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Part One
Methods
City with High Segregation  
\( H = 48.4 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Diversity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City with Low Segregation

**H=0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Diversity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two
Neighborhood Diversity
Black neighborhoods have the lowest racial diversity score

- 1980
- 1990
- 2000

White: 23, 37, 29
Black: 14, 15, 18
Latino: 45, 42, 44
Asian: 61, 46, 50
No Majority: 68, 71, 70
Part Three
Neighborhood Change
Part Four
Segregation
Segregation is declining for the metropolitan region

Chicago Metro
Central Cities
Suburbs

1980: 56, 58, 29
1990: 50, 54, 29
2000: 44, 49, 30
The majority of segregation for the region is between whites and nonwhites.
Suburban segregation is increasingly accounting for more of the total segregation in the region.
Summary

• **Neighborhood Diversity**
  – Neighborhood racial diversity is on the rise.
  
  – Black majority neighborhoods are the least racially diverse neighborhoods.

• **Neighborhood Change**
  – The majority of neighborhoods that have lost racial diversity are in Chicago.

• **Segregation**
  – Segregation has declined for the Chicago Metropolitan Area.
  
  – Despite the decline in segregation for the region, segregation in the suburbs has not declined.
The Politics of Promises in the Transformation of Public Housing*
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# Demographic Changes in North Kenwood - Oakland, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>10,938</td>
<td>9,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent black</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income (in 1999 dollars)</td>
<td>$9,391</td>
<td>$21,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with income over $50,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent homeowners</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value (in 1999 dollars)</td>
<td>$44,160</td>
<td>$219,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families that are poor</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Housing in NKO
The **Fate** of a Promise

**PROMISE**
- No relocation
- No demolition
- Construction of all promised replacement housing units before demolition
- Will not sell land to private interests
- Right to Return

**FATE**
- Full relocation
- Demolition of 4 of 6 buildings
- Demolition proceeded with “substantial” but not full construction of replacement units
- Full private management and partial private ownership
- Fewer units with site-specific criteria
Demolition of Lakefront Properties
Conclusions

- Turnover weakens institutional accountability

- Powerful social capital realizes its interests

- “Rights” of public housing residents diminished by challenges to their moral and cultural legitimacy
Crime and Fear Are Down, But Why?

Wesley G. Skogan
Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University
Crime in Chicago 1991-2005

Murder and Rape
- Murder: -52%
- Sexual assault: -55%

Assault and Robbery
- Aggravated assault: -54%
- Robbery: -64%

Street and Gun Crime
- Street crime: -55%
- Gun crime: -64%

Burglary and Auto Theft
- Burglary: -52%
- Auto theft: -52%
Crime Trends by Race

Homicide

Robbery

Gun Crimes

Burglary
“What If ... Crime Had Not Gone Down?

- 3,100 more murders
- 16,000 more sexual assaults
- 275,000 more robberies
- 250,000 more burglaries
- 222,000 more auto thefts
It’s Not Demography or Economics

• no change in age distribution
• economic advances 1990-2000 disappointing
  very small decline in poverty
  income pulled by the upper brackets
  very tiny increase in home ownership
  25% of all youths poor, and this did not change
It’s not Prisons and Jails

- prisoners from Chicago: 25,286 (+24%)
- number of police: 13,755 (+11%)
- county jail population: 11,082 (+38%)

numbers:
- 0
- 5000
- 10000
- 15000
Impact of Prison on Chicago Crime

minimum impact estimate

maximum impact estimate

"maxi" forecast

violent crimes

violent crime rate
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It’s Not A Declining Crack Market
It’s Not Declining Gun Use

RED gun crime
BLUE non-gun

number of incidents

murders scaled to right axis
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It’s Not Declining Gang Violence

- **Gang Murders**
- **Non-Gang Murders**
- **Gang Assaults (X10)**

Gang assault data available 1991-1999
It’s Also Not . . . .

- because of the demolition of **public housing**; crime rates in and around CHA properties dropped faster than in the remainder of the city, but it always constituted a small percentage of all crime and could not account for its sweeping downturn.

- because of improving **security in the schools**. School-based assault did not decline, and it skyrocketed in the 2000s. Other school crimes – which are down – constitute just a small percentage of the city’s total, and could not account for the dramatic decline in crime in the city.
It’s Not Demonstrated that . . .

• “smarter” policing impacted crime, and that police “got smarter” at a pace matching the decline in crime.

• community factors that are known to control crime grew stronger during this period.

• neighborhood mobilization around the city’s community policing program contributed to the decline in crime during of this period.
Other Claims

• Declining alcohol consumption
• Culture change
• A “tipping point” was reached
• Abortion improved the lot of the living
• Housing and neighborhood revitalization
Other Thoughts

• Probably due to a mix of factors
• Effects of specific factors can rise and fall
• Different factors weigh in at different times

** Crime has been dropping for 15 years

I’ve said nothings about costs and comparative costs and benefits.
Trends in Drug Arrests

Note: excludes traffic arrests
Indicators of Gun Carrying

- Guns seized by police
- Weapons violations

Number of incidents:
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Years:
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- 1997
- 1998
- 1999
- 2000
- 2001
- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
School Crime Trends

- All gun crime: -77%
- Robbery: -47%
- Property crime: -41%
- Vandalism: -34%
- Assault: +206%
Trends in Fear

Afraid to Go Out by Home Ownership

- Home owners
- Renters

Afraid to Go Out by Gender

- Males
- Females

Afraid to Go Out by Income

- More than $40,000
- Less than $40,000

Afraid to Go Out by Age

- Under age 35
- Over age 60
It’s Not The Number of Police

- Violent and property crime predicted by number of police
- Actual property crime (right axis)
- Actual violent crime (left axis)