

NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION IN JEWISH COMMUNITIES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

DAVID P. VARADY

University of Cincinnati

Since the 1920s and 1930s social scientists have noted the tendency for black residential areas to expand into and through Jewish communities rather than through other white ethnic communities (Kain, 1970; Rose, 1969; Sobel and Sobel, 1966). They have attributed the susceptibility of Jewish communities to racial change to the upward social mobility among Jews, to assimilation (i.e., the adoption of societal values emphasizing the suburban way of life), to Jewish family structure (i.e., the tendency for Jewish children to avoid living in the same neighborhoods as their parents), to the lack of commitment among Jews to the physical environment (Sklare, 1972) and to the fact that Jews have never physically resisted black in-migration.¹

Usually, synagogues and other Jewish communal institutions have passively adapted to changes in the community by relocating to newer Jewish communities in the suburbs. One problem with this strategy is the costs incurred for replacing synagogues and other communal facilities. In addition, the neighborhood transition process is never complete. The poor and the elderly are left behind in neighborhoods experiencing physical decline and rapid increases in the incidence of violent street crime (Ginsberg, 1975). Finally, the suburbanized Jewish population may become so dispersed as to make reestablishment of institutions inefficient or impossible.

Jewish communal leaders have become increasingly aware of these problems and as a result have become increasingly interested in the effort to stabilize racially changing Jewish communities. They have been handicapped by the lack of information on the strengths and weaknesses of different racial stabilization strategies. Ironically, a large proportion of the academic case studies of racially changing communities have been of Jewish communities: the Mattapan section of Boston (Ginsberg, 1975), the South Shore Community of Chicago (Molotch, 1972), and several communities in Detroit (Wolf and Lebeaux, 1967). Unfortunately these studies devote little or

no attention to the role played by synagogues and other communal institutions in the stabilization effort.

This paper seeks to add to the limited literature available on the nature and limitations of stabilization efforts implemented by Jewish communal agencies by comparatively analyzing efforts in five cities: Chicago, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Cincinnati, and Cleveland. It should be emphasized that this is an exploratory study. We do not attempt to evaluate with scientific precision the impact of the efforts in these five cities. One reason it is not feasible to do so is that in most of the cases the magnitude of the federation effort is so small that it is unlikely to have any measurable impact on the demographic changes occurring in the area. Furthermore, there was only limited information available on the rate of racial change in these communities (and that was usually out of date) and there was even less data available on religious changes. Finally, it is extremely difficult to disentangle the independent impact of federation stabilization efforts from other forces affecting these communities (e.g., fluctuations in the local housing markets, changes in public school boundaries). It is hoped that this paper can aid in the development of more sophisticated analyses in the future.

Another limitation of this paper should be noted. It does not attempt to cover all the different types of stabilization programs implemented in Jewish communities. In particular, it does not discuss the stabilization strategies of different Hasidic groups, such as the efforts of the Lubavitch Hasidim in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn (Kandell, 1972; Lichtenstein, 1974). Such efforts are worthy of a separate paper.

This paper is divided into four parts. The first part briefly reviews previous research on public and private efforts to attain neighborhood stability once black immigration begins. The second section presents and utilizes a paradigm for classifying Jewish stabilization efforts. The third section presents the five case studies in some detail. Among the questions that it seeks to answer are the following: What are the major component activities of the stabilization program? How is the stabilization effort viewed by members of other groups? Is it considered exclusionary? To what degree is the program perceived as successful and why? What has been the rate of racial and religious change since the program began? On the basis of these case studies the final section discusses the types of federation strategies that have the greatest potential for success and the dilemmas for the Jewish community stemming from such efforts.

This paper draws heavily from open-ended interviews conducted with staffs of various stabilization projects and the staffs of local Jewish federations as well as from reports and other published information on the stabilization projects. The paper also draws upon the author's experiences as a consultant to the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati and Vicinity.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The local residents association is the mechanism most frequently utilized to achieve stabilization when black in-migration begins. Most residents associations have focused on halting the exodus of whites, but some have concentrated on attracting a sufficient number of new white residents to the area. Residents associations activities include attempts at controlling real estate solicitation through persuasion and legislation, maintaining and enhancing community standards by lobbying for more community services and by working on the preparation of community master plans, and building neighborhood cohesion and correcting stereotypes about blacks by, for example, establishing block clubs.

In general, residents associations have had no appreciable impact on the rate of racial change. This is not surprising in that residents associations do not focus on the underlying causes of racial change, i.e., factors like suburban white prejudice, which is responsible for black housing demand's being limited to white communities adjoining the ghetto (Wolf and Lebeaux, 1967). Ironically, as Molotch (1972) points out, these efforts by residents associations may even speed up the rate of racial change by making the areas more attractive for middle-class blacks. These efforts are likely to have little impact on prospective white residents because white residents generally have a variety of modern suburban neighborhoods open to them.

The typical approach that Jewish federations have used to achieve stabilization has been to work through local nonsectarian residents associations (see, for example, Ginsberg, 1975; Varady, 1979). These efforts in Jewish communities have been no more successful than the efforts in non-Jewish ones.

In recent years the boundaries of black residential areas have begun to shift beyond the limits of the central cities. Middle-class suburban communities have begun to experience some of the same problems related to racial change that previously had been limited to neighborhoods in the central city. Interestingly, most of the innovative stabilization programs that have been implemented in recent years have been in suburban areas. This is, in fact, not especially surprising, since these suburban governments have greater flexibility in developing new programs. Central-city policymakers usually have to set priorities among a variety of problem areas (e.g., downtown development, black teenage unemployment) and usually assign neighborhood stabilization low priority for funding. On the other hand, suburban officials usually have a smaller number of problems and consequently can better focus their efforts on racial stabilization.

Two of the most widely publicized suburban stabilization programs are

for Oak Park and Park Forest, both suburbs of Chicago. In order to discourage white flight, Oak Park has implemented an equity assurance program that will reimburse residents for up to 80 percent of any losses incurred in the sale of their homes (Sheppard, 1977; Williams and Simons, 1977). It has also established a \$1.5 million bond fund to enable residents to get low-interest loans to upgrade multifamily dwellings. The most controversial program is a nonprofit housing center whose aim is to disperse members of the different races within the boundaries of the village. It seeks out liberal whites to settle in mixed areas and tries to steer middle class blacks to a variety of neighborhoods so that no one neighborhood experiences complete transition. The integration maintenance plan for Park Forest includes a housing center similar to the one in Oak Park (Onderdonk et al., 1977). In addition, the village has implemented an affirmative marketing strategy that seeks to equalize levels of demand by blacks and whites. If, in a particular neighborhood, most of the homeseekers are black, a special effort is made to try to attract whites to that neighborhood.

These suburban stabilization efforts should be of interest to Jewish federations. The programs described above offer some potential for success since they are directly focused on the local housing market. In addition, in many major metropolitan areas (e.g., Detroit and Boston) the Jewish population is overwhelmingly suburban. This means that it is highly desirable for federations to coordinate their stabilization efforts with those implemented by local governments. We will discuss this subject in far more detail below, when we discuss the stabilization program implemented in Cleveland Heights.

THE PARADIGM

Stabilization strategies in Jewish communities can be examined along two dimensions: the degree of intervention into the local housing market and the role played by Jewish federations (and federation-supported agencies). With respect to the first dimension, we can distinguish between direct and indirect efforts. Indirect efforts (e.g., working through the local residents association) emphasize improving the overall quality of life in the area on the assumption that this will aid in attracting young Jewish families as well as in retaining existing ones. On the other hand, direct efforts intervene into the local housing market in order to attract such families. The second dimension distinguishes between those strategies in which the federation plays an active role and those in which it plays virtually no role at all.

Combining these two dimensions yields four combinations or types of strategies. Figure 1 lists examples of all four types. They are discussed in detail in the following section.

FIGURE 1
Types of Jewish Neighborhood Stabilization Strategies

		Intervention in Housing Market	
		DIRECT	INDIRECT
JEWISH FEDERATION ROLE	None	1. Chicago	2. Pittsburgh
	Important	4. Cleveland	3. Cincinnati Baltimore

DISCUSSION

West Rogers Park, Chicago: A Direct Effort with No Federation Participation

The ethnic transition process in the West Park section of Chicago is of interest because declines in the Jewish population have not been associated with race. Vacancies made available by an aging Jewish population have increasingly been taken by Orientals, East Indians, Greeks, and Latins.

The West Rogers Park Jewish Community Relations Council (WRPJCC) was organized in 1975 by community residents with technical assistance provided by the Jewish Council on Urban Affairs of Chicago. This is a group of liberal Jews, who prior to working with the WRPJCC had not worked on a specifically Jewish project. The founders of the council decided to make it an identifiably Jewish organization because they considered it the duty of the dominant group in a racially changing community (in this case, Jews) to stabilize and improve it. Furthermore, they felt that synagogues were the main vehicle for participation in this community and that synagogue leaders would be reluctant to become closely involved with non-Jewish organizations.

Most of the activities of the WRPJCC are typical of residents associations in transitional communities (e.g., pressuring the city for improved street lighting). Three programs have been specifically oriented toward the Jewish community: an apartment referral service to help landlords locate Jewish families and vice versa, brochures and materials promoting West Rogers Park as a Jewish community, and an equity loan program. The latter program is undoubtedly the most original one developed by the WRPJCC and is

modeled after a program developed by the (Cleveland) Heights Area Project (to be discussed later). The program was organized on the basis of two assumptions: that the high down payment (20 percent) constituted a significant obstacle for young families interested in purchasing a home in the community and, that if low-interest secondary mortgage loans were made available, these would provide the needed economic incentives to convince families to move into the area. The program was established by asking each of the local synagogues to make a \$10,000 loan to the local bank. Up to now the program has not been successful. As of summer 1978, only four families had taken advantage of the loans. The organizers of the council have been surprised by the lack of utilization of the mortgage assistance program, particularly since the program in Cleveland Heights has been far better utilized. They have attributed the underutilization to the high cost of housing in the community (homes usually sell for more than \$60,000) and the fact that even with the second mortgage loans, the homes are still too expensive.

Despite the large financial investment that the Jewish community has in West Rogers Park, over \$12 million (Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, 1975), the Jewish federation has thus far refused funding for the council.² A federation staff member mentioned the reasons for these refusals. First, relatively speaking, ethnic change is not that much of a threat. Federation leaders perceive that the Jewish population has stabilized with the in-migration of Orthodox families. Further, although Jewish religious and communal facilities are concentrated, they are less concentrated than in other cities. Second, some federation leaders view change as inevitable. As the staff member put it: "The federation cannot change demography." Third, there is the question of priorities. Funds that could be used for neighborhood stabilization activities could also be used to meet other needs in the Jewish community. Fourth, federation leaders have been reluctant to support the program because of its potentially controversial nature. It is felt that no matter how serious an attempt is made to explain the purposes of such a community group, it could be branded as exclusionary; federation leaders do not want to be identified as funding an exclusionary group. The explicitly Jewish focus of the council has not improved its position vis-à-vis the federation. Some federation leaders believe that the focus on the Jewish community offends non-Jews in the community and thereby creates a community relations problem. Finally, there is no consensus among Jewish communal leaders about the necessity of preserving West Rogers Park as the last identifiably Jewish community within Chicago. Some leaders argue that while preservation is of obvious importance to the religiously observant, Orthodox families constitute only a small proportion of the total Jewish population. Thus, the disappearance of this community is not that important, except perhaps for "sentimental" reasons.

The concern among federation leaders that the program would be controversial has not been borne out. The lack of controversy may be due to the fact that the secondary mortgage program has not really gotten off the ground. In addition, the council's willingness to work with other groups on broader community problems may have also reduced the potential for controversy. For example, the WRPJCC has worked with other community groups to improve the appearance of the Devon neighborhood business district.

The WRPJCC does not appear to have been an effective tool to promote ethnic stabilization. Although the Jewish population has stabilized at about one-half of the total, after declining from three-fourths of the total in 1963 (Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, 1975), many residents are pessimistic about the future (*Chicago Jewish Post and Opinion*, November 5, 1976). This pessimism is based on the fact that many residents previously moved from racially changing communities on the south and west sides of the city and believe that the same pattern will repeat itself. This pessimism is at least partly justified. With the exception of the Orthodox, few young Jewish families have moved into the community. Their reluctance stems from the perceived low quality of Chicago's public schools and the belief that locations in West Rogers Park have a relatively low prestige value in comparison to locations in suburban communities.

In addition, the relatively slow rate of change is a function of two factors unrelated to the activities of the WRPJCC. As mentioned, the continued in-migration of the Orthodox has been a stabilizing factor. Second, the absence of much panic moving may be due to the fact that Jews are being replaced by minorities other than blacks. If blacks had been the in-migrating group, Jewish out-migration might have been more rapid. The vital question is: Will the in-migration of young Orthodox families be sufficient to maintain the viability of this Jewish community?

Squirrel Hill, Pittsburgh: An Indirect Effort with Little Federation Participation

The Squirrel Hill community of Pittsburgh is currently experiencing neither racial nor ethnic change, but its population is an aging one, and signs of housing deterioration are beginning to appear. Leaders of the community fear that unless trends are reversed the community will undergo both physical decline and ethnic change.

When the Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition, a nonsectarian group, was organized, the Pittsburgh Jewish federation provided \$10,000 and technical assistance. Since then the coalition has made numerous requests for financial support from the federation, but all have been denied. The federation's unwillingness to provide funding may be due to the activist stance the

coalition has taken in relation to City Hall and the unwillingness of some federation leaders to support such an activist group. The coalition has sought to obtain an increased share of available city funds for public projects in the community. It has gone so far as to threaten to have the community secede from the city—a threat seriously taken by the media (Moyle, 1976; Warner, 1976). This strategy has in fact been successful in increasing the amount of city funds directed to the community. Most of the activities of the coalition are typical of residents associations in transitional communities (e.g., a community fair, a crime-prevention program, a transportation program to bring the elderly to and from synagogues and churches). The one unique program was a housing rehabilitation program through which the coalition was supposed to purchase older, deteriorating houses, fix them up and then sell them to prospective homeowners. One rehabilitated home was sold under the program, but the program was then discontinued, because it was found that buyers were rehabilitating homes without the program.

A major goal of the coalition has been to attract young professional families to the community. (Currently about one-fourth of the residents are over 60). No data is available to measure the coalition's effectiveness in achieving this goal. The coalition staff feel that such families have continued to move into the area during the 1970s and that as a result the community's nearly all-white character in 1970 has not changed much. It is impossible to determine how important coalition activities have been in influencing the continued immigration of such families in comparison to known assets of the community: its attractive housing, a diverse business district, and proximity to a university-hospital complex.

The coalition's nonsectarian nature precludes it from attempting to maintain the community's ethnic Jewish character. The proportion of Jews in the community has remained at about 45 percent (Bloom, 1974). This stability of the Jewish population is unrelated to any coalition activity but is instead a result of the continued migration into the area of Jews from other racially changing communities in the city.

The local public schools are the largest question mark affecting the community's future. In recent years, pressure has been exerted by the State Human Relations Board, and the school board in Pittsburgh has experimented with a number of integration schemes. Black students have been bussed into the community, and the middle school now has a black majority. Since about a half of the school-aged children in Squirrel Hill attend private, and parochial schools, the problem of integration of the public schools has had only a limited impact. If in the future a majority of the white families considering moving into Squirrel Hill are oriented towards public schools, this could lead to a change in the racial composition of the community.

Federation Has an Ongoing but Indirect Role

Roselawn, Cincinnati. The Roselawn community of Cincinnati is a racially changing community located in the northern section of the city. The Roselawn Community Council (RCC) was organized with the assistance of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Cincinnati in 1972. Since that time, the Jewish federation of Cincinnati has provided much of the RCC's funding. The activities of the RCC have been typical of those of residents associations in transitional communities (e.g., working with a team of planners from the city planning commission to prepare a master plan for the community, reviewing zoning cases, countering realtor blockbusting).

There has been an uneven relationship between the RCC and the Jewish federation. The two organizations have worked well together when their interests have coincided, e.g., when the council endorsed and helped obtain support for the federation's housing for the elderly project in the community. They have not functioned well together on the issue of neighborhood stabilization because of their divergent interests. The federation has been very concerned about racial stabilization because of its heavy financial investment in the community. It has viewed the RCC as its vehicle for promoting racial stabilization. As typical of other residents associations in changing areas, the RCC has never made racial stabilization an explicit goal of the organization but instead has emphasized maintaining the overall quality of life in the area.³ Further, with the exception of countering realtor blockbusting, none of the activities of the council have dealt with the issue of racial stabilization.

Perhaps the best illustration of the two organizations' inability to promote racial stabilization was the council's unwillingness to implement a racial monitoring system. This system would have sought to refute stereotypical perceptions of the community (i.e., that it was undergoing rapid racial change) and would have provided data which could have been utilized by the federation to evaluate the council. Under the proposed system, volunteers would visit newly sold homes and provide the families with information about the community and the community council. These visits would elicit the racial characteristics of in-migrant families as well as serve as an outreach function for the council. Thus far, the board of the council has been unwilling to implement this proposal. Some members of the board have been unwilling to endorse the system because they feel it would be controversial; black families would not want to be singled out as a separate group.⁴ Other members of the board opposed the monitoring system because they felt that the federation had imposed the program on the council and the RCC board members wanted to maintain the council's autonomy from the Jewish federation. Federation leaders are aware of another problem. Owing to the fact that the RCC is a non-sectarian organization, it cannot implement

programs aimed at maintaining the community's Jewish character. Consequently, a federation committee has been working on a plan of action for the Jewish subcommunity. The plan includes programs aimed at attracting Jewish families to the area, to be implemented apart from the RCC.

The RCC appears to have had no impact on the rate of racial change. The community has changed from virtually all white in 1970 to racially mixed today. Owing to the lack of data, the community's current racial composition is unknown. There has been a sharp decline in interest in the community by young white families in general and by Jewish families in particular. One major factor has been the racial composition of the public schools. Both the junior high school and the high school are overwhelmingly black, while the elementary school has a black majority. In addition, Roselawn is perceived as having a lower prestige level than nearby suburban areas, and as a result the community has experienced difficulty in attracting and holding Orthodox as well as non-Orthodox Jews. Given the fact that neither the federation nor the RCC has had any impact upon the community's changing racial composition up to now, the long-term prospects for stabilization are not promising.

Baltimore. Northwest Baltimore, a large area of 100,000 people that has already gone through the racial transition process, is now predominantly black. Within this large area there remain several identifiably Jewish communities. One, the Glen neighborhood, is the location of the Jewish community center and contains a sizeable Orthodox population. Another, the Liberty Road area, in the northwestern suburbs, has begun to experience racial change.

The Baltimore Jewish federation's approach to stabilization has been to work through the Jewish community council, the main community relations agency in the Jewish community, to strengthen the local community councils in racially changing Jewish communities. In addition it has funded the Northwest Baltimore Corporation and the Liberty Road Community Council.

The Northwest Baltimore Corporation is made up of a number of neighborhood organizations in that section of the city. When a problem occurs, it is brought to the attention of the board. The Glen neighborhood is one of the Jewish communities that has representation on the Northwest Baltimore Corporation. Up to now this has been a weak organization, perhaps reflecting the insularity of the Orthodox population. The Glen Neighborhood Community Council's (GNCC) approach to stabilization has been typical of those of residents associations in transitional communities. Its main stabilization activity has been a program to get neighbors to know one another.

The relationship between the Baltimore Jewish federation and the GNCC

has not been problem-free. A recent dispute concerning a federation-endorsed, federally subsidized housing project for the elderly has created tensions. Neighborhood residents are concerned about the project because the Jewish population is already elderly. Several apartments for the elderly have been built in the community in recent years. They fear that construction of this housing would attract more elderly people and solidify the neighborhood's image of being predominantly elderly. The federation is in a difficult position. While it is concerned about the future of the community, it is also concerned about improving the housing conditions of the residents.

The federation's stabilization effort in northwest Baltimore is not succeeding. The Mt. Washington area is the only section of northwest Baltimore where Jews are continuing to move in, attracted by the fine housing and the high quality public schools. There is at present no substantial movement of Jews into the Glen neighborhood. The Jewish federation's stabilization activities have not successfully solved the three most important problems affecting these communities: realtor steering, rapid racial change in the public schools, and violent street crime.

Until recently, the Liberty Road area in the northwest suburbs was a predominantly white community with a Jewish majority (three-fifths of the total). Recent black in-migration has had a particularly sharp impact on the public schools. Several of the elementary schools are 90 percent black, a junior high school is 70 percent black and the high school is between 20 and 30 percent black.

The Liberty Road Community Council has tried to make the area more attractive to prospective white families by slowing the rate of racial change in the public schools. The council has attempted to do this by putting pressure on the county school board to bus black children out of the Liberty Road area to other parts of the county. Thus far, the school board has been unwilling to implement this idea and has insisted that busing be limited to the Liberty Road area and Pikesville, a nearby suburb which is now considered the center of the Jewish population in Baltimore. Many black parents in the Liberty Road area have resisted the busing idea, preferring instead that their children attend the closest public school.

This resistance by blacks illustrates a dilemma facing stabilization planners. Activities that distinguish between blacks and whites are likely to be controversial, but they are also the type most likely to promote stability. On the other hand "color-free" stabilization policies (i.e., the type typically implemented by residents associations) are not likely to be controversial, but they are also not likely to be successful.

The stabilization effort in this suburban area does not appear to be succeeding. The community is now one-third black, one-third Jewish, and one-third white Christian. Continued declines in the proportion of whites in

general and Jews in particular are to be expected because of racial changes in the public schools and the fact that this is not considered a high-status suburban area.

Cleveland Heights: Federation Has an On-Going and Direct Role

Cleveland Heights is a racially changing municipality immediately to the east of Cleveland. The (Cleveland) Heights Area Project (HAP) implemented by the Cleveland Jewish community federation—with an annual budget of \$23,000—is viewed by national federation leaders as one of the most massive and significant projects developed by a federation in the United States (Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1974).

The HAP is unique from other federation efforts in that it focuses specifically on the Jewish community. The founders of the program reasoned that if Cleveland Heights was to remain a viable Jewish community, it would be necessary to continue to attract young Jewish families, and that a stabilization effort aimed at the total community would not attain this goal. Toward this end, they developed a secondary mortgage assistance program for Jewish families using funds from the federation's endowment fund. This would enable families to afford the initial 20 percent down payment on a home. As of July 1977, 133 loans had been made, amounting to approximately \$369,000. In addition the HAP has mounted a public relations campaign, publicizing the community to the larger population by placing advertisements in Cleveland's Jewish newspaper and by distributing a brochure emphasizing the advantages of Cleveland Heights to Jewish families.

Perhaps the above implies that the HAP is a narrow "parochial" program since it focuses primarily on the Jewish community. Such an assessment would not be accurate. The project's organizers believed that it would be impossible to attain a successful stably integrated community with any one element operating independently. Consequently, the project has worked with other nongovernmental groups (particularly the Cleveland Heights Community Congress) and the city of Cleveland Heights in dealing with broader community problems.

The Cleveland Heights Community Congress is a coalition of over 200 religious, civic, and business groups representing all segments of the community. A major goal of the congress has been to make open housing a reality in all the eastern Cleveland suburbs. Toward this end, the congress has conducted an audit of realtors operating in the community. Both black and white observers visit homes listed for sale in order to ascertain whether steering exists. The congress also uses a new homeowner questionnaire to ascertain the existence of unfair housing practices. Questions deal with the respondents' experiences with banks as well as with realtors (e.g., whether

bankers are reluctant to extend a mortgage loan because of the age of the home).

Cleveland Heights' approach to stabilization—a housing service—is similar to the approach used in the racially changing middle-class suburban areas mentioned earlier (Park Forest and Oak Park, Illinois). Both of these communities have housing centers or housing services. The Cleveland Heights Housing Service publicizes the community by utilizing a brochure (among other techniques), escorts prospective residents through the community, and supplies them with a list of realtors familiar with homes in Cleveland Heights. In return these realtors agree to provide the city with information on the racial characteristics of new homeowners.

In addition, the HAP devotes a significant amount of staff time to community problems affecting both Jews and non-Jews. This effort has included organizing street associations, lobbying for approval of a school bond issue, developing a proposal for a commercial mall, and participating in an inter-faith project to rehabilitate deteriorating housing in the community. Under the latter program the Jewish federation (along with other religious groups) loans money to the city, which in turn loans it to homeowners in order to enable them to renovate their homes. The city insures these loans against default.

The fact that the HAP is so intensely involved in the broader community eliminates the criticism of the project's being too parochial. This may help to explain why the project has not been controversial. In addition, project staff have worked with the Protestant and Catholic communities to establish their own mortgage assistance programs, thereby making this exclusively Jewish program less controversial.⁵

The preceding would imply that the innovative HAP project would have the greatest potential for success of all the other stabilization projects discussed. There is inconclusive evidence, however, that it has been, or will be, successful in promoting stable integration. On the one hand, the relatively slow rate of racial change since 1968, when racial change began (the community is now about 15 percent black), would suggest that the stabilization effort has been successful. Furthermore, the homeowner survey indicates that whites are moving into all sections of the community. On the other hand, the public schools have undergone more rapid racial change than the residential population (three of the 10 schools have black majorities), and racial turnover in the public schools could lead to complete racial residential transition. Furthermore, it should be noted that the relatively slow rate of racial change could possibly be attributable to community characteristics quite apart from any stabilization efforts—its attractive housing, its proximity to a major educational-hospital complex, and its sizeable Orthodox population.

The lack of available data is also an obstacle in evaluating the project's effectiveness in maintaining Cleveland Heights as a viable Jewish community. A 1974 study that applied the Jewish name method to the telephone directory concluded that the Jewish population had declined only slightly between 1970 and 1974. The results of that study are now out of date. At the time of this writing, the Cleveland Jewish federation is planning a refined survey of the Jewish population throughout the Cleveland metropolitan area, and this should be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of the Heights project. One thing is known about Jewish migration flows into and out of the community: a disproportionately large number of Orthodox families have been moving into the community. This is indicated by the fact that during a recent period 30 percent of the families interviewed through the mortgage assistance program were Orthodox.

CONCLUSION

This article has reviewed neighborhood stabilization efforts initiated by Jewish federations (or other Jewish organizations) in five cities. It has attempted to identify the different stabilization strategies utilized, the reactions from members of other ethnic groups to these efforts, and the degree of effectiveness of these efforts. Five principle conclusions may be derived from the discussion.

The traditional federation approach to stabilization, to work through existing residents associations, is fundamentally flawed. As has been indicated by previous research, as well as by the case studies reviewed in this paper, there is little that these organizations can do to influence the rate of racial change. In fact, their efforts to improve the overall quality of life may inadvertently increase the rate of change by making the areas more attractive to home-seeking middle-income black families. Furthermore, because they are non-sectarian organizations, they cannot implement policies aimed at maintaining the Jewish character of these areas. Finally, since the residents associations are independent of the federations, there is no assurance that the residents associations will be willing to implement policies and programs desired by federations.

The Heights Area Project represents a significant departure from the above approach. It focuses on the Jewish subcommunity, and, more specifically, it seeks to attract Jewish families to the area. This strategy is more likely to succeed in maintaining a viable Jewish community than one aimed at improving the overall quality of life. The project's secondary mortgage assistance program is a realistic approach to attracting such families, since it provides a meaningful economic incentive. Because the project is a federation agency, it avoids the problems of coordination and control that occur when federations attempt to work through residents associations.

Even though the HAP has focused on the Jewish community, the project has not been viewed by other ethnic groups as exclusionary. This is due partly to a significant amount of project staff time's being devoted to broader community problems. In addition, the project's staff has worked with other religious groups to establish their own mortgage assistance programs. The preceding implies that future stabilization efforts in Jewish communities should include programs to maintain these areas as viable Jewish communities but should also include their participation in efforts to maintain the overall viability of these communities.

Although the HAP could serve as a model for stabilization efforts in other communities, it will be difficult to apply this model elsewhere. Not all racially changing Jewish communities share Cleveland Heights' strengths: a sizeable Orthodox population, attractive housing, proximity to a university-medical complex, and the fact that it is a distinct suburban municipality. The latter factor has contributed to the municipality's flexibility and, in turn, its ability to participate actively in the stabilization effort. In addition, the quality of organized Jewish life in other cities is generally inferior to that in Cleveland (Elazar, 1976:248-249). As a result, federation leaders elsewhere may be unwilling to take the risks involved in implementing a potentially controversial project like the one in Cleveland Heights. Furthermore, many federations do not have the financial resources available for a massive stabilization project like the Heights Area Project.

The preceding brings us to one of the central dilemmas of Jewish neighborhood stabilization efforts. Those strategies that are most likely to be perceived as controversial (such as programs singling out Jews for benefits) are the ones most likely to be effective. Conversely, those programs that are most likely to be popular from a community relations standpoint are the ones least likely to succeed.

Finally, it should be noted even if these federations could mount significant stabilization projects like the HAP, there would be no certainty of their success. There have been few successful localistic stabilization efforts around the country—governmental or nongovernmental—because the causes of neighborhood change are metropolitan-wide in nature (e.g., the pressure of black housing demand on these communities and racial changes in the public schools). This implies that the prospects for success of federation stabilization projects could be improved if not only metropolitan housing plans aimed at dispersing federally subsidized low- and moderate-income housing throughout the suburbs but also metropolitan educational plans aimed at integrating the public schools in the suburbs as well as in the central city were implemented. Federations should support such policies not only because they would foster increased housing and educational oppor-

tunities but also because these policies would be in their own interests, since they would promote the stability of racially changing Jewish communities.

In addition, federations would have to address another underlying cause of change in Jewish communities: that with the exception of the Orthodox, there is declining interest in living in identifiably Jewish areas. Federations, along with synagogues and other communal institutions (e.g., the schools, youth organizations) could promote the long-term viability of Jewish communities through educational programs. These would emphasize the importance of identifiable Jewish communities not only for the immigrant generation but also for its descendents. The intended aim of such programs would be to increase the likelihood that when these children mature and marry they would choose to live in identifiable Jewish communities.⁶

It is uncertain whether federation leaders will be willing to advocate metropolitan housing and educational plans or to promote educational programs dealing with Jewish residential patterns. These efforts are likely to be controversial. Most Americans are against such metropolitan policies. Furthermore, if federations advocate such policies, this activity would constitute federation participation in the political arena, and many Jews would oppose such participation. The educational programs described above might be considered overly parochial. To implement such controversial policies would prove to be financially risky; that is, some Jews might reduce their contribution to the Jewish welfare funds. However, not to act, and to allow existing patterns of neighborhood change to continue without interference, will pose even greater risks for these Jewish communities.

NOTES

1. Case studies of racially changing Jewish communities have indicated that within these Jewish communities, the Orthodox subcommunities tend to be the most stable (Johnson, 1974). This reflects the strong social bonds within the group as well as the need to fulfill requirements imposed by a strict adherence to religious convictions. More specifically, Orthodox Jews need to be within walking distance of a synagogue because driving is forbidden on the Sabbath and other holidays.

2. The Jewish federation has been indirectly involved with the WRPJCC through the federation's funding of the Jewish community center, which provides staff for the WRPJCC.

3. The subject of racial change has rarely been mentioned in council publications or at board meetings. There was a similar tendency to avoid race-related issues in the statements and publications of the South Shore Commission (Chicago). Commission members did not mention racial integration as a goal but rather such phrases as "a good community" and "a good place to live." These were interpreted by whites as meaning the maintenance of the community's white middle-class character (Molotch, 1972:72-74). The RCC's unwillingness to become involved in the issue of racial stabilization is also indicated by the following recent example. In 1978, the

Mott Foundation allocated up to \$5,000 to individual community councils throughout the city for neighborhood projects. The RCC received funding for three projects, all unrelated to the goal of racial stabilization: a community newsletter, a plaque honoring World War II veterans from the community, and an arboretum.

4. Planners for Park Forest (a racially mixed suburb of Chicago) requested implementation of a racial record-keeping system in order to maintain the area's integrated character. The proposed racial census was never implemented, however, because it would have been too controversial (Onderdonk et al., 1977).

5. Neither the Protestant nor the Catholic community has established a program thus far. This is partially due to the fact that they do not have financial resources available to them comparable to the federation's endowment fund. In addition, if they were to implement their own programs, they would have to do so in a racially nondiscriminatory manner. That is, a Catholic program would have to be open to black Catholics and a Protestant program would have to be open to black Protestants. It is conceivable that if these programs were implemented in such a nondiscriminatory manner a disproportionately large number of blacks would utilize them. In that case, the existence of the program might promote resegregation rather than stabilization. This type of dilemma does not exist for the Jewish community since there are so few black Jews. There is no question that if a black Jewish family applies for the program and is qualified it will be accepted. In fact, one black Jewish family has already participated in the mortgage assistance program.

6. The Park Synagogue High School (Cleveland Heights) offers a course on the Greater Cleveland Jewish community, with a special emphasis on mobility patterns. The students are "confronted" about where they would choose to make their future homes if they did eventually locate in Greater Cleveland (Spiegelman, 1973:2). This course could serve as a model for programs elsewhere.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the National Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, Philadelphia, April 22-25, 1979.

REFERENCES

- BLOOM, ALBERT W.
 1974 "Coalition Coalesces Community." *Jewish Chronicle of Pittsburgh*, March 21.
 Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
 1974 *Winners 1974: William J. Shroder Awards*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
- ELAZAR, DANIEL J.
 1976 *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- GINSBERG, YONA
 1975 *Jews in a Changing Neighborhood: The Study of Mattapan*. New York: The Free Press.
- Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, Planning Department
 1975 *West Rogers Park Jewish Community Study: An Analysis of Community Trends*. Chicago: Jewish Federation of Chicago, Planning Department.
- Chicago Jewish Post and Opinion*
 1976 "Jews Want To Stay But Fear It Is Too Late." November 5.

- JOHNSON, GEORGE E.
1976 "Synagogue Survival Strategies in a Rootless Society: A Case Study." Analysis, 5 April 15.
- KAIN, JOHN F.
1970 Theories of Residential Location and Realities of Race. Harvard University Program in Regional and Urban Economics, Discussion Paper 47. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- KANDELL, JONATHAN
1972 "Jewish Group Buying Homes in Crown Heights to Stabilize the Community." New York Times, January 9.
- LICHTENSTEIN, GRACE
1974 "'Traditional' Crown Heights Now in Midst of Comeback." New York Times, August 1.
- MOLOTCH, HARVEY L.
1972 Managed Integration: Dilemmas of Going Good in the City. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- MOYLE, MIKE
1976 "'14th Ward's Secession Suggested.'" Pittsburgh Post Gazette, December 3.
- ONDERDONK, DUDLEY, DONALD DEMARCO, and KATHY CARDONA
1977 Integration in Housing: A Plan for Racial Diversity. Village of Park Forest.
- ROSE, HAROLD M.
1969 Social Processes in the City: Race and Urban Residential Choice. Resource Paper No. 6. Commission on College Geography. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers.
- SHEPPARD, NATHANIEL JR.
1977 "Chicago Suburb Offers Novel Equity Program in Hope of Preserving Property Values." New York Times, December 26.
- SKLARE, MARSHALL
1972 "Jews, Ethnics and the American City. Commentary, 53, 4 (April): 70-77.
- SOBEL, B.Z. and MAE SOBEL
1966 "Negroes and Jews: Minority Groups in Conflict." Judaism, XV (Winter): 3-22.
- SPIEGALMAN, MARVIN J.
1973 Heights Area Project—The Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland: A Report After One Year of Operation. Cleveland Heights: Heights Area Project.
- VARADY, DAVID P.
1979 Ethnic Minorities in Urban Areas: A Case Study of Racially Changing Communities. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishing.
- WARNER, DAVID
1976 "'14th Ward Residents Threaten to Secede.'" Pittsburgh Press, December 2.
- WILLIAMS, DENNIS and PAMELA ELLIS SIMONS
1977 "Integration: Success in Oak Park." Newsweek, October 17.
- WOLF, ELEANOR P. and CHARLES N. LEBEAUX
1967 "Class and Race in the Changing City," in Leo F. Schnore and Henry Fagin (eds.), Urban Research and Policy Planning. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications: 99-129.