumental in reflecting the new militancy among blacks. Prior to World War I, the black press was under the thumb of Booker T. Washington, an advocate of "separate but equal."49 However, by 1919 the black press had moved a long way from the day and time when Booker T. Washington could virtually silence any black journalist. Now, more than ever, the black press reflected a new militancy in its editorial column. At a conference in 1918 called by the War Department to secure the support of the black press for the War, 31 black editors solemnly called the government's attention to the upsurge of lynching and mob violence in a nation purportedly fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Lynching had taken on the air of a ceremonial act-planned and programmed with public attendance encouraged.50

Early in 1919 the NAACP published a study Thirty Years of Lynching in the US: 1889-1918, which pointed out that there were approximately 3,224 lynchings of blacks. In one section of the publication entitled "Special Features of Lynching" the report noted that a significant number of victims had been "burned alive, others were tortured by death, and some had been beaten to death or cut to pieces." Sixty-one black women had been among those lynched. The sadism and brutality of the lynchings reached a high peak during the week of May 17 to 24, 1918, in Brooks and Lowndes Counties in Georgia. Six blacks were
hanged. One of the victims was an eight-month pregnant woman, Mrs. Mary Turner. An account follows:

Her ankles were tied together and she was hung to the tree, head downward. Gasoline and oil from the automobiles were thrown on her clothing and while she writhered in agony and the mob howled in glee, a match was applied and her clothes burned from her person. When this had been done and while she was yet alive, a knife, evidently one such as used in splitting hogs, was taken and the woman's abdomen was cut open, the unborn babe falling from her womb to the ground. The infant, prematurely born, gave two feeble cries and then its head was crushed by a member of the mob with his heel. Hundreds of bullets were then fired into the body of the woman, now mercifully dead, and the work was over.

RACE RIOTS

Race riots are the dramatic hallmark of the injustice of race relations in the U.S. They have an explosive and destructive character which makes generalizations very difficult. As a form of "collective behavior," their natural history is not easily recorded or analyzed. The history of race relations in the U.S. has been grounded in a system of law enforcement that has denied blacks due process of the law and equal protection of the law, and has therefore weakened the legitimacy of the administrators of the law.

Morris Janowitz contends that the form and extent of collective racial violence are expressions of the social structure and the agencies of social change and social control. Thus, he explores the role of the police and the mass media in fashioning patterns of collective urban violence; moreover, the agencies of social change
and social control are deemed to be crucial in accounting for actual urban racial violence and consequently the manner in which racial conflict, are handled and controlled deeply influences race relations and the subsequent patterns of violence. For instance, Janowitz lists two institutions that help to shape and fashion patterns of collective racial violence:

1. Law Enforcement Agencies (inadequate equal protection for minorities).

2. Mass Media (lack of constructive role in describing problems of social change).

He argues that both are directly related to rioting and in many instances acts as the peripatizing elements that give rise to rioting and to the perpetuation of rioting; thus, he concludes that social tensions generated by discrimination, prejudice, and poverty offer essential but only partial explanations of black mass rioting in the Urban Centers of the United States.52

Janowitz points out that Allen Grimshaw (a student of race riots) concluded in 1962 that there is no direct relation between the level of social tension and the outbreak of social violence. However, he points out that it is too obvious of a living fact that social tension exists where riots breakout and that intervening variables undoubtedly blurred Grimshaw's findings.53
COMMUNAL RIOTS

As the writer has attempted to point out, racial violence has a history as old as the nation itself. However, modern racial clashes can be traced from the beginning of the 20th century. The pattern of racial violence during the first two decades of the 20th century has been characterized by Morris Janowitz as "communal" clashes or riots. Communal riots occurred as a result of struggles between black and white civilians over areas of unclear racial domain. Usually the contested area centered around neighborhood housings or a public place such as a beach or park. In response to the war, large numbers of both black and white persons migrated to the cities during this period. Because of a shortage of housing and legal segregation, whites and blacks were pitted against one another.

The following are a list of what has been put forth by Morris Janowitz and Robert H. Brisbane as probable underlying causes and characteristics of the Communal Riots that marked the first two decades of the 20th century:

Summary of Underlying Causes

1. Relatively large number of new migrants (both black and white) living in segregated enclaves in urban centers under conditions in which older patterns of accommodation were not effective—linked to a phase in the growth and transformation of American cities.
2. Inadequate law enforcement agencies and one that often conspired with white rioters against the black population.

3. Newspapers contributed to racial tension by frequently and repeatedly publishing inflammatory false reports, such as "Black Man Rapes White Woman" (known as the Sex Psychosis). Since the riots lasted for several days, news reports served to recruit white activists from other parts of the city and even from out of town.

4. Big business manipulation (recruiting blacks as strike-breakers while discouraging their participation in white unions by encouraging a false sense of racial superiority among white workers that gave rise to intense racial discrimination and racial prejudice).

5. Poverty.

6. Shortage of housing for both blacks and whites.

7. Police brutality.

8. David Griffith's inflammatory movie "The Birth of a Nation."

9. Rebirth and growth of Klu Klux Klan chapters in almost every sizable city in the U.S.

Summary of Underlying Characteristics

1. Ecological warfare over contested areas—that is, precipitating incidents were small-scale struggles between black and white civilians, often in a public place such as a beach or in an area of unclear racial domain. Characterized by minor but persistent outbursts of violence. For example, the Chicago riot of 1919 was proceeded by two years of residential bombing.57
2. Death and injuries were the result of direct confrontation between black and white citizens.

3. Whites invaded black neighborhoods or the violence occurred on the fringes of black and low-income white neighborhoods. Moreover, much of the violence occurred on the main transfer points (these were usually central business districts where the white population outnumbered Afro-Americans) as blacks attempted to return home or sought some sort of refuge.

4. Weapons usually included bricks, rocks, blunt sticks and hand-to-hand combat. There was a limited number of handguns and rifles.

Janowitz concludes that the pattern of racial violence during the first two decades of the 20th century was a conflict reflecting an attempt by blacks to alter their position of racial subordination and an attempt by whites to maintain their racial domination. In short, the violence during this period was an expression of elements of the white community's impulse to "kick black people back into their place."58

**COMMODITY RIOTS**

During the pre-World War II years, the pattern of rioting underwent a transformation which took full form with outbreaks in Harlem in 1935, in Detroit and Harlem in 1942, in Watts in 1965, and in Newark and Detroit in 1967. In the words of Morris Janowitz, "for lack of a better term, there has been a metamorphosis from 'communal' riots to 'commodity' riots."59 Looting and burning are considered
to be characteristic of Commodity Riots. According to H.L. Nieburg, blacks looted "to obtain trophies, not to get merchandise they could use profitably. Loot has to have symbolic value; strictly utilitarian goods are set on fire." The outbreak of commodity-type riots was first witnessed in Harlem in 1935. In most Northern industrial areas, the black unemployment rate rose to a shocking sixty-five percent. Black labor, relatively unorganized and the target of discrimination and hostility, was not prepared for the depression of the 1930s. Public assistance was given on a discriminatory basis; and in many parts of the country, religious and charitable organizations excluded blacks from their soup kitchens. Such were the general conditions in Harlem in 1935.

According to Robert M. Fogelson, "the Great Depression was in its fifth year in the Spring of 1935; its economic and political repercussions were evident everywhere, and no where more so than in Harlem." Fifty percent of the residents were unemployed and on relief; many were standing in long soup lines, and many were starving.

An explosive situation was inevitable. The riot that erupted was similar to the riots of the 1960s—spontaneous, unorganized, and precipitated by police brutality. Allegedly a black youth was roughed-up after being suspected of shoplifting. Rumors quickly spread throughout Harlem that the youth was seriously injured and the riot was underway. An account follows:
...the Harlem rioters directed most of their aggression against property rather than people. Several thousand strong in 1935, the rioters first threw bricks and bottles at the department store windows and the policemen patrolling nearby. Later they roamed the streets, attacking white passers-by and looting and burning neighborhoods, especially white owned stores. By the next morning one was dead.

The Harlem riots of 1943 erupted following the attempt of a white policeman to arrest a black woman defended by a black soldier. In response to the soldier intervening on behalf of the woman, the policeman shot the black soldier in the shoulder. The news of the shooting rapidly passed through the Harlem Ghetto and the riot was ignited. "Negro rioters assaulted white passers-by, overturned parked automobiles, tossed bricks and bottles at policemen, but the major emphasis was on destroying property, looting and burning stores. Six persons died, over 500 were injured, more than 100 jailed."64

The Harlem riots of 1935 and 1943 marked the beginning of a new type of rioting. It was an outburst against property and retail establishments, plus looting, therefore the notion of commodity riots. In contrast to communal riots, commodity riots started within the black community, not at the periphery. The black communities were established communities, comprising higher concentrations of long-term residents. Confrontation between white and black civilians were minimal in commodity-type riots. The deaths and casualties resulted mainly from the use of force against the black community by police and National Guard units. However, some direct and active
participation by white civilians did take place in such riots (as was the case in Detroit in 1943 and 1967). 65

Meanwhile, wartime racial clashes continued in cities such as Mobile, Alabama; Los Angeles, California; Beaumont, Texas, and elsewhere. The riot in Detroit in 1943 was the most destructive that year. It conformed to the "communal" or contested area pattern. It involved large numbers of recently arrived black and white migrants from the South, and the precipitating incident occurred in a contested area, Belle Isle. More than 50,000 blacks migrated to Detroit in response to the War industry. Housing was desperately needed. Neighborhood turnover at the edge of black and white ghettos bred bitterness and hatred, and recreational areas became centers of racial violence. The federal regulations requiring fair employment standards in defense industries also angered whites, and several unauthorized walk-outs had occurred in automobile plants after black workers were upgraded. Advocates of white supremacy—Gerald L.K. Smith, Frank J. Norris, and Father Charles Coughlin—infamed many white southerners who migrated to Detroit during the war. 66

An account of the racial violence that developed is described vividly by the Kerner Commission: 67

On Sunday, June 20, rioting broke out on Belle Isle, a recreational spot used by both races, but predominantly by Negroes. Fist fights escalated into a major conflict. The first wave of looting and blood-shed began in the Negro ghetto 'Paradise Valley' and later spread to other sections of the city. Whites began attacking Negroes as they emerged from the city's all-night movie theaters in the downtown area. White forays into Negro-residential areas by car were met
by gunfire. By the time federal troops arrived to halt the racial conflict 25 Negroes and 9 whites were dead, property damage exceeded $2 million; and a legacy of fear and hate descended on the city.

To what extent did the riots of the 1960s fit into the patterns described above? Robert M. Fogelson considers the riots of the 1960s to be baffling. Why would blacks explode in violent protest during the 1960s just as the physical conditions of life were ostensibly improving? Fogelson contends that, for all of the inequities and prejudices that persisted in the 1960s, most blacks were probably better off in the 1960s than in any decade in the recent past. Since World War II large numbers of blacks moved into more highly skilled and better paying jobs and gained marginal positions of political influence. At the same time a large majority of whites grew fairly reluctant to measure a man strictly by the color of his skin. To add to this, a battery of Supreme Court decisions made it much harder for Americans, individuals and institutions alike, to practice racial discrimination.68

One explanation offered by James P. Comer to the seemingly paradoxical venting of black anger in the face of the demonstrable economic and educational gains that were being made during the 1960s, is that the concurrence of accelerated socioeconomic mobility and violence cannot be explained on the basis of any objective and measurable criteria such as the number and quality of jobs and the level of employment or income. That is, urban rioting during the 1960s in the wake of black progress suggests that such anger and rage is in part a legacy
of an earlier form of violence: the severe human degradation of a people wrought by the "powerlessness" of enslavement and subsequently of caste. 69

The Watts Riot of 1965, and the Detroit and Newark Riots of 1967 reflect such a legacy of anger and rage. According to the Kerner Report, "...on the evening of August 11, as Los Angeles sweltered in a heat wave, a highway patrolman halted a young Negro driving for speeding. The young man appeared intoxicated, and the patrolman arrested him. As a crowd gathered, law enforcement officers were called to the scene. A highway patrolman mistakenly struck a bystander with his billy club. A young Negro woman, who was accused of spitting on the policeman, was dragged into the middle of the street" thus serving as the precipitating incident. Looting, window smashing and arson soon followed. 70

Blacks primarily attacked property owned by whites, and not white citizens. The principal intent of the rioters was to drive white "exploiters" out of the ghetto. As the riot came to an end, 34 persons were killed (29 blacks and 6 whites) and hundreds injured. Almost 4,000 persons had been arrested and approximately $35 million in damage had been inflicted. 71

The Newark riots of 1967 erupted following an outcry of police brutality (the precipitating incident). "Twenty-three persons were killed—a white detective, a white fireman, and 21 Negroes. One was 73-year-old Isaac Harrison. Six were women. Two were children....
Of the $10,251,000 damage total, four-fifths was due to stock loss. Damage to building and fixtures was less than $2 million."72

Violence, looting, arson and gun battles swept Detroit, the nation's 5th largest city, July 23-30, 1967. "The violence erupted shortly before 4:00 am July 23 when police raided a 'blind pig' (after hours drinking club) on the 12th Street on Detroit's West Side and arrested 75 blacks and the bartender. A crowd gathered outside the building. Rumors spread that the police had beaten a man, kicked a woman, and the bystanders began throwing stones at the police."73 The rioting that began left 43 persons dead (33 blacks and 10 whites). Seventeen were looters, of whom two were white. Fifteen citizens (of whom four were white), one white National Guardsman, one white fireman, and one black private guard died as the result of gunshot wounds. Action by police officers accounted for 21 of the deaths; actions by the National Guard for nine; two deaths were the result of action by store owners. Four persons died accidentally. Rioters were responsible for two of the deaths; a private guard for one (damage estimates ran as high as $32 million). Moreover, two white Detroit policemen were charged August 7 with the July 26 murder of two black youths at the Algiers Motel during the riot. The bodies of three black youths had been found at the motel, a mile from the scene of rioting. The perpetrator of one of the killings in the Algiers Motel remains unknown. "The trial, which opened May 12, had been moved from Detroit at the expense of the defense because
of pretrial publicity. A best selling book, The Algiers Motel Incident, by John Hersey, had been published about the case in 1968." Charges against the two policemen were dropped for lack of evidence despite published reports from eyewitnesses in the motel.\textsuperscript{74}

Janowitz admits the difficulty in attempting to describe the various stages in the natural history of race riots, especially the commodity-type riots (for example, the Detroit Riot of 1943). He points out that two considerations need to be held in mind in pursuing this goal. First, the style of intervention by the law enforcement officers has deeply influenced the anatomy of race riots in the United States. As was pointed out above, law enforcement officers often sympathized and joined white mobs in communal-type riots. The style of intervention by law enforcement officers has been perceived by members of the black community as "police brutality," thus serving as the precipitating incidents of what has become known as Commodity Riots.\textsuperscript{75}

Secondly, (according to Janowitz) "it is, of course, very difficult to assemble accurate documentation in order to describe the natural history of a riot and especially the behavior of rioters in a commodity riot. The riots of the 1960s have produced a number of official inquiries and a variety of private studies, but there are few adequate analyses in depth."\textsuperscript{76}

Janowitz contends that the David O. Sears and John B. McConahay-Watts Riot Study and the President's Advisory Commission on Civil
Disorders conducted a variety of social research studies that focused mainly on the attitudes of the public and the rioters. He then concludes that "the methodology of the sample survey was emphasized, which does not make possible a full analysis of the dynamics of the 'collective behavior' of a race riot"—an observation in which the writer is in total agreement.

An observation of the "objective" conditions of riot torn cities may provide us with more useful information in predicting and explaining riots. Here Janowitz points to a study by Stanley Lieberson and Arnold R. Silverman who carefully matched comparison of riot and non-riot cities between 1913 and 1963. According to Janowitz, "...their evidence supports the proposition that the functioning of local government is important in determining whether a riot will follow a precipitating incident." Thus, (a) cities with more racially integrated police forces had fewer riots; (b) cities which had more representative forms of local government (e.g., city-wide elections of councilmen versus district elections) had fewer riots; and (c) cities were less riot prone that had a large percentage of Negroes who were self-employed in retail trade, such as store, restaurant, or tavern owners—... In short, these measures were indicators of the articulation of the Negro into the social and political fabric of the metropolitan community."78

The motivation of contemporary commodity riots is clearly not desperation generated by the anticipation of starvation, such as in
food riots in India or the Paris bread riot in 1789. However, malnutrition and starvation must be seen in a long list of antecedent conditions towards an explanation of urban violence that may only manifest themselves by "individual" acts violating social controls.\textsuperscript{79}

Moreover, commodity rioting is most likely to be set off by an incident involving the police in the black community where some actual or believed violation of accepted police practice has taken place. The actual occurrence of the incident gives rise to the notion of precipitating factors. Neil J. Smelser tells us that the precipitating incident is more important in its context than in its content, for the precipitating incident uncovers and exposes the ugly legacy of violent character of U.S. history that blacks have been forced to endure. The precipitating incident channels the generalized beliefs into specific fears and antagonisms; it confirms the existence, sharpens the definition, or exaggerates the effect, of the immediate conditions. The precipitating incident is often thought of as a single event—the arrest and beating of a drunk driver, the assault of a young black woman, the shooting of a black youth—which explodes into a riot. Recent evidence suggests, however, that there is no such thing as a precipitating incident. Rather there is a long chain of escalating incidents and rumors which finally peak in the outbreak of rioting.\textsuperscript{80}

In comparison to the communal type rioting, Janowitz characterized the commodity-type rioting as having a greater dispersal of firearms and much more intensive use of fire power. "They are escalated
riots because of the more extensive but still scattered use of weaponry." According to the Kerner Report, "the reports in the mass media of the use of weapons during and immediately after the riots by the rioters were exaggerated... In fact, the deaths inflicted by sniper fire were few. For example, it is reported that five of 43 deaths during the Detroit disorder were linked to sniper fire, and in Newark, two of the 26 deaths."81

Janowitz sees "commodity riots" as declining by the summer of 1968 and being replaced by a more selective, terroristic use of force against whites (primarily the police) by small, organized groups of blacks with unsolidified ideological motives. He contends that it will remain for future historians to assess whether the summer of 1968 was in fact a turning point in the era of commodity riots. The trend in racial conflict from 1964 to 1967 was one of continued, and even expanded, outbreaks that appeared to reach a high point with the massive destruction of Detroit and Newark. By 1968 "there was no new massive national response to the social and economic needs of the black community, except in the important employment sector where industrial corporations started to abandon rigid recruitment and training procedures and to engage an increasing number of inner city personnel who would develop their qualifications on the job."82 Moreover, the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was seen as a prelude to a new type of violence that was emerging. A few blacks felt that the "expressive orientations" (manifested by mass rioting) achieved too few tangible benefits. The new type of
racial violence appeared to be more goal directed. It is almost approp- 
riate to describe these outbursts as political violence. Moreover, 
it is not inaccurate to describe this shift as one from expressive 
outburst to a more instrumental use of violence. Those involved were 
persons who came to believe that white society cannot be changed 
except with violence.83 Peter A. Lupsha characterizes such an orienta-
tion as "instrumental," reflecting the existence of a leadership 
cadre which is hopeful of achieving its goals, and which possesses a 
conceptualization of desired ends.84 

Dramatic manifestations of political violence is regarded by 
Morris Janowitz and Terry Ann Knoft as having begun on July 23, 1968, 
when a group of black men killed three policemen in Cleveland, Ohio. 
The motivation for this attack was the deep resentment felt by blacks 
toward their treatment by the police. The police were viewed as the 
operant enforcers, and perhaps even more importantly as the symbol of 
white authority over the lives of black people. A New York Times 
article described the political violence as "the first documented 
case in recent history of black armed and organized violence against 
the police."85 

Moreover, shootouts with the police continued during the summer 
of 1968 in New York City, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Oakland, Los Angeles, 
and elsewhere. "The shootout in Cleveland on July 26, 1968, created 
such community tension that Mayor Carl B. Stokes responded by the 
unprecedented withdrawal of white police officers and deployment of 
Negro officers and 500 black community leaders to maintain peace."86
Since the Cleveland shootout there have been other indications that policemen have become the primary targets of violence. One magazine reported that at least eight policemen were killed and 47 wounded in such attacks during the summer of 1968.87

The "peaking" or "triggering incidents" that characterized the political violence (sniping) during the summer of 1968 did not necessarily involve some extraordinary escalation of hostilities, nor a traumatic event. It was simply the breaking point in a long chain of precipitating incidents. It appeared in 1968 that hostilities had reached a point where simply the appearance of authority figures acted to precipitate violence.88

CONCLUSION

A historical perspective on racial violence in America illuminates the internal instability of a country torn by social injustice, racial hatred, racial discrimination, and the irresponsibility of a repressive police force.

The tragedy of the riots was not only its violence, but also that the clear message contained in the riots was distorted and ignored by the white power structure. The fact that blacks were thoroughly dissatisfied with their social, economic, and political position in American society was completely overlooked. Despite the fact that the riots exacerbated problems in the black community, white America refused to recognize the legitimacy of the message and, therefore,
failed to make the necessary changes that would accommodate or satisfy the needs and interest of the black community. It is for this reason that violence as a strategy for expressing political protests and grievances will continue to be an important facet of American life. Although intense violent protest took place in the 1960s, they did not produce progressive changes; consequently we can expect the next series of urban racial riots to be more severe and destructive. These riots will simply reflect the fact that the long standing grievances of the black community have not been satisfactorily answered.
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CHAPTER TWO

TOWARD A DEFINITION OF VIOLENCE AS A POLITICAL CONCEPT

The challenging decade of the 1960s produced a rich outpouring of commission and case studies on urban violence. Many of these studies failed to integrate existing materials on urban violence or build on previous findings, thereby resulting in a serious lack of generalizations. One reason for this is obvious: we have no broad-gauge model or general theory in terms of which widely different commission and case studies can be systematically compared and contrasted.

Among the obstacles to the development of such a theory is a good deal of confusion about the nature of violence and the things that differentiate it from related and equally important concepts of power, and force. These terms have different meanings and are of varying relevance; yet in nearly all studies of urban violence published to date, violence, power and force are used almost interchangeably or defined in terms of one another without pointing out their conceptual distinctions. The writers aim is to provide some conceptual directives for such ill defined terms as violence, power,
and force and to provide an operational definition of violence (rioting) as a prelude to empirical examination.

H.L. Nieburg defines violence as "direct or indirect action applied to restrain, injure, or destroy persons or property." For Nieburg, violence has two inextricable uses: its actual use (raw physical power), and its potential use (capability or threat of action). The legitimization of violence requires that the raw, direct use of power be institutionalized or harnessed which means that it must be transmuted into indirect forms of power manifested by prestige, influence, authority, wealth, property-holding, skill, class position, caste, etc.² The institutionalization of violence (monopoly of power) are necessary in every society in order to ensure special privileges to certain classes, to enforce the norms of social relationships, rights and responsibilities, to provide procedures for political change, to conduct and mediate private and public bargaining, and to insure an equitable exchange of values among individuals and groups.³

Power, for instance is the most "overworked" and "ill-defined" word in political discourse. At least three differing images are evoked in the common use of the term power: (1) a possession or a piece of property, (2) a trait or an attribute appearing in the relation of men and/or women, and (3) a moving force.⁴ Power can be defined most concretely in physical terms. "At a higher level of abstraction, power is the ability to direct energy to modify or control the environment, to express values (designs, goals, etc.) through intervention in the configuration of things. In terms of the social environment,
power may be viewed as the ability to direct human energy (i.e., attitudes and behavior) to express or realize certain values by the organization and use, modification and control of both physical and human (i.e., behavior itself) materials.\(^5\)

Nieburg defines force as the reserve capability and means of exercising physical power as a way of supporting the "authority" or "legitimacy" of the political system by use of persuasion, deterrence, or coercion; that is, force then amounts to "potential" raw power or to a "threat" of violence. If violence or direct physical power is actually used, it is a demonstration of "force in action;" thus, we can conclude that violence, raw physical power and force in action are synonomous. For Neiburg, "force equals capability and threat of action; violence equals demonstration of force tending toward counter-demonstration and escalation, or toward containment and settlement. Thus force and violence merge imperceptibly. The actual demonstration (force in action)must occur from time to time to give credibility to its threatened use or outbreak; in this way the threat gains efficacy as an instrument of social and political change or control."\(^6\)

However, Nieburg fails to objectively distinguish between "violence" and "force." Nor does he provide an objective or stipulative criteria for the "potential" aspect of violence; that is, if force and violence merge "imperceptibly," how do we objectively distinguish the two or conceptually discuss them? The former part
of the puzzle may remain unanswered for sometime, however, Carl G. Hempel provides a response to the latter part of the problem.

In attempts to formulate an adequate definition of violence, Nieburg contends that what is needed is a broad definition which emphasizes the continuity of extreme behavior and normative behavior.7 By utilizing such a broad definition of violence, important distinctions between violence, power, and force are brushed over. Hempel suggests that such a definition must involve pointing out the conditional relationship between such concepts as "power," "force," and "violence" and warns of the various shortcomings of generalizing in ordinary language or in everyday terms. For Hempel constructing broad definitions or generalizations in everyday terms tends to have the following various shortcomings:8

(1) their constituent terms will often lack precision and uniformity of usage... and, as a consequence, the resulting statement will have no clear or precise meaning;

(2) some of the generalizations are of very limited scope... and thus have small predictive and explanatory power...;

(3) general principles couched in everyday terms usually have "exceptions."

Thus, the aim of empirical science is not to handicap itself by providing broad definitions but to look for general principles that are capable of establishing connections between different concepts.9 Therefore, the "conditional" relationship of concepts such as power, force, and violence must be made clear before we can conceptually discuss the nature of violence.
In an attempt to solve this problem, Hempel points out that science has devised a system containing special concepts (technical terms), and that these concepts are characteristically abstract and "bear little resemblance to the concrete concepts we use to describe the phenomena of our everyday experience."\(^{10}\)

Since science is intended to observe and systematize the data of our experience, Hempel contends that there must be some connection between two classes of concepts (technical terms and concrete terms). In order to systematize the data of our experience, these two classes of concepts must be linked — "... and this is possible only if scientific principles, even when couched in the most esoteric terms, have a bearing upon, and thus are conceptionally connected with, statements reporting in 'experiential terms' available in everyday language what has been established by immediate observation," and only by virtue of such linkages can the technical terms of science have any empirical content.\(^{11}\)

In order to suggest a relationship (connection) between power and violence, for example, the social scientist has to introduce an abstract term or concept, such as violence, on the basis of physical observationable terms. Hempel suggests a solution of rational reconstruction to the problem of analyzing the logical relations among scientific terms: \(^{12}\)

It's ultimate objective is the construction of a language which is governed by well-determined rules, and in which all the statements of empirical science can be formulated....
Thus Hempel introduces the technical terms or concepts of science by way of "reduction sentences." According to Hempel, a reduction sentence offers no complete definition for the empirical term it introduces but rather a "disposition" (not a directly observable characteristic), on the part of some physical object, to display specific reactions under certain specifiable circumstances. He points out that the vocabulary of empirical science abounds in dispositional terms which are readily transferrable. Moreover, a reduction sentence introduces only a partial, or conditional, determination of the meaning of the term or concept it introduces (it does not attempt to provide a full interpretation of the term or concept); "it assigns meaning to the 'new' term only for its application to objects which satisfy specific 'test' conditions;" thus, terms introduced by reduction sentences cannot be eliminated in favor of primitives (terms in which all other terms of the theoretical vocabulary are ultimately defined). The only exception to this rule is when a reduction sentence is a generalization of a complete definition. Moreover, the inexactness in the meaning of a term introduced by a reduction sentence may be decreased by laying down additional reduction sentences for it which refer to different test conditions - unless the additional reduction sentences have the character of empirical laws; if the latter is the case, such reduction sentences cannot be used in scientific concept formation unless there is evidence to support the laws in question.
With this potential problem kept in mind, Hempel concludes that the "notational convention" characteristic of reduction sentences does justice to what appears to be an important characteristic of the more fruitful technical terms of science (what Hempel refers to as their "openness of meaning"). In other words, Hempel warns that the "narrower thesis of empiricism" (providing full definitions of terms) is too restrictive because it would not give empirical meaning to many terms used in science: dispositional terms and quantitative terms. In regards to quantitative terms, Hempel states that because they may take on a large range of values, it is impossible for one to specify an operational definition for each value.

Therefore, reduction sentences were introduced which provided a partial definition for scientific terms. A scientific meaning was conferred on a term which did not refer to observable features all the time.

Moreover, reduction sentences may well serve as "crystallization points" for the formulation of explanatory and predictive principles. Reduction sentences make it possible to formulate "operational" criteria expressible in terms of observables. "But precisely in the case of theoretically fruitful concepts, we want to permit, and indeed count on, the possibility that they may enter into further general principles, which will connect them with additional variables and will thus provide new criteria of application for them. We would deprive ourselves of these potentialities if we insisted on introducing the technical concepts of science by full definitions in terms of observables."
In addition to making it possible to formulate "operational criteria expressible in terms of observables," reduction sentences allow us to clarify or point out the conditional relationship between such ill defined terms as power, force, and violence because the dispositional use of each word contains common abstract and concrete references, thus power, force, and violence can be defined in terms of one another. Such a conceptual reconstruction would allow definitions to include observable and non-observable characteristics of the word or concept to be defined.

I have attempted to point out the need for conceptual directives in social science research as well as discuss a more liberal thesis of operationalism as an aid to formulating more fruitful concepts in empirical science.

The operational definition is very important in social research, but many relating to human values and behavior are extremely complex - too complex to be expressed fully and adequately in simple operational terms. Such is the case in attempts to operationalize the concept of urban violence. Many scholars to "violence or riots" have simply used the terms and avoided defining how the term is being used.18 Because of the lack of clarity in the literature surrounding the concept of urban violence, many kinds and types of violence are lumped together without allowing for their conceptual differences. Peter A. Lupsha for instance divides or classifies urban violence on the basis of their orientations, i.e., expressive orientations (manifested by the lack of a clear goal orientation-diffused authority structures, and
by the lack of such goals not being articulated by some leadership or cadre structure) and instrumental orientations (reflected in the existence of a leadership cadre which is hopeful of achieving its goals, and which possesses a conceptualization of desired ends).\footnote{19}

Other attempts to classify urban violence include a similar separation of either, "backward-looking" (attempts at preserving tradition), or "forward-looking" (attempts to challenge the status quo and provide for a more equitable distribution of rights and benefits).\footnote{20}

Examination of several leading social science textbooks makes no attempt to provide conceptual clarity as to the many kinds and types of violence.\footnote{21} Given the prevalence of the term "riot" in the literature on urban violence, most social science studies refrain from revealing an explicit definition of what a riot is or is not; rather, they have been content to only provide a broad conceptualization of violence, thus, serving as a general umbrella for many different kinds and types of violence to fall under without pointing out their conceptual differences. Hence, the definitional usage of rioting as a form of political violence has all but totally been ignored.

Definitions are the building blocks of reasoning and discourse. They always contain elements of arbitrariness and of tautology. Moreover, by stipulating and selecting definitions of our own choice, we frequently control the statement of the problem and therefore imply and predetermine our conclusions and/or findings; thus, definitions can be considered a closed system bounded by its own categories and
certain rules of language. The only escape from enclosure lies in it's operational usefulness — which is a cultural artifact, a tool whose truth and power emanate from its success in mediating between the social scientist and the part of his/her social and physical environment under study. The measuring procedure constitutes the full extent of the definition as well as the method of observation of the phenomenon.22 Thus, concepts are tied to readily measurable and readily communicated phenomena and, in a sense, one determines what one wishes to define by finding an acceptable way of measuring it empirically. Therefore, an attempt will be made to develop (stipulate) a definition of urban violence (rioting) that is workable, based upon my understanding of the political, social, and economic environment under study — and of my meticulous examination of the empirical literature on collective violence. The dimensions of urban rioting that this study attempts to address are suggested by the following questions: Was the violence racially motivated? Did it challenge civil authority? Did it involve attacks against the property or persons of another group? Were the individuals acting in concert or simply as isolated individuals? Did the violence involve police violence and the involvement of established authorities? Mutual force seems to be a critical feature of urban riots.

Taking into consideration these various factors, the writer proposes for the purpose of this study the following definition of an "urban riot:"
A) Collective force (four or more persons acting in concert within the geographic boundary of a local urban community);

B) Event involving racial conflict (i.e., disruption by black dissidents involving the defining of white persons and property as relevant targets, and actions by white authority intended to establish control over the means of violence);

C) Event involving damage to property and defiance of civil authority;

D) Event involving a formal response (generally taking violent forms) composed primarily of persons who belong to different racial groups form the community dissidents.

E) Event involving the occurrence of community disruption (such as looting, arson, damage to property, police response) over a period of two days or more.

At a minimum, social science research must adhere to the doctrine which Hempel refers to as the "narrow thesis of empiricism;" that is, the criterion of demarcation between science and non-science is empirical import. Only statements which are testable by means of observational data are empirical. These statements are called observation or protocal statements; thus, the narrow thesis of empiricism is associated with the definition of operationalism where a term is considered scientific if instrumental operations can be specified that will permit observational testing. The operational definition of an urban riot that the writer has offered at a minimum adheres to the narrow thesis of empiricism as well as reflects the historical manifestations of rioting (racial violence), particularly in the first two decades of the twentieth century. This perspective on urban violence (rioting) is in marked contrast to the pseudo-theories that permeated the news media and a large portion of social science literature during the decade of the 1960s. Most of the pseudo-theories
put forth do not adhere to the narrow thesis of empiricism as a mark of social science research and many are devoid of a historical perspective as a guide to meaningful and fruitful concepts. In the following section, a review and critique of the more common pseudo-theories will be presented. Most fall in the category of "pop" social science, often politically motivated. Nieburg contends that "some of the least satisfactory are the most widely embraced; the fervor and frequency with which they are reiterated accent the fact that they are spurious and unconvincing."

While the writer has attempted to develop a general concept of violence, much of the literature in the area of collective violence does not proceed at the conceptual level, and therefore is difficult to fit precisely into the context being considered here. However, the literature on urban violence has been replete with various kinds of theories that for good or ill have been taken seriously by certain individuals. Hence, it is very important that we understand their basic fallacies and for that reason, the writer will attempt to explore what are considered to be pseudo-theories of urban violence even though they are not advanced at the same conceptual level as that on which the writer is operating.
Various theories and/or assumptions have been offered as to the "cause" of the violence which took place in and around the hundreds of black ghettos strewn across the fabric of urban America during the decade of the 1960s.

Many theories on urban violence are no more than popular hypotheses about the causes and explanation of urban violence. They will be referred to as "pseudo- or folk theories." Few, if any, meet the criteria normally used by social scientists in discussing theory or theory construction. Such theories, or pseudo-theories, consist of those hypotheses, notions, and beliefs about the causes of events which—while, they may bear only a limited relation to the reality of the situation—are generally accepted as prime explanatory variables underlying the event. However, they cannot be summarily dismissed, for their acceptance is so widespread (especially in public policy), and they often obtain an element of truth. Nevertheless, most are "scape-goat" hypotheses, often blaming the victim. All of the theories are as old as the country itself and have been invoked repeatedly over time in attempts to explain urban violence. In the following section some of the more popular and common theories will be examined, especially as they are related to recent urban violence in the United States.
THE CRIMINALITY (RIFF-RAFF) THEORY

The widespread notion underpinning the riff-raff pseudo-theory holds that, 1) only a small fraction of the black population (two to three percent of the urban ghetto population) actively participated in the riots; 2) that the rioters, far from being representatives of the black community, were mainly the riff-raff — the young, unattached, unskilled, unemployed, uprooted, criminal (petty thieves, hustlers), and outside agitators; 3) and that the overwhelming majority of the black population (the law-abiding and respectable 98 or 99 percent who did not join in the rioting), totally opposed the riots.26

The above notions were amplified by many public figures in the form of "arm-chair" theorizing. A few examples illustrate this point: "Acting Mayor of New York, Paul R. Serevane, attributed the Harlem riots of 1964 to 'fringe groups'... Brooklyn Borough President, Abe Stark blamed the Bedford-Stuyvesant riots of 1965 on 'small bands of rowdies and hoodlums.' And Mayor Frank Sedota of Buffalo insisted that the 1967 riots were instigated by 'out-of-towners.' Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York called the Rochester riots of 1964 an act of 'lawlessness, hoodlumism, and extremism;' Governor Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey deamed the Newark riots of 1967 'a criminal insurrection.' Governor Ronald Reagan of California castigated the rioters as 'lawbreakers and mad dogs,' insisting that only two percent of the Afro-American community joined in the rioting." The McConne Commission (former Central Intelligence Agency Director) argued that
only two percent participated in the Los Angeles Riots. The Los Angeles Police Chief Parker charged that the riot was "the result of the rebellion of a gang of Negro hoodlums who had no real purpose except rebellion and destruction." The most widely read statement supporting the "riff-raff" assumption is found in Edward C. Banfield's *The Unheavenly City* (1968). In a chapter entitled "Rioting Mainly for Fun and Profit," Banfield charges that the riots were "outbreaks of animal spirits and of stealing by slum dwellers, mostly boys and young men and mostly Negro." In his opinion, the violence expressed by blacks were entirely rationalizations for what in essence was merely meant as harmless fun.

Fogelson contends that the riff-raff notion was highly reassuring for most whites. For if the rioters represented only a small fraction of the black community, the riots were less threatening than would otherwise be the case. Thus, if the riff-raff notion could be promoted, poverty in the ghettos could be ignored and future riots could be prevented merely by muzzling the "trouble-makers" without "radically changing the American metropolis, thoroughly overhauling its basic institutions, or seriously inconveniencing its white majority."

The first myth generated by the riff-raff theory concerns the number and characteristics of participants in the riots. Public officials charged that the participants in the violent clashes were few in number, unrepresentative of the larger black community, and generally from a marginal social status. The level of participation and the social characteristics of the rioters are revealing indices
of underlying factors in the social structure that conditions collective violence. One observation revealed that there was a larger number of blacks (especially women) in the commodity riots of the 1960s than the earlier communal-type riots that swept the American cities primarily during the first two decades of the century. However, "the size of the groups rioting and their percentage of the available population, as well as their social characteristics, became matters of public debate," largely due to the differing definitions of "participation" and the numerous statistical and methodological weaknesses in the various analyses of the arrest data and sample surveys. However, all of the studies conducted agree that such methodological techniques (sample surveys, arrest data and direct observation) are relevant for describing the social characteristics of the rioters.  

The debate concerning participants in the commodity riots may be reflected in the following statement by Morris Janowitz:  

In contrast to the communal riots, where the Negro response was a direct and primitive struggle for survival, the commodity riots had overtones which might be called parapolitical, in the sense that group consciousness persuaded this particular form of collective behavior. In balance it can be said that the commodity riot by 1967 was a form of collective action, which on occasion was large scale and included a broadly representative segment of the lower socioeconomic class of the urban community.  

Moreover, many participants after the riots, could consciously verbalize the structural causes of their social and economic troubles and link their situation to their behavior. In interviews, "they had a tendency to highlight" police brutality "as the underlying cause."  

Suffice to say, for while the riff-raff may take part in
urban violence, all reputable studies provide sufficient evidence that the participants in the riots cut across all "class lines" in the black community, and that the bulk of the rioters were the mature, employed, better educated, and more aware members of the riot community. Olson points out that the Los Angeles Riot Study team found that 15 percent of the black adult population participated at some point during the rioting at one level or another. Sears and McConahay contend that the Watts rioters were relatively well educated and politically sophisticated, that they held positive black self-images, and more freely criticized whites.

As the first major race riot of the 1960s, Watts bears significance in the history of race relations in America. The demographic and social forces which produced Watts and other riots marked an end to the acceptance by blacks of traditional means of political protest.

The high level of participation in the Watts riots prompted the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to test the "riffraff" theory's validity. "A total of 11.2 percent of Detroit's blacks over fifteen years of age and remarkably high 45.4 percent of Newark's blacks between fifteen and thirty-five years of age are reported by the Survey Research Center to have participated in these two cities' disorders."

The tragedy of Watts, it would seem, is not its violence, but rather that its message was so distorted and ignored by so many whites. Conservatives called for repression, and now campaign on racist issues, (e.g., busing). Liberals called for social programs even though
they denounced violence. They, however, ultimately make the same mistake as conservatives in that they propose no fundamental change in the existing power structure. In general whites interpret their own indifference as a sign that the problems of the black ghetto do not urgently demand solution. The federal government and the President in particular have until recently been benevolent supporters of the black civil rights movement. Now these institutions have been taken over by Ford-Reagan conservatives. These individuals threaten to cause mass political disaffection in the black community with their anti-black, anti-poor programs. This may prove to have serious political implications since black trust in government is at a low ebb and the outlook of the black community for the future is rather bleak.\textsuperscript{38} As the symbol of white America – the President – turns against blacks, and as racial isolation increases, bridges toward racial harmony will be fewer, and more violence is quite certain to result. Indeed, Sears and McNamara argue that "given the stormy history of American race relations..., the easiest prediction to make is that we shall have more violence."\textsuperscript{39} Unless the powers of creativity and innovations triumph over the powers fearing threats to the status quo, the future is not bright for America's urban race relations.

The violence of the 1960s was part and parcel of our violent tradition that had its roots in the international slave trade. Through scientific inquiry, we have succeeded in cutting through those explanations and assumptions which characterized public statements by politicians who had a stake in the Watts riot. This is extremely
important to Americans, especially those who are white or removed from the conflict. We are a people deeply influenced by media, and in an attempt to make sense of our lives we have accepted appalling explanations for behavior that threatened the police, merchants, public officials, and white money establishments in general (e.g., the heat or black family disintegration caused the riots). Rather than showing urban violence to be an aberration in the development of social and economic relations, it may be more meaningful to place it on a continuum of non-violent to violent behavior pursued in the absence of effective grievance mechanisms.

THE POLICE BRUTALITY THEORY

The Kerner Commission found that police brutality and police malpractice are one of the tap roots of hostility fueling and fermenting the outbreaks of urban violence. Indeed, this theory has gained a wide degree of credibility. In almost every race riot or racial confrontation that has occurred, police brutality has been commonplace.40

Historians have drawn convincing parallels between the classic method of mob lynching and the policeman's bullet as a means of keeping Afro-Americans in their place.41

Social scientists maintain that conflict and contradictions have characterized the nation as it strived to maintain differences in racial treatments and in systems of racial controls. According to Baron, "the massive reliance upon police power as an instrument of
control over black communities in the cities is perhaps the best
current evidence of this underlying conflict."\textsuperscript{42} However, despite
the significant relationship between police brutality and urban
rioting, the police must be seen as an important arm of the urban
ruling class. With the removal of a police officer charged with brutal-
ity, another police officer with the same negative attitudes toward
black people usually takes his place.

If we are reading the news stories correctly, the police in
our Ohio cities are becoming as dangerous as the so-called "Saturday
night special." The problem is not confined to any one city, Columbus,
and Cincinnati are as bad as Cleveland and Akron. And, Ohio is no
different than Illinois, Michigan, Alabama, South Carolina, or any
other state. For example, \textit{Newsweek} reported large numbers of blacks
murdered by white policemen in the state of South Carolina. They
point out that most of the murders occurred in roughly similar
circumstances: "a black is stopped by a white trooper for an apparent
traffic violation and in the ensuing interrogation the black is
gunned down." In all of the cases, the arresting officers were
 cleared of charges. Incidents of this kind touched off such a wave of
marches and demonstrations in the state of South Carolina that the
Governor was forced to authorize a study by the state's Human Affairs
Commission into possible discrimination in South Carolina law enforce-
ment.\textsuperscript{43}

Police brutality has been protested for so long it has in some
circles become a trite phrase. It is as if such behavior is expected.
No matter how the top eschelon is scrambled, or what kind of examinations are administered, we always seem to end up with the same caliber of police whether they are at the top or bottom in the department.

Efforts to get Safety Directors and Chiefs of Police to be more strict in disciplining policemen that patrol the black community have not been productive; thus, without a good admixture of blacks in all facets of police work, white policemen tend to be more racist. Their prejudices can be more boldly expressed.  

Another factor involved in police behavior, is the apparent collusion between the police department and both the City and County prosecutor's offices. It is rare when a prosecutor finds a policeman guilty on any charge of misconduct. When a policeman is charged with questionable or illegal conduct in the performance of his duty, immediately he has the full support of the entire department in his defense. Only such evidence or information that is favorable to the accused officer is presented to the prosecutor. If the prosecutor tries to investigate on his own, the police will not cooperate, thereby making the securing of any damaging evidence against a policeman most difficult. So long as the police can feel secure from any harsh disciplinary action, they will continue to act irresponsively. The Skolnick Report points out that "the police were inclined to see the riots as the long-range result of faults in the Negro community - disrespect for law, crime, broken families, etc. - rather than as responses to the stance of the white community." Social factors
most evident in the riots such as poverty, discrimination in housing and education, unemployment and so on are given little consideration.

Up to now, most police departments feel little or no responsibility to the black community for their acts of violence; thus, the black community must commit itself to a continuing crusade against irresponsible acts by the police if any improvement in relationships is to be achieved. The black community pays a huge portion of policemen's salary and should be afforded the same protection under the law as any white citizen. Lupsha argues that blacks are more often victims than perpetrators of crimes, and tend to want more protection. "What the ghetto residents hate is the inadequate, capricious, and impersonal handling of problems by the police. They dislike double standards, hypocrisy, and stereotyping that seem a part of urban law enforcement."  

The police must be brought under civilian control and review if respect of the community and of black people are to be established.

THE UNDER OR LOWER CLASS THEORY

This theory has wider acceptance among academicians than public officials. The theory contends that the riots are basically a class phenomenon, a welling up of the grievances of the hard-core poor. Banfield argues that the rioters were lower class, young Negro males who worked off their animal spirits and looted a few stores along the way. Moreover, he contends that:
The lower-class individual lives in the slum and sees little or no reason to complain. He does not care how dirty and dilapidated his housing is either inside or out, nor does he mind the inadequacy of such public facilities as schools, parks, and libraries: indeed, where such things exist he destroys them by acts of vandalism if he can. Features that make the slum repellent to others actually please him. He finds it satisfying in several ways.

In this view the riots are rooted in that class of persons (primarily blacks) caught in the tangle of "lower class pathology."

Unfortunately, analysis of the data from the recent riots does not support this theory. The indicators of class status suggest that rather than the riots being an under class phenomena, they cut across all classes, and every education, income and occupation group in the black community.

In Detroit, Watts, and Newark, for example, there was no difference in education (considered to be one indicator of under class status) between rioters and non-rioters. In all three instances, the rioters were, if anything, drawn from those who had slightly more rather than less education than the non-rioters. However, despite generally higher levels of education, rioters in Newark were slightly more likely than non-rioters to be employed in unskilled jobs.

On employment, another under class indicator, the data from these cities indicates that there is little difference between rioters and non-rioters; moreover, unemployment levels among both groups were extremely high.
Lupsha points out that close to 75 percent of the persons participating in riots in Newark, New Haven, Detroit, Dayton, Cincinnati, Grand Rapids, Boston, Plainfield, and Phoenix were employed. The fact that the rioters represented every class (strata) in the black community suggests that such violence may have been political in nature. According to the Kerner Report, evidence of dissatisfaction with the "ineffectiveness of the political structure and grievance mechanisms" were clearly amplified in many ghetto riots.

**THE RECENT MIGRANT THEORY**

According to this view, riots are basically the products of "cultural shock;" it is argued that the riots are rooted in the inability of recent migrants to adjust to the stress and complexity of urban living which results in alienation from, and hostility towards, the economic and political system. This theory has been used historically in attempts to explain urban violence. It was repeatedly invoked to account for the mob violence that preceded the fall of the Roman Republic.

Sears and McConahay argue that "mass society theorists expect migrants to be generally rootless and violence-prone." Such an assumption serves not only to shift the responsibility for the equitable distribution of goods and services away from the social and political institutions but away from the community as well. Since
the rioters are from outside the community, the community and its leaders are absolved of any responsibility or blame. 58

Not only did the press and other commentators in the Los Angeles area opt for the recent migrant theory for an explanation of urban violence, but the McCona Commission in its report on the Los Angeles riot suggested that the "welfare luxury" of California attracted large numbers of Southern blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans to Los Angeles, both filled with frustration and disillusionment. Thus, the commission suggested that the white community had done too much rather than too little, for blacks and other oppressed nationalities. 59

Recent, as well as historical analysis indicate that the data does not support this assumption. According to Lupsha, "it appears that this 'buck-passing' notion is not only incorrect, but that a counter-hypothesis - that recent migrants acts as a dampener to riots - may have some merit." 60

Moreover, the Sears and McConahay Watts Study lend little support for either the southern or the newcomer aspect of the recent migrant theory. "The young natives, who should have been much more integrated and socialized to the norms and values of the community than the young migrants, rioted to a much greater extent than the migrants did." 61

Finally, the data from the Kerner Commission, which closely examined the socialization and residence patterns in Detroit and Newark, found that 74.4 percent and 74.0 percent of the rioters in these cities, respectively, were raised there; thus, the recent migrant theory appears inadequate in explaining urban violence. 62
THE TEENAGE REBELLION (YOUTH) THEORY

Proponents of this theory argue that the riots are the result of the overflow of pent-up frustration and youthful exuberance of teenagers in the densely populated ghettos. According to Banfield, the riots were "an outbreak of animal - usually young, male animal - spirits. Young men are naturally restless, in search of excitement, thrills, 'action'." 63

While the youth make up most of the active members of the rioters, as Sears and McGonahay point out, the data indicate that every age group is represented in these outbursts. 64 For example, Lupsha reports that 58 percent of the Watts arrests were over 23 years of age, while 74 percent of the New Haven arrests were over 20 years of age. 65

CONSPIRACY THEORIES

The conspiracy theory holds that riots result from the premeditated actions of "outside agitators" who migrated to the ghetto community to arouse an otherwise contented rank and file to engage in acts of violence against local governmental authorities. Lupsha points out that the conspiracy theory often contains an element of truth, "but this truth often lies in the self-fulfilling aspects of such theories, than in an explanation of the urban violence that has occurred." 66

Historical, as well as recent, evidence points out that the black community has never been content being in a subordinate and
second class position and that the only alien predator that has served to arouse the black community has been the presence of racist police, exploitive merchants, and slum-lords.

Interestingly, conspiracy theories were used to explain the French Corn Riots of 1775 and the 1863 New York Anti-Draft Riots, but historical evidence casts doubt on their validity. More recently, Lupsha points out that a survey of U.S. Representatives in Congress after the 1967 riots found that 62 percent of the Southern Democrats and 59 percent of the Republican members of the House believed "outside agitators" were the underlying cause of the riots. Moreover, a national survey found that 45 percent of the whites interviewed and 10 percent of the blacks interviewed believed the riots to be of conspiratorial origin.

However, from most sources (Kerner Commission, New Jersey Commission, Chicago Commission, etc.), one conclusion emerges, namely the absence of organized conspiracy in commodity riots. According to the Kerner Report, "... the urban disorders were not caused by, nor were they a consequence of, any organized plan or conspiracy. Specifically the Commission has found no evidence that all or any of the disorders or the incidents that led to them were planned or directed by any organization or group, international, national or local." 69

Some of the above theories commonly invoked to explain urban rioting are essentially "buck-passing" hypotheses, transferring responsibility outside of the community. Others serve to blame the
victim and to rob the riot of much of its political significance.70 However, each theory in large part fails to offer an adequate explanation of urban violence; thus, let us move on to a higher level of conceptualization of urban violence.

MIDDLE-RANGE THEORIES

The effort by social scientists to develop middle-range theories falls somewhere between the everyday working hypotheses used in research and general speculation bounded by a some grand conceptual scheme. Attempts to arrive at middle-range theories of the study of urban violence have been noted by Lupsha. He points out that what attempts have been made at middle-range theorizing "consist either of stringing together various folk theories, or a somewhat haphazard borrowing from more general notions and assumptions."71 The following review of middle-range theories hopefully will bridge some of the disciplinary gaps and provide a comprehensive treatment of the pervasiveness of racism in relation to urban violence.

Social-Psychological

The characterization of a rioter as a person who deviated from societal norms and standards, however, was not limited to those interpretations (pseudo-theories) that sought to explain violence in terms of the individual characteristics of the participants; that is, such an assumption also permeated a large body of social science literature on collective violence. However, unlike common notions concerning
urban violence, social scientists attempted to explain urban violence
less in terms of the attributes of the individual riot participants
and more in terms of the social process that had placed the riot
participants in a frustrating or tension-producing position from
which violent disruptions might be expected.72

Themes of alienation, deviance, and marginality often merge
from the literature on urban violence. However, the social-psycholog-
ical approach to urban violence provides a more comprehensive
framework of some of the other previous mentioned themes.73

Lupsha points out that the social-psychological approach empha-
sizes the individual's attitudes and perceptions. "The individual
operating in groups and collectives is emphasized which usually require
survey tools and data to test the hypotheses. Often at the base of
this approach is some notion of deprivation or frustration." Such
notions have given rise to such theories as "relative deprivation"
and "rising expectation." Both theories are based on the notion that
there is a gap between one's perceptions of the values, goods, and
status one is entitled to, and his perception of his actual conditions.
The relative deprivation theory in particular assumes that when a person
is aware of this gap, he feels deprived and can become hostile, angry
and aggressive. A theory of rising expectations differs only slightly
from the relative deprivation theory by placing greater emphasis on
mechanisms that make for awareness of this gap. These mechanisms
(population mobility, mass media, advertising, etc.) are seen as
agents of changing expectations.74
Both theories imply that the deprivation or frustration urban ghetto residents experience are merely subjective social-psychological constructs in the minds of the victims. Moreover, terminology such as deprivation and frustration connotes urban problems arising from some chronic inner conflict rather than from broader societal forces that shape the situations of individuals of the groups in which they belong; thus, the social-psychological framework appears to derive their fundamental assumptions from common notions of marginal or recent migrant man.75 Nevertheless, the deprivation and access theories must be taken seriously, for the confusion arising from these theories arises from their political exploitation. For example, based on the subjective relative deprivation - rising expectation study by Ted Gurr, Daniel P. Moynihan recommended to Richard M. Nixon in 1968 a policy of "benign neglect" for black Americans. Moynihan's recommendation rests on the premise that past promises by Kennedy and Johnson had created expectations that could not be met, thus giving rise to urban rioting.76 The optimism and high aspirations of Afro-Americans is based on a Constitution full of promises and a progressive civil rights struggle that had its origin in the international slave trade, and not merely from the ideals expressed by politicians, social reformers, and white liberals in the two or three years just prior to the riot.
The concept of relative deprivation and rising-expectation has taken a number of different forms. Stressing the "objective deprivation" of black socioeconomic levels relative to whites appears to be more useful in examining the situation of black Americans in the 1960s. Likewise, frustration viewed as the blockage of past, present, and future goal-directed activity (as opposed to frustration caused by the gap that exists between one's perception of the values, goods, and status one is entitled to, and one's perception of one's actual conditions) appears to reflect more realistically the actual experience of Afro-Americans and provides a more convincing argument in explaining the emergence of urban violence. Thus, in attempts at middle-level theorizing, the notion of objective deprivation and frustration as a result of blocked goals must be given ample consideration.

**Historical-Economic**

The historical-economic approach focuses on long-range trends and the systematic aspects of urban violence, rather than individual attitudes and perceptions. According to this perspective, people tend to riot because their political and economic alternatives have been cut-off, often by conditions beyond their control. "Changes in the structure of the law, changes in the relationship between the citizen and the polity, changes in technology, and changes in monetary structure, are all examined in this approach as explanations of urban violence."77
Structural-Situation

The structural-situation approach is the most common research approach to the examination of urban violence. This approach is based on the assumption that "there is an interaction, and interactional effects, between persons and the structure of a given situation." Examinations of aggregate data, population growth and density, unemployment, income level, occupation, etc., are typical examples of attempts to make statements about the situational concomitants to violent behaviors. The work of Stanley Lieberson and Arnold R. Silverman ("The Precipitants and Underlying Conditions of Race Riots"), are typical examples of this approach. Lieberson and Silverman make an attempt to determine why riots occur where they do rather than in other cities of comparable size and location. They concentrate on demographic, housing, occupational, and municipal government characteristics in an attempt to determine the effects these units have on influencing where a riot will occur and why riots occur. This approach appears to be very useful as an aid to understanding the source and nature of urban violence and must be included in attempts at middle-range theorizing.

CONCLUSION

By providing a critique of the various theoretical conceptualizations of urban violence, it is hoped that it will increase our understanding of the phenomena and bridge some of the disciplinary differences and approaches. Moreover, an attempt was made to highlight
some of the neglected areas as well as utilize their varying contributions. Although the social science (middle-range) theories of strain, alienation, frustration-aggression, relative deprivation, or some notion of marginality certainly provide more meaningful models for interpreting urban violence than the statements of "pop" social scientists and politicians, they all appear to have neglected a comprehensive examination of the wide-ranging social and political significance of racial discrimination in relation to urban violence. Perhaps as Joe R. Feagin and Harlan Hahn suggest, one critical error in conceptions of the life and structure of the city is that "urban society is viewed as a 'sick' society." By conducting a case study of three cities involving the examination of political variables in the following chapter, the writer will offer an alternative theory of urban violence. Hopefully, this study will inspire more systematic theory building resulting in broader generalizations.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

One area that has lacked middle-range theorizing is the political side of urban violence. Politics, and political values and interest are intimately linked to the recent riots. The political nature of urban riots involve the questioning of the legitimacy of public authority and the demand for greater political participation. These political facts have been overlooked in much of the research and middle-range theorizing about urban violence.\(^1\) The political undertones and the questioning of the legitimacy of authority structures and institutions in recent urban riots are too revealing to ignore, and the political ramifications too important to overlook. Theories that utilize the notions of deprivation and frustration as products of urban violence must be reexamined in attempting to explain the phenomenon. Likewise, the historical-economic and the structural-situation approach must be reexamined in light of their political significance. These various theoretical conceptualizations of urban violence have important explanatory power; yet most lack careful and rigorous empirical testing, and a comprehensive analysis. There is clearly a need to bridge some of the disciplinary
differences and approaches, and to illuminate some of the neglected areas. One area that has been neglected is the political side of urban violence.²

The political underpinning of the recent riots has been illustrated repeatedly in recent research. Sears and McConahay have noted the development of a riot ideology among urban blacks, noting that most ghetto residents see riots as a form of protest.³ This parallels the historical findings that George F. Rude and Eric J. Hobsbawm have uncovered about pre-industrial riots. According to Lupsha, the pre-industrial riots examined by Rude and Hobsbawn were "viewed as a legitimate way of making demands upon a rather distant and aloof authority structure."⁴

The problem with most theoretical conceptualizations of urban violence is that they overlook the fact that the riots are not just products of economic and demographic factors, they are also products of a lack of black political representation. Peter A. Lupsha points out that urban unrest results "... as an anger arising from a rational evaluation of the situation. It is an anger directed at the inability and inadequacy of the political system to process demands, and to make allocations in a responsive manner. It is the gap between the theory and the practice of government in the United States that is one of the root causes of urban violence."⁵

Conceiving of urban riots as politically meaningful acts in a struggle between powerholding groups and powerless blacks on the urban scene appears to be a promising and suggestive framework for
interpreting the recent shift of Black Americans in the direction of urban violence. Approaching urban rioting from a political framework points out that the phenomenon is not one sided. Many recent popular and scholarly analyses of urban violence see violence solely in terms of those trying to alter the existing structure of power, rather than in the activities of those defending the established order. The activities of those defending the established order may be manifested through institutional, organizational or individualistic means. According to Joe R. Feagin and Harlan Hahn, urban violence should be examined in view of the interactional effects between emerging minorities and the existing powerholders and governmental agents representing them. Moreover, a political framework "emphasizing groups with different and competing interest also provides a more satisfactory perspective on the role of governmental authorities in fostering and channeling the emergence and development of violent protest." They conclude that the "crucial role of authorities interacting with those challenging their authority has been given little attention in existing theories about urban rioting." The political perspective offered in this study has two distinct advantages over the existing theories in that it points out the following: 1) an awareness of the wide-ranging economic and political ramifications of the powerful in shaping the development of violent protest among black Americans; 2) the interactive character of relationships between black Americans and the dominant powerholders in urban residential settings. The
perspective offered in this study is an attempt to explain and understand the dynamics of urban violence, its structure and conditioning elements.

**Purpose**

An attempt will be made in this study to determine the extent to which the level of black political representation influences riot severity. In this context riot severity is a dimensional concept not a unitary phenomenon. Furthermore, when one talks about riots, one is talking about an intense violent situation where each situation is not as intense as others. The conception of these violent situations in terms of riot severity as opposed to the mere occurrence or non-occurrence of a riot clearly points out that the violent situations are indeed not unitary phenomena. By viewing acts of violence on a continuum from the least severe to the most severe we wish to underscore the fact that riots are not isolated or spontaneous acts of violence. Rather the riots reflect an endless struggle on the part of Black Americans for a redistribution of the goods and services the country has to offer, and a determination on the part of the dominant powerholders to deny to Black Americans those just demands. This, in essence is the interactional political power relationship perspective being presented in this study. The problem with most theoretical conceptualizations of urban violence is that they ignore the essential point that the riots are not just products of frustration and deprivation, but rather are the products of the political system. Rioting
as a form of violence is conceived of as an anger directed at the inadequacy of the political system to process demands, and to make political and economic allocations in a responsive manner.

The differences in riot severity in urban centers are reflective of other differences in riot torn cities. Specifically, they are reflective of the level of political consciousness of an oppressed group and the extent to which cities are representing the needs and interest of that oppressed group. Based on these differences, the writer wishes to stress two fundamental assumptions: 1) the level of violence will be dependent upon the degree to which blacks feel that they are or are not being represented and, 2) the extent to which governments, on the basis of that assessment, are willing to engage in certain types of activities to correct the situation. Thus, the assumption is that if a city experiences a major riot, blacks must feel very oppressed and are highly conscious of that oppression to the extent that they are willing to engage in extra-legal activities. If a minor riot takes place, then one would expect that black representation is higher in such cities and that the level of political consciousness, anger and frustration is lower. If the political consciousness, anger and frustration had been greater, one would expect a greater intensity of violence. Hence, riot severity as a dimensional concept helps one to explain both the political behavior, and the attitudes and dispositions of the black community. Moreover, the relative position of blacks in the socio-political structure at a particular point in time as well as how governmental units are organized to address itself
to the urgent needs and interest of the black community can clearly be seen. In that sense, the concept of riot severity becomes very important. One of the serious weaknesses in previous studies on urban violence is that they have not attempted to make these distinctions and have refused to look at riots as political acts, and consequently, have ignored important political dimensions of these phenomena.

The writer's purpose in looking at Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland is to both underscore the importance of politics as a force in the riot situation and point out the value of making distinctions between different levels of rioting. If these distinctions are not carefully made, there is the danger that public officials will make policies that are not conducive to solving the problems of the people involved in the riot situation. Thus, it is necessary to begin categorizing riots in order to develop policies that will take into account these differences. The level of frustration and anger as well as the response of the powerholders is presumably less in one riot situation than another. Hence, if policy-makers develop policies to deal with all of the riots the same way, the policies will inevitably be ineffective and not capable of addressing the needs and interest of those people involved in the riot situation. In terms of policy implications, policy-makers need to be aware of distinctions regarding riot severity in order to make relevant policies to meet specific riot situations.

Based on the notion of riot severity as utilized in this study, violence on the part of black Americans can be viewed not as isolated
acts but rather as successive stages of violence rooted in United States history. Hence, urban violence during the 1960s despite minimal economic, political, and educational gains suggest that such anger and rage is in part a legacy of an earlier form of violence: the severe humiliation of a people wrought by the powerlessness of enslavement and subsequently of caste.

Likewise, the irrelevance of the commonplace euphemism often put forth by the news media that "blacks are better off in the United States than the poor in less developed countries" ignores the level of oppression experienced by blacks in this country at this time. Only by viewing violence on a historical continuum and not as isolated acts can we begin to assess the notion of relative deprivation. Black progress during the 1960s must not be viewed in absolute terms but in comparison to the progress attained by whites in the United States. The violence on the part of blacks during the 1960s reflects in part a historical struggle to bridge the social, economic, and political gap that exists between blacks and whites, and a determination on the part of the white power structure to maintain such inequities. Thus, the violence on the part of black Americans in the wake of relative progress during the 1960s can be most meaningfully understood in the context of the violent continuum in the United States history.
Hypotheses

Several general hypotheses primarily drawn from the writer's experience and careful examination of the literature will be tested. In all instances the independent variable will attempt to provide some explanation for riot severity in three cities: Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland.

Using the Kerner Commission's index to measure riot severity, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis One: The lower the proportional representation of blacks on city police departments, the greater the severity of riots.

Hypothesis Two: The lower the proportional representation of blacks on city fire departments, the greater the severity of riots.

Hypothesis Three: The lower the proportional representation of blacks on city councils, the greater the severity of riots.

Hypothesis Four: The lower the proportional representation of blacks on school boards, the greater the severity of riots.

Hypothesis Five: The lower the proportional representation of blacks as precinct or district committee persons, the greater the severity of riots.

Hypothesis Six: The lower the proportional representation of blacks as ward chairpersons or leaders, the greater the severity of riots.

The Kerner Commission ranked the 1967 riots into three categories of violence—major, serious, and minor. This study will attempt to utilize the same categories in an effort to determine the severity of rioting in Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh during the riot years, 1965-1969. The three main categories of riot severity are the following:
Major Riots. These are characterized generally by a combination of the following factors: (1) law officers or civilians killed; (2) law officers or civilians injured; (3) types of criminality including any of the following - sniping, looting, vandalism, arson, interference with firemen; (4) four or more arrests made; (5) police action involving local police, state police or national guard; (6) action resulting in property damage; (7) violence lasting two or more days.

Serious Riots. These are characterized generally by: (1) law officers or civilians injured; (2) types of criminality including any of the following - looting, vandalism, arson, interference with firemen; (3) four or more arrests made; (4) police action involving local police; (5) action resulting in property damage; (6) violence lasting one or more days.

Minor Riots. These are characterized generally by: (1) types of criminality including any of the following - looting and vandalism; (2) less than four arrests made; (3) police action involving local police; (4) action resulting in property damage; (5) violence lasting less than one day.

The independent variables used to explain riot severity fall under two major categories:

I. Black Political Representation in City Government

   A) City Police Department
   B) City Fire Department
   C) City Council
   D) Board of Education
II. Black Political Representation in Political Party Organization (Democratic Party)

A) Precinct or District Committee Person
B) Ward Chairperson or Ward Leader

Black representation or the amount of political power black people have in city government and political party organization (Democratic Party) can be quantified and measured by the proportion of political and elected offices and jobs in specific areas. This type of representation is referred to as Stone's Index of Proportional Equality. According to Stone, the first law for measuring the political power of an ethnic or racial group is that there must be a direct relationship between its proportion of the population and its proportion of all political jobs and elective offices; thus, black political representation must be commensurate with its proportion of the population.

However, for political reasons (municipal departments' sensitivity to the discovery of non-compliance concerning court ordered civil rights directives, and the destruction of municipal records as political parties changed hands), data could only be obtained for the three cities under investigation on the six political variables listed above.

The six political variables selected for this study in part reflect targets identified by the rioters themselves. While the riots did not represent an organized attempt to overthrow the existing political structure, few would argue that they lacked a political purpose. In almost every riot, the lack of black policemen and firemen was clearly illuminated. City Councils and School Boards have been isolated by many students of urban politics as important and powerful decision-making bodies effecting the lives of city residents.
Indeed, Stanley Lieberson and Arnold R. Silverman's careful comparison of riot and non-riot cities between 1913 and 1963 generated the following evidence in support of their proposition that the functioning of local government is important in determining whether a riot will follow a precipitating incident.\(^{12}\) (a) cities with more racially integrated police forces had fewer riots; (b) cities which had more representative forms of local government (e.g., district elections of city councilmen and school board members versus city-wide elections) had fewer riots; (c) cities with large percentages of blacks self-employed in retail trade, such as store, restaurant, or tavern owners had fewer riots. Hence, we can conclude from Lieberson and Silverman's study that black representation on the indicators above influences whether a riot will follow a precipitating incident or not and it logically follows that if black proportional representation reduces the probability that a riot will occur, black proportional representation should reduce riot severity. The political party organization (Democratic Party) is deemed to be important in the selection of black candidates to run on the party ticket for such crucial seats on the School Board and City Council. The writer assumes that blacks must exercise proportional political representation before the socioeconomic structure will change.

The five year time period, 1965-1969, was selected for the study because most major, serious and minor riots in the United States and in the select cities occurred at this time.
Background

It is only recently that institutional racism has been studied as a social problem by political scientists and sociologists. It was not until after the urban riots of mid-1960s that the focus shifted from studying the victims of racism (i.e., Moynihan's Pathological Negro) to studying the institutions that perpetuate it. The trend was to see racism primarily as a problem in the minds of the individuals rather than in the organization of social, economic, and political life.

The climax of civil rights legislation came in the mid-1960s, the culmination years of struggle for basic democratic rights. The rights gained in the mid-1960s included the right to enter public places and to purchase all services offered to the general public without being segregated or otherwise discriminated against, the right to vote and to be elected to office, and the right to be free from arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, police brutality and killings.

Of course the victories were and remain far from complete. Many eating places evaded the law by establishing themselves as white only private clubs. School desegregation was only fractionally accomplished (e.g., Columbus Public Schools), and in many northern cities segregation has increased. Gerrymandering, zoning, redlining and other devices are used to reduce the effectiveness of black people's votes. There are still many cities, suburbs, and sections of town, where black people are not permitted to live. Police brutality and killings of blacks continue on a large scale.
After 400 years of struggle against racial oppression, black people still lack basic economic, political, and social rights. As President Kennedy observed on June 12, 1963:  

One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons are not fully free. They are not freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression.

Moreover, Harold Baron argues that up until the mid-1960s, the three principal targets of the Civil Rights Movement in the North were discrimination and inferior condition in housing, jobs and education. However, after failure to bring about changes in these areas, the fourth major goal of the Civil Rights Movement has become the acquisition of proportional political representation.

Indeed, one of the most serious forms of racial inequality stems from the lack of black political representation in decision-making affecting the lives and destiny of black people. Related are inequality in access to decent housing, quality education, meaningful employment and adequate health services - all more or less impinging on one's political well-being. The current priority of political struggles is quite logical; that is, political equality is a necessary condition for furthering and safeguarding the gains of the civil rights movement, for making real the formal economic and social equality now inscribed into law. Census data clearly point out that in the areas of housing, education, occupation, and income, blacks still rank among the "poorest of the poor." Herman P. Miller argues that although the lowly position of Afro-Americans has been to some, over documented, such
evidence pointing out the obvious to some is not apparent to others. "Facts form the only solid basis for the discussion out of which justice and truth may emerge." He concludes that even though violent protest to the wretched conditions of ghetto life took place, "it is not yet too late for facts." It is necessary to provide a general outline of the overall conditions existing in urban communities as a prelude to the discussion on the political nature of urban violence, pinpointing primarily housing conditions and segregation, unemployment, and education and income inequities.

Demographic and Economic Factors - Recent Trends

The stark reality of urban ghetto housing eliminates the need for citing elaborate statistics to prove the existence of substandard housing in the black community. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, substandard and segregated housing, and a high concentration of the black population in central cities increased during the sixties. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK AS PERCENT OF OVERALL POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed, the Kerner Commission reports that 56 percent of the country's black and brown families live in central cities today, "and of these, nearly two-thirds live in neighborhoods marked by substandard housing and general urban blight."18

Statistics available for the period since 1960 indicate that the trend is continuing as the following table points out:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING CONDITIONS FOR BLACKS AND WHITES 1970</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Lacking Some or All Plumbing Facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati: White 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland: White 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh: White 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Owner Occupied Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati: White 38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland: White 46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh: White 50.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. continued

C. With 1.01 or More Persons Per Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The existence of segregated housing markets places Afro-American communities in a vulnerable position to be more severely exploited. That is, adequate housing for Afro-Americans is undermined by the actions of estate brokers who often refuse to show blacks properties outside the ghetto or transition neighborhoods. Banks and other lending institutions often refuse mortgages for homes in changing or blighted areas (redlining); similarly, insurance companies often refuse to provide adequate insurance against fire, theft, and other forms of natural disaster. Thus, Baron concludes that blacks are restricted to a "black only" housing market while whites, in turn, "because of prejudice and a realistic recognition of the worse conditions in the ghetto, limit their shopping to properties in the white market."20 Baron's position is supported by Taeuber and Taeuber's segregation index for the cities under study, as shown in Table 3.21
TABLE 3

INDEXES OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Numerous studies have pointed out the unequal distribution of goods and services one receives as a result of segregated housing and consequently, segregated schooling. 22

TABLE 4

MEDIAN SCHOOL YEAR COMPLETED BY PERSONS 14 YEARS AND OVER BY RACE: 1970, 1960 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland (1970)</td>
<td>12.0 (SMSA)</td>
<td>10.9 (SMSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati (1970)</td>
<td>11.4 (SMSA)</td>
<td>10.2 (SMSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (1970)</td>
<td>12.0 (SMSA)</td>
<td>10.6 (SMSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland (1960)</td>
<td>11.2 (Urban Area)</td>
<td>9.5 (Urban Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati (1960)</td>
<td>10.3 (Urban Area)</td>
<td>8.6 (Urban Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (1960)</td>
<td>10.9 (Urban Area)</td>
<td>8.9 (Urban Area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the income of black families, when examined on a nationwide basis, have basically remained at a constant percentage of white incomes since World War II. The same income differentials appear to reflect the same pattern when examining the three cities under investigation.  
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**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati (1970)</td>
<td>$9,716</td>
<td>$6,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland (1970)</td>
<td>9,827</td>
<td>7,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (1970)</td>
<td>9,409</td>
<td>6,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati (1960)</td>
<td>6,317</td>
<td>3,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland (1960)</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>4,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (1960)</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>3,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On a nationwide basis in major cities, the Afro-American unemployment rate is two and one-half to four times that of the whites.  
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FIGURE ONE

PERCENT UNEMPLOYED - PERCENT OF MALES UNEMPLOYED BY COLOR, 1954–1973

The U.S. Department of Labor observed that in recent years the social and economic conditions of ghetto residents are getting worse, not better. "In the Rough section of Cleveland, black families in 1965 had $800 less in real purchasing power than they had in 1960; in South Los Angeles, family purchasing power fell off by $200. Unemployment rates in these areas, even during a boom, generally range upwards of 10 percent."27 Moreover, a study by McCord et al of Cleveland and Cincinnati points out that the black unemployment rate has been over 10 percent since at least 1950. They conclude that the evidence of such a constant high rate of unemployment among blacks contributed to rioting in these cities.28 Knowles and Prewitt conclude that racial differences in unemployment rates and income are only partially explainable on the basis of differences in education and occupation. "In every occupational group and at every level of education, black workers have higher unemployment rates and lower incomes than whites with comparable backgrounds. Studies that take into account variation in education, occupation, and other relevant characteristics have found that between 13 and 38 percent of the differential between the incomes of black and white men is attributable to discrimination."29 It is within this demographic and economic background that the dynamics of urban violence can best be understood.
Methodology and Data Source

The methodology employed in this study is a comparative case study of an exploratory nature. Case studies of particular events are conducted for the purpose of generating data or information that is often useful for testing general hypotheses. One cannot confirm or disconfirm a hypothesis with one case study, but one case study is better than none and many case studies of similar situations or events may generate findings that point in the same direction, thereby permitting a weak confirmation or disconfirmation.\(^{30}\)

The comparative case study method must have at least two cases. Arend Lijphart distinguishes between six types of case studies:\(^{31}\) (1) atheoretical case studies; (2) interpretative case studies; (3) hypothesis-generating case studies; (4) theory-confirming case studies; (5) theory-infirming case studies; and (6) deviant case studies.

Since the main thrust of this study is devoted to generating new hypotheses, the "hypothesis-generating case studies" approach seem appropriate. Because science is a generalizing activity, the hypothesis-generating case studies approach begins with a general notion of possible hypotheses to be tested. During the actual investigation of the cases being examined, the hypothesis-generating approach attempts to formulate definite hypotheses to be tested subsequently among a larger number of cases. "Their objective is to develop theoretical generalizations in areas where no theory exists yet."\(^{32}\) Such an approach may prove to be a highly useful instrument in
scientific political inquiry. The principal problems facing the comparative method are that there are usually many variables and a small number of cases. However, Lijphart points out that, "given the inevitable scarcity of time, energy, and financial resources, the intensive comparative analysis of a few cases may be more promising than a more superficial statistical analysis of many cases."33

If little is known about the cases in question, or if there are no middle-range theories to guide the research, a small number of cases may prove to be necessary - generating meaningful proposition and hypotheses. In such a situation, Lijphart concludes that "the most fruitful approach would be to regard the comparative analysis as the first stage of research, in which hypotheses are carefully formulated, and the statistical analysis as the second stage, in which these hypotheses are tested in as large a sample as possible."34

Next, Lijphart warns that given a small N in comparative case studies, it would be a mistake to reject a hypothesis if one or two deviant findings showed up because one can easily think of a contrary case. Rather, deviant cases can only weaken a probabilistic hypothesis, "but they can only invalidate it if they turn up in sufficient numbers to make the hypothesized relationship disappear altogether."35

Furthermore, Lijphart contends that since the movement from hypothesis to theory is contingent upon analysis of a whole range of case studies, it is often more practical to give priority to the focus of a limited number of comparable cases and the discovery of "partial" generalizations.36
Lastly, the comparative method as a form of measurement utilizes "nonmetrical ordering" or "ordinal measurement." Ordinal measurement in comparative studies is an important logical step prior to finding relationship among variables.\textsuperscript{37}

Selltiz, et al list several other broad groupings in which case studies might fall. One of these groupings is referred to as formulative or exploratory studies. The major purpose of such a study is to increase the "investigator's familiarity with the phenomenon he wishes to investigate... or with the setting in which he plans to carry out such a study; clarifying concepts; establishing priorities for further research; gathering information about practical possibilities for carrying out research in real-life settings, providing a census of problems regarded as urgent by people working in a given field of social relations."\textsuperscript{38} Because of the complexity of conducting research in "real-life settings," both the exploratory and the hypothesis-generating case studies approach has guided the research in this study and have proven to be especially fruitful in the search for important variables and meaningful hypotheses. Selltiz et al points out that one of the best methods in exploratory research for arriving at important variables and meaningful hypotheses is to review the related social science and other pertinent literature with sensitivity to the hypotheses that may be derived from it\textsuperscript{39} (this is the purpose for the survey of the literature in Chapter One, Racial Violence in America: A Historical Perspective).
Lastly, Sellitz et al warn that if the discovery of meaningful hypotheses are to be fruitful (for present or future consideration), "the research design must be flexible enough to permit the consideration of many different aspects of a phenomenon."40

Whatever drawbacks comparative case studies have the researcher should attempt to minimize their weaknesses and to capitalize on their inherent strengths. In attempting a comparative study, one has to be careful about the conditions and assumptions of the case(s) under investigation. Three case studies were selected to be investigated because of the realistic constraints of time and resources. Pittsburgh, Cleveland and Cincinnati were chosen to be the focus of the study. All three cities were geographically convenient and had sufficient resources (data) available to make a study like this possible. All three cities experienced riots during the time period under investigation, have similar demographic, economic, and political characteristics, and are basically major industrialized cities with a significantly diverse population. Finally, there has been no comparative case studies of an exploratory nature in these cities before. Hence, an attempt is being made to add yet another significant contribution to the area of urban studies. The above considerations necessarily led the researcher to various official and unofficial sources in an attempt to acquire data for the independent variables under investigation; thus, the data source for the independent variables includes the following: official and unofficial department spokespersons, rank and file members of organizations and departments, classified
and confidential documents, departmental records, municipal library records, books, personal interview, newspaper reports, court cases, personal accounts, biographical statements, and many other undisclosed sources.

The data source for the dependent variables were drawn from the following areas: the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate has compiled data on the severity of urban racial disorders in American cities from 1963 through July 31, 1968. (See U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders, before the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, Senate, on S.R. 150, 90th Congress, 1st session, 1967, pt. 1.) From 1965-1969, other sources were used to assess the intensity of urban racial violence. These sources were: Violence in the U.S. Volume 1: 1956-67, edited by Thomas F. Parker; Violence in the U.S. Volume 2: 1968-71, edited by Thomas F. Parker; and Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.
FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF
DATA, AND INTERPRETATIONS

Cincinnati

Cincinnati, the Queen City, was founded around 1788 and experienced rapid growth during the first half of the 19th century. It soon became the largest city west of the Alleghenies. Cradled in the southern bend of the Ohio River, Cincinnati, flourished as a river town with the bulk of its commercial and manufacturing establishments resting on the banks of the Ohio. 41

According to Zane L. Miller, the three largest nationalities to settle the area were Germans, Irish and Afro-Americans. The Irish and blacks shared the Ohio river bottoms with wholesale houses and factories while the Germans occupied the district dubbed "Over-the-Rhine." 42 Blacks have a long history in Cincinnati, pre-dating the Civil War. 43

By 1850, the city ranked fourth in the nation in manufacturing, perhaps most noted for its breweries. 44 The biggest influx of immigrants occurred between 1890 and 1910. By 1914 many ethnic enclaves had been established. The Catholic church played a big role in the lives of the immigrants and became the dominant institution in the central city. 45

The Protestant elite, so fearful of the wave of Catholic immigration, even convinced the Catholic church hierarchy of Catholic "inferiority." The following statement appeared in the newspaper, The Catholic Telegraph: 46
Where a Roman Catholic Church is built in a good neighborhood, the social quality of the population...is apt to deteriorate, liquor saloons are...likely to be opened, moral offenses and interruptions of good order occur more often, and the tendency is down hill decidedly.

While life in the city was difficult for the European immigrants, the hardest hit by poverty and disease were the blacks and to a lesser degree the Irish. Both the blacks and the Irish worked as common laborers or in domestic service.47

Despite the fact that legal discrimination was struck down by the repeal of the Black Laws in the 1880s the local newspaper proclaimed that the "Color-line is everywhere."48 In 1909 a study by a doctoral student in history at the University of Michigan revealed that discrimination and the level of hostility of whites towards blacks had been steadily increasing since the 1880s. This study found:49

...that the tightening noose of discrimination had virtually cut off all contacts between Negroes and the city's whites. Negroes were refused jobs as health investigators...were excluded from the fire department because white firemen objected to eating and sleeping 'alongside' them. There were only 12 black patrolmen on the 610-man police force...other areas of employment were just as tightly closed. There were no Negro stenographers or bookkeepers, no clerks in stores or factories, no teachers in the public schools. Negro workers were excluded by all the trade unions except the hodcarriers and building laborers. Law, Medicine, and the ministry were 'open' but blacks could scarcely make a living in these professions....

Segregation was complete. Virtually all hotels, restaurants, drinking places, theaters and amusement parks were closed to blacks and by 1910 housing was completely segregated.50
In response, the black community developed its own organizational life. Between 1880 and 1900 civil rights groups appeared. The most powerful was the Cincinnati branch of the National Progressive League which in 1897, claimed 1,000 members and control of 3,000 votes. The strongest and most prestigious black political club was the Douglass League. It often took an independent line in local politics and had its own clubhouse. However, like the Irish, these black organizations were virtually ignored outside of their own circles. As further documentation will show many of these same conditions existed at the time of the urban riots in the 1960s.

No riots were reported in Cincinnati during the riot years, 1965-1966. However, racial tension began to mount in the city beginning in 1965 when a black man was believed to have murdered a white secretary. In December, 1966, a black jazz musician named Posteal Laskey was arrested and charged with murder. In May of 1967 he was convicted and given the death penalty. A number of people in the black community felt that the atmosphere was too racially charged for Laskey to receive a fair trial. They were further aroused when it became known that a white man convicted of murdering his wife received a much lesser sentence. They charged that the differences in the sentences reflected a double standard of justice for white and black people.

A protest demonstration led by Laskey's cousin, Peter Frakes, led to his arrest on charges of blocking traffic. Many blacks viewed
Frakes' arrest as additional evidence of police misconduct under the guise of the city's anti-loitering ordinance. Between January, 1966 and June, 1966, blacks accounted for 70 percent of those persons arrested under the ordinance. The apparent selective enforcement of the ordinance often resulted in police brutality.\textsuperscript{54}

Peter Frakes' arrest served only to spark another massive protest on June 12 at a junior high school in the Avondale District. According to the Kerner Commission, "part of the significance of such a protest meeting lay in the context of past events. Without the city realizing what was occurring, over the years protest through political and non-violent channels had become increasingly difficult for Negroes. To young, militant Negroes, especially, such protest appeared to have become almost futile."\textsuperscript{55}

An examination of past events uncovered wretched political, and economic conditions for blacks in Cincinnati. Although the city's black population had reached an all time high by 1967, the one black on the city council had lost his seat\textsuperscript{56} (see Table 9). To make matters worse, there were two blacks on the city council during the 1950s with a far smaller black population. The Kerner Commission in its study of Cincinnati pointed out that blacks attributed the lack of black city council representation to "dilution of the Negro vote through abolition of the proportional representation system of electing the nine councilmen."\textsuperscript{57}

Moreover, by 1967, although 40 percent of the city's school children were black, there was only one black on the board of
education\textsuperscript{58} (see Table 10). "Of more than 80 members of various city commissions, only three or four were Negro."\textsuperscript{59} Picketing by the NAACP at city construction sites to protest the lack of black membership in building trades unions produced no results.\textsuperscript{60}

Middle-class black leaders began to lose influence in the black community as the promise for jobs never materialized. According to the Kerner Commission, almost 15 percent of Cincinnati blacks were unemployed compared with four percent unemployment for whites. "Two of every five Negro families were living on or below the border of poverty."\textsuperscript{61} The black teenage unemployment rate was estimated to be far above 20 percent.\textsuperscript{62} Because of such a high rate of unemployment among black youth, they often interfered with deliveries being made by white truck drivers, complaining that very few were black. Indeed, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission confirmed such charges, pointing out that less than two percent of truck drivers in the Cincinnati area were black.\textsuperscript{63}

These and other grievances surfaced at the June 12th protest demonstration in defense of Posteal Laskey and Peter Frakes. As the police mobilized nearby to monitor the protest rally, they were perceived as a vivid reminder of the legacy of brutality and discrimination against blacks in Cincinnati, and the riot got under-way\textsuperscript{64} (see riot severity, Table 6).

Whites arrested during the riots were charged with disorderly conduct— for which the maximum sentence was 30 days in jail and a $100
fine. Most blacks arrested were charged with violation of the Riot Act and received a one year prison sentence and a $500 fine.

Black leaders requested an open meeting with city council members in order to present them with a list of all demands and grievances. Included were "demands for repeal of the anti-loitering law, release of all prisoners arrested during the disturbance, full employment for Negroes, and equal justice in the courts." 66

City council members denied black leaders an open meeting with them. The riots intensified. The next afternoon, the city council held an open session. The chamber was overflowing with black residents, most of whom gave strong support as different spokespersons criticized the city's political administration. Meanwhile, the National Guard dispersed some of the black residents waiting outside the chamber for their turn to testify, thereby, causing a massive walkout. 67

By June 18, the police and National Guard had defused the riot. "Of the total of 404 persons arrested... 338 were 26 years of age or younger. Of the adults arrested, 29 percent were unemployed." The arrest records indicate that the riots cut across every class in the black community. 68

Violence erupted again in Avondale July 3-4. Young black militants incensed over the fact that there were no black firemen began to set fires and throw bricks at policemen and firemen as they arrived to extinguish the fires. Twenty-seven fires occurred during the night, causing an estimated $1 million in damage 69 (see riot severity, Table 6).
The same pattern of violence broke out again in Avondale, July 27-28. The primary targets appeared to be fire department and police department personnel. Twenty-two fires occurred during the two days of rioting, causing an estimated $282 thousand in damage (see riot severity, Table 6). During the two day riot, the police "accidentally" shot a black bystander in the vicinity of the fire.\(^{70}\)

In a personal interview with Chief Lugannani and Captain Miller of the Cincinnati Fire Department, the writer inquired as to why there were no blacks on the Cincinnati Fire Department prior to 1968. In response, they contended that blacks were not able to pass their civil service examination in order to qualify.\(^{71}\) The writer brought it to Captain Miller's attention that when one black passed the test in 1967 he was not appointed. Miller maintained that the black person the writer was referring to was "probably too far down on the list to be appointed."\(^{72}\) The Cincinnati Fire Department managed to appoint three black firemen in 1968. By 1969, there were five black firemen out of a total of 1,935 men (see Table 8). In the Annual Fire Division Report, 1973, Chief Lugannani reported that there were "no ready solutions to the problem of attracting more black applicants who can qualify as Firefighters." He admitted that "... with the type of competitive examinations legally required and the number of Firefighter jobs available (25-30 a year)... 'racial integration of the fire service will be painfully slow.' In this context the appointment of three black Firefighters in 1968, as compared with none in
1967, can be regarded as progress.\textsuperscript{73} The Cincinnati Fire Department is presently under federal court order to speed up racial integration of the fire service.

Another major riot occurred April 4-11, 1968. The riot was similar to the June 12-18, 1967 riot. The focus of the violence centered on the alleged murder of a black woman by a white policeman, the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the high rate of unemployment. One black and one white were killed during the riot and 304 people were arrested\textsuperscript{74} (see riot severity, Table 6).

In response to the rioting, a Contract Compliance Office was approved by city council members in 1970 (by 1968, two blacks were elected to city council). The Contract Compliance Office was delegated with the responsibility of making sure that there was proportionate representation of national oppressed minorities on all city related contract jobs. The Office had the authority to take away a city contract from a corporation if its work force did not reflect proportionate representation. Sherman Kinney, Jr., Assistant Director of the Office of Contract Compliance, conceded that his office has had limited success in enforcing contract compliance, primarily because the office is understaffed. He pointed out that of the $61 million awarded in city contracts during the riot years, 1965-1969, there were no blacks, or if any, very few blacks working under such contracts. It was as late as 1973 before this office was able to effectively enforce contract compliance. Kinney contended that the
construction and building related contracts were the most difficult to enforce because of the racist policies of the building and trade unions.75

As Tables 9 and 10 indicate, blacks had 22 percent representation on the city council by 1968 and 28 percent representation on the board of education by 1969. The crucial seats won on the city council in 1968 may in part reflect the positive vote in favor of establishing a contract compliance office. The Cincinnati School Board was unsuccessful in passing a much needed school bond referendum in order to improve the city schools. Many contend that the defeat can be traced to the strong lobbying of a conservative "tax payers" interest group that had successfully seated two of its members on the school board in 1966. As a result, racial violence in the Cincinnati schools increased dramatically in number and severity during the school year.76

Lastly, a proposal to improve police-community relations by hiring more blacks and replacing regular police patrols in the black community with police-community relations personnel received little support77 from the city administration.

Summary

According to the Kerner Commission's index of riot severity, Cincinnati experienced two major riots and two serious riots (see Table 6). The first major riot appeared to have merely tapered off to two serious riots during the summer of 1967. The second major riot occurred in the spring of 1968. All four riots appear as an
extension of one another, either rekindling or extinguishing an old flame: a legacy of racial injustice. The trend reflecting black political representation before and after the riots in Cincinnati are the following (see Tables 6-12):

1) Black political representation on the city police department increased by one percent after the riots occurred in Cincinnati, suggesting that the lower the representation of blacks on the Cincinnati police department, the greater the severity of rioting. However, blacks were grossly underrepresented on the police department. Blacks comprise 28 percent of the population in Cincinnati but represented six percent of the police department before the riots and seven percent one year after the riots. By 1969, black representation dropped to six percent again.

2) The Cincinnati fire department had no black representation prior to 1968 (post-riot year). Three blacks were appointed in 1968 and two blacks were appointed in 1969 representing 0.3 percent and 0.5 percent respectively. Particularly with the fire department, it would be difficult to refute the hypothesis: the lower the representation of blacks on the Cincinnati fire department, the greater the severity of rioting.

3) Blacks held one seat on Cincinnati's city council in 1965, representing 11 percent representation and no black representation during the years 1966-1967. In response to the major riot that erupted in April, 1968, two blacks were elected to Cincinnati's city council suggesting that the riots served as a functional tool to bring about
greater black representation. Moreover, the two blacks retained their seats on the city council in 1969 representing 22 percent representation. The data suggest that the lower the black representation on Cincinnati's city council, the greater the severity of rioting.

4) Cincinnati's school board had one black member 1965-1968 representing 14 percent black representation. An additional black was elected to the school board in 1969 (post-riot year) bringing the total percentage of black representation on Cincinnati's school board equal to the percentage of blacks in Cincinnati. Hence, the data suggest that the lower the black representation on Cincinnati's school board, the greater the severity of rioting.

5) Blacks were underrepresented on the Democratic Party precinct executive committee during the years 1965-1967. However, in 1968-1969, black representation on the precinct executive committee rose to 28 percent, reflecting proportional black representation. The data suggest that the lower the black representation on the Cincinnati Democratic Party precinct executive committee, the greater the severity of rioting.

6) Blacks tended to be overrepresented as ward chairpersons in the Cincinnati Democratic Party. However, one deviant case in the study does not refute the hypothesis that the lower the proportional representation of blacks as ward chairpersons, the greater the severity of rioting.
Overall the data generated in Cincinnati tends to lend credence to the proposed hypothesis: the lower the black representation in city government and political party organizations (Democratic Party), the greater the severity of rioting.

Selltiz et al point out that if the discovery of meaningful hypotheses are to be fruitful (for present or future consideration), the methodology employed must be flexible enough to permit the consideration of data from various sources to aid in the explanation of the phenomenon under investigation. Hence, the logical conclusion of the data (based on personal interviews, demographic and economic factors, historical overview, and political variables) suggest that black underrepresentation was a significant fact underlying the riots that took place. Moreover, the data lends some support to the proposition that the extent to which blacks were underrepresented had an impact on the intensity of the riots. However, in terms of the data collected, it is not possible to establish this point conclusively. Despite the fact that this dissertation is a hypothesis-generating study, the evidence appears to be strong enough to support the central proposition. One proposition that this study strongly supports is that black representation does not substantially increase until a riot of significant magnitude takes place. For example, an additional black was appointed to Cincinnati's school board in 1969 (post-riot year) bringing the total percentage of black representation on Cincinnati's school board equal to the percentage of blacks in Cincinnati. Likewise, the Cincinnati Fire Department
had no blacks in their fire service prior to the riots but appointed three blacks to the fire department in 1968 in response to the riots. Quite often such increased representation is a direct response by the part of the white ruling class to give blacks at least symbolic representation. It also reflects a direct response on the part of the black community to its own felt need to develop the kinds of institutions and protest organizations that will produce greater black representation. Some evidence of the importance of riots in this context is the fact that as riot severity decreased black political representation was reduced to the previous pre-riot year(s) probably because there was no riot to stimulate continued efforts on the part of the black community to sustain the victories gained by the riots.

The pattern of increased representation during the post-riot period provides further evidence in support of the conception of riots as an important political resource for oppressed communities.

Hopefully, this dissertation will generate future studies which will examine black political representation over a period of time (before and after the riot period) and that will shed more penetrating light on this phenomenon. Additional research of a longitudinal nature might also be able to more strongly confirm the general level hypothesis: the lower the representation of blacks, the greater the severity of rioting.
A point of qualification needs to be made about black representation. The writer is not saying that in all cases, the numerical representation of blacks will be reflected in the quality of representation that the black community receives. Numerical representation does not always translate into effective politics that will serve the needs and interests of the black community. Blacks in political positions may be distrusted and linked to the old power structure. The mere numerical representation of blacks in public positions will not necessarily lead to substantial changes in the conditions of the black community. If appreciable and visible improvements are not achieved, greater black representation may actually heighten the anger and frustration of the black community. Hence, the level of black representation may not always translate a one to one correspondence with riot severity. Thus, to get a correct assessment of the relationship between these two factors, it is necessary to engage in intensive empirical research in specific cities. However, it can be argued that in order for the black community to have any sense of satisfaction at all, at least a minimum level of representation is necessary, and that it was this lack of minimum level of representation in Cincinnati that was at least partially responsible for the fact that blacks thought it necessary to engage in severe forms of rioting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; City</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Injured</th>
<th>Types of Criminality</th>
<th>Interference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Sniping</td>
<td>Looting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12-18, 1967</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3-4, 1967</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27-28, 1967</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4-11, 1968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date &amp; City</td>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>Police Action Called</td>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>Category of Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12-18, 1967</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3-4, 1967</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27-28, 1967</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4-11, 1967</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
(a) U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders, before the permanent subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, Senate, on S.R. 150. 90th Congress, 1st session, 1967, pt. 1.
**TABLE 7**

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE (CITY GOVERNMENT)

Black Representation on City Police Department (Cincinnati)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Police Department</th>
<th>Total Black Policemen</th>
<th>% Black in Police Department</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Annual Reports: Division of Police, Cincinnati, 1964-1967, 1968-1973, Table 1; also, see City Roster - Active Employees, May 16, 1974, Department of Personnel and Civil Service Commission, Cincinnati, Ohio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Fire Department</th>
<th>Total Black Firemen</th>
<th>% Black in Fire Dept.</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Annual Report, Fire Division, 1964–1967, 1968–1973, Department of Personnel and Civil Service Commission, Ohio; also, see City Roster - Active Employees, May 16, 1974, op. cit.; also, personal interview, Captain Miller, Fire Department, Cincinnati, Ohio.
### TABLE 9

**Political Representational Variable**

Black Representation on City Council (Cincinnati)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total City Council</th>
<th>Black Councilmen</th>
<th>% Black on Council</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sources:**

Ray Miller, Staff Assistant, Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, State House Annex, Columbus, Ohio; also, Hamilton County Democratic Party Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202.
**TABLE 10**

**POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE**

Black Representation on
Board of Education (Cincinnati)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total School Board Members</th>
<th>Total Black School Board Members</th>
<th>% Black School Board Members</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Ray Miller, Staff Assistant, Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, State House Annex, Columbus, Ohio; also, Hamilton County Democratic Party, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202.
TABLE 11

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE

Black Representation in Political
Party Organization (Democratic Party) -
Precinct Executive
Committee Members (Cincinnati)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Precinct Executive Committee Members</th>
<th>Total Black Precinct Executive Committee Members</th>
<th>% Black Precinct Executive Committee Members</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Mrs. Pamela M. Swafford, Executive Director, Hamilton County Democratic Party, 615 Main St., Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
### Table 12

**Political Representational Variable**

Black Representation in Political Party Organization (Democratic Party) - Ward Chairpersons (Cincinnati)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>Total Black Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>% Black Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sources:**

Mrs. Pamela M. Swafford, Executive Director, Hamilton County Democratic Party, 615 Main St., Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
**Pittsburgh**

The city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is located where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers flow together to form the "Forks" of the Ohio. The city's strategic location was the original impetus for its rapid growth. Goods could be floated to markets in the West and South thus earning the city the nickname of "Gateway to the West." The flourishing river commerce rapidly transformed Pittsburgh from an Indian trading post to a major manufacturing city and an entrepôt.\(^7^9\)

The depression of 1817-1821 coupled with a Congressional decision to make Wheeling, West Virginia the point at which goods should cross the Ohio River via the National Road, nearly proved the ruin of Pittsburgh industry. Pennsylvania's answer to the challenge of the National Road was the construction of a paved turnpike from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh. The work was completed in 1813 and the road immediately became one of the great national commercial highways in the U.S. and reestablished Pittsburgh as a major industrial center.\(^8^0\)

The chief industry was iron and metal works and by the end of the 19th century the blast furnace and the smoke stack came to dominate the skyline. "It was the 'Smoky City,' America's classic Coketown. Few communities were so frequently compared to hell. A visitor in the 1880s felt as though he had 'reached the outer edge of the infernal regions'... It looked like hell, literally."\(^8^1\)
"Labor conditions were horrifying; men were treated as 'cogs' and 'animals.'" In fact some of the bitterest labor wars in the history of America were fought in this "hell." By 1901, Andrew Carnegie had consolidated the steel industry by the ruthless and violent suppression of unionism and by the skillful manipulation of ethnic diversity. The control of industrial growth was firmly entrenched in the hands of management.

Coinciding with the mass exploitation of industrial workers was the migration of blacks to the city. "Lured by the prospect of higher wages, and opportunity for social betterment, black migrants from the South crowded into Pittsburgh early in this century to such an extent that between 1910 and 1930, their numbers increased 93 percent." According to Scott most of the migrants were engaged in unskilled labor. "Ninety-five percent of the Negro workers in the steel mills were unskilled laborers." Discrimination in employment and housing were among the most severe problems facing the black migrant. Blacks were forced to live primarily in two neighborhoods; the Hill district (later to be the scene of urban violence) and the Homewood-Brushton area. Both areas were marked by overcrowding and dilapidated housing. The segregated pattern has changed little over the past four decades.

Another wave of migration occurred after the Depression, when the demand for industrial labor brought an additional 38,675 blacks to the city of Pittsburgh. Thus, "migration and natural increase
combined raised the total black population from 54,983 in 1930 to 100,692 in 1960, the largest three-decade increase in the history of Pittsburgh.\textsuperscript{87}

It is against the background of this brief historical sketch that the urban riots in Pittsburgh will be analyzed.

Violence swept through the predominantly black Hill district to the North Side of Pittsburgh, April 5-12, 1968. However, no one could agree on the precipitating incident that brought the violence to life\textsuperscript{88} (see riot severity, Table 14).

In response to the riots the Attorney General of Pennsylvania established a tension control unit in the heart of the urban community. In an interview with Michael Louik who headed that unit, Louik argued that "discriminatory treatment of all kinds contributes towards peoples dissatisfaction with the system, and that can contribute to unrest, and in that sense we concentrate to some extent on trying to eradicate unemployment."\textsuperscript{89} Furthermore, the inequality in employment opportunities becomes very clear when we look at the labor force, controlling for race and sex:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Black Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>241,618</td>
<td>160,242</td>
<td>81,376</td>
<td>135,927</td>
<td>24,276</td>
<td>68,352</td>
<td>13,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(66.3%)</td>
<td>(33.7%)</td>
<td>(56.2%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(28.2%)</td>
<td>(5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>203,750</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>80,750</td>
<td>103,361</td>
<td>19,639</td>
<td>65,512</td>
<td>15,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(60.3%)</td>
<td>(39.6%)</td>
<td>(59.7%)</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
<td>(32.2%)</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>212,560</td>
<td>127,580</td>
<td>84,080</td>
<td>106,650</td>
<td>20,930</td>
<td>68,020</td>
<td>15,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(60.9%)</td>
<td>(39.1%)</td>
<td>(50.1%)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td>(32%)</td>
<td>(7.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Moreover, Louik maintained that discrimination in housing, schooling, and in the criminal justice system all add up to create community tension. He added that the lack of black representation on the police and fire department has become a sore point in the black community because of their close contact with black people and their visibility in the black community. Black representation on the city’s police and fire department never reached higher than seven percent and two percent respectively while the black population of Pittsburgh is 20 percent (see Tables 15 and 16). He pointed out that during the 1968 riots, much of the effort of the rioters was directed at setting fire to exploitive white businesses and
throwing bricks at policemen and firemen as they arrived to put out the fire.\textsuperscript{92}

On November 3, 1972, the NAACP and the Assistant Attorney General's Office brought the Civil Service Commission to Court (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania \textit{et al}, Plaintiffs vs. Stephen A. Clickman, President of the city of Pittsburgh Civil Service Commission, \textit{et al}, Defendants) for its discriminatory hiring practices (see black representation on Pittsburgh's fire and police departments, Tables 15 and 16). The U.S. District Court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. However, the Pittsburgh Courier correctly pointed out that the recent ruling by the U.S. District Court in favor of a quota hiring system for minorities may be moot with speculations of possible cutbacks for the city's police and fire departments. The speculations proved to be real as the city council failed to allocate the necessary funds to hire more black policemen and firemen\textsuperscript{93} (see black representation on Pittsburgh's city council, Table 17). Deputy Chief Jack H. Harrison of the Pittsburgh Fire Department pointed out that the two percent representation of blacks on the fire department has been maintained as far back as 1936.\textsuperscript{94} Likewise, Police Inspector William H. Moore maintained that black representation of the police department has never been above seven or eight percent.\textsuperscript{95}

Inspector Moore, the highest ranking black police official in the nation at one time, has traveled extensively throughout the country lobbying for more black police personnel and was one of the originators of the Black Policeman's Association. He stressed the
need for such organizations as a way of unifying and concentrating power for black people whether it be to service or protect the black community. He emphasized the vulnerability of black and/or poor communities to economic exploitation and police brutality and expressed a special sensitivity to such communities. Moore pointed out that black policemen are well received in black and/or poor communities because of their commitment to fair treatment.96

Moore maintained that in general, the riots that occurred in Pittsburgh can be traced back to a long history of inequality in the areas of municipal government, housing, school, and employment. However, the riots in particular can be partially explained by the fact that the "have-nots" are primarily left in large urban centers. Therefore, he concluded that "when poor blacks see white businesses take money out of their community to bedroom suburban communities, and witness billions of dollars invested in the downtown projects in which they are excluded, then poor blacks are going to take what belongs to them."97

Moreover, Moore maintained that in Pittsburgh and other industrialized urban centers, he had witnessed over the years a massive buildup of military hardware in police departments. He pointed out that such massive military buildups complemented as escalation of police brutality in the black and poor communities. Hence, he concluded that violence was inevitable no matter what method of protest was being utilized to expose racism.98 While touring the Hill district (riot area) in a squad car, one of the black policemen expressed to the
writer grave concern over the armament buildup in police departments. He suggested that most modern military hardware in police departments should be banned.99

Racial violence broke out again August 25-29 as a coalition of black and white civil rights groups joined several hundred non-union black construction workers in a peaceful demonstration to shut down $200 million worth of construction projects after trade unions refused to increase black employment on construction jobs. The Black Construction Coalition (a loosely organized alliance of several black groups) charged that blacks had been denied construction jobs because they were not admitted to white controlled labor unions.100

On August 26, the police began to attack the demonstrators, charging that they were blocking traffic.101 About 700 black and white protesters returned the next day to continue the demonstration. At this time, white construction workers began to throw bricks and bottles at the demonstrators and the demonstrators hurled bricks and bottles back at the workers (see riot severity, Table 14). Late that afternoon, Mayor Joseph M. Barr announced that the owners of the ten halted projects had agreed to stop operations to permit negotiations.102

Summary

According to the Kerner Commission's index of riot severity, Pittsburgh experienced two serious riots (see Table 14). The relationship between black political representation and degree of riot severity appears to have remained the same before and after the riots
on all variables except the board of education (see Table 18). The
trend reflecting black political representation before and after
the riots in Pittsburgh are the following (see Tables 14-20):
1) Black representation on Pittsburgh's police department was seven
percent every year in the study with the exception of 1966 (five
percent representation) while blacks made up from 19 percent to 20
percent of the Pittsburgh population during the riot years. There
appears to have been no greater black representation on Pittsburgh's
police department during the post-riot year. However, blacks were
grossly underrepresented on the police department. The data suggest
that the lower the representation of blacks on the Pittsburgh police
department, the greater the severity of rioting.
2) The Pittsburgh fire department maintained two percent black
representation during all of the riot years under investigation.
The data suggest that the lower the representation of blacks on the
Pittsburgh fire department, the greater the severity of rioting.
3) Blacks held one seat on Pittsburgh's city council during the riot
years under investigation, representing 11 percent representation.
There was no increase in black representation in response to the riots
that erupted in 1968-1969. However, the data suggest that the lower
the black representation on Pittsburgh's city council, the greater
the severity of rioting.
4) Blacks held two seats on Pittsburgh's board of education during the
years, 1965-1966 reflecting 13 percent representation. In 1967,
there were three blacks on the board of education, reflecting 20
percent black representation while blacks made up 19 percent of the total population of Pittsburgh. In response to the serious rioting during the years 1968-1969, blacks gained an additional seat in each of those years reflecting 27 percent and 33 percent representation respectively. The fact that blacks were overrepresented on the board of education during the years in which the serious riots took place suggest that the increased representation may have been in response to riot severity. Thus, the data suggest that the lower the black representation on Pittsburgh's board of education, the greater the severity of rioting.

5) Blacks were underrepresented on the Democratic Party District Executive Committee in Pittsburgh during the years 1965-1969. During these years, blacks represented 18 percent of the Democratic Party District Executive Committee while blacks made up 19 percent of the total Pittsburgh population. The data suggest that the lower the black representation as district executive committee members in Pittsburgh's Democratic Party, the greater the severity of rioting.

6) Blacks represented 16 percent of the Democratic Party's Ward Chairpersons during the years 1965-1969. Hence, the data suggest that the lower the black representation as ward chairpersons in Pittsburgh's Democratic Party, the greater the severity of rioting.
While the degree of riot severity in Pittsburgh is not of the same magnitude that was found in Cincinnati or Cleveland, there does exist and association between proportional representation and riot severity. The variation in riot severity will be further elaborated in the conclusion. Overall the data generated in Pittsburgh tend to lend credence to the proposed hypotheses.

Pittsburgh had less than proportional representation on all of the political variables examined with the exception of the board of education. The fact that blacks were overrepresented on the board of education after serious riots took place suggests that the increased representation may have been in response to riot severity. In comparing Pittsburgh with Cincinnati, it can be seen that both cities were characterized during the years under investigation as having low black representation (less than proportional black representation) and experienced serious riots. The fact that the riots in Pittsburgh were not as intense as those in Cincinnati leads one to conclude that the data only weakly confirms the proposed general hypothesis. However, when data derived from the writer's personal interviews with various official and unofficial departmental spokespersons, and an examination of the demographic and economic characteristics of the city are considered, the general hypothesis is more strongly confirmed. All sources of data, taken collectively, more or less point in the same direction suggesting partial confirmation of the proposed general hypothesis: the lower the representation of blacks, the greater the severity of rioting.
### TABLE 14

**RIOT SEVERITY (PITTSBURGH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; City</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Injured</th>
<th>Types of Criminality</th>
<th>Interference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Law Officers</td>
<td>Law Civilians</td>
<td>Sniping</td>
<td>Looting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5-12, 1968</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>45 58</td>
<td>no yes yes</td>
<td>505 no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25-29, 1969</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>12 38</td>
<td>no no no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; City</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>Police Action Called</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>Category of Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Police State Police National Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5-12, 1968</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25-29, 1969</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Total Police Department</td>
<td>Total Black Policemen</td>
<td>% Black in Police Department</td>
<td>% Population Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police Inspector William H. Moore, Commanding Officer, No. 2 Police Station, 2000 Center Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Fire Department</th>
<th>Total Black Firemen</th>
<th>% Black in Fire Department</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

Jack H. Harrison, Deputy Chief, Fire Department, 527 Public Safety Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
TABLE 17

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE

Black Representation on City Council (Pittsburgh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total City Council</th>
<th>Black Councilmen</th>
<th>% Black on Council</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Ray Miller, Staff Assistant, Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, State House Annex, Columbus, Ohio; also, Allegheny County Democratic Party, William Penn Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
TABLE 18

Political Representational Variable

Black Representation on Board of Education (Pittsburgh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total School Board Members</th>
<th>Total Black School Board Members</th>
<th>% Black School Board Members</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Ray Miller, Staff Assistant, Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, State House Annex, Columbus, Ohio; also, Allegheny County Democratic Party, William Penn Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
### TABLE 19

**POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE**

Black Representation in Political Party Organization (Democratic Party) - District Executive Committee Members (Pittsburgh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total District Executive Committee Members</th>
<th>Total Black District Executive Committee Members</th>
<th>% Black District Executive Committee Members</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

TABLE 20

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE

Black Representation in Political Party Organization (Democratic Party) - Ward Chairpersons (Pittsburgh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>Total Black Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>% Black Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Allegheny County Democratic Party, Wiliam Penn Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Cleveland

The city of Cleveland was founded in 1796 by General Moses Cleaveland, head surveyor of the Connecticut Land Company and is located along Lake Erie. The city was settled by New Englanders who had moved westward, with a small number of German merchants and Irish workers along the docks on the south shore of Lake Erie.¹⁰³

Growth was stimulated by improved transportation facilities, the emergence of steam craft on Lake Erie, harbor improvements and, most importantly, the completion of the Erie Canal in 1825, which linked Cleveland to Akron and eventually to the Ohio River.¹⁰⁴ These developments along with the railroad helped to establish Cleveland as an industrial center by the middle of the 19th century. According to Nelson and Meranto, Cleveland was transformed into a classic "boom"-town and between 1860 and 1890 the population increased 600 percent, making Cleveland the tenth largest city in the nation.¹⁰⁵

The upsurge in commercial growth and industrialization brought to Cleveland an influx of European immigrants who were to meet the demand for cheap labor. "By 1910 these immigrants and their children made up seventy-five percent of the central city's population."¹⁰⁶ Indeed, nearly every nationality in the world found their way to Cleveland. Like the pattern in many other cities, the immigrants established their own communities. Within these communities, the church, nationality clubs, newspapers and often precinct captains served as ties to the outside world, interpreting for the immigrant what
was a confusing and often hostile American scene. Payment for services rendered by the party machine were extracted in party loyalty. 107

Blacks migrated to Cleveland in mass numbers during World War I to meet the needs of the defense industry. Upon their arrival they meet a critical housing shortage. An investigation made in 1917 by the Chamber of Commerce revealed that thousands of blacks were living in box cars on railway sidings and that in the vicinity of large manufacturing plants, workers were herded together, paying $8 a week for a single room for a whole family. 108

To assist the new migrant the established black community formed the Negro Welfare Association of Cleveland. This organization acted as a clearing house for the problems confronting blacks migrating to Cleveland. Their efforts focused on: relief work, nursing services, legal aid, employment, cultural and recreational activities, crime and education. 109

A second wave of black migration occurred after World War II at about the same time that whites were leaving the city for the suburbs. "Between 1930 and 1965 almost 300,000 whites left the city while the black population increased by 204,000: thus by the latter date one out of every three Clevelanders was black." 110

Due to the pervasive segregation policy of the housing industry blacks were confined to the already overcrowded East Side of the city. "Their confinement to the overcrowded section of the West Side resulted in 9,000 black families living in substandard units, 13,000 living
in overcrowded units, and 23,400 families paying more than a quarter of their income for rent.\textsuperscript{111}

Segregated and substandard housing along with unemployment and job inequities, police brutality, political powerlessness and decaying schools set the stage for what was to become the severest urban riots ever experienced in the city of Cleveland in the 20th century.\textsuperscript{112}

The Cleveland riots of 1966 and 1968 were by far the most severe of all of the cities under investigation (see riot severity, Table 21). However, the summer of 1966 was not the beginning of the wave of violence in Cleveland. Omens of violence occurred on April 7, 1964 as a coalition of black and white civil rights workers were at a demonstration protesting the building of a new school. The new school was perceived as a means of enhancing de facto school segregation. When police moved in to disperse the demonstrators, violence erupted. During the melee that followed, a white construction worker ran over a white integrationist, the Reverend Bruce William Klunder, with a bulldozer and killed him. In response, 86 percent of Cleveland's black public school pupils boycotted classes on April 20th. They called for an end to racially segregated schools.\textsuperscript{113}

Racial tension continued in the Cleveland school system as white and black students fought each other at the 3,320-student Collinwood High School, March 18-19, 1965. Classes were cancelled for the day.
Two students were hospitalized and 36 adults and teenagers were arrested on and near the school area. The Ku Klux Klan was believed to have instigated the racial violence. 114

After sporadic racial rock throwing incidents in June, 1966, Cleveland experienced one of the most severe racial confrontations in the 20th century on July 18-24, 1966 (see riot severity, Table 22). A grand jury blamed the racial violence on a "small group of professional radicals and Communists." 115 However, at a later investigation, two undercover agents for the Cleveland police department confessed that they found no evidence of a communist conspiracy. Black leaders in Cleveland denounced the grand jury's report as a "camouflage" to "cover the white community's responsibility for the riots." 116 Bertram E. Gardner, black director of the Municipal Community Relations Board, charge that: "... the living conditions were the things that caused the riots.... They [the rioters] didn't need any Communist to tell them they're suffering.... I think [the grand jury report] represents generally the average white man's emotional blindness against the real causes...." 117 Indeed, Walter Williams provides an excellent scientific study of the economic and housing conditions of the Hough section of Cleveland from 1960 to 1966. Williams clearly points out that poor economic and housing conditions contributed to the 1966 Cleveland Hough riots. 118

Moreover, Attorney General Nicholas Deb. Katzenbach rejected the communist conspiracy charge when he testified before a Senate subcommittee August 17. He argued that the real causes for the
racial violence were "disease and despair, joblessness and hopelessness, rat-infested housing and long-impacted cynicism." Katzenbach predicted that other cities with the same problems, the same frustrations, and the same racial tensions, will experience the same intensity of racial violence as Cleveland's Hough and Watts.\textsuperscript{119}

The violence in Cleveland's Hough reached its most severe level when the police department began to spread false rumors that there were "snipers" in the black community. None were to be found. However, the Cleveland police solicited the help of white vigilantes, and they both used the false rumors about black snipers being entrenched in the Hough area as an excuse to murder black people.\textsuperscript{120}

An account follows: \textsuperscript{121}

Members of a black family driving from their apartment in an area east of Hough were shot at by police July 21 after the driver, Henry Towns, 22, refused to get out of the car. Towns' wife, Diana, 16, and her 3-year-old son by another marriage were wounded critically; the couple's 7-month-old son and Mrs. Towns' half-brother, Ernest Williams, 12, were also wounded, but not seriously. Towns was arrested and charged July 22 with assault with a deadly weapon (the auto). The family reportedly frightened by a fire in a nearby building, had been driving to a relative's home outside the riot area.

As the Hough riots came to an end, the Cleveland police had succeeded in murdering two blacks (one woman and one man), and white vigilantes succeeded in murdering two black males that were not where near the Hough area. The police defended all four murders. Scores of blacks ended up on the injury list, most critically.\textsuperscript{122}
The shoot-out in Glenville on the night of July 23, 1968 reflected an organized conspiracy on the part of the Cleveland police department to wipe out all militancy in the black community. Louis H. Masotti and Jerome R. Corsi provide an excellent description and analysis of the shoot-out in Cleveland (Glenville). Included in their study is a brief history of racial violence and injustice in Cleveland as a prelude to the shooting. They clearly single out historical injustices dealt blacks in Cleveland by the city's school board, city council, police department and city contract awards.

Fred Ahmed Evans, leader of the black militants involved in the Glenville shoot-out was a decorated Korean War hero. Later, as a civilian, he was to return home to live a dehumanizing life in the Cleveland slums. Masotti and Corsi point out that this fact can't be overlooked as a prelude to racial violence since most blacks are recruited from ghetto to fight in foreign wars, and subsequently returned to the slums.

However, Evans determined to alter the living conditions of blacks in Cleveland, started an anti-poverty program, "promoted blackness and racial pride and also worked to keep the city cool." Evans' headquarters was immediately placed under police surveillance and he was constantly harrassed by the police. Masotti and Corsi argue that "the policeman is, in effect, today's last line of defense of white power and the status quo - which can be oversimplified to read 'law and order'." Indeed, former Cleveland police chief Richard Wagner lobbied before the state legislature in May, 1965 to retain
the death penalty for the following reason: "We need capital punishment to keep the Negro in line." Furthermore, the demand for more black policemen in Cleveland has been successfully opposed by Cleveland's police department as the statistics point out (see Table 22). These were some of the general circumstances surrounding the shoot-out in Cleveland.

The riot commission reported that "it is uncertain who fired the first shot." However, the racial violence was underway on the evening of July 23, 1968. Within an hour and a half, seven people lay dead. Four of the fatalities were blacks, three were white policemen. Three more blacks were murdered later that evening by white vigilantes outside of the Glenville area. On July 24, another black was murdered by a white vigilante group outside of the Glenville area. A black Cleveland minister declared, "... once the first shot had been fired, every Negro would have been fair game...." Violence continued in Glenville and other East Side neighborhoods for the next five days.

Because black Mayor Carl B. Stokes succeeded in preventing violence in Cleveland after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in April, 1968, "Clevelanders looked upon him as a positive guarantee against future racial disturbances in our city." Indeed, Stokes' decision to pull-out white policemen and National Guardsmen from the black community and to entrust the responsibility for the maintenance of order to the city's 165 black policemen and to hastily-organized black citizens' patrols positively reduced the severity of the violence and channelled the violence to the
negotiating tables. In the opinion of most Clevelanders, "... Mayor Carl Stokes saved a lot of lives, both black and white, by keeping whites out of the Negro area the night after the shoot-out."  

Five blacks were indicted by a Cuyahoga county grand jury August 26 on charges of first-degree murder in the July 23 shooting of the three policemen and a civilian. Fred Ahmed Evans was convicted of murder on May 12, 1969 and was sentenced to die in the electric chair. Neither the police nor the white vigilante group were brought to trial for the murder of the seven blacks.  

Summary

According to the Kerner Commission's index of riot severity, Cleveland experienced two major riots and one minor riot (see Table 21). The minor riot that flared up in 1965 can be viewed as a warning signal for the two major riots that erupted in 1966 and 1968.

The relationship between black political representation and degree of riot severity are the following (see Tables 21-27):

1) Black representation on Cleveland's police department remained at a constant seven percent before and after the riots, while the percentage of blacks in Cleveland rose from 34 percent to 38 percent during the riot years. Blacks were grossly underrepresented on the Cleveland police department. Hence, the data suggest that the lower the representation of blacks on the Cleveland police department, the greater the severity of rioting.
2) Cleveland's fire department had four percent black representation while blacks represented from 34 percent to 38 percent of the Cleveland population during the riot years. The data suggest that the lower the black representation on Cleveland's fire department, the greater the severity of rioting.

3) Blacks had 30.3 percent representation on Cleveland's city council during the 1965-1966 riots. In the aftermath of the 1968 Glenville riots, black representation on the city council rose to 33 percent, suggesting that the riots served as a useful tool to bring about greater black representation. However, blacks were underrepresented on Cleveland's city council. The data suggest that the lower the black representation on Cleveland's city council, the greater the severity of rioting.

4) Black representation on Cleveland's school board doubled after the riot at the 3,320-student Collinwood High School in March, 1965 (see Table 25). However, blacks were underrepresented on Cleveland's school board. Hence, the data suggest that the lower the black representation on Cleveland's school board, the greater the severity of rioting.

5) Blacks tended to be over represented as precinct committee persons in the Cleveland Democratic Party (see Table 26). However, one deviant case may weaken a hypothesis but not refute it. Thus, the lower the representation of blacks as precinct committee persons, the greater the severity of rioting.
6) Blacks tended to be slightly overrepresented as ward chairpersons in the Cleveland Democratic Party (see Table 27). However, one or two deviant cases in a comparative case study cannot refute a hypothesis, only weaken it. Hence, the hypothesis holds that the lower the representation of blacks as ward chairpersons, the greater the severity of rioting.

The general level hypothesis is not fully established by the data collected in Cleveland. However, the data does show that riot severity did have positive effects in terms of increasing black political representation. While not reaching proportional measures, gains were made in all areas except fire and police departments. Black representation in the fire department remained constant (low) while the black police representation showed a slight decline. As non-elected positions, fire and police posts were the most immune to change. If anything the riots heightened the hostility that police and fire personnel felt against the perceived enemy... the black community. The situation reached such proportions that Mayor Carl Stokes fired the police chief and replaced white police in the riot areas. Riot severity may not have brought direct or immediate representational gains, however, after the riots the police and fire departments became the first targets of discrimination suits.

Black representation increased slightly on city council with the addition of one black member bringing the total number of black council seats to eleven. Likewise black representational gains were registered by the school board which doubled black participation.
The fact that black representation approaches proportional levels only with political party variables reflects the fact that ward and precinct lines are drawn along neighborhood boundaries and thus reflect segregated housing patterns. Overall, Cleveland experienced the most severe level of rioting in relation to Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, while having slightly greater proportional black representation than the other two cities. This seemingly paradoxical situation will be taken up in the concluding section covering all three cases.
TABLE 21

RIOT SEVERITY (CLEVELAND)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; City</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Injured</th>
<th>Types of Criminality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Law Officers Civilians</td>
<td>Law Officers Civilians</td>
<td>Sniping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 1965</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18-24, 1966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23-28, 1968</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; City</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>Police Action Called</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>Category of Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 1965</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18-24, 1966</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23-28, 1968</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes*</td>
<td>yes major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Federal troops also called.*
TABLE 22

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE
(CITY GOVERNMENT)

Black Representation on City Police Department (Cleveland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Police Department</th>
<th>Total Black Policemen</th>
<th>% Black in Police Department</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

James W. Barrett, Former Detective, Cleveland Police Department, Cleveland, Ohio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Fire Department</th>
<th>Total Black Firemen</th>
<th>% Black in Fire Department</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Lt. Eugene Cuyton, President of the Afro-American Fireman's Association, Fire Department Headquarters, 17th and Superior, Cleveland, Ohio.
### TABLE 24

**POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE - BLACK REPRESENTATION IN CITY GOVERNMENT**

Black Representation on City Council (Cleveland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total City Council</th>
<th>Black Councilmen</th>
<th>% Black on Council</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

Ray Miller, Staff Assistant, Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, State House Annex, Columbus, Ohio; also see, Cuyahoga County Democratic Party, Cleveland, Ohio.
TABLE 25

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE

Black Representation on Board of Education (Cleveland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total School Board Members</th>
<th>Total Black School Board Members</th>
<th>% Black School Board Members</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Ray Miller, Staff Assistant, Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, State House Annex, Columbus, Ohio; also see Cuyahoga County Democratic Party, Cleveland, Ohio.
TABLE 26

POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE

Black Representation in Political Party Organization (Democratic Party) - Precinct Committee Persons (Cleveland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Precinct Committee Persons</th>
<th>Total Black Precinct Committee Persons</th>
<th>% Black Precinct Committee Persons</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Location of Voting Places, Cuyahoga County, Board of Elections, 2400 Payne Ave., Cleveland, Ohio; also, James W. Barrett for Sherriff Headquarters, 11909 Iowa Ave., Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio.
**TABLE 27**

**POLITICAL REPRESENTATIONAL VARIABLE**

Black Representation in Political Party Organization (Democratic Party) - Ward Chairpersons (Cleveland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>Total Black Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>% Black Ward Chairpersons</th>
<th>% Population Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

Location of Voting Places, Cuyahoga County, Board of Elections, 2400 2400 Payne Ave., Cleveland, Ohio; also, James W. Barrett for Sherriff Headquarters, 11909 Iowa Ave., Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio; Ward 12 is 95 percent black but had a white chairperson until the 1966 elections.
Conclusion

A closer examination of the data (see riot severity, Tables 6, 14, and 21) reveals that Cleveland experienced the most severe riots, Cincinnati experienced the second most severe riots, and Pittsburgh experienced the least severe riots. Since black political representation in all three cities is comparable, the possible explanation for the differences in riot severity may be attributed to the percentage of blacks in each city. Indeed, John C. White's assessment of riot and non-riot cities in an attempt to isolate factors causing urban violence concludes that "most of the variation in riots seemed to be accounted for by total population, percentage non-white, median family income, and population density."\textsuperscript{134} In other words, White concludes that black violence is most likely to occur in big cities with many poor blacks living close together in a small area.

In all three cities, black representation was lowest in non-elected positions (police and fire departments). As a result of such glaring disproportional black representation, all three cities are presently under federal court order to speed up racial integration on their police and fire departments. Implementation of the federal court order has been painfully slow because of the city council's refusal to allocate the necessary money in order for the police and fire department to hire more blacks.

Likewise, the school board has generally been insensitive to passing necessary school bond referendums in order to improve central city schools. Blacks make up the majority (percentage wise) of central
city schools, yet blacks were underrepresented in all three cities on the school board and city council.

Blacks had more or less equal representation and overrepresentation in the Democratic Party Organization (precinct and ward committee persons). However, such representation reflects a proportional or district representational system as opposed to a city-wide or at-large election system (ex. city council and school board). Blacks comprise 90 percent to 95 percent of most of the precincts and wards in which they were proportionately represented.

Although blacks were generally underrepresented in all three cities, the data suggest that Cleveland had the overall highest amount of black representation on the select variables under investigation and Pittsburgh had slightly higher black political representation than Cincinnati. Pittsburgh and Cincinnati appear to conform to the general proposed hypotheses: the lower the proportional black political representation, the greater the severity of riots. Moreover, Pittsburgh had greater black political representation than Cincinnati and a correspondently lesser amount of riot severity. Cleveland appears to be the deviant case in the study. Cleveland had the greatest amount of black political representation (in comparison to Pittsburgh and Cincinnati) and a correspondently greater amount of riot severity. An in-depth analysis on a wide range of variables might be necessary in all three cities in order to explain the variation in riot severity and black political representation. Such an in-depth investigation would require a huge amount of resources and
consequently, is beyond the scope of this study; however, conjectures, speculations, and a stronger reliance on the existing empirical literature on these cities may be in order. Hence, the central question becomes: How are the political representational variables associated with riot severity, how can we account for the variation in riot severity and black political representation in all three cities, and can we conclude that riot severity was used as a functional tool in order to bring about greater black political representation?

In response to the first probing question, Nelson and Meranto provide an excellent description and analysis of the 1966 Hough riots, and the salient characteristics of the political system and its relationship to the riots. They point out that despite the rejection of the "conspiracy theory" (for lack of evidence) by the United States Attorney General and the FBI, Mayor Locher disagreed with the Attorney General's assessment of the riot and refused "to admit that decaying social conditions and the lack of governmental response were responsible for the violence." Despite the association of less than proportional black political representation on the police department, fire department, city council, school board, precinct executive committee, and as ward chairpersons - with riot severity, there is no attempt to imply causation. It has merely been hypothesized that the riots (and consequently, riot severity) erupted in all three cities under investigation partially because of a lack of black proportional political representation on the six political variables proposed. Moreover, it is assumed that riots (and
consequently, riot severity) occur as a result of the formal channels for voicing grievances being blocked (e.g., Cincinnati's city council, etc.) and as an anger resulting from being excluded from important political jobs and offices (decision-making bodies). The central underlying assumption is that proportional black representation in key political jobs and offices affecting the lives of black people will act as a deterrent to the occurrence of riots, and consequently, act as a deterrent to riot severity. For example, Nelson and Meranto point out that "the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights conducted its first hearing on ghetto life in a northern city and laid bare the desperate conditions of blacks in Cleveland."\textsuperscript{136} When blacks began to agitate against these desperate conditions, then Mayor Locher and his law director, Bronis J. Klementowicz, publicly encouraged the police department to fill the jails with those blacks agitating for change, and urged the city council to pass laws in which the police could more effectively follow these directives.\textsuperscript{137} Likewise, in Cincinnati, the city council passed an anti-loitering ordinance and an anti-riot act designed specifically to give the police a freer hand in keeping blacks in their place.\textsuperscript{138} No high ranking white police official in Cleveland and Cincinnati would discuss with the writer the question concerning black proportional representation on their police force. One high ranking police official even got hostile as a result of such probings. Surely such prima facie evidence can be hypothesized to be salient to riot severity. Likewise, fire departments pay adequate salaries and are very visible in the black
community. Yet one rarely sees a black fireman. As indicated earlier, all three cities are under federal court order to speed up black proportional representation on it's police and fire departments.

A common salient characteristic of the school system is that the school board has effectively adhered to the neighborhood school concept which has consequently resulted in highly segregated schools. Several studies clearly point out that separate school systems receive unequal resources and consequently polarize the races as was witnessed in Cleveland's Collinwood High School and Cincinnati's public schools. Racial polarization and segregation in both Cleveland and Cincinnati's public schools influenced riot severity.

The importance of black representation in political party organizations (Democratic Party) cannot be overstressed. In providing an analysis of Carl Stokes' attempt to win the 1967 primary in Cleveland, Nelson and Meranto point out that Stokes changes of winning the primary would have been enhanced if he were endorsed by the Democratic Party and "if he won under the party label it would help his administration in obtaining special federal assistance." Stokes became Cleveland's first black mayor, secured federal anti-poverty funds for the black community (ex-Mayor Locher blocked all federal anti-poverty from going into the black community during his administration), successfully averted a riot (and consequently, reduced riot severity) in Cleveland following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in April, 1968, and was highly praised for reducing riot severity during the Glenville riots. Clearly the importance
of black political representation in political party organizations (Democratic Party) and riot severity can be seen.

Variation in riot severity in the three cities is even more difficult to explain. However, reasonable speculation and conjectures is possible. Cleveland had the greatest amount of black political representation (although less than proportional representation) and the most severe riots. One possible reason for greater black representation in Cleveland can be attributed to the ward election system as opposed to the at-large election system. As wards shifted in composition from white to black, another black person would eventually be elected to some political office. Cincinnati and Pittsburgh have an at-large electoral system. The Kerner Commission pointed out that Cincinnati blacks complained that the at-large election system diluted their vote and that they had greater black representation during the 1950s under the proportional representational system. Indeed, James Stanton, then City Council President (Cleveland) had a proposal to reconstruct some of the black wards in a manner which would have reduced black representation. The proposal was defeated.

Greater riot severity in Cleveland may be explained by the obvious fact of a larger black population and a high concentration of black people living in a small run-down area (Hough and Glenville) than in Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. Moreover, Cleveland conforms to what Sears and McConahay refer to as "the new urban blacks." Such blacks more critically question the social and political
arrangements in urban centers, have higher degrees of political consciousness and more clearly see riots as a form of political protest. Sears and McConahay argue that such political consciousness takes place in cities where a large black population exists in a densely populated area. Moreover, the manifestation of this new black consciousness may be reflected in the number of black political organizations (Advanced Black Guard, Black Unity House, 21st District Congressional Caucus, Black Inner City Clergy, Sunni Muslims, and the Black Nationalists of New Libya) as opposed to the traditional political civil rights organizations (NAACP, Urban League, CORE). It appears that during the riot years, Cincinnati and especially Pittsburgh initially relied more on the traditional civil rights organizations as a vehicle for evoking social and political change. However, blacks in all three cities appeared to have made the connection between less than proportional black representation and riot severity. Violence as a form of political protest was clearly seen as a viable vehicle for provoking effective and meaningful social and political change.

The data does suggest that riot severity did increase black representation in all three cities, and did produce a sort of organizing activity in the black community and a certain kind of response on the part of the white society.

In conclusion, the association of riot severity with less than proportional black representation is difficult to explain away and certainly deserves attention. The political implications that can be
drawn from such an association may be debatable, yet the significance can hardly be questioned. There is no attempt to imply a causal relationship between riot severity and black political underrepresentation; yet the association cannot be ignored. The difficulty of drawing absolute conclusion to provide full confirmation of the proposed general hypothesis points to the need for a follow-up study to more clearly determine the relationship that may exist between riot severity and black political underrepresentation. While there was some variation between Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh concerning riot severity and black political underrepresentation, the variation was not significant enough for the writer to really confirm in a comparative way the differences that representation will in fact make on these particular cities.

One of the fundamental reasons why blacks could increase their political representation in Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh was because the riots had the effect of opening up blocked channels and creating new channels of communication in which blacks could exercise political influence, and as a consequence, black representation increased. Hence, one can draw the conclusion that because black representation increased, there was a precipitous decline in riot severity. Such a carefully drawn conclusion underscores the political nature of the riots.

Moreover, one can predict that as blacks begin to see political channels blocked again (i.e., cut back in poverty programs, freeze on housing, etc.), riots will reoccur. Furthermore, it can be argued
that the extent to which blacks perceive these channels to be blocked will affect the level of riot severity that will take place.

Hence, the relationship between black political representation and degree of riot severity appear to be the following:

1) The lower the proportional representation of blacks on city police departments, the greater the severity of rioting.

2) The lower the proportional representation of blacks on city fire departments, the greater the severity of rioting.

3) The lower the proportional representation of blacks on city councils, the greater the severity of rioting.

4) The lower the proportional representation of blacks on school boards, the greater the severity of rioting.

5) The lower the proportional representation of blacks as precinct or district committee person, the greater the severity of rioting.

6) The lower the proportional representation of blacks as ward chairpersons or leaders, the greater the severity of rioting.

It can be argued that the findings only generate a weak confirmation in support of the general hypotheses. Moreover, many would contend that the strength of the study lies in the fact that the findings are extremely difficult to disconfirm. However, both arguments may very well illuminate the inherent strengths of a comparative case study of an exploratory nature. That is, one cannot confirm or disconfirm a hypothesis with one case study of an exploratory nature, but three case studies all more or less pointing in the same direction can generate partial generalizations. The partial
generalization uncovered by this study coincides with the general theory that guided the study; that is, the lower the proportionate political representation of a racial or ethnic group, the greater the severity of rioting. Moreover, it can be argued that disproportionate political representation of a racial or ethnic group is conducive to violence (rioting), and subsequently, conducive to riot severity.

The main purpose of this study is devoted to generating new hypotheses to be tested subsequently among a larger number of cases where no middle-range theory presently exists. This study can, therefore, be seen as the first stage of research that has increased the investigator's familiarity with the phenomenon under study, clarified concepts, established new hypotheses to be subsequently tested for further research, and generated information concerning the limitations and practical possibilities for carrying out research in real-life settings. Because of the complexity of conducting research in the real-world, the comparative exploratory or case study approach have proven to be especially fruitful in uncovering meaningful hypotheses to be tested. The following areas appear to be meaningful for generating new hypotheses concerning black proportionate political representation: number of black city commissioners, number of black municipal judges, number of blacks employed in city government departments, number of blacks represented in the awarding of city contracts,
and the presence or absence of a black mayor. The above were the most
salient areas uncovered by this research that appeared to have in-
fluenced riot severity.
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CHAPTER FOUR

VIOLENCE AS A FORM OF POLITICAL PROTEST

The Relevance of Violence

The birth of the United States as a "free nation" was rooted in the violent overthrow of a colonial regime, and this tradition of violence has permeated the social fabric of North America from that time to present. By any statistical measure, the U.S. outranks all countries in the world in the prevalence of violent acts.¹ Political violence has been, in fact, a conventional form of behavior in this republic, which employed violence to affirm its unity in the Civil War. The significance of violence in the development of this country suggests that violence has been instrumental in evoking social and political change.

Violence as a form of political protest cannot be dismissed as irresponsible and meaningless. To set it apart from the processes that give rise to change in a society is to ignore the continuum that exists between violent and nonviolent societies and would amount to whitewashing an entire culture of violence in United States history. The relevance of violence in the United States society may be seen as a last resort in the bargaining spectrum only after other channels
for political bargaining are closed. Moreover, violence or the threat of violence, may in fact change the bargaining equation itself. Like many other forms of extreme behavior, isolated violent acts may be looked upon as society's early warning system, uncovering deep-rooted grievances crystallizing beneath the surface of social relations, and foreshadowing larger events to come. Indeed, omens of violence, particularly the murder of the Reverend Bruce William Klunder in 1964 and the student conflict at the large Collinwood High School in 1965, clearly gave warning of the two major riots that erupted in Cleveland in 1966 (Hough Riots) and 1968 (Glenville Riots).  

H.L. Nieburg maintains that the consequence of ignoring the normal dynamics of political violence has blinded us to meaningful social change and creates unwarranted concern and alarm; that is, "the public by a large majority endorses the gunning down of adolescent looters on the street," and even blame those that engage in positive efforts to treat the roots of social distress as contributors to social evils. "'Law and order' becomes a slogan for repressing extremism by escalating the conflict rather than for attacking its causes."  

Such a reaction defeats our common sense and blurs our best judgement, and can lead us dangerously to take the wrong course of action. For example, what blacks in run-down ghetto areas called "survival" and legitimate forms of political protest, the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) under the leadership of Rep. Edwin E. Willis (Louisiana, Dem.) called irresponsible acts of violence and "guerrilla warfare," and recommended to President Johnson a plan
by which such black citizens could be "isolated and destroyed in a short period of time." Moreover, two teenagers in the Hill District (black community) of Pittsburgh pointed out the vigilance that had to be maintained in order to ward off a "rat attack." An eight year old child joined in, "you should see my momma, she's not afraid of rats. She gets a big stick and beats the hell out of them... my momma, she's tough." If the stark reality of living in underdeveloped ghettos is not considered "survival" by Rep. Edwin E. Willis (Louisiana, Dem.), then the writer suggests that he spend a night in the neighborhood of that mother and her eight year old son. In short, emotionalism around urban unrest cannot blind us to the tradition of violence in America to protest or challenge the entrenched power structure.

The Inevitability of Change

Meaningful change requires the capability and determination to compel or demand unacceptable cost from the dominant power-holders. According to Nieburg, there is an economy of the use of force in terms of cost, risk, and benefits, whether for developing countries or for disaffected minorities, even at greater cost to the weakest group. Such a strategy may be the only means by which a small nation or minority group can maintain respect for its independence, values,
demands and political bargaining power. "The weak may lose, but they may also win by testing the cost-risk-benefit constraints of the strong; in any case, they may have no choice. For both sides risk arises from the loss of ability to limit, control, or predict the dynamics of a confrontation crisis." Property loss and/or destruction of property can bring power-holding groups and powerless minorities to the bargaining/negotiating tables more readily than the loss of human lives. This was a shocking revelation of the commodity-type riots during the 1960s.

According to Ralf Dahrendorf, conflict is inherent in an industrialized society and often brings about a new consensus. Moreover, Nieburg maintains that "society is inherently composed of competitive individuals and groups, all struggling to maintain or advance their position or advantage of a wide variety of means." On the stability-instability continuum, a state of instability must not be seen as isolated from society's "normal" state, but rather as an extension of it. The appearance of conflict or instability merely indicates that the "decision making" process is being intensified and carried on by other means; thus, Nieburg concludes that "conflict is an essential aspect of growth, one that we can neither fully control nor prevent, nor should we wish to do so... History clearly demonstrates that societies can and do recover and even profit from seizures and disasters,..."
Continued reliance on orthodox political tactics has left black Americans in the position of a virtual social caste after three hundred years of struggle in order to gain legitimate political expression. The demonstrated failure of legitimate means of placing long-standing grievances on the political agenda has led many blacks to resort to violence as a form of political protest;\textsuperscript{11} hence, the rioting that swept the American cities during the decade of the 1960s may be viewed as an exaggerated form of the normative pattern of violence in this cultural context.\textsuperscript{12}

Social scientists who tend to characterize political violence as irresponsible and irrational behavior, erroneously tend to equate stability with successful democracy. Neglected are the historical manifestations of violence that have all but been totally ignored or treated as transient aberrations.\textsuperscript{13} The model of a stable and effective democratic system stresses consensus, harmony, and a multiplicity of competing groups peacefully and successfully having their demands and grievances met through a process of negotiation, bargaining and compromise. Such a model for change is referred to as incrementalist decision-making in a pluralistic society.\textsuperscript{14}

In order to bring about meaningful change, Dolbeare clearly points out that "without a sense of where power is now located, how it is used, what values and interest are dominant - and how change may come about in those respects - there is neither a rational basis for judgement between competing prescriptions nor any idea of how to bring them about in the real world."\textsuperscript{15}
The incremental decision-making model in a pluralistic society represents one set of competing prescriptions for change. While not attempting to advance a set of prescriptions for change in the American political system, the writer's intentions are to carefully analyze incrementalism—pluralism as a viable vehicle for meaningful political and social change and to evaluate the necessity of violence in a pluralistic society. In commenting on the inevitability of change, Robert A. Dahl points out that "in the entire history of political institutions, no political system has ever been immutable."16

Incrementalists hold to the position that political change in the United States takes place in small steps (i.e., is incremental) and using this process a mutual adjustment of interests takes place and therefore interests are not ignored, but rather, widely differing values and objectives come together and are ultimately balanced for the common good of all. The incrementalists argue that going about change in these "small steps" avoids large mistakes and good policies are ultimately made of actors "... going through a trial and error process."17

C. Wright Mills sees the incrementalist approach as going back to the philosophy of John Adams and "romantic pluralism," i.e., that groups within society are relatively equal and check and balance each other as economic and political decisions are made through their input. Mills feels that this approach has many weaknesses. First of all, it does not take into account the differences in power between the top, middle and bottom levels of society; this approach especially
ignores the possibility of a "community of interests" among the top group. For Mills, there is nothing sacred about checks and balances, and, in fact, these do not exist when groups in society have unequal power.  

Mills contends that the only balance of power which now exists is among the middle sector of society and this sector is concerned with narrow state and local issues. Life and death decisions, e.g., war, the building of nuclear plants, are made by groups of people connected with big business and more and more frequently, the military. 

The theory of balance, then, or incrementalism, is not a valid theory. Important decisions are made at the highest levels of society and minor decisions are made at the middle levels of society, and then within very narrow confines. Mills calls this level the "noisy content of politics." This middle level, because of the media attention given it, becomes then, the glowing example of pluralism at work. But, how diverse are the people making decisions at the middle level? In 1952 four out of five representatives and two out of three senators received incomes other than their government salaries and were overwhelmingly white aging males, with the most power held by those persons with seniority on committees. So, by the time our "decision-makers" get an issue to decide on it is watered down and structured to such an extent there is little flexibility or room for independent thinking. Mills asks, "How do these senior members of Congress maintain their seniority?" The answer is simple, reelection depends on stressing safe, local issues and ignoring national problems.
This, then, is our "balance of power" with minor decisions debated at the middle-levels of society under the guise of "major policy-making" while major decisions are decided in the conference rooms of big business and in the pentagon. The theory of balance assumes that within society there is a "harmony of interests," but according to Mills, the dominant ruling groups' interests are those most frequently expressed. "... to say that various interests are balanced is generally to evaluate the status quo as satisfactory or even good; the hopeful ideal of balance often masquerades as a description of fact."\(^{22}\)

Thus, Mills concludes that many viable alternatives and potential issues do not reach the governmental arenas and consequently do not become part of the observable balancing process.

Moreover, incrementalism assumes that we are living in a pluralistic society in which everyone has an opportunity for input into the political system to make their demands known. At the same time, incrementalism assumes that power within the society is relatively evenly distributed and that there is no one "right" decision that needs to be made, but that there are a series of small "incremental" decisions. Given all of the above, power, then, for the incrementalist, balances itself and a mutual adjustment of interests is achieved.\(^{23}\)

The strengths of the incrementalist model are few and the writer must state them with qualification. To begin, decision-making using the incrementalist model gives policy makers a chance to test out
policies and if they see that the policies are not workable they can backtrack and start over. The incrementalist model also limits details in decision-making (i.e., they do not examine every little variable before making a decision), thereby speeding up the process of decision-making.24

The weaknesses of the incrementalist model, far outweigh the strengths. There is, first of all, no provision for fundamental decisions, e.g., war, which always precede incremental ones. Added to this, what may appear to be an incremental decision may really be the implementation of a fundamental decision. Incrementalism also focuses on short-run planning which often times tends to neglect "basic societal innovations." While an accumulation of short-run policies could lead to a significant change, there is nothing in this approach to guide the accumulation of such policies which can result in policies being either "circular" or "dispersed."25 Consent is seen as the basis for decision-making for the incrementalist, but when examined closely, consent is really the expression of the interests of the most powerful segment of society. Incrementalists say that values cannot be ranked or summarized, therefore they are ignored. "Decisions so reached would, of necessity, reflect the interest of the most powerful, since partisans invariably differ in their respective power positions;" hence, "demands of the underprivileged and politically unorganized would be underrepresented."26

The incrementalist model can be seen as a tool of the powerful who can and do make the fundamental decisions and then let the other
interest groups in society (and this does not include the poor, minorities or working people) play around with the incremental additions to the fundamental decision, all the while being directed and constrained by the original fundamental decision.

**Violence as a Form of Political Protest**

Violence as a form of political protest becomes necessary when members of a community have articulated needs which are not being met and for which there appears to be no avenue for forcing action to meet these needs. Thus, when a request for an open meeting with Cincinnati's city council members was turned down, blacks became frustrated and stepped up their looting and burning of private property. In response to the increased riot severity, Cincinnati's city council members quickly changed their minds and held an open session.27 Likewise, when city council members and Mayor Joseph M. Barr refused to create a Contract Compliance Office in Pittsburgh to insure proportionate black representation on all city related contract jobs, a coalition of black and white civil rights groups and several hundred black non-union construction workers took to the streets in protest. Only after violence erupted did the owners of ten construction projects agree to stop operations to permit bargaining and negotiations.28

Graham and Curr contend that political violence is both "natural and predictable" when "... an individual or group is denied the opportunities to meet their basic and man-made needs."29 Indeed, the history of blacks in the United States is a history of enslavement,
brutality and oppression of a people. After a decade of hopes, dreams and disappointments, beginning with Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation to Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat in the front of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama, blacks continue to be excluded from decision-making in the United States; they also continue to suffer super-exploitation (last hired, first to be fired), resulting in massive unemployment (black city youths suffer from 30 to 50 percent unemployment). At the same time, the majority of blacks are denied the right to a quality education through residential segregation and discrimination.

Added to the above outward manifestations of powerlessness is the reality of a day to day existence in which one can be victimized by police or other authority figures without redress. As Mary Berry states in Black Resistance, White Law, violence against blacks in the United States has been and continues to be "constitutionally sanctioned violence," while at the same time the "... violent suppression of black resistance" has been sanctioned by a government which for blacks has not been concerned with legal rights, but has been motivated primarily by racist concerns. Police Inspector William H. Moore of the Pittsburgh police department echoes Berry's concerns, pointing out that black and poor people are terrorized daily by police brutality. Likewise, James W. Barrett, former detective of the Cleveland police department, argues that blacks are offered the least protection by the law and are more likely to be the victims of "law and order."
All of the above must be placed in the context of 250 years of black history in the United States—two hundred and fifty years of hopes and dreams and disappointments. In 1976 the black community is required to come to grips with the loss of many of these dreams and the perpetuation of deteriorated living conditions for the majority of blacks in the United States. According to Parenti, the United States is not really a pluralistic society; that is, a wide variety of groups representing all sectors of society do not participate in decision-making, nor is the power of elites checked by the competing power of other elites. Community power studies which discuss the "indirect power" (usually meaning voting) of the poor often have not included the poor within their studies. Pluralists argue that the ability to be heard is an example that pluralism works, but Parenti counters that the ability to be heard within a system is not the same as sharing of the political, and economic power. Parenti's view from the bottom clearly points out that power is acquired by those within society who already have the most power and influence, and though the political order might continue to function, large numbers of the population are still being ignored.  

Poor people and oppressed nationalities are systematically obstructed from effecting public policy despite the seriousness of their grievances. Lacking the financial resources to mobilize ghetto residents, the poor are fundamentally blocked from creating "issues" of their plight within the conventional political channels. It is rather the powerful who, dictating the political agenda, relegate
the poor's grievances to non-issues. Rules, procedures, qualifications, and bureaucracies are designed from middle class perspectives and work against blacks as institutional forms of racism. Against this structure which, is oppressive and blocks means of redress, violence (e.g., the Watts 1965 riot) becomes the "functional equivalent" for conventional political activity. Violence in the riot is a symbolic protest to voice grievances; participants and non-participants with the Watts Curfew Zone supported this view.

However, the participants in the Watts riot were not revolutionaries. In their protest, they did not hope to fundamentally change American economic relationships, but rather sought to make their success possible within that system which excluded them. Their optimism that this was possible (the New Urban Black) was a strong factor leading to the riot. From this we can conclude that political violence (instrumental use of violence to accomplish a specific or general goal of society change) may take place within or without the "pluralism" of American democracy. That is to say, violence is not in itself revolutionary.

Nieburg argues that conflict is an inherent component of any society. And that "social action always moves along a continuum between violence and non-violence simply because social life is dynamic." Conflict exists in a "bargaining" process between actors in social life. "... bargaining among individuals and social groups has always been the chief factor in shaping and changing human societies." Ascendant groups in the formation of the state attempt
to monopolize the legitimate use of force. State bureaucracies, procedures, etc. are reflections of ruling class norms (e.g., efficiency more important than humanism) and are designed to protect the interests of dominant groups. The advanced concentration of power and resources in the hands of the modern corporation has destroyed the independent middle class economic units (small farmers, entreprenuers, etc.) upon which the pluralist model of society is based. This has heightened the possibilities for political violence.

By permitting a pluralistic base, the democratic state enables potential violence to have a social effect and to bring social accommodation with only token and ritual demonstrations, facilitating a process of peaceful political and social change.41

The politically powerless groups of today -- the poor and black (minority citizens) and on higher levels the elderly, consumers and white collar and wage workers -- do not have the ability to create social change through symbolic means alone. The tighter power cliques of today are less vulnerable to public pressures than were the decen-tralized power structures of yesteryear. Even if one is only out for one's own "fair share" of the social pie, it's harder to grab a piece. And if one is questioning fundamental assumptions (e.g., white capitalism, individualism), one is inviting severe repression (e.g., the Black Panthers).

Nieburg looks at violence as society's "early warning system" revealing deep political conflicts. He adds, "when a community drifts toward alienation and violence, leaders of the establishment cannot evade the responsibility of adjusting majority values in order to
What we find today in the like of ex-mayor Yorty and Chief Parker (Watts, 1965) is, however, attempts to adjust majority attitudes, through the media primarily, to moderate or immobilize the effectiveness of minority demands. We find today that even extreme political behavior like the Watts riot is an ineffective means of social change. Even the resort to violence by disaffected political groups (e.g., the poor, urban black) does not erase the near monopoly of legitimacy, communications, tradition, finance, and social control mechanisms held by the entrenched power structure. Indeed, the severity of rioting in the three cities under investigation did not substantially increase black political representation. Consequently, violence does not necessarily question or affect fundamentally the underpinnings of the political system. It may be argued that violence like the 1960s riots actually reinforced those underpinnings.

In discussing the use of violence in a program of social revolution, the gap between theory and practice become unrealistic. So many variables are involved in struggle (police reaction, media and reactions of desired allies, immediate tangible benefits) it is impossible, and even undesirable to detail the specific role of violence. But a general view is possible.

We now come to the question, what function might violence serve as a form of political protest? As Nieburg points out, violence and disorder are "... intrinsically related to the social process." As long as those who have been excluded from society direct their
violence only toward themselves they can easily be ignored, but when that violence becomes directed toward white businesses or the police as the protector of private property, they can no longer be ignored. It is clear, then, that violence serves as a signal that all is not well with a group of people and a demand that these people be welcomed into the political and economic life of the United States. Political violence serves as a threat to force those in power to negotiate with the powerless. Political violence also serves as a unifying tool for the black community. But what about those in power? Violence for the oppressed as much as for the powerful (with the possible exception of some crazed politicians or generals), is a tool to improve the group's bargaining position. Unless commitment to non-violence is politically feasible (e.g., for Martin Luther King and Cesar Chavez), it seems unrealistic to drop violence from an oppressed groups' list of tactics. In some places like South Africa, this would approach suicide. The fact that 176 blacks were murdered and 1,139 blacks were seriously wounded in the Soweto riots (massacre) the week of June 28, 1976 is one that must be deeply disturbing to those who have high regard for the sanctity of human life. However, infinitely more disturbing is the fact that approximately 8,000 blacks die daily in South Africa from starvation and poor living conditions. This is commonly referred to as "Vorster's white-minority national planned genocide program." Thus, the total rejection of violence seems to be an elitist position of the comfortable which the poor cannot afford to take. Questions of violence and non-violence
are often game questions of the liberals. They avoid the central question: Will violence help oppressed groups to organize and grow in the directions which will replace the old order with a new one dedicated to right the wrongs of the present? As the squeeze grows tighter, tactics must reflect the quest for control first and the ideals of the new order second. So the question becomes: Will violence bring us closer to victory? But as FRELIMO shows, human values may flourish during armed struggle, and the political world is so complex that the question of violence is not as central and overriding as one might think. Reliance on violence may be supported by organization and effective employment of non-violent strategies. Different levels of violence will continue to be used also and will merge imperceptibly with non-violence at many points.

The use of violence may further the cause for a social revolution or it may prove to be counter-revolutionary. As protest it may be silenced and invite repression or raise awareness. It may mean military victory. As protest, it draws attention, helps participants develop positive identities by allowing them to be socially assertive, and may achieve specific goals. Coming from the poor, black, and other powerless groups, it invites negative reaction. These groups must use it carefully though they have fewer alternatives to it.

But violence is humanly a powerful tool. So it invites attention. It is the consequences of violence that cannot be predicted or judged. However, as Martin Luther King, Jr. observed, political violence on the part of blacks would be seen as an excuse for the mass annihilation
of many black citizens, as well as an excuse to increase the police power within black communities. Indeed, a black Cleveland minister correctly pointed out during the Glenville riots that once the first shot had been fired, every black in Cleveland became "fair game." Likewise, after the first stone was thrown in Soweto, South Africa, every black instantly became a target. In reaction to both riots, whites rushed to buy arms and ammunition for protection - although at no time were any white communities threatened.

In sum, political violence will always serve legitimate functions as a means of drawing attention to grievances, perhaps opening the doors for negotiation, perhaps even forcing concessions on the part of those in power. But, the writer feels that none of these concessions (incremental changes) will be worth the loss of life within the black community. Alternatives must be developed such as organizing on other levels in an attempt to build a mass movement of all working class and oppressed peoples before fundamental changes within society can be realized.

The Politics of Violence

Most violent crime in America is associated in the public mind with the presence of blacks; however, any review of history shows violence to be an institutionalized part of America's social structure. Beginning with the mass slaughter of native American Indians, this country has rarely experienced a period without violent strife of some kind. Labor violence, lynchings, race riots, assassinations, and mob violence are all part of the United States history.
Joe B. Frantz maintains that America's violent tradition is based on its frontier experience, which cultivated a materialistic philosophy that made property rights a major priority over human rights, especially those of Native Americans and Chicanos.50 The contemporary cultural supports for violence are reflected in the countries anti-humanitarian values, prevalence of hand-guns, sacredness of private property rights, and a constant state of war preparedness. The latter appear to be instrumental in creating a collective public predisposition toward violence. As C. Wright Mills points out, "war or a high state of war preparedness is felt to be normal and seemingly a permanent condition of the United States."51 The empirical verification of Mills observation seems to have been borne out by the fact that "the Defense Department, whose $4-billion education budget doubled the entire budget of the Office of Education"52 and still continues to rank as the largest single item in the federal budget. Indeed, Police Inspector William H. Moore of the Pittsburgh police department expressed horror as he witnessed the buildup of military hardware in police departments throughout the country.53 Former detective, James W. Barrett of the Cleveland police department expressed the same concerns. They both argued in favor of a war on poverty instead of a war waged against the poor and oppressed nationalities.54

Acts of violence (direct and indirect) used by the state in the interest of political and economic elites are what might be called "legitimate" violence. Violence committed by collective members of
America's working-class and minority groups is regarded as "illegitimate" violence. Thus, the mass murder of workers, students and oppressed nationalities by the police is seen as necessary for "national security." If we accept as a definition of violence any behavior designed to inflict physical injury to people, it is clear that the greatest perpetrator of violence is big business. The Consumer Product Safety Commission reported that each year, over 30 million Americans are hurt and 30 thousand killed because of unsafe consumer products other than automobiles. This is three times the number of homicide victims in a year.

It is because the people who run the government serve the interest of private ownership that laws are designed to punish only those who commit "illegitimate" acts of violence. For the most part, those prosecuted will be members of America's working class, oppressed nationalities and the poor. All too often, those prosecuted fall in all three categories; therefore, as Staples concludes, "it would be more accurate to see violence as a political act because its definition and the penalties for it reflects one's status in the society, not the objective fact of physical injury inflicted upon a person. The power to define and enforce laws against violence is contingent upon one's standing in a society stratified along class and racial lines." This can be seen in the fact, for example, that more blacks than whites were arrested in Cincinnati under the city's anti-loitering ordinance. Moreover, whites arrested during the Avondale riots were charged with disorderly conduct - for which the
maximum sentence was thirty days in jail and an one hundred dollar fine. Most blacks arrested were charged with violation of the Riot Act, and received a one year prison sentence and a five hundred dollar fine. Likewise, the Cuyahoga County grand jury indicted five blacks on charges of first degree murder for the shooting of three policemen and a civilian in Cleveland, and sanctioned the murder of seven blacks by police and white vigilante groups as "legitimate" acts of violence. If we accept such a carefully drawn conclusion, the political nature of violence in the United States becomes clear; thus, oppressed nationalities are forced by mere means of survival to address themselves to changing the very system of social norms, rules, procedures, interest and values which the police power is required to protect. Rioting as a form of political violence (whether deliberate or spontaneous) can more accurately be viewed as counter-violence in response to "normal" police security procedures and directives that are designed to enforce widely accepted norms and values. However, it must be pointed out that no national oppressed minority group welcomes the tremendous loss of human life in a confrontation with the status quo unless it has no other choice.

Staples maintains that the violence (rioting) that permeated urban America during the 1960s were acts bent on denying the very legitimacy of the political state itself. The entire basis of undemocratic rule was being questioned by collectives who had no political power or stake in their own community. "They refused to obey the laws of an unjust society, where 'law-and-order' signifies the
perpetuation of the status quo." For it is this same status quo which embodies racist attitudes and practices that relegated black people to the status of an oppressed nationality in the first place.61

Fogelson contends that looting may be considered a political act because it is a direct attack upon the concept or private-property rights.62 As Dynes and Quarantelli observed, the looting that has occurred in recent racial outbreaks is a bid for a redistribution of property.63 Blacks did not feel they were doing wrong—they were stealing what was morally and idealistically theirs anyway. One woman from Philadelphia who stole clothing during a 1964 riot illustrated this feeling when she told the local NAACP president, "Listen man, this is the only time in my life I've got a chance to get these things." Studies show that blacks are indeed economically deprived. "... these findings show that fully one-third of the blacks are unemployed, underemployed, underpaid, or otherwise 'sub-employed.'" Fogelson points to racial discrimination, statutory unemployment, residential segregation, and overall unemployment as reasons for the Afro-American's economic deprivation.64

Arson, which was used less commonly, was another direct manifestation of the political overtones of violence. The selectivity which was carefully used points out the political consciousness of the ghetto residents. Instead of destroying all property, there was some spared (black owned property). Fogelson notes a tendency to burn stores and especially those "which charged excessive prices and sold inferior merchandise."65
Hence, in a society that gives private property a high priority over human rights, violence is an inevitable part of its social structure. Contemporary America has become the world's most destructive society. In seeking to extend its control over the world's peoples and resources, it has killed or supported the killing of millions of people throughout Asia, Africa and South America. For example, Vietnam was once the "rice-basin of the East," but the Vietnamese finally decided to throw out their foreign exploiters and take control of their own resources. In response, America bombed and defoliated Vietnam to the point of ecological disaster. Vietnam has huge resources of tin, which American industry wanted and was prepared to do almost anything to get.  

In its declining stage, state monopoly capitalism needs an exploited working class to take the brunt of its economic vagarities. Blacks (especially youth) have disproportionately carried this burden. As William Tabb points out, blacks have been set aside as a reserve labor pool for the purpose of keeping certain unskilled, undesirable, low-paying jobs in circulation, while at the same time serving as a cushion for the economy. Likewise, while white America represses black youth for their violence at home, it welcomes them in its imperialist wars abroad. Masotti and Corsi strongly argue that this fact cannot be overlooked as a prelude to urban violence since most blacks are recruited from ghettos to fight in foreign wars, and subsequently returned to the slums. Fred Ahmed Evans stands out as a case in point. Evans, the supposed "instigator" of the Glenville
riots was a decorated Korean War hero. After returning to the Cleveland slums after the war, Evans started an anti-poverty program and promoted black culture and racial pride. Evans was immediately placed under police surveillance. He was convicted of murder by a "hung" jury as a result of the Glenville shoot-out and now sits on death row. Evans' honorary war metals won for his bravery during the Korean War suddenly became insignificant. Sam Yette argues that such tragedies are not isolated incidents and clearly points out that Vietnam, for example, became a dumping ground for unemployed blacks and working class whites. Yette concludes that "racism and war, like capitalism, require institutional victims - a class of expendables." Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. makes a similar observation, 'we are willing to make the Negro 100 percent of a citizen in warfare, but reduce him to 50 percent of a citizen on American soil.... Half of all Negroes live in substandard housing and he has half the income of whites. There is twice as much unemployment and infant mortality among Negroes.' This high rate of infant mortality can only be traced to environmental factors such as poor diets, inadequate health care, poor housing, etc. Moreover, 'there were twice as many Negroes in combat in Vietnam at the beginning of 1967, and twice as many died in action - 20.6 percent in proportion to their number in the population as whites.' Thus, the violence of the political state far exceeds that of its oppressed black inhabitants.

In light of such madness, groups besieged by daily violence in the form of poverty and racial oppression have little to lose.
CONCLUSION

The interconnections between black political powerlessness and riot severity presented in Chapter Three helps to illuminate the political dimensions of violence in America. The data suggest that the riots in Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland did not take place in a vacuum, but were the products of a long history of black neglect, exploitation and oppression. It becomes clear that violent outburst by blacks in these cities constituted political acts designed to register an impact on the political process through extra-legal means under conditions in which regular channels for the articulation of group interest and the exercise of group power were substantially blocked. The special contribution of this study is the support it provides for the hypothesis that the more removed blacks are from the formal decision-making process, the more severe will be their violent or extra-legal response.

Instead of viewing the riots as meaningless outbursts, they can best be understood as legitimate protests against genuine grievances in the black community. There was no shame expressed by blacks while burning and looting buildings in the black community. The fact that property, and not people, was the target of the rioters points to the economic deprivation in the black community. Emotions of excitement and feelings of accomplishment many times characterized the riots; this fact leads one to believe that there was some kind of unity directed at a common enemy. Once hundreds of blacks in Cincinnati,
Pittsburgh and Cleveland had rushed into the streets and joined in the riots, they realized that all blacks had suffered similar injustices, that racial discrimination, though many times personal in its impact, is institutional in its origin. The sense of accomplishment revealed in the riots was not a sadistic one derived from destruction but rather derived from a successful attempt at communication. When legitimate channels for articulating a minority group's interest becomes blocked, violence becomes the only means left available to gain attention to that group's grievances. Thus, when a request during the Avondale riots for an open meeting with Cincinnati's city council members was ignored, blacks became angry and increased their looting and burning of private property. In response to the increased riot severity, Cincinnati's city council members quickly communicated with blacks concerning their grievances through formal channels. There were no blacks represented on Cincinnati's city council during this period (1967).

Cincinnati experienced two serious and one major riot. In response to the major riot that erupted in April, 1968, two blacks (22 percent) were elected to Cincinnati's city council suggesting that the riots served as a functional tool to bring about greater black representation. Had black representation on Cincinnati's city council been commensurate with their proportion of the population (28 percent), blacks may have had freer access to city council members and the level of riot severity probably would have been reduced. Likewise, when city council members and Mayor Joseph M. Barr refused to create a
Contract Compliance Office in Pittsburgh to insure proportionate black representation on all city related contract jobs, a coalition of black and white civil rights groups and several hundred black non-union construction workers took to the streets in protest. Only after violence erupted did the mayor and city council members decide to create a Contract Compliance Office and the owners of ten construction projects agree to stop operations to permit bargaining and negotiations. Blacks make-up 20 percent of Pittsburgh's population while only representing 11 percent of Pittsburgh's city council. Perhaps if there had been a black mayor of Pittsburgh and representation on Pittsburgh's city council commensurate with the proportion of blacks in the population, the riot severity in Pittsburgh might have been reduced. Moreover, if Cincinnati (1967) and Cleveland (1965) had greater black representation on their school board, the violence in Cincinnati's and Cleveland's public schools would probably have been reduced.

Due to violent protests in Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland some communication was established. Black Americans were at least heard and seen. Reporters and cameramen rushed into the riot torn areas, riot commissions were established, elected and appointed officials shook in their boots, and sociologists and political scientists were forced to go back to the drawing board in attempts to explain away the riots.
In the aftermath of the 1960s riots, blacks were able to achieve greater representation within the socioeconomic and political system. To some extent blacks were able to advance their position beyond the pre-riot period. However, these advancements were insufficient to resolve the long standing grievances of the black community and in some instances the gains made have been wiped-out by negative government acts in 1976. Therefore, until sufficient changes in the governmental process become institutionalized and blacks win permanent representation in the process of governmental decision-making, we can expect the use of riots as a political weapon by the black community to continue.
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