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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

David Harvey's recent 'state of Geography' address is an important attempt to establish the basis upon which to create a "popular geography, free from prejudice but reflective of real conflicts and contradictions, capable also of opening new channels for communication and common understanding" (Harvey, 1984: 9). Harvey insists, however, that "the present condition of Geography and proposals for its transformation must be firmly grounded in an understanding of history" (pg 1, my emphasis), and in particular a materialist conception of history.

Geographical works adopting an historical materialist(1) perspective have, over the past decade, both increased markedly in number and gained the respect of many within the geographical community. The writings are found in every field of human geography and these geographers have made important contributions to developing an understanding of how social relations are produced and re-produced over time and in space. In particular, these researchers have played a major role in exploring the internal relation

(1) See, for example, Anderson (1980).
between space and society. That is, they have identified the way in which transformations of space and society mutually presuppose each other. This contrasts with a more traditional view, held by many geographers, which holds that space has an independent effect on social relations.

The influence of an historical materialist methodology on geography in the 1970's is not an historical accident, but reflects the significance of the social conflicts and 'disruption' characteristic of most western social formations during the 1960's. The focus of the social geography emerging in the early 1970's revolved around documenting the existence and social relevance of this conflict and was often concerned with identifying ways in which more liveable and socially just environments could be produced. As the stridency of the conflicts diminished during the 1970's, however, geographers such as David Harvey and Kevin Cox in the United States, began moving away from this essentially empiricist, distribution oriented approach to socio-spatial change towards an approach more concerned with the primacy of production relations. In particular, they argued (separately) that the accumulation of capital and class struggle were important structural determinants of the changing social geographies of cities.

(2) See McCarthy (1979) and Burnett (1980) for reasonably comprehensive literature reviews.
The emergence and development of a 'politics of turf' literature(2) followed a path similar to that outlined above and it forms the point of departure for this dissertation. The first section of this chapter therefore identifies the major orientations within the 'politics of turf' literature. Studies of neighborhood activism have undertaken analyses of data provided by surveys or content analyses and have attempted to establish the correlates of neighborhood activism. In the second section a critique is developed which focuses on the failure to regard neighborhood activism as an historic process. This critique becomes the beginning point for the analysis which follows in this dissertation. The third section discusses the organization of this dissertation.

1.1 THE POLITICS OF TURF LITERATURE

Over the past few decades neighborhood-based social struggles have become increasingly important in United States cities. 'Displacement of the poor', 'exploitative rents', 'exclusionary zoning', 'destruction of homes', 'redlining', and 'depreciation of property values' are rallying cries used by neighborhood activists and have become popularised as slogans, especially in the press. These calls have as immediate context a variety of landuse changes which were introduced, or assumed a new form, during the
1960's. These land use changes include: urban renewal, gentrification, slum clearance, the building of inner city highways, and the development on a large scale of apartments and shopping centers.

These conflicts have provided a focus for the development of a 'politics of turf' literature. The majority of this research has been cross-sectional and conducted to explain specific instances of neighborhood activism. The methodologies employed have been by and large empiricist, regarding neighborhood activism as a dependent variable to which links have been sought with a variety of 'independent' variables describing the activists, the issues and their neighborhoods. This section details what the research has to say about who these activists are and what aspects of neighborhood change define the form of activism which emerged.

1.1.1 The Activists

Numerous studies have provided empirical evidence that a 'politics of turf' is more common in high-ranking as opposed to low-ranking socio-economic neighborhoods.(3) Although the precise reason for this difference is not made explicit in the literature, a number of contributory fac-

(3) See, for example, Bailey (1972); Bell and Newby (1976); Bridgeland and Sofranko (1975); Cole (1974); Crenson (1982); Cutler (1973); Lamb (1975); Lowe (1977); McCourt (1977); Orbell and Uno (1972); Pahl et al (1983); Williams et al (1971); Zehner and Chapin (1974).
tors have been suggested to explain the low incidence of activism in low ranking socio-economic neighborhoods. **First,** the expectations residents have of neighborhood organisations and local governments differ among status groups (see, for example, Downes (1971) and Williams et al (1971)). High-status communities expect better public services and amenities and are more concerned with maintaining the social fabric of their neighborhoods. On the other hand low status communities are concerned with keeping taxes low and are less concerned with amenity. Furthermore, low status residents are more divided on the issue of what constitutes a negative externality. As a result, residents in high status neighborhoods, because their goals are similar, unite more readily when their amenity is 'threatened'.

**Second,** the resources with which to oppose negative externalities are much more readily available to high status groups than to low status groups. As Mollenkopf has argued, poor people's neighborhoods get destroyed because the people lack the vocabulary to defend their neighborhoods (Mollenkopf, 1975). Furthermore, and as Crenson suggests, where a 'politics of turf' does emerge in low income neighborhoods it is due to high status residents and not the poor. Crenson continues by suggesting that three things give relatively rich people the motive and ability to engage in public service activities:
First, they're exposed to the problems of poor neighborhoods -- problems for which they are likely to have a low tolerance precisely because they have a relatively high standard of living. Second, they have the education, organizational skills, and sense of personal competence to believe that they can make things happen in their neighborhoods. And finally, rich people who live in poor neighborhoods have power, precisely because they're rich and their neighbors are poor. (Crenson, 1982: 4)

The research has a strongly distributional focus: unequal access to resources, for example, is seen to affect some groups more than others. As Pahl et al note:

Some groups (or areas) are very vulnerable to economic and physical change, whereas other groups (and areas) can adapt, adjust and benefit from such change. This inequality is manifested in their unequal access to housing, employment and other opportunities. (Pahl et al, 1983: 91-2).

Although a significant number of studies have remarked on the strong correlation between socio-economic status and neighborhood activism, most have taken this relationship as given and have not examined the possible multicollinearity between socio-economic status and homeownership, stage in the life cycle and so on. In one of the few comprehensive behavioral studies of activism, Cox (1982b) found that in fact the independent effect of status was weak, and instead the presence of children in the home, homeownership and the perceived existence of problems in the neighborhood were more significant 'variables' when attempting to explain who the neighborhood activists were.
The concern with children is explained as follows: (4)

Given the neighborhood school concept ... one would expect households with children in the public schools to be more concerned about issues of neighborhood change due to their implications for school peer groups (Cox, 1982b: 102)

Cox's survey research bears out this hypothesis.

Further, homeowners are far more likely to be activists than renters. Support for this conclusion has been found in a variety of contexts. (5) Explanations offered for this significant relationship vary, however. One explanation holds that homeowners are activists because they regard the home as an investment (See Agnew, 1978). As negative externalities would lead to a reduction in property values owners are forced to either leave the neighborhood or oppose the 'threat'.

However, a more comprehensive study than Agnew's found that

a fairly substantial fraction of homeowners do have an investment orientation (28%), but they are no more likely to be active, when appropriate controls for other variables are inserted, than those who do not have such an orientation. (Cox, 1982b: 116)

Cox's survey indicated that a reason for the owner-activism relationship might be the transaction costs faced by homeowners: selling a house "and buying up elsewhere presents a

(4) See, in particular, Cox (1982b); Cox and McCarthy (1980); Molotch (1972); Wolf and Lebeaux (1969).

(5) See, for example, Agnew (1978); Bloomberg and Rosenstock (1968); Cox (1982b); Orbell and Uno (1972); Weissman (1970).
considerable cost barrier to adopting the typical renter strategy of relocation" (Cox, 1982b, 122).

1.1.2 The Neighborhood

A number of researchers have identified the characteristics of the immediate 'social' environment as correlates of activism. Neighborhood organizations are found to exist more often in areas which are homogeneous in terms of tenurial composition, occupation, socio-economic status, and the like.(6) Further, higher rates of neighborhood activism are found in those homogeneous neighborhoods in which a land use conflicting with the character of the neighborhood has been proposed.

It is not only the immediate 'social' environment which is deemed important. There is also evidence that activism is more common in areas undergoing development and/or redevelopment.(7) As Samuel Hays has argued,

urban development, because it focussed on community change ... helped to reactivate ... community impulses and met increasing opposition from them. (Hays, 1974: 31).

Neighborhood change is opposed if it poses a threat to one's living environment.

---------------------

(6) See, for example, Crenson (1978); Davidson (1979); Downes (1971); Hall (1977); Williams et al (1971).

(7) See, for example, Downes (1971); Janelle (1977); Janelle and Millward (1976); Ley and Mercer (1980); Shelley (1982).
It has also been suggested that the particular characteristic or form of the proposed land use or facility is an important consideration. Increasing socialization in the provision of services, for example, has resulted in ever larger, more centralised facilities: sewage works, shopping centers, multi-family units, etc. The majority of these facilities are "noisy, smelly, ugly, scary or otherwise disagreeable to their immediate neighbors" (O'Hare, 1977).

In overview the major research focus has been the identification of the correlates of neighborhood activism — who the actors are and/or what the defining features of the neighborhood happen to be. One can have very little quarrel with the empirical regularities suggested by the research. Certainly homeownership, the presence of school-going children in the home and urban development have consistently emerged as concomitants of neighborhood activism.

1.2 CRITIQUE

However, in all of the 'politics of turf' literature there is no sense of neighborhood activism as a process undergoing change; a process which is furthermore continually redefined as social contexts change. There is, in short, no recognition of neighborhood activism as part of a broader sociohistorical process. As a result the emergent
character of neighborhood activism is lost. Researchers appear to regard the 'politics of turf' as a transhistoric phenomenon; a political action which derives its meaning from 'independent' factors and not from the (developing) sociohistorical context within which it has emerged.

This is not to say that there have been no historical studies of neighborhood activism. To be fair, most studies do trace specific instances of turf politics over particular periods, and could thus be classed as 'historical'. But the particular conception of 'history' adopted by these researchers is limited and does little to alter the image of an ahistorical conception of neighborhood activism.

There are two levels at which one can argue that neighborhood activism research is ahistorical and asocial. The first, or internal critique, would suggest that the temporal and sociospatial contexts within which much of the research has been conducted is too restricted. The time periods chosen by most researchers are, for example, too short to adequately develop an explanation of the emergence and continuation of neighborhood activism. In most instances only a few years -- usually the duration of a particular controversy -- are described.

It is not simply temporal restrictions, but also sociospatial ones which prove limiting in the 'politics of turf' literature. The spatial scope of historical explanations
is limited to changes in the character of the immediate social environment. There have been almost no attempts to situate neighborhood activism within spatially broader social transformations of urban areas.

These restrictions are not in themselves sufficient grounds for one to argue that the politics of turf literature is ahistorical and asocial. More importantly, one needs to address the epistemological basis of this research if these 'tags' are to be justified. In particular, for example, neighborhood activism researchers regard status, tenure and stage in the life cycle as 'exogenous' variables which produce neighborhood activism. Herein lies a major problem for there is a failure to recognise the sociohistorical basis of such 'independent' variables.

There are two aspects to the sociohistorical dimension which should be considered. On the one hand, the correlates of activism described earlier must not be seen as exogenous variables but as having been produced and reproduced within a broader social context. That is, attitudes towards children and tenurial status, for example, are not transhistoric phenomena but are continually in a state of flux. Thus, explanations of neighborhood activism must recognise that it is not homeownership per se or childcenteredness per se which produces neighborhood activism, but the socially defined meanings that the home and children take on in specific social contexts that are important.
On the other hand, and related to the first point, the social context itself is changing over time. That is, social meanings deemed important today were not important during previous time periods. There is the possibility, for example, that neighborhood activism is highly contemporary; hence, and if it is, a contrasting of contemporary social contexts with past social contexts may provide clues as to why there is neighborhood activism today.

One can therefore understand why Erik Olin Wright argued that historical studies should be investigations of the dynamics of social change, not merely investigations of the past. To analyse a problem historically, is to study contradiction and change, not simply to uncover 'origins'...The critical issue is not the temporality of the data but the way in which they are analysed " (Wright, 1977: 13).

Hence what is needed in order to explain the emergence and existence of neighborhood activism is a theory of social change. Given the critique developed above this theory of social change must be both socially holistic and, given the concern with neighborhood activism, must locate conflict in a central position. With regard to the former, the theory must recognise the social context within which neighborhood activism emerges. That is to say, the theory must not ossify categories: it must be sensitive to the meanings certain characteristics, like homeownership, for example, take on in specific social contexts. The theory
must furthermore allow one to explain changing social meanings in terms of changes in the broader social context. At the same time, this theory must place conflict in the center of the picture. As the concern of this dissertation is with explaining neighborhood activism, what is needed is a theory of social change which allows an evaluation of the origin of such conflicts.

Theories of social change fall into two broad categories: those which are atomistic as opposed to those which are relational in their underlying social ontologies. On the one hand, atomistic theories view totalities—societies, cities, institutions, etc.—as "an aggregate of elements—a mere sum of parts—which enter into combination without being fashioned by some pre-existing structure within the totality. If a structure... arises in the totality it can be explained as something contingent upon the way in which the elements just happened to combine" (Harvey, 1978: 288). Social change is viewed within atomistic theories in a purely quantitative sense: as comprising a rearrangement of factors such that some factors increase in importance relative to others. Atomistic theories assume, therefore, that "facts about societies, and social phenomena generally, are to be explained solely in terms of facts about individuals" (Bhaskar, 1979). The approach finds classic expression in models which posit...
that individual behavior is purely a function of one's preferences, subject usually to constraints such as income. Tiebout's (1956) theoretical model which sparked so much subsequent research provides a case in point.

On the other hand, and contrasting with these atomistic approaches, is a relational view of social change which seeks to "identify the transformation rules through which society is restructured" (Harvey, 1973: 290). This view holds that the world of appearances is generated by "unseen, hidden mechanisms embedded in the relations through which people produce their material life" (Cox, 1982: 291). Therefore, an understanding of social change must be found in the contradictions and conflicts generated by the social relations fundamental to particular social formations.

The differences between atomistic and relational theories of social change are stark. For example, atomistic theories reify categories whereas relational theories view concepts in their historical context. As Harvey notes, the former view is limiting, for "concepts and categories cannot be viewed as having an independent existence, as being universal abstractions true for all time" (Harvey, 1973: 293). At the same time, atomistic theories of social change are developed on the basis of an inadequate conceptualization of relations (see Sayer, 1982). This confusion
is most noticeable in the case of debates over the homogeneity versus heterogeneity of preference functions. As Cox notes, "that preference functions are separable from objective characteristics is not treated as problematic by ... these (atomistic) perspectives" (Cox, 1982: 291). Relational approaches, in contrast, are based upon a "differentiation between internal necessary and external contingent relations" (Sayer, 1982: 71) in the development of a theory of social change.

Relational theories of social change are most satisfactory when it comes to an understanding of how social relations are produced and re-produced over time and in space. Importantly, relational approaches provide the means whereby one can explain the categories deemed important in atomistic models. For example, to return briefly to the example of Tiebout (1956), a relational view of social change allows one to explain why, particularly in the post-War period, preferences appear to be separate from the objective conditions for realizing those preferences (see Cox, 1982).

One such relational theory of social change which could be developed to explain the emergence and existence of a 'politics of turf' is historical materialism. In particular, the approach takes as its starting point the historical basis of neighborhood activism and attempts to identi-
fy those dynamics of social change in *lato sensu* which have produced or underlain the emergence of neighborhood activism. More specifically, through building on the insights offered by the 'politics of turf' literature this dissertation

* identifies the emergence and changing character of neighborhood activism,

* explains the form of neighborhood activism found in the 1960's and 1970's as a conjunctural response to certain behavioral tendencies and the changing form of property capitalism, and

* examines broader, sociohistorical processes which underlay the emergence of a defensive and exclusionary activism found in the 1960's and 1970's.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

The body of the dissertation contains four chapters and attempts to describe three aspects of the investigation into the sociohistorical context of neighborhood activism. First, the historical emergence of a politics of turf is delineated. Chapter 2, therefore, details the way in which, over the past eighty years, turf politics has changed in Columbus, Ohio. These shifts in the character of neighborhood activism provide the context for the historical materialist analysis provided in subsequent chapters.
Second, historical correlates of the temporal trajectory of neighborhood activism are identified. On the one hand, in Chapter 3 shifts in homeownership and the presence of children provide suggestive evidence for a statement on the historical links between activism and these variables. On the other hand, Chapter 4 links activism with changes in the urban development process.

Finally, the broader sociohistorical context is examined in order to explain these historical correlates. This is accomplished in Chapter 5 which attempts to explain both the tendencies identified in Chapters 3 and 4, and the form assumed by the 'politics of turf', in terms of the sociohistorical context within which they emerge.

In order to clarify the argument provided in this dissertation a brief summary follows.

1.3.1 Summary of the Major Argument

The first step in this study involved the identification, historically, of the changing character of neighborhood activism. Using the results obtained from a content analysis of a local newspaper -- the *Columbus Dispatch* -- and an examination of rezoning files, the major empirical shifts in the intensity, character and historical geography of neighborhood activism are identified. Striking differences between pre-1960 and post-1960 activism are found. In particular, neighborhood activism in the post-1960 period has become more defensive and intense with a distinct
focus on the exclusion of certain land uses and facilities from residential neighborhoods. Important historical changes in the location of conflicts were also found. Over time neighborhood activism has become more suburban, and has assumed a more concentrated geographical form.

The initial task was to explain these quantitative and qualitative changes in terms of broader material and social transformations which impinge on the social geography of urban areas. On the one hand a variety of changes in certain behavioral tendencies were identified. These were increasing tendencies towards the avoidance of apartment dwellers on the part of owners and parents with school-going children. On the other hand the real estate development process has also changed over time. In particular, the changing scale of construction and the spatial integration of real estate markets are identified. Importantly for this dissertation these changes in behavioral tendencies and changes in the urban development process occur at about the same time that an exclusionary activism emerges and becomes more intense.

However, these relationships simply describe a variety of aspects of social change which have an important bearing on the emergence and increasing intensity of neighborhood activism. For an understanding of why these tendencies themselves occur, changes in the broader, sociohistorical
context are addressed. These changes are reflected in the way in which a new set of attitudes towards homeownership, children and neighborhoods have emerged over the past eighty years. These attitudes in turn have resulted from the resolution of a crisis of legitimation which occurred around the turn of the century. The resolution of this crisis revolved around the development of a new set of meanings for labor, such as upward mobility and a focus on consumption, which replaced those meanings -- paternalism, the Protestant ethic, etc. -- which were dominant in the nineteenth century labor process. It is suggested that the emergence of these new meanings, and the implications they had for people, allows one to understand why a defensive, exclusionary activism has emerged over the past eighty years.

1.4 METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

The analysis which follows relies on many different data sets and sources. In order to simplify the narrative and not adversely affect the continuity of the argument, extensive use of footnotes is made to describe the data sets and methodologies used in the analyses which follow.
Because of the locational specificity of neighborhood activism, historical investigations of a 'politics of turf' prove problematic. Researchers must contend not only with a variety of problems associated with historical research — the availability of data, difficulties with interpretation, non-reporting, and so on — but an added problem of where to obtain a relatively reliable data source. The only available, comprehensive, historical source of information on local political activism is a local newspaper: the 'Columbus Dispatch'. This provided the basis for the identification of instances of neighborhood activism over the past eighty years.

In order to obtain a reasonably systematic data set, all even-year newspapers were read and instances of neighborhood activism recorded. Information was collected pertaining to the location of each controversy, the kind of issue under consideration, and whatever other information was provided. Unfortunately, the relative importance of each
controversy could not be accurately gauged because the amount of newspaper coverage devoted to neighborhood controversies varied: there were changes in the size of the newspaper, the significance attached to neighborhood (as opposed to city-wide and national) events, reporter interest, and so on. Where possible, however, attempts were made to ensure the reliability of the content analysis.(8)

Over the eighty-year period (1900 through 1980) 717 separate instances of neighborhood activism were identified. This neighborhood activism varied in terms of the number of activists involved, the kind of issues addressed and the geographical location of the activism. While this chapter addresses these differences it is important to emphasise that in especially the pre-1940 period the majority of the activism involved requests for services, facilities and the like. In the post-1940 period, however, much of the activism consisted of protests over urban development and services. This distinction, as is argued later, reflects an important change in local government. In the late 1940's the Columbus City Council introduced a capital improvements programme and a fixed rate of tax assessment. This meant that residents no longer had to form a coalition to collec-

(8) It was not possible to verify the newspaper coverage of all instances of neighborhood activism. In the case of rezonings, however, it was possible to verify the instances of activism as rezoning files are accessible and located in the Development Department of the Columbus City Council.
tively request urban services for their neighborhood. Thus, the instances of activism involving requests for services was sharply reduced in the post-1950 period.

This chapter traces the character of the turf-politics so-defined over the past eighty years. In particular, an attempt is made to document quantitative, qualitative and spatial shifts in neighborhood activism. The first and major section describes the temporal shifts in activism and evidence is provided for the thesis that neighborhood activism has assumed a more intense and more exclusionary form than had hitherto been found. The second section identifies the changing historical geography of neighborhood activism: in particular post-1960 activism is more 'suburban' in character and more concentrated geographically.

2.1 CHANGING FOCI OF NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM

The instances of neighborhood activism recorded from the content analysis were aggregated into six categories (Table 1). Each of them defined the major focus of concern to residents and included the following: high density residential rezoning, non-residential rezoning, roads, annexation, urban renewal and the provision of services. (9) In broad

(9) These categories do not reflect separate issues of concern to neighborhood activists. Rather, the issues reflect the major aspect of concern to the activists. There is therefore a certain degree of overlap between categories. For example, a residential rezoning might
terms 'downward' rezoning (38%), the provision of urban services (31%) and roads (24%) comprise the major areas within which we find neighborhood activism. These figures, however, disguise important shifts over time in both the intensity and focus of turf politics. With regard to the former, the volume of neighborhood activism has increased dramatically over the period, especially during the 1960's and 1970's. Moreover, there is a growing focus of activism over rezoning, away from an earlier orientation towards the provision of services. These will be described in more detail below.

have been opposed on the grounds that the local road network could not accommodate the increase in automobiles. This issue would have been categorised as an instance of 'downward rezoning'.
Table 1

The 'Politics of Turf' in Columbus, Ohio: 1900 through 1980.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>RESID</th>
<th>NONRES</th>
<th>ROADS</th>
<th>ANNEX</th>
<th>URBREN</th>
<th>SVCES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>37(65)</td>
<td>26(42)</td>
<td>20(33)</td>
<td>6(10)</td>
<td>4(7)</td>
<td>9(15)</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>36(64)</td>
<td>26(44)</td>
<td>15(25)</td>
<td>7(13)</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
<td>15(26)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>16(13)</td>
<td>18(14)</td>
<td>27(21)</td>
<td>8(6)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>32(25)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>20(6)</td>
<td>16(5)</td>
<td>23(7)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>37(11)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>10(9)</td>
<td>20(17)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>66(58)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>47(44)</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>42(39)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>27(10)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>66(25)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>33(14)</td>
<td>9(4)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>58(25)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22(153)</td>
<td>16(115)</td>
<td>24(171)</td>
<td>6(43)</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td>31(224)</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where RESID = High Density Residential Rezoning,
NONRES = Non-Residential Rezoning,
ANNEX = Annexation,
URBREN = Urban Renewal, and
SVCES = Services.

NOTE: Row percentages are given, with the figure in parentheses referring to the number of distinct cases of neighborhood political activism recorded for the even years, within each category.

SOURCE:
Columbus Dispatch, 1900-1978, even years.
2.1.1 Increasing Intensity of Neighborhood Activism

It became clear when reading the newspapers that an important difference between pre- and post-1960 activism existed. In particular, the intensity of activism increased markedly over the past thirty years. Not only did there appear to be more instances of litigation, more referenda, and more anger expressed at City Council meetings, but the actual number of protests increased dramatically.

In fact, the actual number of recorded instances of activism more than doubled between the 1950's and 1960's. Of course, it might be argued that this is simply a function of the increasing population size of the city over the eighty-year period, and the post-War migration of people to northern cities. However, the marked increase in neighborhood activism during the 1960's and 1970's far exceeds that which would be expected on the basis of Columbus' population increase alone (Table 2). For example, prior to the 1960's observed neighborhood activism was less than expected given the population of the Columbus metropolitan area: there were, in fact, only half as many protests as one would expect. In the 1960's and 1970's, however, observed levels of neighborhood activism exceeded by over 30% what one would expect. This is all the more significant when one realises that the population of the Columbus metropoli-
tan area increased substantially from about 470,000 in 1950 to over 900,000 in 1970.
### Table 2

**Expected and Observed Neighborhood Activism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>EXPECTED</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>REZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**

1. Only protests were included in the compilation of this Table because with the introduction of a capital improvements program in the late 1940's requests for services were no longer necessary.

2. **EXPECTED** = Expected percent. based on the metropolitan population.

3. **ALL** = Observed percent. of all conflicts.

4. **REZONING** = Observed percent. of only conflicts over downward rezoning (residential and non-residential).

**SOURCE:**

Columbus Dispatch, even years.
2.1.2 Changing Focus of the Conflicts

The increasing intensity in neighborhood activism over the past eighty years is linked to a changing focus of neighborhood politics. In the earlier time periods a large proportion of all activism concerned itself with the provision of services, while in later time periods downward rezoning issues dominate (Table 1). We find, for example, in the 1920's downward rezoning comprising only 2% and the provision of services 42% of all neighborhood activism. In the 1970's, however, the situation was reversed with downward rezoning comprising 63% and services 9% of all neighborhood activism. These shifts are described below.

Neighborhood Activism over the Provision of Services.

Neighborhood activism in the early twentieth century revolved around attempts to secure previously unavailable use-values for the neighborhood. Neighborhood-based activists expressed concern about facilities and services found, or rather not found, in their general living environment, their neighborhood or street. With regard to the former, people requested improvements to the living conditions of their community as a whole, such as the provision of parks, fire houses, etc. They were often, however concerned only with obtaining city services for the road on which they lived. These included paving the road, street cleaning services and garbage collection facilities.
As noted before, however, the introduction of a capital improvements programme and a fixed rate of tax assessment in the late 1940's meant that it was no longer necessary to collectively request these services. As a result requests for the provision of services and facilities were obviously reduced. However, protests over the provision of services continued unabated. In fact, in the post-World War II period almost all instances of activism over roads and services were protests (Table 3).

Moreover, the specific focus of protests change. If we disaggregate the protests over 'roads', for example, objections to street widenings and the construction of highways increase dramatically over time. In the pre-1960 period street widenings and the construction of highways are issues of concern in only about one-quarter of all protests over roads. The remainder were protests over road and parkway provision, road repairs, and so on. In the post-1960 period, however, protests over street widenings and highway construction increase to over 40% of all instances of activism over road construction.
Table 3

Protests over Roads and Services, 1900 through 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>ALL ACTIVISM</th>
<th>PROTESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads Services</td>
<td>Roads Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>20(33) 9(15)</td>
<td>17(28) 9(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>15(25) 15(26)</td>
<td>13(18) 18(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>27(21) 32(25)</td>
<td>17(10) 22(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>23(7) 37(11)</td>
<td>16(4) 24(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>20(17) 66(58)</td>
<td>14(8) 29(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>47(44) 42(39)</td>
<td>13(6) 29(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>27(10) 66(25)</td>
<td>10(3) 38(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>33(14) 58(27)</td>
<td>16(5) 32(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes ALL recorded instances of neighborhood activism.
2. Includes only those instances of activism where PROTESTS were being voiced.

NOTE: Row percentages are given, with the figure in parentheses referring to the number of distinct cases of neighborhood political activism recorded for the even years, within each category.
Neighborhood Activism over Downward Rezoning

The major change in the focus of neighborhood activism is away from activism over services towards opposition to downward rezonings. These downward rezonings have become more controversial as individuals and coalitions of residents have attempted to restrict or exclude certain land uses and/or social groups from their neighborhoods. And these protests over downward rezoning have increased markedly in the post-1960 period. We find, for example, activism over downward rezoning issues exceeding by over 50% what we would expect based on the metropolitan population (Table 2). Thus, downward rezoning issues account for much of the marked increase in the intensity of neighborhood activism over the eighty-year period.

These changes indicate that increasingly the 'politics of turf' has become focussed around threats to the use-values of (and thus residents have become defensive of their) residential neighborhoods. That is, the post-War activism indicates a concern more with the preservation of existing living arrangements; a defend what we have behavior. This is in contrast to the earlier activism organised to materially change living conditions — as implied in the concern with obtaining services and facilities.

The shift to a more defensive and thus exclusionary form of activism is specifically evidenced when one examines the
applications (i.e. the permits) to build multi-family residential units in Columbus, Ohio. These multiple family projects have become increasingly controversial (Table 4). We find, for example, only one protest per 815 permits in the 1920's; this compares to one protest per 56 permits in the 1970's. Further, the exclusion of higher density residential development has dominated recent neighborhood activism: it comprises only 2% of all activism in the 1920's as opposed to 37% of all activism in the 1970's. (10)

Overall, the character of neighborhood activism has changed substantially over the past eighty years. In particular, earlier activism was organized around attempts to secure use-values for the neighborhood (e.g. public services, trees, etc.) and this activism is on the whole without any defensive (and hence, exclusionary) motivations. Later activism is predominantly defensive and concerned with excluding building developments and services from urban

---

(10) In spite of popular accounts there is very little evidence in Columbus that the exclusionary focus of neighborhood activism was racially inspired. In fact, there were a number of instances where black owners opposed the building of apartments for low-income blacks. For example, in 1952, black homeowners opposed the building of apartments for low-income blacks in the Clifton Road and Brunson Road area. The $1.75 million/198 unit/7 acre project caused a storm of protest with residents arguing it would lead to decreasing property values and would change the character of the neighborhood.

(11) Further evidence of this is given by the numerous instances of activism which argued against what may broadly be defined as 'growth'. We find activists opposing sidewalks (because they were proud of their
Table 4

Neighborhood Activism over Multi-Family Projects, 1920 through 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>RESREZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>1 : 56</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>1 : 41</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>1 : 98</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>1 : 151</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>1 : 156</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>1 : 815</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where RATIO = Ratio of protests to total multi-family construction permits granted for the previous decade.

RESREZ = Multi-Family Conflicts as a percent. of all neighborhood activism.

SOURCE:
Columbus City Council Annual Reports, 1922-1980 (even years). Table 1.

'back to nature' neighborhood), overhead cables ('aesthetically ugly'), sporting facilities in public parks ('destroys pastoral community'), assessments for public services ('destroy the road's country lane atmosphere'), freeways and so on.
The next section, whilst retaining this temporal dimension, focusses on the geography of activism over the past eighty years.

2.2 HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM

Recently, a number of geographers have focussed attention on the locational patterns of neighborhood activism. Janelle and Millward (1976), for example, commented on the fact that most neighborhood activism was concentrated in two areas: near the central business district, and in peripheral parts of the city.

This geography of activism, they suggest — and other have concurred — is linked to changes, or impending changes, in land use and/or social composition. For example, activism is more common in areas undergoing a transition from one set of land uses to another or in which there are a variety of land uses (see Janelle, 1977; 1979; Shelley, 1982). Also, these researchers suggest that neighborhood activism is less likely to be found in stable residential neighborhoods — stable, that is, in terms of population turnover (Janelle and Millward, 1976).(12) Although subsequent chapters address possible explanations for the spatial patterns of neighborhood activism, little is known, 

(12) Earlier, Williams et al (1971) suggested a more complicated model, one in which not just population turnover, but social status and the form of activism were critical explanatory variables.
however, about the geography of neighborhood activism as it has changed over time. In this section the historical geography of neighborhood activism is described.

Neighborhood activism, one expects, is related to population distribution. Areas of high population concentration should have relatively high levels of activism compared with areas of low population concentration, all other factors being held equal. Thus it is necessary to standardize neighborhood activism in terms of population distribution. This was accomplished using the census records.

The 717 instances of neighborhood activism identified in the content analysis were mapped in order to identify significant changes in the location of neighborhood activism over time (see Figures 1 through 8). The maps show for each decade:(13)

* the actual location of conflicts; and

* those wards/tracts of the city or metropolitan area where the incidence of activism -- standardized by population -- was greater than one standard deviation above the mean.

Two sets of changes over the period are most striking: the first reflects the correspondence between activism and the changing distribution of Columbus' population; the sec-

(13) All maps of Columbus, Ohio have an approximate scale of 1:200000. Approximate Columbus boundaries are given for the pre-1960 maps. The post-1960 maps contain, for reference purposes, the boundary formed by the outerbelt (I-270).
Figure 1: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1900's.

Figure 2: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1910's.
Figure 3: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1920's.
Figure 4: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1930's.
Figure 5: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1940's.
Figure 6: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1950's.
Figure 7: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1960's.
Figure 8: Geography of Neighborhood Activism, Columbus, Ohio: 1970's.
ond reflects the increasingly spatially concentrated nature of activism in the Columbus metropolitan area.

2.2.1 Activism and the Distribution of Population

Over the past eighty years there is some evidence of the suburbanization of neighborhood activism throughout the metropolitan area. This is not to suggest that earlier activism did not occur in suburban locations. In fact, in the pre-1950 period one gets activism in both central city and suburban locations. The 1950's and 1960's, however, are characterised by a very strong suburban focus for conflicts. This trend continues into the 1970's although a few central city locations (most notably, German Village, which is an area undergoing substantial gentrification) become significant. Further evidence for the increasingly suburban character of conflict derives from an examination of neighborhood activism across the different independent jurisdictions of the metropolitan area. Controlling for population, for example, much greater degrees of activism were recorded in the independent suburbs in the post-1960's period than in Columbus (Table 5).

Further interesting points emerge from an examination of those wards/tracts where there was more activism than would be expected on the basis of population size. These tracts/wards are indicated by the shading in Figures 1 through 8. First, there are temporal shifts in the geo-
### Table 5

**Suburban versus Central-City Opposition.**

#### NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>INDEP. SUBURBS</th>
<th>COLUMBUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Observed = Number of instances of neighborhood activism, and

Expected = Number of instances of neighborhood activism based on relative share of metropolitan population.

**SOURCE:**

Columbus Dispatch, even years, 1900-1978.

Decennial Censuses, Columbus, Ohio, 1900-1980.

Graphic location of activism. In particular, the central city dominates pre-1950 activism. In the 1950's and 1960's, however, most neighborhood activism is suburban. The 1970's signal to a limited extent a return to the cen-
central city. This is possibly due to downtown urban renewal and gentrification.

Second, even though we have a general suburbanization of activism, not all suburban areas contain instances of activism. For example, in the pre-1910 period, the central city residential areas and northern suburbs account for one third of all the activism. In the 1920's and 1930's the northernmost wards account for much of the activism: respectively 35% and 20%. And from 1940 onwards the politics of turf is concentrated in only a few areas.

Overall, the geographical location of activism has changed over time. Whilst earlier activism was focussed on downtown areas, during the post-1960 period independent suburban jurisdictions have accounted for a much larger proportion of activism than would be expected given their populations. In the next sub-section the spatial concentration of this politics of turf within Columbus is examined.

2.2.2 The Spatial Concentration of Activism.

Whilst the geographical location of activism has changed over the past eighty years it is also evident that neighborhood activism is geographically concentrated. In fact, an increasing proportion of all conflicts have been found in relatively few locations within the city and/or metropolitan area. If we take, for example, the tracts/wards
with greater than one standard deviation above the mean level of activism (as the 'extreme' cases), their proportion of all activism increases markedly over the eighty years (Table 6). In the 1900's these wards/tracts contained 30% of all the activism whereas in the 1970's this figure had increased to about 56%.

In order to investigate more precisely the concentration of neighborhood activism over the past eighty years, however, the historical geography of neighborhood activism was analysed using quadrat count analysis (see Haggett, 1965; Taylor, 1977). This involved placing a grid over the map of neighborhood activism and counting the number of conflicts within each cell. In order to investigate the null hypothesis that the location of neighborhood activism was a random process, the frequency distributions so derived were then compared, using goodness-of-fit tests, to a Poisson distribution. However, in such analyses one risks the possibility that results will be scale-specific. To minimise this possibility two grids were selected: the first consisted of quadrats of one kilometer square; the second comprises quadrats of 2.25 kilometers square. The results of goodness-of-fit tests are displayed in Table 7.

The quadrat count analysis proves to be most interesting. With only one exception (1920's using the large grid)
Table 6

Geographical Concentration of Activism: Census Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th># AREAS</th>
<th>&gt; 1 S.D.</th>
<th>PROP.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>36(22%)</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>18(16%)</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7(11%)</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7(12%)</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4(21%)</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2(13%)</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2(17%)</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3(16%)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where AREAS = Number of Tracts or Wards,

> 1 S.D = Number of tracts/wards with greater than one standard deviation of activism, with this number expressed as a percent. of all wards/tracts in parentheses,

PROP. = Percent. of all activism occurring in those wards/tracts with greater than one standard deviation of activism,

TOTAL = Total instances of neighborhood activism.

SOURCE:

Columbus Dispatch, even years, 1900-1978.
Decennial Censuses, Columbus, Ohio, 1900-1970.

The frequency distributions for the geography of activism between 1900 and 1960 are not statistically different from
Table 7

Quadrat Count Analysis of Neighborhood Activism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>1 km² cells</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2.25 km² cells</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POISS</td>
<td>NEGBIN</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>POISS</td>
<td>NEGBIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where NEGBIN = Comparisons with Negative Binomial Distribution;
POISS = Comparisons with Poisson Distribution;
K = Mean² / (Variance - Mean);

S = Significant at 0.01 level;
N = Not significant at 0.01 level.

SOURCE:
Columbus Dispatch, even years, 1900-1978.

that of a Poisson distribution. In other words the geography of neighborhood activism is no different from what we would expect from a random process. In the post-1960 peri-
od, however, the frequency distribution is significantly different from the Poisson distribution. This indicates a possible spatial clustering of neighborhood activism in the later time period.

Reasonable confirmation of this was obtained through a comparison of these quadrat counts to a negative binomial distribution which approximates a situation where there is a high degree of spatial clustering. When the quadrat counts were compared to a negative binomial distribution, all time periods (with the exception once again of the 1920's using the larger grid) compared favourably at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 7). A spatial clustering parameter was then calculated \((k)\) (14) and the results are displayed in Table 7 (see Taylor, 1977: 144). As can be seen, the 1960's and 1970's display the greatest degree of spatial clustering.

The quadrat count analysis indicates in two ways the increasing spatial concentration of neighborhood activism over time. First, the Poisson distribution does not provide a good fit for 1960 and 1970 whereas the negative binomial does. Second, the spatial clustering parameter \((k)\) is at its lowest for the 1960's and 1970's. In fact, given the oscillation of \(k\) before 1950 and the trend after 1950 towards more spatial clustering, one could argue that there is a qualitative difference between the pre-1950 and 

(14) When \(k\) is low spatial clustering is implied.
In summary, the changing geographical location of activism in Columbus appears to involve at least two dimensions. On the one hand, conflict has been found, at various points in time, in most of Columbus' neighborhoods. On the other hand, and at any one time, this activism is geographically concentrated. In later chapters reasons for these shifts in the historical geography of activism are addressed. In particular, it is suggested that conflict is most frequently found in areas undergoing change as a result of new development (in suburban areas) or re-development (such as gentrification) (see Chapter 4), and this explains in part the historical geography of neighborhood activism.

2.3 OVERVIEW

The character of neighborhood activism over the past eighty years in Columbus, Ohio has thus changed. The previous sections have shown that the 'politics of turf', especially in the post-1960 period, was quantitatively, qualitatively and locationally different from neighborhood activism found in the early twentieth century. In particular, neighborhood activism has become more intense, more exclusionary and more concentrated in space. The 1960's and 1970's activism, to which almost all of the politics of turf literature refers, is thus a recent phenomenon.
The defensive and exclusionary character of post-1960's activism resulted from concerns expressed by activists with the protection of specifically their homes and more generally their living place from external threats. These threats arose from the form of urban development taking place during this period. Developments seen to be threatening included multi-family residences, highways, large retail facilities, and the like, and all were perceived by neighborhood activists to impact adversely on property values, the quality of schools, and so on.

The material and social bases of this emerging politics of turf appear, therefore, to be two-fold. On the one hand, activists were defending a particular conception of the home, where homeownership, property values and children were important. On the other hand, activists were responding to a particular form of urban development.

Fortunately, recent research, especially the contributions of two geographers, provides important clues concerning the relationship between on the one hand conceptions of the home and the urban development process and on the other the politics of turf. With regard to the former, Kevin Cox has argued that "necessary for the emergence of turf politics is the commodification of the neighborhood" (Cox, 1982a:11) and, in particular, he argues, homeownership plays a central role in this process. With regard to the
latter, the importance of the urban development process to neighborhood activism has long been recognised. David Harvey (1974, 1978a), for example, has outlined both the crucial importance of the financial superstructure and the emergence of an urban development interest—especially property capitals—to the 'urban transformation'. Furthermore, the continual transformation on an expanded basis of the urban realm, he argues, provides the preconditions for neighborhood activism.

The relationship between these broader material and social changes and an emerging politics of turf is, however, dealt with in a quantitative and historically general sense by these researchers. This is partly the result of their aims: for Cox's concern was the changing consciousness of labor in the living place (Cox, 1982a) and Harvey's concern was with the urban development process and the emergence of class monopoly rent (Harvey, 1974).

Our task in the next two chapters, therefore, is to integrate these approaches into an historically more specific explanation of the politics of turf in Columbus, Ohio. In particular, the next two chapters seek to delineate the major historical correlates of the neighborhood activism so defined in this chapter. In Chapter 3 the emergence of a defensive and exclusionary activism is related to two behavioral correlates considered important
in the politics of turf literature. These correlates are homeownership and the presence of school-going children in the home. An attempt is made to show that these correlates are in fact historically emergent and represent growing tendencies on the part of owners and parents with children to locate with respect to each other and to avoid locating near renters. Chapter 4 moves away from these 'social' changes to examine the links between neighborhood activism and changes in the way in which urban neighborhoods are produced. In particular, it is recognised that the emergence of a defensive, exclusionary activism is associated with changes in the scale of developments and an increasing integration of residential real estate markets.
Chapter III

THE "BEHAVIORAL" BASES OF NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM:

OWNERSHIP AND CHILDREN

Behavioral studies of activism record tenurial status and stage in the life cycle as the major behavioral correlates of neighborhood activism.\(^{(15)}\) In particular, homeowners and parents with school-going children are more likely to become neighborhood activists than are renters and those without children. The reason advanced for this relationship is that these 'social groups' have a higher stake in the neighborhood and thus have more to lose from any external threats imposed on them by urban development. Homeownership, for example, involves a considerable material and psychological investment in a particular neighborhood. And similarly, parents with children make an investment in their neighborhood in terms of a variety of aspects of the socialization process: education, safety, and so on. These investments are, furthermore, relatively fixed and cannot easily be exchanged by residents for other homes in other neighborhoods. It is in this context, researchers

\(^{(15)}\) See, for example, Cox and McCarthy (1980) and Cox (1982b).
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argue, that one can understand the homeowner-parent bias of neighborhood activism.

The cross-sectional nature of this research, however, limits the generalizations to specific spatial and temporal contexts. Unfortunately, there has been no evaluation of the historically emergent character of the relationship between owners and parents on the one hand and their stakes in neighborhoods on the other. One is left in some doubt therefore as to what these behavioral correlates mean for the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive activism. Do the results of the behavioral research suggest, for example, that the increasing intensity of exclusionary activism is a result of quantitative changes in homeownership and family size? Or do they suggest that the emergence of a 'politics of turf' has something to do with historical changes in the locational behaviors of owners and parents?

This chapter attempts to evaluate such hypotheses. In particular, an argument is developed which suggests that the emergence and increasing intensity of a defensive, exclusionary activism is linked both to changes in the number of owners and parents as well as to an increasing sensitivity on their part to the residential location of other social groups. It is argued that there has been a behavioral propensity, on the part of owners and parents with school-going children, towards the avoidance of certain social groups.
3.1 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Information collected in the content analysis does not allow a systematic and reliable evaluation of the relations between owners and parents with children on the one hand and their investment in neighborhoods on the other. The exclusionary character of later activism and the frequent reference to ownership and/or children does, however, provide suggestive evidence for this relationship. Exclusion was particularly evident in opposition to 'downward' rezonings, especially those facilitating low income residential developments, where "homeowners fear subsidised housing will bring lower property values, crime, litter, trespassing, traffic congestion, noise and overcrowded schools" (Columbus Dispatch, 1972).(16) The evidence is, however, insufficient for any detailed conclusions to be drawn.

----------------------

(16) A variety of exclusionary mechanisms were used by activists in order to maintain the continuity of their neighborhoods. Instances found in Columbus included lobbying the city council; buying up vacant land in order to control the development process; using the referendum mechanism or courts to reverse rezoning decisions; pressuring the city council to cut off services to federally funded projects; obtaining upward rezonings and attempting to increase land or floor area requirements. Other forms of exclusion include:

* opposition to street widenings (to control the flow of outsiders);

* opposition to swings in parks (to keep outsiders' children out); and

* the use of annexation to exclude obnoxious facilities and to provide 'buffer zones'.
An alternative methodology was therefore sought which would demonstrate historical changes in the relations between on the one hand ownership and the presence of children and on the other hand their stakes in the neighborhood. It was recognised that if such a relationship existed it should be reflected in the locational behaviors of owners and parents. That is, homeowners should be trying to distance themselves from renters while parents should be trying to distance themselves from those social groups regarded as having no positive influence on the socialization process. It was decided, therefore, to examine how a variety of indicators of residential choice criteria have changed over time. The particular objective was to demonstrate the emergent character of both homeownership and the presence of children as residential choice criteria. This would in turn allow a link to be drawn between these trends and the changes in neighborhood activism identified in Chapter Two.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first details historical changes in the locational behaviors of homeowners. In particular, an attempt is made to document an increasing sensitivity on the part of homeowners with respect to the residential location of renters. The second section evaluates the impact of children on locational choice and shows an increasing correspondence between the
location of parents with children as well as homeowners. The final section argues that these historical changes in residential choice suggest a tendency towards the avoidance of especially renters on the part of both owners and parents with children. This behavioral propensity towards avoidance, when coupled with other tendencies (such as urban development) provides the necessary ingredients for the emergence of neighborhood activism.

The analyses provided in this chapter draw on published Census data to investigate general trends in the criteria of residential choice. Unfortunately, this introduces a problem because the pre-1950 censuses contain published information for the Columbus central city only and not for the whole metropolitan area. As a result, in many of the analyses detailed below, there is a disjunction between the pre-1950 trends and the post-1950 trends, which has little to do with behavioral propensities in Columbus, Ohio, and much to do with the use of Census records.

3.2 LOCATIONAL BEHAVIOR OF OWNERS WITH RESPECT TO RENTERS

Cross-sectional studies of the 'characteristics' of neighborhood activists and non-activists have identified the overwhelming significance of a tenurial effect. In particular, the research shows that homeownership is significantly correlated with activism. Kevin Cox's survey
research, for example, suggests that of all 'within-individual' variables, homeownership is the one with the most explanatory power (see Cox, 1982b). This result holds true even when the effect of socioeconomic status is held constant. Further, given the existence of some neighborhood 'problem', homeowners are more likely to become activists whereas renters will tend to move out of a neighborhood in which they are experiencing problems.

It appears therefore that homeowners have a greater stake in the neighborhood than renters. Researchers have concluded that this investment in neighborhoods comprises, for owners, both a material and 'ideological' component (see Chapter One). The content analysis materials suggest that whether or not the investment will be realized depends significantly on the tenurial composition of the neighborhood. This suggests, in turn, that homeowners will be averse in their location to renters. Over time this sensitivity should be reflected in the increasing localization of owners relative to renters.

This section attempts therefore to detail historical changes in the sensitivity of homeowners with respect to the location of renters. It is suggested that this sensitivity in the residential choice of owners is historically emergent and is reflected in both the increasing localization of homeowners and in the increasing effect of neigh-
borhood homeownership rates on property values. Importantly for the argument of this dissertation this tendency towards the avoidance of renters correlates with the emergence of a defensive, exclusionary neighborhood activism.

3.2.1 The Localization of Homeowners

Evidence that has been collected shows that owners are, indeed, increasingly separated from renters. In the first place, I have put together data on the localization of homeowners relative to renters at the ward/tract level for the period 1910 to 1980 (Table 8). The trends are quite clear. Associated with the increasing proportion of homeowners in each tract is an increasing standard deviation in these proportions over time. For example, there is a general increase in the weighted standard deviations of ownership rates from 9.1% in 1910 to 16.7% in 1940 to 20.1% in 1980. This suggests that over time census tracts have become more homogeneous in terms of tenurial status.

Similar conclusions result from an examination of the localization coefficients. What one finds is that the localization of owners relative to renters has increased substantially over the past seventy years. In fact, between 1910 and 1980 the coefficient of localization has more than doubled: from 20.2% in 1910 to 45.0% in 1980.

When taken together these descriptive statistics indicate that owners and renters have increasingly become sepa-
Table 8


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>% OWNERS WEIGHTED MEAN</th>
<th>STDDEV</th>
<th>COEFFICIENT OF LOCALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

1. For the 1910-1930 analyses census wards were used, whereas in the 1940-1980 period census tracts were used.

2. Coefficients of localization were calculated using the numbers of owners or renters in each ward/tract expressed as proportions of the total number of owners or renters.

SOURCES:

Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio (Washington, D.C.: USGPO).
rated in space. The general trend in the location of owners relative to renters is towards an increasing localization of owners. This supports our contention that there is a growing sensitivity on the part of homeowners to location vis-a-vis renters. Parenthetically, there are two slight deviations in this trend. The period between 1920 and 1940 and the period between 1960 and 1980 evidence slight reductions in the spatial separation of owners and renters. In the next chapter it is suggested that a contributory cause of this reduction in the separation of owners and renters may have been the substantial construction of multi-family dwellings during these periods.

These general trends are further supplemented by an examination over time of spatial autocorrelations of tenurial composition. Using data for blocks, homeownership rates were correlated with those of randomly selected contiguous blocks.\(^{(17)}\) The results for each of the years 1950 through 1980 are displayed in Table 9. The correlation coefficients increase monotonically over time. The first order nearest neighbor correlations, for example, increase

\(^{(17)}\) Random samples of 50 blocks for each census time period (1950 through 1980) were selected. For each of these blocks the contiguous northern block was selected as first order nearest neighbor and the next most contiguous block (in a northerly direction) as the second order nearest neighbor.
from 0.22 in 1950 to 0.90 in 1980. The correlations provide, therefore, suggestive support for the thesis that there has been a progressive localization of tenure groups.

Table 9

Spatial Autocorrelation of Tenurial Composition: 1940 to 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1st Order Nearest Neighbor</th>
<th>2nd Order Nearest Neighbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
1. Pearson's Product Moment Correlations are displayed.
2. See footnote 17 for methodology.

SOURCES:
Decennial Censuses, Columbus, Ohio, Block Data, 1940-1980.
3.2.2 Ownership and Property Values.

The increasing localization of owners with respect to renters detailed in the previous section provides important evidence that over time owners have become increasingly sensitive to the location of renters. As remarked upon earlier, cross-sectional studies of activism suggest that owners have a greater stake in their neighborhood than renters. If this 'investment' becomes more significant over time and if owners show an increasing sensitivity to their location vis-a-vis renters, then one should expect property values to be bid up in neighborhoods with high ownership rates. That is to say, if home ownership is a historically emergent behavioral propensity then the effect of neighborhood ownership rates on property values should increase over time.

In order to substantiate this contention five multiple regressions were performed for the census years 1940 through 1980. Using information for census tracts the

(18) The methodology used in this analysis has been reviewed by Ball (1973). There are a variety of points pertinent to this analysis which should be noted. First, the majority of studies use Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) analysis to 'predict' home values. It might be suggested that a Two Stage Least Squares (TSLS) analysis more satisfactory means of separating out demand and supply effects. Oates' (1967) study shows, however, that TSLS does not produce results very different from those resulting from OLS analysis. Thus, it was decided to use an OLS methodology. Second, these housing values were deflated to constant 1967 dollars. One should note, however, that as our concern is with trends in the various effects, and hence are interested in the beta values alone, such
value of housing was selected as the dependent variable. A variety of independent variables were chosen in order to control for the influence of social effects such as socioeconomic status and stage in the life cycle. This inclusion of a variety of 'independent' variables allows the effect of neighborhood homeownership rates on property values to best be isolated. In particular, the independent variables used in the analysis were:

* % of total units owned;
* % of population under 20 years of age;
* % of total units which were single family;
* % of population who were black;
* % of population who were high school graduates;
* % of economically active population who were white collar;
* % of total housing units less than 10 years old;
* median income.

The regression results indicate a striking trend in the effect of neighborhood homeownership rates. What is most significant is that the effect of neighborhood ownership rates on property values has increased monotonically over the forty-year period. Further, the coefficients for ownership are significant at the 99% level of confidence for deflation makes no difference to the results. Finally, the inflated effect for 1940 could possibly be due to a variety of correlated variables not being included in the analysis and the fact that the 1940 data set does not include any 'independent suburban' tracts.
# Table 10

**Home Value and Homeownership: 1940 through 1980.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERCEPT</td>
<td>1281.9</td>
<td>-2833.7</td>
<td>1240.8</td>
<td>-2716.1</td>
<td>-20427.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OWN</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &lt; 20 YEARS</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% SINGLE FAMILY</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BLACK</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HI SCH GRADS</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED. INCOME</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% WHITE COLLAR</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UNITS &lt;10 YRS</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Significant at 0.01 level.

**NOTE:**

1. Beta values are displayed.
2. See Footnote 18.

**SOURCE:**

Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio, 1940-1980.
the 1970 and 1980 years. The increasing effect of ownership on property values is all the more impressive given that for no other variable do the beta coefficients behave so well. In the case of each of the other independent variables there is no general trend evident over the forty-year period.

The increasing importance of the neighborhood homeownership rates coefficients provides excellent support for the thesis suggested earlier. They indicate that over the past forty years property values have increasingly been influenced by rates of homeownership. In particular, in more recent time periods property values have been higher in homeowning neighborhoods holding other variables constant. One can suggest therefore that property values are bid up in homeowning neighborhoods. This, it is suggested, is a result of the aversion of owners to the location of renters.

It is in this context that one can understand the conclusions of the behavioral studies concerning the stakes or 'investments' homeowners have in their neighborhood. The regression results provided here indicate that it is only recently that the stakes in neighborhoods have been greater for homeowners than for renters. This therefore allows one to understand the increasing sensitivity on the part of homeowners to their location vis-a-vis renters and possibly
also the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive neighborhood activism.

3.3 CHILDREN, HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

A second theme to emerge from the content analysis revolved around the concern, expressed by activists, about the potential deterioration in the quality of their children's lives. A large proportion of the neighborhood activism recorded in the content analysis was organised around threats to the socialization and reproduction of the next generation of labor power. This neighborhood activism included opposition to the overcrowding of schools, introduction of pinball arcades, sale of liquor, construction of drug treatment centers, group homes, half-way houses and the like. Multi-family units were seen to be particularly threatening given the possible effects they would have on schools, services, tax rates and the like. Support for these conclusions is found in cross-sectional studies of activism which indicate that one is more likely to be active given the presence of children in the public-school system (see, for example, Cox, 1982b). However, and as noted previously, these studies do not provide any evidence of the emergent character of such correlations.

It was decided, therefore, to use census data to investigate historical changes in the locational behavior of
parents with children. This would allow some conclusions to be drawn concerning the historical relationship between exclusionary activism and the presence of children in the home. There was, however, an important methodological problem to be faced. Census records, for example, simply list 'age' categories and do not allow a comparison of the relative location of parents with children with respect to other social groups. Thus the analysis could only examine the impact of children on locational choice and from this infer changes in the locational behaviors of parents with children. In spite of this the analyses detailed below do seem to indicate that

* the relative location of children has changed over time, and

* parents with children have increasingly located near owners rather than other social groups.

3.3.1 Localization of Children

There is some evidence that the relative location of children has changed over time (Table 11). In particular, the weighted standard deviations of the proportion of the total population who were 'children' (defined as those less than 20 years of age) have increased over time. (19) These standard deviations increase from 2.6% in 1910 to 5.1% in

---

(19) Once again the 1940 results provide an exception to the monotonic trends, due more than likely to the fact that no independent suburbs could be included in the analysis.
1950 and to 7.4% in 1980. It should be noted, however, that these results could be due to a segregation by family size. For example, one might find that this localization of children reflects a segregation of small families from large families. Nevertheless, the results do indicate a general trend towards the localization of children.

Further, there is some evidence that the relative location of young children with respect to other age groups has changed. Examination of the localization coefficients comparing children with those over 65 years of age, for example, shows an increasing separation in space between the young and the old. In 1940 this localization coefficient was 18.12% but by 1980 it had increased to 31.51%.

There is, therefore, evidence consistent with the idea that children (especially parents with children) have become more localized over especially the past forty years. If this evidence was conclusive, what would it mean? For example, in the case of homeowners it was suggested that their increasing sensitivity to location vis-a-vis renters was a function of the stake they had in their neighborhood. The question in the case of parents is, then, what is their stake in neighborhoods?

It could be argued that parents make an investment in particular neighborhoods in terms of the potential that exists for their children's socialization. As Alan Scott
Table 11


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>% &lt; 20 YEARS OF AGE (Mean)</th>
<th>% &lt; 20 YEARS OF AGE (StdDev)</th>
<th>LOCALIZATION COEFFICIENTS (&lt;20/&gt;65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>29.57</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>16.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>25.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>30.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>31.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

1. Coefficients of localization were calculated by comparing respective proportions of those aged less than 20 years with those greater than 65 years (<20/>65).

SOURCE:

Decennial Censuses, Columbus, Ohio, 1910-1980.
has suggested, urban neighborhoods function as foci of socialization and reproduction in three quite distinct senses:

(1) they help to underpin the rearing and nurturing of children in socially functional ways;

(2) they facilitate the development of active networks of social and ideological relationships among groups of individuals with similar life experiences and life expectations; and

(3) they signal and in turn partly determine a particular level of social status.

(Scott, 1980: 125).

Schools, safety and aspects of the general living environment play important parts in the socialization process and are therefore integral parts of a parent's residential location calculus.

There is, in fact, some evidence consistent with this contention and which furthermore suggests that these 'stakes' are historically emergent. A recent study, for example, has shown that school quality has become an important part of parents' residential location calculus over the past fifty years. In particular the study shows that up until 1960 at any rate growing numbers of new parents found education, in terms of the quality of the school their children would attend, to be an important factor to take into consideration when choosing a residential location ... Those neighborhoods perceived as containing desirable schools would have higher real estate values. (England, 1984: 22).
There does appear, therefore, to be some evidence that school quality was until at least the 1960's an increasingly important indicator of property values. The results are not quite as conclusive for the post-1960 period. The reason for this could possibly be the reduction in the proportion of the total population who were children in Columbus during the 1960's and 1970's which could have meant a reduction in the overall effect of school quality on property values.

There is therefore some evidence (albeit limited) that the residential location calculus of parents with children has changed over the past eighty years. Parents with children have generally located with respect to each other and this is particularly true, in the post-War period. It might be suggested, therefore, that parents with children have become more sensitive to their residential location with respect to social groups who may have a negative influence on the socialization process. The question is: who are these social groups who would be regarded as detrimental to the reproduction process? In the next subsection evidence is presented which shows that parents with children have sought to locate near owners and, given the trends discussed in the previous section, to thus avoid renters.
3.3.2 The Relationship Between Homeowners and Parents with Children.

There was some evidence in the content analysis that activists linked the effects urban development may have on children with the effects it has on property values. Generally speaking, the concern with socialization and reproduction issues was also expressed as a concern with the effects urban development may have on property values. It was therefore decided to examine the location of parents with children with respect to homeowners over time. This would allow some conclusions to be drawn regarding the impact of children on locational choice.

The research task involved an examination of the effect homeownership rates had on the proportion of children in a census tract. A number of multiple regressions were performed using the proportion of children in a tract as the 'dependent' variable. In addition to homeownership it was decided to control for the independent effects 'suburbia' and 'status' might have on 'children'. Unfortunately, however, pre-1950 censuses do not have an adequate (and comparable over time) measure of status. Thus two sets of regressions were performed: the first examined simply the effect of ownership on children for the period 1910 through 1980, holding constant distance from the central business district (as a measure of 'suburbanization'); and the sec-
ond examined the effect of ownership, status and distance on the presence of children. A brief discussion of these results follows.

With regard to the first set of regressions the effect of ownership rates on children increases for the post-1940 period (20) (See Table 12). For example, the beta coefficient for '% Own' increases from 0.23 in 1940 to 0.36 in 1960 to 0.38 in 1980. Not only does the effect of ownership increase in importance over time, but it is significant at the 99% level of confidence only for the 1960 through 1980 analyses. The simple and partial correlation coefficients suggest similar trends. The 1940 through 1980 period, for example, witnesses an increasing correlation at the tract level between the rates of ownership and children.

Second, when introducing the effect of status the increasing importance of 'ownership' is not reduced but in fact enhanced (see Table 13). What one finds is that the effect of ownership is significant and increasing for the 1950 through 1970 periods, the effect of distance is rapidly reduced over time and the effect of income remains relatively constant for at least the 1950 through 1970 period. Importantly, the effect of income on the presence of children is in fact negative when holding constant distance.

(20) The disjuncture between pre-1940 and post-1940 regressions more than likely reflects the different geographical units used for census enumeration (wards as opposed to tracts) and the non-availability of data in the pre-1940 censuses for suburban areas.
Table 12

Children, Homeownership, and Distance: 1910 through 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>% &lt; 20 YEARS</th>
<th>SIMPLE</th>
<th>PARTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Significant at 0.01 level.
2 = Significant at 0.05 level.

NOTE:

1. Distance = Distance from Central Business District
2. % < 20 Years = Percent. people in wards/tracts who were less than 20 years old (as a measure of the number of children)
3. The partial correlations are between ownership and children holding constant distance from the CBD.

SOURCE:

Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio, 1910-1980.
from the central business district and homeownership rates. Once again these trends find support in the simple and partial correlation coefficients.

Overall, these regressions provide the evidence necessary for a description of the impact of children on locational choice. The regression results suggest that parents with children have, in effect, been trying to locate near owners rather than, for example, near high socioeconomic status groups. This conclusion is supported by the beta coefficients in Table 13 which indicate that income does not play a major independent role at all in explaining the proportion of children in a census tract. This is in contrast to the effects of ownership which are positive and increase in significance over time.

Similar evidence is obtained from an examination of the location of children relative to owners. Coefficients measuring the localization of children relative to owners decrease substantially in the post-1940 period (Table 14). This trend provides further suggestive support for an argument that there appears to be a behavioral propensity whereby parents are trying to get near owners.

The reason for this behavioral propensity may lie in the fact that homeownership increasingly signals a particular
Table 13

Children, Homeownership, Distance, and Income:
1950 through 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>SIMPLE</th>
<th>PARTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Significant at 0.01 level.
2 = Significant at 0.05 level.

NOTE:
1. Simple correlations are between children and homeownership.
2. Partial correlations are between children and homeownership, holding constant income.

SOURCE:
Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio, 1950-1980.

level of social status. That is, there is some evidence in Columbus for a convergence between income and tenurial com-
Table 14

Coefficients of Localization: Children Relative to Owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>COEFFICIENT OF LOCALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE:
Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio, 1910-1980.

position. The past forty years, for example, have witnessed an increasing social polarization between owners and renters.\(^{(21)}\) (Table 15). For example, median incomes of

\(^{(21)}\) These data were compiled using the cross-tabulations provided in the post-1940 censuses of tenure by income category for the Columbus metropolitan area.
renters have not increased at the same rate as median incomes of owners. In 1950, the median renter income was 76% of the owner median income but by 1980 this percentage had decreased to 50%. Furthermore, this is not simply a difference in median incomes, but a difference in the distribution of incomes for each tenure group. For example, a decomposition of income variances for owners and renters shows that the social polarization between these groups has become more noticeable. That is, the 'between-tenure groups' variance has accounted for an increasing proportion of the total variance in the post-1950 period. In 1950, for example, the between-tenure groups variance explains only 6% of the total variance but by 1980 it explains over 16%. Thus, owners have become relatively recently a distinct socioeconomic status group. This is not to suggest that a variety of housing classes have emerged but simply that the social distance between owners and renters has become increasingly apparent.

The convergence between ownership and the presence of children appears to signify that the trends identified previously are, in fact, behavioral propensities which increase in intensity over time. That is, the changing locational strategies of owners and parents with children represent outcomes of a set of values/meaning structures which have increased in importance over time. Owners and
Table 15

**Income Differences Between Tenure Groups: 1950 through 1980.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN INCOMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Owners</td>
<td>4571</td>
<td>7164</td>
<td>12071</td>
<td>22200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Renters</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>4781</td>
<td>7547</td>
<td>11116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Rent/Own(%)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE DECOMPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Between</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Within</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--1950 to 1960</td>
<td>OWNERS</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>RENTERS</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--1960 to 1970</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--1970 to 1980</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

1. See footnote 21.

SOURCE:

Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio, 1950-1980.
parents with school-going children have avoided locating near renters. Furthermore, there is some evidence that during the 1960's these behavioral propensities converge. This might suggest that they are in fact historical correlates of a defensive, exclusionary neighborhood activism. The next section attempts to detail more precisely what these relationships might mean for the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive activism.

3.4 OWNERSHIP, CHILDREN AND EXCLUSIONARY ACTIVISM

The behavioral propensities detailed previously suggest that over the past few decades there have been growing tendencies for owners and parents with children to locate with respect to each other and to avoid locating near renters. This section attempts to explain these regularities and suggest what they may mean for the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive activism. In particular, two related hypotheses suggest themselves.

The first hypothesis suggests that the behavioral propensity towards the avoidance of renters is a result of changes in the meanings ascribed to homeownership and children and the degree to which these changes are reflected over time. There is some evidence, for example, that the meaning of homeownership has changed over the past seventy or so years, away from a concern primarily with those use-
values associated with ownership towards a concern with exchange-values as well. (22) Similarly, there is a body of research which addresses the historical basis of the family and in particular changing attitudes towards children. (23) Importantly, homeownership and a concern with the education of one's children have assumed a central role in the general reproduction process over the past sixty years or so. Apartment dwellers constitute a threat, however, to these goals. One would expect, therefore, a tendency towards the avoidance of renters on the part of these social groups.

This hypothesis suggests further that this tendency has always received phenomenal expression and has increased over time as rates of ownership and rates of parents with children have increased. Accordingly in Table 16 one finds that Columbus' homeownership rate has increased from 38.4% in 1910 to 40.9% in 1940 to 60.2% in 1980. The proportion of the total Columbus population who were children increases similarly over the past seventy years. In 1910 24.4% of Columbus' population were children, and this figure increases to 28.2% in 1940 and to 37.1% in 1970. Based on these increases advocates of this hypothesis would suggest that the behavioral propensity towards the avoidance of renters increases particularly from the 1930's or so.

(22) See Cox (unpub.) and Chapter 5.
(23) See, for example, Fass (1977), Lasch (1976) and Riesman (1950).
Table 16

Owners and Children in Columbus, Ohio, 1910-1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE:
Decennial Censuses for Columbus, Ohio, 1910-1980.

The second hypothesis suggests that the behavioral propensity towards the avoidance of apartment dwellers only receives phenomenal expression given such trigger mechanisms as substantial increases in homeownership and the baby boom. That is, the impact of owners on property mar-
kets, for example, becomes significant only when the number of owners relative to renters exceeds a certain threshold. In the case of Columbus one notes that it is only in the post-1950 period that the number of owners begins to exceed the number of renters and it is during this period that the effect of ownership on property values becomes significant. Similarly, the post-1960's represents a period in which the post-War baby boom finds visible expression. That is, the 1950’s and 1960’s represent a peak period in terms of the relative number of children found in Columbus, Ohio. This hypothesis suggests, therefore, that the intensity of post-1960 activism is explained by the catalytic effects produced by substantial numbers of homeowners and parents with children during this period. It does not address the possibility that the social meaning ascribed to homeownership and children may have changed qualitatively.

The hypotheses reflect two quite different ways in which the avoidance of renters can be explained. The first hypothesis regards the behavioral propensity towards avoidance as an historical outcome of particularly qualitative changes in the meanings ascribed to homeownership and children. The second hypothesis explains the avoidance of renters simply in terms of quantitative changes in the relative importance of homeownership and the presence of children.
Unfortunately, there is no way in which these hypotheses can be evaluated. However, for our purposes, whatever the explanation may be there does appear to be a clear tendency towards the avoidance of apartment dwellers. One can imagine, therefore, the effect, for example, a substantial increase in the construction of multi-family dwellings might have on these behavioral propensities. Such construction could clearly lead to an intensification of attempts by neighborhood activists to keep their 'owner-dominant' neighborhoods 'pure'. This, it is suggested in the next chapter is an important conjunctural reason for the post-1960's increase in the intensity of exclusionary activism. The argument suggests that while owners and parents with children increasingly become separated in space from renters and other social groups the large scale construction of multi-family units made substantial inroads on this relationship and provoked a response in the form of neighborhood activism.
The previous chapter detailed the historical emergence of two important behavioral correlates of neighborhood activism: homeownership and the presence of children in the home. However, the immediate context for understanding the emergence of a defensive and exclusionary politics of turf is the process by which urban areas are developed and redeveloped. Conflict results from specific 'developments' which are considered, by neighborhood activists, to be threatening. Historical materialist researchers have argued that over the past eighty years or so this 'development' process has changed quantitatively and qualitatively.(24) In particular, and as cases in point, they cite the massively increased investments during the post-War period in the built environment, and the changing role and influence of the state in the urban development process.

This chapter seeks to identify those tendencies in the urban development process which are related to the emergence of an exclusionary activism. The first objective is
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to show that the relationship between neighborhood activism and urban development is historically specific. This is accomplished in the first section. The second section outlines more precisely those changes in the urban development process which appear to be related to the emergence of an exclusionary activism. In particular, the increasing scale of developments and the spatial integration of housing markets are considered. In the final section it is suggested that these specific changes in urban development may be related to broader changes in the production of the built environment.

4.1 RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION AND NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM

The previous chapter detailed the existence of a tendency over the past thirty years or so on the part of homeowners towards the avoidance of apartment dwellers. It was further suggested that conflict could result if residential construction disrupted this behavioral propensity. This section describes the historical relationship between residential construction and turf politics. The first subsection delineates the general links between activism and residential construction, whereas the second sub-section focusses more specifically on the relationship between the construction of apartments and exclusionary activism.
4.1.1 Activism and Residential Construction.

Previous research conducted by Cox and McCarthy (1980) indicated that for the period 1970 through 1978 a strong, positive relationship existed between residential construction and turf politics. In particular, they found that in tracts where there was a significant amount of residential construction, there was a correspondingly high degree of neighborhood activism. The non-availability of data, however, precluded their extension of the time period under consideration.

A similar methodology to that used by Cox and McCarthy (1980) allowed the identification of the historically changing relationship between neighborhood activism and residential construction. In particular, for each of the four decades in the post-1940 period, a simple regression was performed. The period 1900 through 1940 was not considered because residential construction information is not available for the pre-1940 censuses, and in any event the amount of defensive, exclusionary activism is low.

The regressions measured the effect of residential construction on neighborhood activism. The dependent variable chosen was the number of instances of neighborhood activism found in each census tract for the given decade. Because census tracts vary in size, the number of instances of activism was transformed into a relative measure: the num-
ber of conflicts per 1000 persons living within the census tract. The independent variable chosen was the proportion of the total number of dwelling units built during the previous decade. This provided a measure of the amount of construction which had taken place within the census tract relative to pre-existing construction. The regression results are displayed in Table 17.

The results are quite striking. The beta coefficient for residential construction shifts from a non-significant negative value for 1940’s activism to positive, significant values (at the 99% level of confidence) for activism in the 1960’s and 1970’s. Thus there is evidence that over time the effect of residential construction on activism increases. Importantly, the beta coefficient is significant for both 1960’s and 1970’s activism, and not significant in the earlier cases.

These trends are most informative. They immediately suggest that the relationship between activism and residential construction is historically specific. Further, they provide support for the contention raised in Chapter 2 that post-1960’s activism is qualitatively and quantitatively different from earlier activism and that the more recent, exclusionary and defensive activism is linked to the urban

(25) The low R2 values are possibly due to a variety of factors. These include the aggregation of conflicts, the sampling methodology used and the inadequate measures of the relative amounts of activism.
Table 17

Activism and Construction: Regressions for the 1940's through 1970's

RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.0070</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.0030</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Significant at 0.01 level.

NOTE:
1. The dependent variable was the number of conflicts per 1000 persons in each census tract.
2. The independent variable was the percent of all dwelling units within the census tract built during the decade under consideration.

SOURCE:
development process.

4.1.2 The Relationship Between Activism and Construction

When one examines the yearly trajectory of neighborhood activism over specific neighborhood issues, there is considerable year-to-year variation. For example, in the case of activism over downward rezoning issues the recorded instances increase from the late 1950's, peak during the early 1970's and decline during the late 1970's (Figure 9). Parenthetically, this year-to-year variation in activism over downward rezoning issues is not confined to Columbus, Ohio. An examination of the number of references to rezoning in The New York Times index reflects a similar trend. (26) In 1954, for example, there were only two references to zoning (see Table 18). The number of references to zoning increases to 11 in 1966 and reaches a high in 1974 of 92 inserts. Overall, these trends are very similar to those found in Columbus, Ohio.

In Chapter 2 it was suggested that the changing geography of conflicts is possibly linked to processes of neighborhood change, amongst which residential development ranks highly. This conclusion finds support in the recent work of Cox and McCarthy (1980). They suggest, for the case of Columbus, that the year-to-year variation in conflicts is

(26) The number of inserts under various zoning categories were counted using the indices every four years beginning in 1954.
Table 18


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contr. Rezonings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Int.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc Govt Exclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Lawsuits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure Groups</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Federal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- State</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

SOURCE:
The New York Times Index.
linked to construction cycles, interest rates and broader national shifts in capitalist accumulation. Their research was, however, confined to the 1970's. A longer term comparison of neighborhood activism with residential construction is therefore needed in order to evaluate the broader historical basis of this relationship. This subsection attempts to detail more precisely the historical relationship between activism over downward rezoning issues on the one hand and the construction of multi-family units on the other.

The correlation between activism and construction cycles does seem to be a distinctly post-War phenomenon (Figure 9). We find, for example, very little correspondence between activism and construction cycles in the period prior to the mid-1950's. To specify it in quantitative terms the relationship between neighborhood activism over downward rezoning and the construction of multi-family dwellings was formalized through the calculation of moving correlations for 12-year intervals. The results are displayed in Table 19. Three distinct periods may be recognised:

---------------------------

(27) Cox and McCarthy (1980) draw on Harvey's (1974) contention that events of national and even international import are "transmitted via the financial superstructure" into "the decision environments of local housing markets" as they relate neighborhood activism in Columbus, Ohio to broader shifts in capitalist accumulation.
* The 1920's where activism over downward rezoning issues is linked to a moderate degree to the building of multi-family dwellings,

* The 1930-1950 period where there is no relationship between activism over downward rezoning and construction,

* The post-1950 period where there is a strong relationship between neighborhood activism and construction.

From the above it would appear that the increasing intensity of neighborhood activism is related to the increasing impact in the 1960's of the urban development process. Moreover, the form of that development -- especially the construction of apartments -- when coupled with the behavioral propensities identified previously, helps to explain the intensity of post-1960's activism. The next section details more precisely those changes in the urban development process which appear to be linked to neighborhood activism.
Figure 9: Activism and Residential Construction, 1900 through 1980. Sources: U.S. Statistical Abstracts, 1900 - 1980; Columbus City Reports, 1922 - 1980; Columbus Dispatch.
### Table 19

**Downward Rezoning Activism and Construction: Moving Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924-1936</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1942</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1948</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-1954</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-1960</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1966</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1972</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1978</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NOTE:**

1. Pearson's Product Moment Correlations are presented. These were calculated using, on the one hand, conflicts over downward rezoning issues and, on the other hand, multi-family construction in Columbus for the years under consideration. Only even years between 1924 and 1978 were considered.

**SOURCE:**

Reports of the Columbus City Council.

Columbus Dispatch.
4.2 HISTORICAL CHANGES IN THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Research literature (see Harvey, 1978) and the content analysis suggest two aspects of the urban development process which contribute to the relationship between activism and urban development. On the one hand, the sheer scale of planned developments is regarded by neighboring residents as threatening. On the other hand, activists themselves recognise the potentially adverse effects the increasing integration of real estate housing markets may have on their neighborhood. In this section an attempt will be made to specify more clearly the relationship between an exclusionary neighborhood activism and these two aspects of the residential development process.

4.2.1 The Changing Scale of Development

The marked increase in defensive and exclusionary activism appeared in part to be due to changes in the size of property developments. Investigation of this relationship proved difficult, however, because there was insufficient data available for the identification of trends. The Columbus Dispatch, for example, often did not report the acreage involved. Furthermore, the City Bulletin (containing details of the issues over which there was a conflict) only began recording acreage from 1970. Thus available data sources did not allow a comprehensive record to be made of the relationship between activism and the size of proposed developments.
The available cases of turf politics, where the acreage of proposed apartment developments was given, do, however, provide suggestive evidence that the scale of developments is important. Thus, controversial apartment developments in Columbus over the past eighty years are the more grandiose in scale especially when compared to the average size of apartment complexes (see Table 20). For example, the average size of multi-family developments increases from 2.68 in the 1920's to 7.77 in the 1970's, whereas the controversial residential rezonings in the 1960's and 1970's averaged respectively over 40 acres and 130 acres in size. (28)

It was also possible to put together a data set for the period 1970 through 1974 reflecting more precisely the relationship between size of development and degree of controversy (29) (Table 21). These data indicate quite clearly that larger rezonings were on the whole more controversial than smaller rezonings. For example, less than two per-

(28) Similarly, there were specific instances of activism where scale clearly played a major role. This was especially true in the case of rezonings for shopping centers. One example, of this was the intense opposition in 1968 to the location of a Scottenstein store on East Main and McNaughten. The Triple R Association (a local homeowners organisation) was most vocal in arguing that the shopping center would increase traffic congestion, was too big for the neighborhood, and in any case wasn't needed as local shops provided all the neighborhood's requirements.

(29) The City Bulletin's were examined and information concerning all rezonings, including those found in the content analysis, recorded.
Table 20

Building Permits and Controversial Apartment Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY BUILDING PERMITS1</th>
<th>AVERAGE SIZE OF CONTROVERSIAL APARTMENTS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>Av. Project Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>19455</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>11234</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950's</td>
<td>3871</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940's</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>4750</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Columbus City Bulletin, various years.

2 Includes only those instances where the size of the controversial apartments could be determined.
cent. of the rezonings smaller than 1 acre were controversial. The comparable figure for developments over 50 acres is 30.5%.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>CONTROVERSIAL</th>
<th>% CONTROVERSIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 Acres</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-50 Acres</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 Acres</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Acre</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES:
Columbus Dispatch; City Bulletin.

This concern with the scale of urban development, expressed by activists, suggests that possibly there have been changes over time in that scale. This is already apparent in the case of the construction of multi-family dwelling units (Table 20). Consideration of changes in the size of all facilities planned over the past fifty years shows that, in fact, there are marked increases in the scale of construction. An examination of the residential
construction records for even years between 1932 and 1980 in Columbus, Ohio indicates this very well (Table 22). What one finds is that during the post-1960 period approximately 20% of all residential developments contained over 6 units. The comparable figure for the period between 1930 and 1960 is 10%.

Furthermore, an examination of sample data from the Columbus City Directories indicates the increasing scale of apartment developments in the post-War period. (30) In 1940, for example, 79% of all apartment units were single structures, and all apartment units were in developments smaller than 20 units (Table 23). In 1980, however, one finds almost forty percent of all apartments built in developments containing over 100 units, and only 54% of all the apartment units built were in developments containing 20 units or less.

These trends appear to indicate that a defensive, exclusionary activism is related to changes in the form of urban development. The sheer scale of facilities planned, for example, likely intensifies apprehension of those in the immediate vicinity, and therefore elicit antagonism. The next section addresses a related concern of activists — that neighborhood change and development is linked to broader processes which put neighborhoods at risk by inte-

(30) Random samples of apartments were selected for the periods 1940, 1960 and 1980, and the size of each development recorded.
Table 22

Size of Residential Developments for Columbus, Ohio.

SIZE OF DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>SINGLE</th>
<th>2-6 UNITS</th>
<th>&gt;6 UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-80</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-70</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-60</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-50</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-40</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

1. Only even years were used in the compilation of this Table.

2. Figures represent the percent of all developments in particular size categories.

SOURCES:

Columbus City Annual Reports.
Table 23
Percent of Apartment Units in Developments of Given Size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SIZE (IN UNITS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
1. Percentages are displayed in the Table.
2. Samples of 100 'developments' were selected for each year.

SOURCE:
Polk's City Directory, Columbus, Ohio, 1940, 1960, 1980.

4.2.2 Integration of Real Estate Markets

A number of researchers have remarked upon the sensitivity of neighborhood activists to the effects urban development may have on their homes and immediate neighborhood.(31) In particular this sensitivity is directed towards the impact neighborhood change will have on the

(31) See for example, Molotch (1969); Tuttle (1972); and Wolf and Lebeaux (1969).
real estate market. There is insufficient evidence on exactly what it is about real estate markets that concerns activists the most. However, from available evidence one can reasonably infer that underpinning these concerns is a recognition that it is the spatial integration of housing markets which puts whole neighborhoods at risk and thereby causes residents substantial concern. In the introduction to this sub-section some of the available evidence is reviewed and these inferences drawn.

The awareness of neighborhood activists to the effects of real estate markets is reflected in a variety of arguments and actions used by them. In many cases, they argue that property values will decline if there is substantial neighborhood change. This concern with property values is generally expressed as a concern with the multiplier effects neighborhood change has on real estate finance markets. That is, residents express concern that if there is substantial neighborhood change not only will property values be reduced but it will become more difficult to realize those property values. Activists make reference in this context to both redlining and the fact that the competitive bidding process will drive down their property values. (32)

(32) One of the most comprehensive documentations of both of these aspects may be found in Bernstein (1972). In discussing the sale of her in-laws house in Mattapan, during a period in which there was substantial neighborhood change, she develops these links between property values and real estate markets:
Furthermore, there is a recognition on the part of activists that the impact of real estate markets on neighborhoods is both localized in space and results in very rapid neighborhood change. (33)

This awareness on the part of residents of real estate markets is also demonstrated through their coming together to form neighborhood associations which intervene directly in the real estate process. Such organizations might cre-

When my in-laws decided to sell our two family home in Ormond Street, the FHA appraised it at a reasonable price. A reputable agent brought a prospective Black buyer to see it. He agreed on the price... The new buyer's credit was good. He had no outstanding bills. He held the same position for 12 years. His wage was good, and he was prepared to put down a substantial down payment. The agent assured us that there would be no trouble with this buyer. He went to BBURG (a mortgage finance organization), but the mortgage was turned down. When our shocked agent attempted to see Reverend Ross to get a better explanation, the door was closed in his face. It was necessary for my in-laws to go down $3000 from our asking price with another realtor. When my in-laws purchased the home in 1963, it took four weeks for the paper to be passed. It took nine months for this mortgage to go through with BBURG. It was the same bank who took the mortgage. For us to get our mortgage at our new dwelling in W. Rox., it took only three weeks.

(33) This process finds its best expression in blockbusting. Using Mrs. Bernstein's evidence once again, we find that over a very short period of time the racial composition of her neighborhood changed completely: "there was a visual campaign to get whitey out. There were 121 white families on Ormond Street. By the end of 1970 there were only 7 left" (Bernstein, 1972, 96).
ate their own real estate agency to control neighborhood change. (34) The creation of these agencies was a direct response to what activists regard as the single most important negative influence on neighborhood change: realtors. The neighborhood-run agencies were supposed to perform a 'steering' function in attracting desirable residents into the neighborhood. There is, therefore, on the part of these "already situated land users", a concern to attract to their area a kind of land user who will enhance the "neighborhood condition" (Molotch, 1972).

Further, the formation of neighborhood associations often reflects a recognition of the importance of inter-neighborhood differentials in residential desirability. This accounts for a variety of actions being performed to improve the neighborhood: beautification programs, attempts to improve neighborhood schools, and the like. It also accounts for the concern with excluding those social groups regarded as having a negative impact on residential desirability. In particular, blacks, renters and blue collar workers are regarded as having a detrimental effect on

(34) An instance in which this occurred was in Mattapan where the Residents' Organization decided to establish a real estate service to assist white and Black homeseekers to find suitable accommodations without discrimination. ... The (existing residents' believed) that if property turns over without discrimination and without panic, Mattapan as a whole will become integrated and a ghetto pattern will not develop. (Mattapan, 1968: 101).
property values.

Overall, the activists are most concerned with the impact of both real estate markets (especially finance markets) and 'undesirable' social groups on their neighborhood. Underpinning these concerns is a recognition that neighborhood change is linked to broader processes which put neighborhoods at risk by integrating them into a metropolitan wide housing market. That is, activists recognise that, for example, declining property values are not the result simply of conditions within the immediate geographical environment, but also of conditions in the broader metropolitan area. Thus, inter-neighborhood comparison and competition reflects a concern with the impact a metropolitan wide (and not neighborhood specific) real estate market may have on one's neighborhood.

The sub-sections which follow investigate the historical basis of this spatial integration of residential housing markets. In particular, an attempt will be made to show that in Columbus there has been a general trend towards the spatial integration of real estate markets. These rather lengthy sub-sections provide evidence which indicates that there has been a general democratization of access and spatial integration of housing finance markets. These have implications for residents living in urban neighborhoods. Most importantly they have meant that the residential
desirability of a neighborhood has become more a function of conditions in the metropolitan area as a whole and less a function of the immediate geographical environment. Thus residents have become hypersensitive to neighborhood change given the broader implications it has for property values and a consequent neighborhood change of a cumulative character.

Residential Mobility Patterns

The major objective of this sub-section is to demonstrate that, in Columbus, Ohio, residential mobility patterns have changed significantly, with resulting impacts on the neighborhood change process. These changes in residential mobility patterns, it will be argued, have resulted in the breakdown of localized housing sub-markets. They have, therefore, increased the possibility of threats to the socialization and reproduction functions of urban neighborhoods.

In a general context there is evidence that from about the late nineteenth century there has been a reduction in the friction of distance on residential mobility patterns. (35) However, it is only with the development of the automobile and telephone, and their consequent democratization, that dramatic changes become evident. An implication of this democratization of access has been that it is no (35) See Walker (1978) for an analysis of the spatial implications this had for urban neighborhoods.
longer necessary, for example, to locate close to kin, shopping areas and work places. People can disperse all over the city without adversely affecting their 'quality of life'. For residents living in urban neighborhoods this has meant an increasing chance of 'outsiders' entering their living places. These outsiders are often viewed with apprehension by residents because of the potentially significant influence they have on the use- and exchange-values of their homes.

In broad outline it does appear to be the case, for example, that today people live further from their work places, leisure spaces and homes than, say, fifty years ago. Indeed this has been shown to be the case elsewhere. (36) For our purposes, however, we propose to show that over the past eighty years in Columbus, Ohio people were becoming more mobile and were less 'spatially-bound' than had hitherto been the case.

Evidence collected for Columbus, Ohio indicates that there has, in fact, been a reduction in the friction of distance associated with residential mobility patterns. Samples of 150 mobile households were selected for each of three time periods --1910, 1940 and 1970-- and the distances separating old and new residences determined. (37) The


(37) During each of these years a random sample of 150 residents was selected from the Columbus City Directory. These residents were 'followed-up' using the directory-
observed frequency results are displayed in Table 22. These data indicate a marked decrease in the friction of distance between 1910 and 1970. In 1910, for example, approximately one-half of the sample relocated no more than one mile from their original residence. Thirty years later this proportion had declined by only four percentage points, from 49% to 45%. By 1970, however, the friction of distance had declined markedly: only 19% of the 1970 sample relocated within one mile of their original residence. The gravity coefficients indicate, similarly, a substantial reduction in the friction of distance. The gravity coefficients decline from -2.12 in 1910 to -1.06 in 1970.

Note that if two-mile bands are used, the friction of distance in the 1910 and 1940 migrations is even more evident. In 1910, for example, 74% of the people travelled less than two miles and the figure for 1940 was 61%. These contrast with the 32% of people in 1970 who travelled less than two miles between residences.

The gravity coefficients were calculated using a methodology developed by Morrill and Pitts (1967). In brief, the frequencies are standardized in terms of the area encompassed by each distance band. The log of the midpoint of each distance band was then regressed on the log of these frequencies. The resulting beta coefficients are displayed in Tables 24 and 25.
The changes do not however support a view that the friction of distance declined more between 1940 and 1970 than between 1910 and 1940. This is most likely because the geographical area of Columbus has changed over the past seventy years.

Hence, while these differences in mobility patterns are substantial, they do not necessarily index the degree to which people are indifferent to distance in later time periods. That is, it is difficult to argue that these changes reflect only a reduction in the friction of distance in residential mobility patterns, and not other factors such as the historical geography and demography of the city. For example, increasing distances between residences might simply reflect the larger areal extent of Columbus during later time periods. Furthermore, people in the 1960's might have had relatively fewer opportunities to locate closer to their original residences than was the case fifty years previously.(40)

It became necessary, therefore, to compare these actual migration patterns to what one would expect if people were behaviorally indifferent to distance. This was accomplished through the adaptation of a methodology developed by Peter Taylor (1977).(41) In brief, expected migration

(40) A more detailed discussion of the methodological issues raised in analyses such as these can be found in the debate between Curry (1972), Cliff, Martin and Ord (1974) and Johnston (1973; 1975).
Table 24


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DISTANCE (Miles)</th>
<th>1910 OBSERVED</th>
<th>1940 OBSERVED</th>
<th>1970 OBSERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVITY COEFF.</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

1. See footnote 37 for a description of the methodology used in obtaining the observed migrations.

2. See footnote 39 for the methodology used in determining the gravity coefficients.
frequencies are calculated on the basis of inter-tract distances and housing products. The resulting expected frequencies are displayed in Table 23. Quite clearly the distance decay for these expected distributions is not as strong as that of the observeds: the gravity coefficients decline from -1.09 in 1910 to -0.39 in 1970.

It was decided to formalize the relationship between the expected- and observed- values, through the calculation, for each of the time periods, of coefficients of dissimilarity (Duncan and Duncan, 1955) (See Table 26). These coefficients index the proportion of the total population who would have to be moved in order for there to be agreement between the observed- and expected- distributions. For

(41) The expected distribution of migration distances is obtained as follows. First, each inter-tract distance and product of the total housing units in these tracts was calculated. Second, these products were classified into distance bands. For each distance band the summed products of housing units was obtained. Finally, the expected proportion of all migrations over each distance band was determined using these summed products. See Taylor (1977) for a more detailed description.

(42) In the calculation of 'expected' distances, straight-line inter-tract distances were calculated. This was because if one was to use shortest route street distances in 1970 over 13000 hand calculations would have to be performed. We did, however, decide to compare, for 1940, the difference between using straight-line distances and street distances in the determination of the expected migration proportions within the one-mile distance bands. The correlation between these two sets of proportions --straight line and street distances-- was 0.891. Thus I am confident that my use of straight line inter-tract distances does not lead to any serious distortion.
Table 25

Expected Residential Migrations: 1910, 1940 and 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DISTANCE (Miles)</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVITY COEFF.</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
1. Expected migration frequencies are displayed in the Table.
2. For the methodology used in the calculation of the Gravity Coefficients see footnote 39.
3. See Footnote 41 for the methodology used in compiling these expected migration frequencies.

SOURCE:
Decennial Censuses, Columbus, Ohio, 1910, 1940, 1970.
our purposes larger coefficients reflect a situation where people are not behaviorally indifferent to distance. Separate analyses were performed for the one-mile and two-mile bands. Irrespective of the distance bands used the trends are in the correct 'direction'. The 1910 observed and expected distributions, for example, are less similar than is the case in 1970. These trends provide suggestive support for the contention that over the past seventy years residents have become more behaviorally indifferent to distance.

Table 26


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Mile Bands:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Mile Bands:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

1. C = Coefficient of Dissimilarity (see Duncan and Duncan, 1955).
A second aspect of this democratization of access in Columbus is given through an analysis of the location of white collar workers relative to blue collar workers. More specifically, the ratio of white collar to blue collar workers in each tract in the Columbus metropolitan area for the census periods 1940 through 1980 was calculated. (43) Descriptive statistics and simple density gradients (44) were examined. These generally reflect a dispersion of blue-collar workers throughout Columbus (see Table 27). The coefficient of variation, for example, decreases over time. This indicates, for especially the 1950 through 1980 period a general dispersion of blue collar workers. Similar results were obtained when these ratios of white collar to blue collar workers were regressed against distance. The resulting beta coefficients decrease substantially over time. There appears to have been a general suburbanization of blue collar workers in especially the post-1960 period.

Overall, these results indicate that the post-War period has been associated with the dispersion and suburbanization of blue collar workers throughout the Columbus metropolitan area.

------------------

(43) Comparable data is not available for earlier time periods.

(44) That is, these ratios were regressed against distance from the Central Business District (as a measure of suburbanization). The resulting beta coefficients are displayed in Table 27.
Table 27

Ratio of White Collar to Blue Collar Workers: 1940 through 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STDDEV</th>
<th>C.V.</th>
<th>BETA COEFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>.5351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>.4371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.4711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>.3561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>.2771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Significant at the 0.01 level.

SOURCE:
Decennial Censuses, Columbus, Ohio, 1940-1980.

In overview, there is evidence that residential mobility patterns have changed. In particular, there has been a spatial integration of residential housing markets given the general democratization of access and reductions in the friction of distance associated with residential mobility patterns.

The democratization of access obviously has a variety of implications for both real estate markets and residents living in urban neighborhoods. On the one hand, for example, the reduction in the friction of distance leads to an
intensification of competition between those involved in the real estate process as they try to deliver 'superior' goods to clients who now have a greater freedom to move. Furthermore, these clients are not just those who can afford to buy houses but include many who must rent, rather than purchase, a home. Thus the increasing scale and intensity of apartment construction, and consequently its suburbanization, becomes a reality. On the other hand, this increased mobility and construction of residences poses a threat to residents themselves for it increases the chances of having 'socially undesirable' people locating within their neighborhoods. Thus, a resident's concerns with the effects of broader social processes can be understood. Neighborhood 'problems' are affected by a broader integration of housing markets and may well have increased in magnitude as a result of this democratization of access and changes in the development of real estate. The upshot of this for residents is that the options of Exit, Voice and Loyalty (Hirschman, 1970) become realities which must be addressed.

Spatial Integration of Housing Finance Markets

At the same time as residential mobility patterns have become spatially less restricted, the spatial restrictions on housing finance markets have been reduced. This increasing spatial integration of housing finance markets
is most evident in the case of the major financial investors in the development of real estate: the Savings and Loan Associations (S & L's).

Over the past century in Columbus, Ohio, there has been an increasing spatial integration of housing finance markets. Evidence for this comes from an investigation of mortgage records. Four time periods -- the 1870's, 1906, 1949 and 1980 -- were selected. These reflect respectively early Columbus, a year just prior to the 1908 S & L's 'crash', an early post-World War II period, and a recent time period. Within each time period two S & L's were selected and random samples of mortgage records obtained for each. In order to ensure that the analyses of each time period were comparable, similar S & L's were selected. These were the Buckeye Building and Loan and Main Federal Building and Loan Associations(45) which were in existence during three of the time periods. During the 1870's neither of these S & L's existed and thus the German Building and Loan and Home B & L Associations were selected to reflect early Columbus. The location of each mortgaged property was mapped (see Figures 10 through 17) and some centrographic analyses performed (see Table 28).(46) A number of conclusions can be drawn from these analyses.

(45) The Main Federal S & L was previously the Allemania S & L.
Figure 10: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: German B & L, 1870's

Figure 11: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Home B & L, 1870's.
Figure 12: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Allemania B &
Figure 13: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Buckeye S & L, 1906.
Figure 14: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Allemania S & L, 1949.
Figure 15: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Buckeye Federal S & L, 1949.
Figure 16: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Main Federal S & L, 1980.
Figure 17: Spatial Location of Mortgagees: Buckeye Federal S & L, 1980.
Table 28

Spatial Integration of Housing Finance Markets,
Columbus, Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAVINGS AND LOAN</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>WITH</th>
<th>BETW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1870's German</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1870's Home</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1906 Allemania</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1906 Buckeye</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1949 Allemania</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.616</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 1949 Buckeye</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 1980 Main Federal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1980 Buckeye</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
1. SD = Standard Distance.
2. WITH = Within S & L's Variation.
3. BETW = Between S & L's Variation.

First, the analyses confirm that housing finance markets have become increasingly spatially integrated. In the nineteenth century S & L's were more locationally confined in their lending practices than is the case in more recent times. The maps, for example, indicate that S & L's in the
1870's provided mortgages for properties within geographically confined areas and not for properties over the whole of Columbus (Figures 10 and 11). In 1980, however, mortgages from each S & L were scattered all over the metropolitan area (Figures 16 and 17). Further evidence is obtained when comparing the standard distances.\(^{(47)}\) In the case of our sample of S & L's significant differences were found over the four time periods. The average standard distances, for example, increase from 0.27 in the 1870's to 0.61 in 1906 to 2.5 in 1949 and to 2.9 in 1980. This is suggestive of an increasing spatial integration of housing finance markets.

In order to investigate more fully these differences over time the total variance was apportioned into 'within-S & L' and 'between-S & L' components. That is, a simple variance decomposition analysis was performed so that one could distinguish for each time period the degree of geographical specificity of respective S & L's. Striking differences result when such a methodology is employed. In the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century the within-S & L component was approximately 99%, suggesting a high degree of localization in mortgage lending. By 1980, however, this within-S & L component had almost halved to

\(^{(47)}\) Standard distances provide useful measures of relative clustering. A low standard distance implies clustering whereas a high standard distance implies dispersion.
56%. This provides strong support for the contention that there has been a progressive spatial integration of housing finance markets.

Along the same lines there is suggestive evidence for the declining 'community' orientation of S & L's over the past century. For example, in the 1870's the sample of mortgagees of the German Building and Loan all had German surnames, whereas the comparable figure for Home Building and Loan was 2.5%. This high degree of 'ethnicity' in the German Building and Loan declined rapidly over the subsequent century. For example, examining the only 'German' S & L which existed for an extended period of time -- the Allemania/ Main Federal S & L -- we find a decrease in its ethnic base from 80% in 1906 to 30% in 1980 (Table 29).

These trends provide reasonable support for our contention that there has been an increasing spatial integration of housing finance markets. S & L's do appear to lose their geographical specificity and/or 'community' orientation. These changes, moreover, are consistent with David Harvey's observations in Baltimore. He argued that in Baltimore there had been a decline in community S & L's and all S & L's had "become more business-like and in general (increased) in size and sophistication" (Harvey, 1976: 37).

The spatial integration of housing markets has had a variety of implications for residents. 'Community' orient-
Table 29

Sample of S & L’s in Columbus, Ohio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
<th>ASSETTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. German</td>
<td>1870-80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home</td>
<td>1870-80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Allemania</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Buckeye</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allemania</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Buckeye</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Main</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Buckeye</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
1. Sample Size: Reflects relatively the size of the S & L.
2. German: Percent of mortgagees with German Surnames.
3. Assetts: Assetts of S & L expressed as percent of largest S & L.

SOURCE:
Mortgage Records, Franklin County Recorder’s Office, Columbus, Ohio.

ed S & L’s could potentially restrict residential mobility through limiting access to housing finance to those moving within ‘community’ areas. A spatially integrated housing
finance market, however, makes no such restrictions. Further, the spatial integration of housing markets has implications for the realization of property values. That is, where the housing market is spatially integrated, property values in areas which are 'at risk' cannot be realized as no-one is willing to finance mortgages in those areas. At the same time, new developments often face no such shortage of mortgage finance. Thus one can appreciate the somewhat anomalous situation whereby there is no finance for houses in one area and more than enough mortgage finance in another area.

In overview, there have been a variety of important changes in urban development which are directly related to the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive form of neighborhood activism. The historical specificity of neighborhood activism appears, therefore, to be related to changes in the real estate development process. On the one hand, the sheer scale of facilities planned has changed, particularly over the past forty years. This enhanced scale is regarded as threatening to the socialization and reproduction functions of urban neighborhoods. On the other hand, residential real estate markets have also changed. In particular, there has been a spatial integration of real estate markets which has resulted in an enhanced concern with the effects of urban development on residential neigh-
borhoods. In the next section it is suggested that these changes in real estate development process have possibly to do with the changing way in which the built environment is produced.

4.3 THE CHANGING ORGANIZATION OF REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT

The previous sections have provided a link between the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive activism and two specific changes in the real estate development process: the growing scale of residential developments and a spatial integration of housing markets. This section addresses the possibility that these changes are related to broader shifts in capitalism whereby property has become regarded more and more as a "pure financial asset" (Harvey, 1982b). That is, it will be suggested that over the past seventy years land has increasingly become a distinctive means by which capital accumulation can take place. This has resulted in an enhanced competitiveness within the real estate industry which, in turn, has important consequences for the way in which residential environments are produced.

A variety of researchers have commented upon the way in which the form of the real estate development process has changed over the past sixty years or so. They note, for example, the demise of amateur landlords and the rise in professional landlords,(48) the decline in community-based

(48) See Allen (1983) for a thorough review of landlordism.
S & L's and the increase in S & L's operating as finance capitals,(49) and the increasing industrialization of the real estate development process.(50) In particular, some researchers have noted the emergence, in especially the post-War period, of a group of property capitals (see Boddie, 1980; Ambrose and Colenutt, 1975). As Ambrose and Colenutt argue:

The existence of a development industry is a relatively recent phenomenon. Before the Second World War there were very few large development companies. Instead, redevelopment was undertaken by individual entrepreneurs, or by firms developing buildings for their own occupation. There were few speculative office blocks and the tendency was for firms to own freeholds to their premises rather than rent. Certainly, there was no public awareness of 'developers' as such. Few property companies were quoted on the Stock Exchange, there was virtually no property press dealing with commercial development, and there was no coherent organization lobbying for the developers.

After the War all this changed.

(Ambrose and Colenutt, 1975: 37).

What is most significant about this changing form of real estate development is that over time property has become an arena for capital accumulation through the appropriation of surplus value in the form of rent. This contrasts with earlier forms of real estate development which seemed to be organized more in terms of the production of revenues for consumption than as a means for the accumula-

(49) See, for example, Harvey (1974).

(50) See, for example, Checkoway (1980).
tion of capital on an expanding basis.

David Harvey (1982b) has characterised this process as
one in which land as a pure financial asset becomes most
evident. That is, investment in property becomes no dif­
ferent from, let us say, investment in the stock market.
Property becomes simply another vehicle through which the
accumulation of capital on an expanded basis can occur. An
important implication of this view of land is that real
estate capitals become locked in a competitive struggle
with other real estate capitals in order to reproduce them­
selves. The enhanced competitiveness between the producers
of the built environment results in a variety of related
tendencies within the real estate development process.

Most significantly, the competition between property
capitals produces a tendency towards their progressive cen­
tralization and concentration. Fifty years ago, for exam­
pie, most firms involved in the real estate business were
relatively small and concentrated on only one aspect of the
urban development process. There were building contractors
who only built, savings and loans who only lent money, and
real estate developers who only subdivided land. More
recently, however, large firms which accomplish a number of
these functions emerge: they subdivide land, improve it,
market the product, and -- sometimes -- finance the new
owners. At the same time, these larger developers can
afford themselves the best market research and hire the best architects and planners who inevitably produced a superior product. All of these technological improvements mean that the larger firms became more profitable forcing the smaller firms into mergers, joint ventures and/or becoming publicly-held companies (Goodkin, 1974: 80). This situation results in still further concentration and centralization of real estate capitals.

There is however a concomitant tendency towards an increasing division of labor within the real estate development process according to product line. For example, some firms only deal in residential realty, others in industrial realty, and so on. Further, the increasing division of labor has resulted in the emergence in the 1960's of property management as an important aspect of property capitalism.

These tendencies within the real estate development process have important implications for the production of the built environment. In particular, one finds increases in the scale of developments; an increasing spatial integration of housing markets; and an increasing focus on technological innovations. All of these have facilitated the way in which profits from the holding and development of real estate can be secured.
The increasing scale of real estate developments over the past eighty years is reflected in the historically recent development of large shopping centers, apartment complexes, planned community developments and so on. Large developments allow property capitalists to ensure that all positive externalities associated with property developments are internalized to their particular development, in order to ensure enhanced profits. At the same time, however, these capitals attempt to externalize any social costs associated with their developments onto society at large. Lamarche indicates the process as follows:

the more property capital becomes concentrated and extends its control over urban space, the more it is in a position to itself create the conditions of its own profitability, that is to say, to plan the organization of its property so that the nature and activities of the tenants of a given site are more mutually advantageous and, hence, maximise its profits. (Lamarche, 1980: 103).

Examples of the increased scale of developments include urban renewal schemes which increase the profit-making potential for real estate development through internalising a variety of positive externalities within a single development. Similarly, in new 'suburban' developments one gets the 'staging' of property developments in order to enhance the prices developers may obtain. The capturing of these externalities results, therefore, in enhanced values in the cases of both development de novo and redevelopment.
The competitiveness of the real estate market also results in a spatial integration of housing markets. This is most evident in the case of property finance. As noted previously, S & L's move away from a 'community' orientation and become more business-like. This results in risks now being spread over a number of neighborhoods, cities and even countries in order to provide more stable conditions for capital accumulation.

Finally, one finds an increasing emphasis on the use of technological innovations to reap profits. Innovations organized around life-cycle characteristics have been introduced: single-storey ranch houses with two-car garages (for child-centered families); adult communities (for elderly people); and swinging single communities (for singles or childless couples). Further innovations include: walled communities (for security); leisure communities (organized around recreational facilities); and suburban developments (with schools as central selling points). The introduction of these innovations has enhanced the capturing of technological rents and hence has meant increased profits. Whilst not something raised in earlier sections, these innovations do help to undermine the residential desirability of some neighborhoods as compared with others and hence increase the vulnerability of those living in certain 'technologically obsolete' areas. The vulnerabili-
ty of older inner suburbs to the forces of neighborhood change should be seen in this light.

Some empirical support for this changing organization of real estate development in Columbus, Ohio may be found in an examination of residential plats. A data set including the number of plats for each 'zero' year between 1920 and 1980 was compiled and included information on the size of development (acreage and number of lots), names of the developers, and various features of the developments (number of exits, cul-de-sacs, and kind of road system used) (see Table 30). A number of points relevant to the argument should be noted. First, the emergence of development companies and consequently the decline of individuals as major agents in the development of real estate is quite clear. In 1920, for example, only 20% of all lots were developed by companies as opposed to 92% in 1980.

Second, technological developments in the real estate process are recognised in the increasingly packaged and commodified form which later plats assume. For example, the number of cul-de-sacs and curved streets increases while the number of exits decreases dramatically between 1920 and 1980.

Third, the increasing concentration and centralization of capital is illustrated by the marked increase in the proportion of area developed by companies who recorded more
Table 30

Residential Plats Recorded in Zero Years, Franklin County, Ohio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>%LC</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>E/P</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>%CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where N = Number of plats recorded during the year,  
C = # of developers who were incorporated companies,  
%C = Percent. of total lots developed by companies,  
%LC = Percent. of total lots developed by companies  
who developed more than one plat during year,  
TL = Total lots platted,  
E = Total number of exits from the developments,  
E/P = Average number of exits per development,  
%CS = Total number of developments with cul-de-sacs,  
CV = Number of developments with curved roads, and  
%CV = Percent. of developments with curved roads.

SOURCE:
Franklin County Recorder's Office, Columbus, Ohio.

than one plat in each year under consideration. In 1950,  
for example, only 31.5% of the total lots were developed by
these 'larger' development firms. By 1980, however, these 'larger' firms were developing 91.9% of all lots platted.

The argument provided in this section does appear to have some local expression. In particular, the changes in urban development which are linked to the increase in neighborhood activism may be related to the post-War emergence of a group of property capitals whose goal is accumulation through the appropriation of surplus value in the form of rent.

4.4 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This chapter has developed a number of links between neighborhood activism and urban development. In particular, the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive neighborhood activism appears to be related to a shift in the way in which urban neighborhoods are produced and re-produced. In particular, links between conflict on the one hand and changes in the scale of developments and the spatial integration of housing markets on the other hand were addressed.

It is in this context that one can begin to appreciate the emergence of neighborhood activism as a response to certain conflicts of interest between people and producers of the built environment. People want to conserve (and increase if at all possible) their living place use values.
In Chapter 3 it was suggested that an important aspect of these living place use values was the avoidance of 'undesirable' social groups. On the other hand property capitals must continually create new use-values, many of which are for these 'undesirables'. Opposition results because property capitals must develop in particular places where social costs can be externalized and positive externalities internalized. What are therefore positive use values (stability, security, etc.) to people become restrictions to the accumulation of property capital (no growth, restrictions on the revolutionizing of the forces of production, etc.). The result is a process which is continually conflict-ridden.

The behavioral tendency toward the avoidance of apartment dwellers and urban development are thus necessary conditions for the emergence of defensive, exclusionary neighborhood activism. What remains to be done in the concluding chapter is to attempt to explain why homeownership, the presence of children in the home, and urban development are significant aspects of the social context which has emerged over the past sixty years or so.
In this dissertation an attempt has been made to situate neighborhood activism within an historical context. It has been shown that an exclusionary, defensive form of activism is historically quite recent. In particular, an exclusionary activism becomes more intense in the post-1960 period, and represents a qualitatively different form of neighborhood activism than that associated with the earlier twentieth century. Further, a number of historical correlates of this conflict and changing social and material conditions within urban neighborhoods were identified. Most importantly, links between neighborhood activism on the one hand, and certain behavioral tendencies and changes in the urban development process on the other were detailed.

This chapter attempts to explain these historical correlates. The particular approach adopted evaluates the changing meanings ascribed to them. The central question posed in this evaluation is: why is conflict associated with homeownership, the presence of school-going children in the home and changes in urban neighborhoods? The neces-
sity for such an explanation is provided in the first section where it is argued that the historical correlates of conflict are in fact associated with important qualitative changes in the social meanings ascribed to these variables. The changing form of turf politics, for example, represents the growing importance of a politics of space based on special interest groups. This contrasts strongly with the party-based ward politics of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Circumstantial evidence is also presented to argue that attitudes towards the home and towards children have changed. Further, changes in the production of the built environment recorded in Chapter 4 presuppose broad changes in the social meanings ascribed to neighborhoods.

The second section attempts to explain these changing social meanings. Links between these meanings and broader social changes in advanced capitalism are drawn. It is suggested that around the turn of the century a broad set of class conflicts ultimately resulted in the emergence of a new set of social meanings. These new meanings had important implications for attitudes towards homeownership, children and urban neighborhoods and allow one to understand the emergence of a defensive, exclusionary neighborhood activism.
5.1 CHANGING SOCIAL MEANINGS

This section provides some evidence that over the past eighty years the social meanings ascribed to neighborhood activism, homeownership, the presence of children in the home and the neighborhood itself have all changed.

5.1.1 The Emergence of Turf Politics

The content analysis highlighted an important shift over the past seventy years or so in the form taken by neighborhood politics. In particular, evidence that was collected indicated the emergence of an exclusionary, defensive form of neighborhood activism. The term 'politics of turf' captures the essence of this activism, for it emphasizes both the way in which residents respond to threats, and the spatial character of that response. That is, neighborhood activism is a political defense of residential space engaged in by groups who see their respective residential spaces as defining antagonistic interests. Its apparent separation from, for example, 'party politics' or the 'economy' is evident. Very rarely do neighborhood activists link the issue under concern to either 'economic', 'class' or 'party political' ideologies.

There has therefore been an important shift in the kind of politics found in urban areas. While this dissertation has not evaluated the relationship between the emergence of a politics of turf and other forms of politics (such as
party politics), the increasing intensity of neighborhood activism provides some evidence for the growing importance of a spatially based politics. This

spatial politics involves on the one hand, the politicization of space: the location of industry, housing, public facilities rapidly become political issues. And there is a complementary spatialization of politics: a tendency to see political objectives as realizable through a particular structuring or restructuring of space; and as contested by those having different structurings in mind. (Cox and Mair, 1984: 1).

This is not to say that there was no spatial politics during, for example, the early twentieth century. In fact, local (urban) politics were often ward-based and thus distinctly spatial (see Hays, 1964; 1974). An important component of these politics was, however, their party-political basis (see, for example, Whyte, 1964). This contrasts strongly with more recent conflicts over space which are experienced as occurring between special interest groups. For example, homeowners form coalitions to exclude renters from their neighborhoods.(51)

(51) There is evidence that in the case of ethnic 'communities' voluntary organizations have emerged as substitutes for the 'loss of community'. Importantly, even these organizations "operate as interest groups" (Lopata, 1964: 223).
5.1.2 Changing Attitudes Towards Homeownership

The past seventy years have witnessed an increasing tendency on the part of homeowners towards the avoidance of renters. In detailing these historical relationships it was suggested that this may be the outcome of the way in which the meaning of homeownership has changed. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive survey of how homeownership has been viewed, over time, by residents. Available literature, however, does suggest a variety of aspects which appear to have specific temporal contexts. My reading of the literature suggests three aspects to the changing meaning of homeownership:

* homeownership as a means of coping with the domination of the world outside,
* homeownership as a facilitator of the reproduction of families,
* homeownership as defining rights to a stream of revenue.

There is some evidence, for example, that around the turn of the century ownership was advocated as a means of coming to terms with the unpredictability of the workplace. Sanborn, writing in 1901, for example, argues that the proper counterpoise to the domination of the millionaire is the establishment of the human millions in homes of their own, on land of their own, making the American people once more a 'territorial democracy', and no longer the serfs of the overgrown capitalists or the voting machines of the political bosses. (Sanborn, 1901: 168).
Evidence that homeownership provided some sort of insurance against the unpredictability of the workplace is obtained from a variety of sources. There is evidence, for example, that proportionately more immigrant groups owned their homes than native Americans. While some might argue that this difference was due to particular sociocultural traits of immigrants groups, Hogan provides evidence to show that homeownership provided, for these groups, insurance against the hardships of the workplace. Around the turn of the century, he argues

home ownership was the first and primary line of defense against the vicissitudes of the wage labor system. (Hogan, 1978: 244).

And, he continues,

To immigrants in Chicago, home ownership was a safeguard against irregular employment, illness, death, low wages, and all the vicissitudes of life in a wage labor society. (Hogan, 1978: 236).

The use of homeownership as a form of insurance explains to a certain extent the fact that immigrants were often acquiring homes at the expense of their children's education (Thernstrom, 1964). Child labor was particularly prevalent during the late nineteenth century, and, it is argued, this labor provided a form of social insurance

(52) As Zunz argues in the case of Detroit:

The first striking feature of the housing statistics is that working class immigrants owned their homes proportionately more often than middle-class, native white Americans. (Zunz, 1982).
against hard times.

In the post-depression era, however, a new set of meanings begins to emerge, revolving around the importance of ownership, particularly to the socialization process. One of the leading proponents of ownership during this period -- Edith Elmer Wood -- argues:

> those who own a home ... have a sense of permanency. ...In addition, the ownership of property makes for conservatism ... For every social, health and moral reason, the owned home is most important for the children's sake. (Wood, 1931: 35-37; my emphasis).

The view that homeownership provides a stable environment for the reproduction process continues well into the 1950's in the writings on the positive aspects of suburbia (see, for example, Wood, 1958).

The final set of meanings revolve around the home as a repository of exchange values. It is difficult to pin this set of meanings down to a particular time period although evidence indicates it is a relatively recent notion. Here, the home is regarded as a financial asset with both a variety of pecuniary benefits (tax exemptions, deductions) and certain advantages in terms of its rate of return relative

(53) This is not to say, however, that the ownership of housing can be regarded in the same way that one analyses the expanded reproduction of exchange values: that is, in class terms.

The (accumulative potential of housing) does not derive from class-based exploitation. It might be argued that it is more in the form of a lottery with one set of consumers gaining at the expense of another. In other
to other investments. (53) Regarding the home as an investment stands in stark contrast to a recognition that home ownership is a form of social insurance. (54)

One could argue, moreover, that it is the emergence of this recent meaning which explains to a certain extent the behavioral tendency on the part of homeowners towards the avoidance of renters. Apartment dwellers, for example, are regarded as having adverse pecuniary effects on neighborhood property values.

5.1.3 Changing Attitudes Towards Children

While there is only scattered evidence for change in the meaning of homeownership, there is far more evidence that attitudes towards children have changed over the past eighty years. (55) The research suggests that as the patriarchal Victorian family gave way to a more democratic family structure, parental attention began to focus more on children.

_____________________

words, no real accumulation takes place.
(Forrest, 1983: 214)

(54) Luria provides evidence that in fact real estate was not a good investment during the late nineteenth century in Boston: home ownership was "probably an investment inferior to most" (Luria, 1976: 278). He suggests, furthermore, that this could possibly explain the different rates of home ownership between the middle- and working-classes.

This growing concern with children was expressed in a variety of ways. On the one hand, attitudes towards education changed. As mentioned previously, a child's education was not a major consideration in working class households around the turn of the century. However, as Hogan shows, during the early decades of the twentieth century more and more children, irrespective of population groups, stayed on longer in school (Hogan 1978: 178). The meaning ascribed to a child's education appeared to have changed. Initially, what was of most concern to families was staving off poverty, and sending children out to work provided one means of doing so. Over time, however, prolonged school attendance for children had to be encouraged because of "the economic necessity of education to gain a job" (Hogan 1978: 244).

The growing importance of education was given an added impetus through the involvement of the 'middle-classes' who instigated school reforms requiring children to attend school beyond the early grades. As Ueda shows in the case of the suburb of Somerville:

"middle class ethnic groups ... espousing progressive ideals of a better educated citizenry and more efficient social services, promoted school reform against the opposition of Republican, old stock, and business groups to increase their social mobility and to control assimilation in their own way" (Ueda, 1979: 168).

(56) As Zunz (1982: 239) argues: "workers turned to their children to supplement the family income". Also see Hogan (1978: 244).
On the other hand, there is evidence that parental concern with peer groups has changed. As peer groups have become more central to the socialization process, so parental concern for the effects 'negative' peer groups may have on their children has increased. As Lasch (1976) argues: "child rearing became more demanding and emotional ties between parent and child more intense as ties with relatives outside the immediate family weakened" (see also, Sennett, 1970). Riesman describes the process quite well:

(People) look for nice neighborhoods in which their children will meet nice people. Although much of the moving about in America today, within and between cities, is in search of better jobs, it is also increasingly in search of better neighborhoods and the better schools that go with them. Since many others, too, will also be shopping for better neighborhoods, this pressure, combined with the rapid shift of residential values and fashions characteristic of American cities, means that no one can ever settle down assuredly for the rest of life. ... By their very location ... parents show how much store they put on their children's contacts. (Riesman, 1950: 66/67, my emphasis).

These changing attitudes towards children have implications for the residential location decisions made by parents. As indicated previously education emerges as an important aspect of residential utility (see England, 1984). And similarly, the increasing localization of

(57) Riesman argues, for example, that as

the family's importance in socialization declines, the child, who must learn at an early age how to get along with the group, grows up under the influence of the media, the school and his peers. (Riesman, 1950).
parents with children with respect to other social groups suggests a concern with the effects of peer groups on their children’s socialization.

5.1.4 Changing Attitudes Towards the Neighborhood

Presupposing the changes in the production of the built environment discussed in Chapter 4, is a shift in the meaning of the neighborhood. In particular, more recently, residents have come to treat the neighborhood and residential location in an objective manner, as characterized by certain ‘objective’ attributes such as social composition or the physical surround. There is evidence, for example, that neighborhoods are evaluated according to the degree to which they symbolize relative status. That people strongly associate socioeconomic status with neighborhood has been shown elsewhere. (58)

The physical surround of one’s home also emerges as an aspect of this commodification. This physical surround includes a number of supposedly ‘independent’ characteristics, all of which enhance the overall quality of the home.

(58) With reference to a study of stratification in Kansas City it is concluded that "(r)esidential address was considered (by respondents) the quickest index to a family’s social status -- the foremost sign of the breadwinner’s financial competence and his or his wife’s social ambitions" (Coleman and Neugarten, 1971: 30).

(59) These include a well-wooded landscape, street patterns which adjust to the natural contours of the land, cul-de-sacs to provide insulation from traffic noise, underground utilities, the exclusion of commercial and
and neighborhood. (59) The classic study by Werthman et al. indicates this meaning of the neighborhood -- the social class aesthetic -- as a composite of various 'objective' characteristics very well (Werthman et al., 1965).

There is some evidence that this recognition of the neighborhood in 'objective' terms is relatively recent. Around the turn of the century, for example, people were much less likely to regard the neighborhood in this way, as defining, that is, a separate realm apart from the subjective. Instead, neighborhoods were seen to be an extension of one's self.

The solidarity of the traditional neighborhood included physical as well as social projects. The old swimming pool, the familiar hills and trees, the architecture and location of buildings, all function as sentimental attachments of the neighborhood. The individual becomes so closely identified with all these objects of early and intimate contact that they tend to form a part of the 'extended self' (McKenzie, 1924: 349).

Overall, the available evidence points to broad changes in social meanings. It appears that attitudes towards homeownership, children and the neighborhood have changed over the past eighty years. Homeownership has come to be regarded as a form of investment and not simply a means of social insurance. Children have come to be regarded less as a means of overcoming poverty and more concern has been directed by parents towards the education of their chil-

industrial facilities, and a variety of housing styles.
The concern with the 'objective' characteristics of neighborhoods is also recent. These tendencies are in turn linked to the emergence of a defensive, exclusionary activism. Exactly when these changes took place is not important for the argument presented here. For the purposes of this dissertation what is important is that the meanings associated with the tendencies defined earlier have changed and increasingly become established within society at large. The question that remains to be addressed is: Why do these new meanings/actions emerge and replace the old meanings? In the next section it is suggested that around the turn of the century there were a variety of social changes which generated these shifts in social meanings.

5.2 SOCIAL CHANGES, SOCIAL MEANINGS, AND TURF POLITICS

The period between the 1880's and 1930's represents in the United States a severe crisis for capital. This was evidenced by the widespread increase in both working class demands and organization. The rise in socialist parties during this period occurred over much of the United States although it was concentrated mainly in the heavy industrial cities of the North East U.S.A. It is through examining the resolution of these class conflicts that one can trace the emergence of the meanings previously described.
The crisis occurring during this period was, for capital, one of legitimation. Hitherto capital had exploited popular meanings inherited from pre-capitalist modes of production: the Protestant ethic, authoritarianism, the church, the family, pride in a craft, paternalism, etc. A legitimation crisis was brought about because these meanings were no longer necessary to the new form of capitalism emerging around this time. Aspects of this new labor process included the spread of the joint stock firm and Taylorization at the point of production (see Joyce, 1980). A void was therefore created through the obsolescence of old meanings. Into this void emerged a working class movement which sought to define new meanings and changed social conditions appropriate to their realization. In particular, a socialist view of the future came to the fore and included demands for the equality of (economic and political) power.

The resolution of this legitimation crisis involved a number of dimensions. Most importantly, the working-class demands became, ironically, the basis for the solutions used by capital and the state to solve the legitimation crisis. The solutions involved, in general, the creation of conditions within society whereby workers could individually solve their existential problems. For example, economic salvation was to be attained through individualist strategies. Thus, upward mobility was encouraged. At the
same time, workers' calls for freedom and control of the means of production were also refashioned. The solution hit upon in this case was to ensure that freedom became synonymous with consumption. That is, the arena for the attainment of individual freedom was to be the living place rather than the workplace; where consumption rather than production dominated. Thus, people were encouraged to improve their consumption advantage through the ownership of cars, houses and consumer durables in general.

The state played a central role in facilitating the realization of these meanings. In particular, the new meanings required the state to play a far greater role in the provision of schooling, welfare, planning and those conditions which would facilitate increased consumption.

The provision of education became a major concern of the state. The growing importance of upward mobility resulted in an expansion of, and democratization of access to, the educational system (see, for example, Hogan, 1978). At the

(60) Nasaw (1979), Spivey (1978) and Violas (1978) develop the relationship between the role of the school and changes in the labor process around the turn of the century.

(61) Lubove argues, for example, that the "social insurance movement ... aspired to rationalise the income-maintenance system in the United States. Such rationalization hinged upon centralization, government initiative, and the transfer of responsibility from the voluntary to the public sector (Lubove, 1967-8: 87).

(62) See Hays (1964; 1974) for example.
same time the state became involved in the subsidization of particularly large consumer durable purchases. For example, the FHA and FSLIC emerged in the post-1930 period and had a significant impact on both the property development process as well as homeownership rates. The state also assumed a central role in the provision of welfare. This was in order to provide a safety net and ensure the collective reproduction of workers. Overall, between the 1880's and 1930's there occurred a substantial centralization of reproduction functions in the hands of the state. This facilitated the process whereby individuals could solve their existential problems.

Resolution of the legitimation crisis in these ways had important implications for people's attitudes towards children, homeownership, and neighborhoods. On the one hand it led to an erosion of the old meanings and on the other hand resulted in the emergence of a set of new meanings.

5.2.1 Erosion of Old Meanings

The centralization of reproduction functions in the hands of the state liberated people from the social relations which had hitherto dominated their lives. Children came to be no longer seen as a form of social security. This was because the material conditions presupposing child labor had been replaced with the emergence of a welfare state. The welfare state also led to an erosion of atti-
tudes towards homeownership. Previously, an owned home was regarded as a form of security which one could fall back upon during hard times. With the introduction of unemployment benefits and a variety of social insurance schemes this meaning of homeownership could no longer be justified.

The emergence of a welfare state also had implications for the relationship people had with their neighborhoods. That is, people were no longer tied down to particular communities where the complex web of social relations had previously sheltered them from the vicissitudes of life as wage laborers. No longer, for example, were people dependent on specific others (particularly their extended family) for aid during hard times.

In summary, therefore, the resolution of the legitimation crisis led to an erosion of those attitudes towards children, the home and the neighborhood which dominated life in nineteenth and early twentieth century cities.

5.2.2 Emergence of New Meanings

Why, then, did a new set of meanings towards children, the home and the neighborhood emerge out of the resolution of the legitimation crisis? The answer to this question lies in a recognition that underpinning this resolution was a shift towards individual solutions to existential problems. In particular, upward mobility and consumption were important aspects of this solution. People's new found
concern, for example, with upward mobility and improving their consumption advantage allows one to understand why a new set of attitudes towards children, the home, and the neighborhood emerged.

Parental concern for the welfare of their children, for example, reflects a concern with their children's future consumption advantage. Consumption advantages for children can, in turn, be obtained through parents improving their children's access to both quality education and peer groups who would have a positive influence on the socialization process. One can therefore understand that over time all ethnic and population groups kept their children at school for longer and longer periods in an effort to enhance the economic welfare of their children. (Hogan, 1978: 231).

Similarly, the emergence of an attitude towards homeownership as an investment can be understood. In particular, homeownership becomes less a use-value for achieving economic security and more an exchange value, a means whereby one's consumption advantage through the tax sheltering of income could be maximized with housing becoming a repository of savings showing reasonable rates of return.

Finally, one can also appreciate the emergence of an attitude towards the neighborhood which is defined objectively. This is because on the one hand, the welfare state liberated people from specific residential locations. On the other hand, however, there is an incessant concern
on the part of people with maintaining their consumption advantage. Residents become hypersensitive to those changes in their neighborhood, such as population turnover, which might threaten their consumption advantage. Neighborhoods become commodities -- bundles of easily substitutable goods -- which residents evaluate 'objectively'.

It is in this context that one can understand the historical emergence of atomistic theories of consumer location, such as that proposed by Tiebout (1956). In his model "we can conceive of a utility-maximizing consumer who weighs the benefits stemming from the program of local public services against the cost of his tax liability and chooses as a residence that locality which provides him with the greatest surplus of benefits over costs" (Oates, 1969: 959). The 'objective' relationship which he suggests consumers have with urban neighborhoods is, we would argue, very recent and has emerged given the commodification of the neighborhood.

It does appear to be the case that the tendencies discussed earlier, and the meanings ascribed to them, emerge out of the resolution of a legitimation crisis occurring around the turn of the century. Individualist solutions to existential problems -- epitomized by neighborhood activism -- are historically quite recent and reflect the social atomization induced by policies of cooptation and incorpo-
ration of the worker as a willing buyer and seller of commodities (see Cox and Mair, 1984).
Chapter VI
CONCLUDING COMMENTS

6.1 THE DISSERTATION BRIEFLY SUMMARIZED

This dissertation has attempted to place neighborhood activism in a sociohistorical context. In the first chapter it was suggested that an historical analysis should undertake two related sets of analyses. The first locates the temporal and geographical dimensions of the problem under investigation and identifies historical correlates. This was accomplished in Chapters 2 through Chapter 4. In particular, it was demonstrated that an exclusionary, defensive form of neighborhood activism has increased over the past eighty years. These shifts in neighborhood activism were linked to changes in a variety of behavioral tendencies and with changes in the urban development process. Homeownership, the presence of children in the home, the changing scale of residential construction and an integration of real estate markets were suggested as important correlates of the historical trajectory of neighborhood activism.
The second stage in the analysis attempted to explain these historical correlates. This was provided in Chapter 5 where it was argued that the social meanings ascribed to the correlates themselves were, in fact, historically emergent. Attitudes towards children, the home and the neighborhood have changed over the past eighty years. A context for these changes was provided through a brief description of a legitimation crisis for capital occurring between the 1880's and 1930's. The resolution of this crisis involved a new set of meanings defining social life under capitalism: meanings which in turn allow one to understand the defensive, exclusionary neighborhood activism.

6.2 THE RESEARCH IN REVIEW

It is useful at this point to place the analysis offered in this dissertation in a broader context and evaluate its contributions to urban geography and social science as a whole. The contributions appear to be three-fold. First, the research has indicated the importance of understanding social relationships in terms of the specific sociospatial contexts in which they are found. Neighborhood activism as we know it is highly contemporary and an understanding of why this is so comes from a broader sociohistorical analysis. My analysis confirms a suspicion that categories, and theories for that matter, must not be ossified but must be
understood in terms of the meanings they assume in specific contexts. In the case of models of urban form, for example, one can argue that the importance of 'distance', and its meaning, has changed over time. Similarly, central to an understanding of neighborhood activism is an analysis of those social changes which give rise to such conflict.

Second, this dissertation has attempted to provide a relational analysis where theory and empirical tests are fused into a broader sociohistorical model. Conventional approaches -- hypothetico-deductive, inductive and empirical/statistical (see Sayer, 1982) -- are too rigid to allow an evaluation of what social relations mean and how these meanings change over time. And finally, this dissertation has shown that it is possible, through the use of a variety of primary and secondary data sources, to reconstruct empirically trends in the historical geography and social life of urban areas.

The research has, however, raised a number of questions which, given the particular framework adopted, could not be resolved. Most importantly, it became clear that the historical basis of activism in Columbus, Ohio may be different from that found in other cities in the United States. The overwhelming significance of 'suburban' forms of conflict, for example, may not be found in contexts where there is a strongly developed central city bias to urban
restructuring. Descriptive trends identified using the New York Times indices (see Chapter 4) suggest, however, that my results may in fact reflect national trends quite well. Further, the analyses presented in this dissertation do not address the (relatively autonomous) effect other forms of protest (such as protests over civil rights) may have had on the emerging politics of turf. And, finally, the research does not address adequately the various forms of consciousness which may dominate a politics of turf.

6.3 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Notwithstanding these comments the analyses provided in this dissertation reinforce a contention that neighborhood activism must be seen in its historical context. The behavioral correlates identified in the politics of turf literature in fact signify broader meanings and tendencies found in advanced capitalist settings. They are not 'independent' variables and their importance derives from the way in which social life is produced and re-produced in specific social contexts.
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