

Part III. Gathering

Everyday Racialization

Contesting Space and Identity in Suburban

St. Louis

Jodi Rios

The Normandy suburbs of St. Louis, Missouri, were conceived of, developed, and marketed as working- and middle-class suburban neighborhoods and shopping districts. Today, however, this area is largely defined as *urban* space in the lexicon of public discourse. The stately homes on curvilinear streets and bungalow houses with picket fences still remain, as do numerous parks, golf courses, country clubs, cemeteries, strip malls, and parking lots.¹ So what has changed to turn suburban space urban?

The recent controversy in the Missouri state legislature and in public debate regarding how to define and deal with underperforming schools in the state clearly reveals that, in the imaginations of citizens, parents, administrators, and policy makers, *urban* stands in for poverty, marginalization, and minority-occupied space, while *suburban* represents economic stability, privilege, and majority-white neighborhoods. What changed in the Normandy suburbs was not the physical environment but the color of the residents and, eventually, the value of their property, as a result of public and private disinvestment.

The discussion that follows was written prior to August 9, 2014, when the shooting of an unarmed black teenager by a white police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, sparked a series of protests in the St. Louis region and across the United States. The Canfield Green Apartments, where the shooting took place, are within the school district now known as the Normandy Schools Collaborative, and the shooting victim, Michael Brown Jr., had recently graduated from Normandy High School. While this essay does not specifically address the Ferguson protests, it does offer insight into the racialized space and sentiments that underlie recent events in this area.

The residents of the Normandy suburbs found themselves in the crosshairs of the urban

schools debate when the former Normandy School District, with a student population that is 98 percent African American, lost its accreditation in 2013. Both state and school officials explained the district’s demise as stemming from its inability to deal with unfortunate “urban problems”²—or, in less polite settings, “the ghetto mentality that plagues the area”³—more specifically, a high proportion of female-headed households, violence, and rampant drug problems (although statistics show that rates of violence and drug activity in the area are comparable to those in south St. Louis County).⁴ Mobility rates of residents and functional homelessness,⁵ which are pointed to as representative of a distinctly urban school district, are two of the biggest challenges faced by the district, and the superintendent has repeatedly called for the use of alternative metrics in evaluating teacher and school performance in “an urban district that has many external challenges.”⁶ Shortly after the district lost accreditation, the Missouri Supreme Court upheld the state’s Student Transfer Program, which requires unaccredited districts to pay transportation and tuition costs (ranging from \$9,500 to \$21,000 annually per student) for any student requesting to transfer to an accredited district. More than one thousand Normandy students (approximately 25 percent of the district population) transferred to schools in what are apparently the authentic suburbs—based on media representations of the transfer process. Consequently, the district ran out of money in the spring of 2014. A hotly contested emergency funding bill was passed in March 2014 in order to keep the district open through the academic year. The battle over funding was largely framed as a debate about whether Missouri taxpayers should be responsible for bailing out failing urban schools. The district was subsequently restructured by the state board of education, which suspended all contracts, temporarily placed it outside accreditation standards, and renamed it the Normandy Schools Collaborative, prompting a new set of court actions and student transfer debates.

Race—whether the topic is couched in euphemisms or actively invoked—is unequivocally at the center of both formal deliberation and ad hoc discussions regarding the condition and codification of the Normandy school district, including who should be blamed, who should determine the district’s fate, who should pay for actions taken, and whose responsibility it is to educate “poor, urban kids.”⁷ The reactions of parents and other residents in the Normandy suburbs, which are divided between those choosing to leave the district and those choosing to stay, as well as the reactions of residents in the receiving districts, have been highly

racialized. After attending a public hearing in the majority-white district that would soon be receiving most of Normandy's transfer students, one Normandy resident commented: "When I saw them screaming and hollering like they were crazy, I thought to myself, 'Oh my God, this is back in Martin Luther King days,' they're going to get the hoses out. They're going to be beating our kids and making sure they don't get off the school bus."⁸ The statements by white parents that this resident was responding to included "I now have to worry about my children getting stabbed? Or taking a drug? Or getting robbed? Because that's the issue" and "We don't want [these kids] at Francis Howell."⁹ Many people in the receiving districts condemned these sentiments as racist, and when Normandy students showed up in August 2013, some groups of students and parents made efforts to welcome them.

In the Normandy area, the topic of race is also both highly vocalized and played down. It was, however, at the forefront of a recent public hearing at which Normandy school district residents accused the state Department of Elementary and Secondary Education of "putting chains around our ankles," perpetuating separate and unequal education, and intentionally splintering the black community. Several speakers compared putting the fate of the all-black district in the hands of mostly white state officials to slavery, one stating, "All that's missing is the whip," and several residents compared their grandchildren's experience to their own experience growing up in the Jim Crow South.¹⁰ Local and national media have reported on this controversy, including a *New York Times* article and slide show focused on the racial conflict and a PBS Web series that features the debate in a segment asking what has changed since the March on Washington fifty years ago.¹¹ The ongoing debate over the so-called urban condition of an area developed as suburban neighborhoods reveals the degree to which race, space, and identity are mutually constituted in the everyday imaginations and realities of metropolitan lives. It also illustrates the many contradictions that residents of this area consistently experience relative to outside representations of their community and their own claims regarding themselves and the place in which they live.

The Normandy suburbs challenge the idea that the United States has entered a postracial era.¹² Statistically, race remains a surprisingly accurate predictor of interrelated quality-of-life issues in the United States, including location of residence, quality of education, income, and health.¹³ Although legalized segregation and formal obstacles enacted to maintain racial difference in the United States were largely dismantled following the mid-twentieth-century civil

rights movement, distinct racialized histories continue to play out at all levels of metropolitan life. Scholars and practitioners concerned with issues of equity must then ask: How are bodies coded by space and space by bodies? How do historical perceptions of space, race, and gender coalesce to affect identity and determine rights in metropolitan areas today? What are the visible and invisible practices that maintain social and spatial disparity in the United States? How do continued distinctions between urban and suburban space in both scholarship and practice reinforce racialized paradigms that support racial projects?

In this chapter, I consider processes of racialization in the context of metropolitan space in the United States today.¹⁴ I argue that racialization, defined as actions and practices that create and maintain systems of domination based on physical and cultural difference, is not only a residue of prior modes of racism but also an active and structuring principle that continues to shape the built environment. While the ideological and political modes of producing racialized people and space are most visible at institutional levels such as municipal code enforcement, lending practices, government funding allocation, and education, *everyday racialization*—the integration of *race thinking* through routine practices—subtly works to produce and reproduce both real and imagined spaces of the city.¹⁵ The ways in which binary distinctions, such as acceptable versus deviant behavior, good versus bad space, and safe versus dangerous places, become associated with people and groups illustrate how everyday racialization takes place. The woman who assumed stabbings, theft, and drugs would become the norm if black students from the Normandy district attended her child's school is an example of this binary thinking. Distinctions between good and bad, however, are ever changing, and associations with things like rap music, the wearing of baggy pants, or what it means to “be ghetto” are mediated by consumer culture and the commodification of racialized practices. The Normandy suburbs, which I will return to later in this chapter, call attention to the extent that space (both real and imagined) is both a player and a product of processes of racialization, and how the continued work of race affects issues of metropolitan equity.

The implications of race are increasingly downplayed in American society, and the popular media have used the election (and reelection) of the first black U.S. president to argue that the nation is achieving a postracial status. Such sentiments are echoed in decisions recently handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court, which wrote in recent majority opinions that race is less significant today than it was during the era of civil rights legislation.¹⁶ Scholars in various

disciplines have cited metropolitan examples, such as increased diversity in the suburbs, new forms of cosmopolitanism in central cities, and nonwhite representation in urban government, as evidence that race is less important in American society today.¹⁷ In sub/urban scholarship, it is now typical to find difference cast along lines of ethnicity, class, culture, sexual orientation, and so on, with few acknowledgments regarding how historical modes of racial formation inform differential space. In response to arguments that the effects of race will disappear if one accounts for neighborhood, wealth, education, family history, and so on, John Powell and Caitlin Watt have asked, “What do you think race is?”¹⁸ This is an important question for urban scholars and leads to an even more perplexing question: What explains the paradox between urban policies, laws, and political positions that make no mention of race and metropolitan landscapes where segregation and neighborhood disadvantage stubbornly persist along racial lines?¹⁹

Urban historians looking at mid-twentieth-century cities have documented the relationship between race and patterns of metropolitan development in the United States.²⁰ This scholarship has revealed what are today well-known policies enacted to segregate the nonwhite population and deny homeownership to millions of nonwhite citizens across the United States, such as Federal Housing Administration lending guidelines, discriminatory real estate practices, restrictive covenants, and federal urban renewal policy. As Dianne Harris drives home in her recent book on postwar suburbia, the perceived, if not actual, development of post–World War II U.S. suburbs for a specifically white middle class was not only highly orchestrated by institutional policy and real estate markets but also seared into the psyche, imagination, and normative assumptions of the American public through calculated promotion and representation that both produced and maintained normative middle-class ideals as synonymous with white culture.²¹ In this way, the suburbs became defined as white space in spite of the fact that U.S. suburbs have always maintained surprising diversity. Margaret Garb, in her book on housing reform in Chicago between 1871 and 1919, shows that the link between race and homeownership began much earlier than the post–World War II era, stating, “Even at the turn of the [twentieth] century, a single-family house set on a tidy yard was fast becoming a mark of household health, respectability, and morality,” where perceptions of respectability worked in relationship to whiteness.²² The American obsession with the single-family house and the importance of property ownership was institutionalized by New Deal–era housing policy and instilled over time in U.S. culture the view of homeownership as a fundamental right tied to white citizenship. The

real and imagined boundaries that resulted along racial lines regarding who belongs where in cities were gradually justified through economic, rather than moral, arguments.

Economistic abstractions of social relations, including variations of Marxist theory on one hand and public choice theory and neoliberal theories of development on the other, support economic explanations of power relations that privilege analytics of capital and labor markets and reduce race to an inflection of class or a minimal component of economic determinism. Moreover, recent preoccupations with globalization—the global distribution and flow of information, capital, and surplus labor—inherently disregard and disempower the transformative potential of human agency and localized forms of social reproduction, which are devalued as insignificant compared to new definitions of the geopolitical.²³ Both the economistic and global frameworks explain metropolitan life and space in capitalist terms and flatten our understanding of how race operates (as both cause and consequence) on rights to, and in, the city. Specifically within the design disciplines, scholarship and practice over the past decade have continued to perpetuate spatial binaries (e.g., suburban/urban, stim/dross, vibrant/blighted, productive/unproductive)²⁴ that reinforce ubiquitous racialized signifiers of white and black space in the American city.²⁵ The metropolitan landscape of de facto, rather than de jure, segregation is narrated and read today as a postracial site of consumption by developers, designers, nongovernmental organizations, policy makers, grassroots coalitions, and scholars alike, using the language of development and class stratification.

While historians writing in the post–civil rights era convincingly linked race-based policies to patterns of development and spatial disparity,²⁶ recent sub/urban scholars have rightfully pointed out how this work also obscured rich and complex histories of metropolitan space that did not follow the trope of lily-white, pristine suburbs in contrast to dark and decaying urban cores.²⁷ In a March 2001 special issue on prewar suburbs and a special section on diverse postwar suburbs in January 2013, contributors to the *Journal of Urban History* successfully refute the urban/suburban binary by calling attention to how the idealized suburbs never existed in the pre- or postwar eras and how deviations from the ideal far exceeded any normative reality of such places.²⁸ Some recent scholarship, including chapters in this book, go even further to dispel suburban simplifications, foregrounding powerful sub/urban histories and experiences that both complicate and implicate long-held assumptions of what the suburbs are and are not. These authors highlight alternative suburban narratives, such as the nuanced and contingent racial

formations of Asian, Latina/o, and African American suburban residents; the contingent history of the suburban apartment complex and suburban row housing in contradistinction to the single-family house as idealized suburban typology; and gay identity and empowerment in relationship to suburban identity.²⁹ Taken together, this emerging literature also calls attention to complex relationships between race and class distinction and uniquely privileges everyday experience to reveal actual rather than assumed places and phenomena.³⁰

Specific to African American experience, a few recent scholars have done much to correct the historical omission of black suburbanization in the United States.³¹ For example, historian Andrew Wiese provides an exhaustive account of African Americans' influence on American suburbanization and links this history to the larger black experience in the United States.³² As part of this work, Wiese identifies typologies of suburbanization in the 1940s previously not recognized as "suburban," in which blacks laid claim to land on the urban periphery of many U.S. cities and reproduced spatial practices from their experience in the rural South. Taking an ethnographic approach from a sociological perspective, Mary Pattillo highlights the Janus-faced nature of the lives of middle-class African Americans and shows how minority solidarity is perpetually troubled by the quest for personal liberation and accumulation.³³ Pattillo reveals how the spatial imagination of the black middle class operates in relationship to whiteness, where it comes into conflict with racial identity when blacks as a group are either forced or choose to live in economically diverse but racially homogeneous metropolitan areas. Farrah D. Gafford's focus on the community scale and importance of identity formation in a middle-class black suburb of New Orleans reveals how place identity pivots around the convergence of race- and class-based determinants and powerfully endures long after the people disappear.³⁴ All three of these authors, however, privilege the perspective of the black middle class, which carries its own set of assumptions regarding suburban values and suburban lives. As a result, poor and working-class blacks are acknowledged as living in areas beyond the urban core but are distinguished from true black suburbanites and portrayed as a threat to the rights of the black middle class. This is in keeping with the tendency of scholars and the media to qualify suburban locations occupied by poor blacks as something other than true suburbs (e.g., suburban ghettos or suburban slums). As a result, we are left to believe that while suburbs can be defined as something other than white, they are fundamentally dependent on middle-class associations and identity.

Historians such as Steven Gregory and Robert O. Self resist both the urban/suburban binary and the middle-class perspective by focusing on the nuances of African American politics in metropolitan space.³⁵ Gregory exhaustively traces the interplay of race and class in the African American community of Corona, New York, while Self puts black power and suburbanization in direct conversation with one another throughout his history of Oakland, California, and surrounding suburbs. Both of these scholars' ethnographic studies drill down beyond typical surface readings of white/black dynamics, revealing previously overlooked histories of how the politics of space and struggles for power play out at multiple levels of community and identity formation.

Scholars who have looked specifically at the American ghetto have also traced African American space and experience in the city.³⁶ Most of this work has been rooted in the field of sociology, where space is treated as a container of behaviors bounded and reinforced through state policy and social pathology.³⁷ Similar to the trope of the idealized white suburbs, this work often reinforces simplistic representations such that *the ghetto* stands in for racially dependent associations with the urban core and, in some cases, any black space. Several scholars have looked specifically at structural forces of racism and exclusion to explain spatial disparity, although this work runs the risk of oversimplifying complex social processes.³⁸ Exceptions to such oversimplification come from scholars across disciplines who focus on the generative agency of people *in place* that emerges from marginalized spatial identity. For example, Stuart Hall and his colleagues conceptualize the ghetto as both a real space in which racialized bodies are policed and delimited and as an *imagined geography* of anxiety and danger necessarily conceived in relationship to the politics of racialized space and identity.³⁹ Michael Keith is concerned with nuanced practices in places identified as the ghetto, such as the generative outcomes of graffiti tagging and street culture, relative to the ways in which the ghetto has been historically represented in the modern city.⁴⁰ John L. Jackson Jr. explores notions of racial sincerity and ghetto authenticity while tracing the commodification of ghetto practices and identity by mainstream culture.⁴¹ Mario Luis Small presents the dangers of spatial codification in his descriptively titled essay "Is There Such a Thing as 'the Ghetto'? The Perils of Assuming That the South Side of Chicago Represents Poor Black Neighborhoods."⁴²

Recent work that offers alternative readings of metropolitan space—from core to edge—do in fact blur real and imagined boundaries and codifications linked to space and race.

However, the fact that this scholarship continues to be bounded by discursive frameworks—designated as suburban, urban, or ghetto literatures—reveals the narrative power of early planning theory such as that of the Chicago school, which defined distinct zones of classification and argued that natural patterns of urban development based on economic drivers *logically* resulted in a white suburban periphery and a nonwhite urban core of ethnic ghettos. Although many have since disputed the natural occurrence of residential segregation and challenged a centrifugal simplification of urban space, the suburban/urban spatial binary continues to haunt metropolitan scholarship.

Dark Bodies in White Space: The Case of the Normandy Suburbs

The African American families who moved to the Normandy suburbs in the wake of the civil rights movement discovered that the white spatial imaginary dictated their rights to, and in, the suburbs by limiting their options, devaluing their property, and discouraging investment. Later, the same suburban imaginary dictated their own attempts at producing *good suburban subjects* for the purpose of being recognized by the county and securing the resources they had expected to find beyond the city limits. Paradoxically termed a *new suburban ghetto* within urban literature and media,⁴³ the Normandy suburbs are viewed by many in the region as an unqualified *urban ghetto*, defined by pathologies of poverty, race, and culture. Many of the residents, however, do not accept this representation. Rather, they point to spaces and practices associated with suburbia—detached homes, backyards, public green space, neighborhood policing, political autonomy—and defend the notion that they too are suburban dwellers claiming and defending symbols of privilege and normativity. The intersection of stigmatized black space with the white spatial imaginary in the Normandy suburbs produces unique practices of both liberation and subjugation and provides important insight into what it means to be a racially determined sub/urban citizen.

The racialization of space in the geography of the Normandy suburbs predates suburban development. It was here that many Native American tribes ceded their land to William Clark (of the Lewis and Clark expedition), who represented the U.S. government as the superintendent of Indian affairs. Clark bought nearly half the area's land in the early 1800s for his private residence and as hunting grounds for visiting tribal parties, in the hope of negotiating successful

concessions. The area is also the site of the oldest African American commercial cemetery in St. Louis, dating back to the mid-1800s, in which many notable black St. Louisans are buried, including the wife of Dred Scott. By the late 1800s, many summer estates for elite city residents were built in the area. It was further developed as middle- and upper-class railcar suburbs (according to garden suburb typology) in the 1920s and 1930s. Following World War II, the majority of the area was filled in with working-class streetcar suburbs and marketed to first- and second-generation white European immigrants. The neighborhoods were originally unincorporated, but threats of annexation from neighboring municipalities and the ease of incorporation under Missouri state law led to a leapfrogging phenomenon of municipal incorporation between 1945 and 1953. During this time, more than twenty neighborhoods incorporated into semiautonomous fourth-class cities, villages, or hamlets with populations ranging from three hundred to forty-five hundred.⁴⁴ Fueling incorporation were residents' desires to maintain neighborhood homogeneity and establish limited home rule governance. Similar to the rhetoric used in other U.S. cities at the time, municipal autonomy and fragmentation were framed as democratic rights of citizenship.⁴⁵ Local disputes regarding issues such as elementary school catchment areas, unpopular county ordinances, and proposed mixed-income housing were also catalysts for quick incorporation of small neighborhoods wanting to set up their own, albeit limited, governments. Today the Normandy suburbs constitute a patchwork of twenty-four fragmented municipalities occupying ten square miles of St. Louis County. The area is officially defined by the boundaries of the Normandy school district—roughly Interstate 70 to the north, the inner-belt freeway (I-170) to the west, University City to the south, and the city of St. Louis to the east. Although uneven distribution of services and governance and fierce competition over resources remain common, many local polities recently entered into a joint initiative called Vision24:1 (twenty-four municipalities with one vision), which is intended to build coalitions across the fragmented geography.

{~?~IM: insert ump-archer-fig12-01 here.}

{~?~TN: Figure 12.1} The area known as the Normandy suburbs includes twenty-four municipalities and is defined by the boundaries of the Normandy school district within St. Louis County. There are ninety municipal governments in St. Louis County, but the city of St. Louis does not reside within any county.

As documented by a frenzy of academic research published from 1973 through 1976, the push by African Americans out of the urban core and into the Normandy suburbs at the end of

the 1960s attracted much attention from St. Louis County policy makers and local municipal leaders, who attempted to curb white panic and slow what they believed would be an inevitable social and physical decline of the area.⁴⁶ As in many cities across the United States at that time, racial tensions were running high, and today many residents remember practices of violence and property damage aimed at discouraging new black families from buying in the area and white homeowners from selling to black buyers.⁴⁷ Blockbusting practices among realtors are well documented, and redlining strategies among lenders became commonplace in St. Louis County throughout the 1970s.⁴⁸ Statistics show several areas reaching black populations of 70 percent by 1975 and 89 percent by 1980. Employing a vocabulary of war, studies describe the area as “falling” quickly to “negro invasion.” The Federal Housing Administration and the Home Owner’s Land Corporation guidelines that established risk ratings for lenders perpetuated the war analogy. With racial homogeneity at the top of the risk assessment list, documents stated that neighborhoods “invaded” or “infiltrated” by African Americans had or would lose all value and “fall” to the “occupation” of blacks.⁴⁹ Another study stated: “The ineluctable sequence of *black penetration, to invasion, to succession* becomes predominant under certain circumstances.”⁵⁰ Recent writings on the St. Louis suburbs continue this narrative regarding the “fall” of communities brought about by “racial tipping”—the ratio of black residents that guarantees an area will eventually become all black.⁵¹

The prophecy of plummeting home values and declining schools became self-fulfilling as spatial stigmatization followed blacks into the suburbs. One local policy maker remarked, “Ghetto spillover now stretches almost all the way across the county in a northwesterly direction.”⁵² The spatial imaginary of the ghetto gradually replaced the white spatial imaginary associated with the original suburban spaces and practices, and was based solely on the presence of African American residents. Following this logic, “ghetto” represented any predominantly African American space irrespective of spatial or class specificity. The urban core was no longer the sole container of black space in St. Louis, and this shift distinctly challenged the suburban imaginary of many people. These contradictions of racialized spatial imaginaries heightened the experience and anxiety of race for suburban blacks and whites and raised questions regarding the rights of suburban citizens, the nature and politics of identity in the metropolitan region, and the power of spatial/racial imaginaries to determine experience and practice in space.

The Case of Pagedale

Developed in the 1940s for working-class Lutherans and Catholics of German and Irish descent, the city of Pagedale is one of the twenty-four Normandy suburbs. The municipality is made up of three neighborhoods that incorporated into one entity in 1950 and is named for Page Avenue, a major thoroughfare running through the city's footprint. The city limits encompass roughly fourteen hundred small homes, two commercial districts, two large churches, an industrial zone, and a large Lutheran cemetery. In keeping with the suburban imaginary, advertisements for new homes in Pagedale touted "clean neighborhoods, quiet streets, and a fruit tree in every yard."⁵³ The first- and second-generation working-class European immigrants who moved to Pagedale gained more access to the benefits of citizenship by differentiating themselves from African Americans left behind in the city. Their desire to live separately from blacks was not merely an issue of racial prejudice—it was a real and perceived necessity regarding their rights and belonging within American society. The equation of whiteness with fitness for citizenship and homeownership shaped processes of racialization in the United States and was essential to the assimilation of European immigrants into "white society."⁵⁴ By moving out of neighborhoods identified as ethnic ghettos in the city and into the suburbs, ethnic minorities claimed "whiteness" in contrast to ethnic associations with the "dark" space of the urban core. As documented in the literature on the American ghetto, by the second half of the twentieth century, the ethnic ghetto first described in terms of the Jewish ghetto in Europe no longer held the same meaning in American cities. The term *ghetto* evolved to represent specifically black space. At the time of incorporation, Pagedale represented a place where immigrant families could leave ethnic associations of city neighborhoods behind and establish themselves as white citizens participating in the "American Dream."

{~?~IM: insert ump-archer-fig12-02 here.}

{~?~TN: Figure 12.2} The city of Pagedale, Missouri, is one of the twenty-four municipalities that make up the Normandy suburbs. With an area of 1.1 square miles and a population of 3,300, Pagedale is the second-largest city in the Normandy suburbs and borders six municipalities.

Twenty years later, the black residents who moved to Pagedale in the 1970s were motivated by the same desire to claim their rights to the American Dream. The first wave of black residents joined the ranks of middle-class homeowners and paid top dollar for the limited number of homes offered to nonwhite buyers. St. Louis historians and political scientists have

noted that the area's proximity to industry, to racially transitioning areas in the city of St. Louis and neighboring Wellston, and to the historically black suburb of Kinloch created openings for black home buyers that did not exist in more insulated and desirable neighborhoods.⁵⁵ As panic set in among white residents and municipal leaders, property values fell, in keeping with the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuated by real estate practices. Many homes were bought as rental properties or sold at depreciated values by the late 1970s. As a result, many low-income African Americans looking to leave inner-city housing projects and areas increasingly affected by crowding, drug epidemics, and limited opportunities were able to move to Pagedale. Social and kinship networks often remained intact when residents from housing projects found suburban homes near those of family members and old neighbors, creating what some have described as a mini-diaspora into the suburbs.⁵⁶ By 1980, the majority of white residents had left Pagedale, and the community was 79 percent African American. It would be another ten years, however, before the municipal leadership reflected the racial demographic. Today the city of Pagedale has a population of 3,304 and is 94 percent African American, with a per capita income of \$11,005. All of the city's leadership is made up of black women, and 29.5 percent of residents (39 percent of children) live under the poverty line.⁵⁷

Intersections of class and race were fully evident throughout the process of demographic inversion in Pagedale. As the first wave of black home buyers lost value in their homes through their mere presence, many perceived themselves as having been followed by the problems (and people) they sought to escape. Likewise, residents who benefited from lower rents and housing prices after the first wave of families moved in often resented those they identified as power-wielding "brothers and sisters" and believed them to be closely aligned with "the man."⁵⁸ Class status, however, does not necessarily determine residents' outlooks regarding power, subjectivity, or identity. As one resident who moved to Pagedale from the housing projects in the city in the 1970s explains:

You take families that come from the projects, just like I did, and you put them in a house and they don't know how to act. That's what city living does. Nobody's taught them the difference. It puts them in a position to just run rampant and wild if they haven't been trained to live a certain way. Then when they come to the county they bring all that with them. That's what we gotta deal with. That's why we create laws and ordinances that protect our city because people have investments and we are trying to get our share from the county. We can't prove them right with what they accusing us of. It's *who* you're bringing in and what they're accustomed to. They come with what they're used to. Where they come from, they were doing what they want and nobody teaching them another way to do it. We have a better chance in the county with our little municipality of enforcing

the laws that teach people how to live. It's the teachings that we have. When I came to Pagedale I didn't know how to take care of property or how to act in the county. Someone had to tell me—you don't be doing that here. I didn't know it wasn't permissible. When people know what they're doing and why they're doing it they start to say, "Well that's not bad at all, I got my barbecue in the backyard, I got my privacy and everything. I don't have to have all my kids in the street playing and be looking at my neighbor—all in their business."⁵⁹

The attitudes expressed by this citizen are shared by many in Pagedale and cut across class, gender, and generational lines. Current municipal leaders, all of whom are African American, maintain a *moral polity of blackness* defined and deployed paradoxically through the white suburban imaginary and an age-old politics of respectability. The desire to prove authenticity as good suburban citizens in order to claim rights and resources within St. Louis County results in ardent racialization and hypermanagement of bodies in space. Through ordinances intended to discipline behavior construed as black, the suburban imaginary is enforced more stringently than would be considered acceptable in predominantly white neighborhoods, and the city is in the business of subject making—of making good suburban citizens. Several scholars have described the quest for model-citizen status in and through the suburbs by various ethnic minorities, most often Asian Americans. Wendy Cheng describes how Asian and Latina/o Americans “had to either ‘pass’ as white . . . or evidence a ‘proper’ relationship to property as conceived as coextensive with a middle-class, white nuclear-family based vision of Americanness” in order to achieve provisional acceptance in the suburbs of Los Angeles.⁶⁰ In the case of African Americans however, the specific and long history of racism and differentialized space in the United States produces equally specific suburban practices and outcomes that differ from those associated with other ethnic minorities.

In Pagedale, and in other municipalities of the Normandy suburbs, we find overtly racialized prohibitions: “No sagging pants”; “No loud music or excessive bass”; “No more than two people assembling in public space without a permit”; “No barbecuing in front or next to a house”; “No congregating on a porch”; and so on.⁶¹ Pavilions and many park benches have been removed from public spaces in Pagedale, many of which are fenced off and locked. While local ordinances aimed at policing social behavior and space are commonplace in sub/urban living, the formal and informal policing carried out in many municipalities of the Normandy suburbs specifically targets perceptions of so-called ghetto behavior and black male deviance. Pagedale leaders associate efforts to socially and spatially police residents with new development brought about by political alliances with county leadership and the city's strong partnership with a local

community support and development agency.⁶² While many positive things are happening in Pagedale, including extensive investment, a new bank and grocery store, increased resources in the community, and a low crime rate, the majority of people living outside the area who were interviewed for this study regard Pagedale as similar to, if not the same as, the inner-city ghetto.⁶³ The public debate around the loss of accreditation by the Normandy school district illustrates similar regional attitudes. Local media coverage that frames public participation as “circus-like” behavior at public hearings and council meetings frustrates municipal leadership and encourages hyperpolicing of so-called black behavior. The ongoing cycle of social policing in relationship to regional perception highlights the contradictions between real and imagined spaces of the city and reveals the power of the suburban imaginary to dictate spatial and political practice.

Not everyone in Pagedale rejects the label of “the ghetto.” Many residents claim ghetto identity and refute accusations that Pagedale is not the true hood, or that residents are not “for-real black” and have lost ghetto authenticity—in this case equated with black authenticity.⁶⁴ Social media sites reveal music videos, amateur footage of gang fights, and freestyle rap battles intended to establish Pagedale as an authentic ghetto in response to claims by some in the urban core that suburban ghettos are tame, inauthentic versions of the real location of black agency, credibility, and creativity. Pagedale is mentioned in the lyrics of internationally known rap artist Murphy Lee’s song “St. Louis Nigga,”⁶⁵ to which nationally recognized freestyle rapper Aye Verb has responded with his own music video, “Get to Know a Nigga,” filmed in Pagedale.⁶⁶ Aye Verb, who hails Pagedale as his turf and uses language rather than violence to do battle (in freestyle rap or smack competitions across the United States), presents Pagedale as representing the authentic “streets of St. Louis,” where respect is earned through street cred, although he laments the violence associated with such respect. The local rap group Gangsta Bubs takes the argument one step further in its homage to Pagedale “Luv My Hood,” representing Pagedale as a gang-banging hood where violence and drugs dictate the norms of the street, stating “talk bad about the ’Dale, I wish you would, one phone call’ll get you put off in the mud.”⁶⁷ Gangsta Bubs’ video is filmed with the intention of claiming the spaces and symbols of Pagedale and begins in front of the mayor’s prized “Welcome to Pagedale” sign and the city’s signature “Knockout Roses.” While these examples are certainly mediated by larger forms of representations and meaning that I do not take into consideration here, many residents proudly

embrace the idea of “coming from the hood,” which they associate with black culture, and contest claims that Pagedale is not the “real hood.”⁶⁸ The last example could be dismissed as promoting senseless violence, which I do not intend to celebrate. However, representations like “Luv My Hood” emanate from fierce discrepancies regarding identity and place, as well as specific experiences of race and inequality in the United States, and it is important to acknowledge them as such.

Conclusion

At first glance, the distinction between those who reject ghetto classification in favor of suburban identity in Pagedale and the other Normandy suburbs and those who view ghetto and black identity as mutually constituted could appear to be broken down to the difference between those who practice a politics of respectability and those who attempt to break free from such politics. Or the distinction could be one of generation, gender, and class differences regarding issues of African American identity. Such distinctions have been described in sociological and urban studies. For instance, Elijah Anderson’s distinction between *decent* and *street* culture among African American men, Nikki Jones’s description of the inherent tensions between *good* and *ghetto* in the lives of African American girls, and Michael Keith’s contrast of the *ethnic entrepreneur* with the *street rebel* in London all highlight the value-oriented conceptual categories regarding conformity and dissonance that determine a so-called moral order within racialized communities.⁶⁹ As these authors point out, and as my own experience supports, such clear distinctions do not hold up. Many variations and contradictions regarding situated identities can be found in the attitudes and practices of single individuals across gender and generational lines whereby the degree of “law-abiding citizen” is not necessarily determined by whether a person claims the suburbs, the ghetto, or both. At the center of these phenomena is the notion of authenticity, which pivots around race. In order to claim suburban authenticity, must black residents eschew black (often associated as ghetto) identity, and vice versa? What are the stakes associated with each? And even if they do, will they be granted suburban citizenship? Residents, sub/urban scholars, and certainly those currently embroiled in the fate of the Normandy school district cannot seem to agree regarding whether Pagedale and the rest of the Normandy suburbs are urban or suburban. However, this binary construction of racialized space continues to inform classifications and expectations regarding differentiated metropolitan space across the United

States. As a result, the convergence of competing quests for authenticity and struggles over rights to the city play out at every level of practice—including allocations of resources, regional politics, municipal policing, media representation, outside investment, and interactions between neighbors. The significance of black bodies occupying traditional white space in the Normandy suburbs of St. Louis County intersects with multivalent black identities and puts race at the center of perception and action. Race is then the constitutive and operative force determining how political subjectivity, identity, and the physical environment are formed, maintained, and contested.

The case of the Normandy suburbs illustrates the limits and consequences of spatial categorization and suggests that the question “Is it the suburbs or is it the ghetto?” is indeed the wrong one to be asking with regard to such places. Qualifying communities like Pagedale as *suburban ghettos* does not acknowledge the important, if contested, history of metropolitan space that current residents are in the process of making, just as prevailing readings of *the urban* inaccurately describe agentic processes and contingencies currently at work in city cores. As this example shows, race, as signified through both the body and identity, is an active structuring force that informs how urban space is classified, represented, discussed, and ultimately acted upon. Most scholarship and practice focusing on metropolitan areas, however, has not directly confronted how space, like bodies, is inscribed by race. I therefore return to these questions: How do prevailing frameworks of metropolitan analysis obscure the work of race today? How do continued distinctions between urban and suburban space in both scholarship and practice reinforce racialized paradigms that support racial projects?

Note regarding research methodology: Information on the attitudes and opinions of residents was collected between 2005 and 2011 through individual interviews, focus groups, and participant observation in conjunction with community engagement courses and design–build studios, and through my participation as a principal investigator for the Page Avenue Health Impact Assessment, funded in part by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Over the same period I established personal relationships with residents as a result of extensive time spent in the area.

1 The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* recently produced a video highlighting areas in the Normandy suburbs, “A Video Portrait of Normandy School District,” April 10, 2014, <http://www.stltoday.com>.

-
- 2 Analysis of transcripts from Missouri Senate Education Committee hearings, public hearings sponsored by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Normandy School Board meetings held between July 2013 and March 2014 that were focused on the crisis of the Normandy school district reveals repeated use of the word *urban* in reference to the problems, challenges, and character of the district.
 - 3 Key-informant interview. This attitude, framed by the rhetoric of personal responsibility, is also repeatedly expressed in letters to the editors of local news publications concerning this issue. For example, one writer stated: “The citizens of Normandy need to get off their collective butts and start taking responsibility for educating their children. The reason [other school districts are successful] is because the parents have worked hard, are involved . . . , and follow the American tenet of individual responsibility.” Letter to the editor, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, February 16, 2014.
 - 4 St. Louis County crime-mapping statistics for 2013, <http://maps.stlouisco.com/police>.
 - 5 Persons or families may be classified as functionally homeless if they move often between locations such as the homes of family members or friends, automobiles, or motels. For a discussion of types of housing stability, see Sam Tsemberis, Gregory McHugo, Valerie Williams, Patricia Hanrahan, and Ana Stefancic, “Measuring Homelessness and Residential Stability: The Residential Time-Line Follow-Back Inventory,” *Journal of Community Psychology* 35, no. 1 (2007): 29–42.
 - 6 Ty McNichol, district superintendent, statement made at a public hearing of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, November 11, 2013.
 - 7 For example, views expressed at the Missouri Senate Education Committee hearing on bills SB624 and SB516, February 5, 2014.
 - 8 Quoted in John Eligon, “In Missouri, Race Complicates a Transfer to Better Schools,” *New York Times*, July 31, 2013.
 - 9 Comments made at Francis Howell School District town hall meeting, attended by author, July 20, 2014.
 - 10 Comments made at a public hearing at the University of Missouri–St. Louis (in Normandy suburbs footprint) at which the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education introduced its recommendations for how the state of Missouri should deal with underperforming school districts, attended by author, February 25, 2014.
 - 11 Eligon, “In Missouri, Race Complicates”; “Still Segregated,” episode 3 in *The March @ 50*, PBS Web series, produced by Shukree Tilghman, September 9, 2013, <http://video.pbs.org/video/2365071680>.
 - 12 Debates regarding whether or not the United States has achieved a postracial society—one in which race no longer matters in significant ways—have been waged over the past twenty years. For example, see Bill Keller, “Profiling Obama,” *New York Times*, July 28, 2013. Scholars such as David Theo Goldberg argue that “postracial” is yet another racist project that obscures racialized systems of power defined by the modern state; see David Theo Goldberg, *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009). For further discussion of postracial questions, see also “Race in the Age of Obama,” special issue, *Daedalus* 140, no. 1 (Winter 2011).
 - 13 U.S. Census data, 2010. For examples of data analyses relative to race, see Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2011*,

Current Population Reports, P60-243 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2012); Jeremy Pais, Scott J. South, and Kyle Crowder, “Metropolitan Heterogeneity and Minority Neighborhood Attainment: Spatial Assimilation or Place Stratification?,” *Social Problems* 59, no. 2 (May 2012): 258–81; Michael McFarland and Cheryl A. Smith, “Segregation, Race, and Infant Well-Being,” *Population Research and Policy Review* 30, no. 3 (June 2011): 467–93.

- 14 In doing so, I accept John O. Calmore’s description of race as “a fluctuating, decentered complex of social meanings that are formed and transformed under constant pressures of political struggle,” in “Critical Race Theory, Archie Shepp, and Fire Music: Securing an Authentic Intellectual Life in a Multicultural World,” *Southern California Law Review* 65 (July 1992): 2129.
- 15 Philomena Essed conceptualizes “everyday racism” in “Everyday Racism: A New Approach to the Study of Racism,” in *Race Critical Theories*, ed. Philomena Essed and David Theo Goldberg (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002); John A. Powell and Caitlin Watt distinguish between everyday racialization and racism by decoupling outcome from intent in “Negotiating the New Political and Racial Environment,” *Journal of Law in Society* 11 (2010): 31–69.
- 16 In June 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down key parts of the 1965 Voting Rights Act (VRA), allowing nine states (mostly in the South) to change election laws without answering to federal antidiscrimination guidelines. Critics of the VRA cited the election of Barack Obama as evidence that the law is no longer relevant, and Chief Justice John Roberts agreed that “the country has changed.” In the same month the Supreme Court ruled that lower courts must take a skeptical look at affirmative action programs at colleges and universities, stating that institutions must first exhaust all race-neutral processes in order to achieve diversity on campuses.
- 17 See, for example, Lawrence C. Levy’s op-ed “Race and the Suburbs,” *New York Times*, October 30, 2008; Elijah Anderson, *The Cosmopolitan Canopy: Race and Civility in Everyday Life* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009). For a discussion of whether the election of Barack Obama reproblematises and reracializes black leadership in urban areas, where it had become largely accepted, see Manning Marable, “Racializing Obama: The Enigma of Post-Black Politics and Leadership,” *Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society* 11, no. 1 (2009): 1–15.
- 18 Powell and Watt, “Negotiating the New Political and Racial Environment,” 45.
- 19 Michelle Wilde Anderson and Victoria C. Plaut discuss this question in their essay “Property Law: Implicit Bias and the Resilience of Spatial Colorlines,” in *Implicit Racial Bias across the Law*, ed. Justin D. Levinson and Robert J. Smith (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- 20 For examples, see Ronald Bayor, *Race and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Atlanta* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); David Freund, *Colored Property: State Policy and White Racial Politics in Suburban America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Colin Gordon, *Mapping Decline: St. Louis and the Fate of the American City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Arnold R. Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940–1960* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford

-
- University Press, 1985); Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993); Raymond A. Mohl, ed., *The Making of Urban America* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1988); Amanda I. Seligman, *Block by Block: Neighborhoods and Public Policy on Chicago's West Side* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996); Heather Ann Thompson, *Whose Detroit? Politics, Labor, and Race in a Modern American City* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004).
- 21 Dianne Harris, *Little White Houses: How the Postwar Home Constructed Race in America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).
- 22 Margaret Garb, *City of American Dreams: A History of Home Ownership and Housing Reform in Chicago, 1871–1919* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 205.
- 23 Sallie Marston, John Paul Jones III, and Keith Woodward, “Human Geography without Scale,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30, no. 4 (2005): 416–32. See also Eric Sheppard, “The Spaces and Times of Globalization: Place, Scale, Networks, and Positionality,” *Economic Geography* 78, no. 3 (July 2002): 307–30.
- 24 For example, see Alan Berger, *Drosscape: Wasting Land in Urban America* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006); Lars Lerup, “Stim and Dross: Rethinking the Metropolis,” *Assemblage*, no. 25 (1994): 82–100; Deborah E. Popper and Frank J. Popper, “Small Can Be Beautiful: Coming to Terms with Decline,” *Planning* 68, no. 7 (2002): 20–23; Justin B. Hollander, *Sunburnt Cities: The Great Recession, Depopulation and Urban Planning in the American Sunbelt* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
- 25 George Lipsitz developed the concept of the white spatial imaginary in relationship to “the possessive investment in Whiteness” and has more recently linked it to divisions of urban space. See George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998); Lipsitz, *How Racism Takes Place* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011). Michael Keith also uses the conceptual framework of the normative urban imaginary in his analysis of urban space in *After the Cosmopolitan? Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism* (New York: Routledge, 2005).
- 26 See Eligon, “In Missouri, Race Complicates”; “Still Segregated.”
- 27 For a comprehensive review and discussion regarding omissions and oversights in the first generation of suburban scholarship, see Matthew D. Lassiter and Christopher Niedt, “Suburban Diversity in Postwar America,” *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 1 (January 2013): 3–14; also see Becky M. Nicolaides and Andrew Wiese, eds., *The Suburb Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2006).
- 28 *Journal of Urban History* 27, no. 3 (March 2001); *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 1 (January 2013): 3–100.
- 29 Willow Lung-Amam, “Beyond Ethnoburbs: Diversity and Immigration in Fremont, California, 1956–2010” (paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Urban History Association, October 25–28, 2012); Wendy Cheng, “The Changs Next Door to the Diazes: Suburban Racial Formation in Los Angeles’s San Gabriel Valley,” *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 1 (2013): 15–35; Sarah Potter, “Family Ideals: The Diverse Meanings of Residential Space in Chicago during the Post–World War II Baby Boom,” *Journal of Urban*

-
- History* 39, no. 1 (2013): 59–78. See also the contributions to this book by Willow Lung-Amam (chapter 13), Matthew Gordon Lasner (chapter 20), Trecia Pottinger (chapter 2), and Tim Retzlöff (chapter 4).
- 30 See the contribution to this volume by Becky M. Nicolaides (chapter 1); Margaret Crawford, “Everyday Urbanism,” in *Everyday Urbanism: Margaret Crawford vs. Michael Speaks*, ed. Rahul Mehrotra (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Taubman College of Architecture, 2005); John Archer, “Everyday Suburbia: Lives and Practices,” in “Suburbs: Dwelling in Transition,” ed. Steven Logan, Janine Marchessault, and Michael Prokopow, *Public: Art Culture Ideas* 43 (2011): 22–31.
- 31 For example, see Bruce D. Haynes, *Red Lines, Black Spaces: The Politics of Race and Space in a Black Middle-Class Suburb* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006); Kevin M. Kruse and Thomas J. Sugrue, eds., *The New Suburban History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006); James Rosenbaum, Stefanie DeLuca, and Tammy Tuck, “New Capabilities in New Places: Low-Income Black Families in Suburbia,” in *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*, ed. Xavier de Souza Briggs (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2005); Leonard Rubinowitz and James E. Rosenbaum, *Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- 32 Andrew Wiese, *Places of Their Own: African American Suburbanization in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- 33 Mary Pattillo, *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).
- 34 Farrah D. Gafford, “‘It Was a Real Village’: Community Identity Formation among Black Middle-Class Residents in Pontchartrain Park,” *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 1 (2013): 36–58.
- 35 Steven Gregory, *Black Corona: Race and the Politics of Place in an Urban Community* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998); Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003).
- 36 The ghetto, as a stigmatized space of separation and exclusion, can be traced to Venice, where it was adopted in 1516 as a mechanism of Jewish containment and gradually came to represent stigmatized urban space across European cities. In American cities, the Jewish ghetto evolved into a space of ethnic marginalization in the late nineteenth century and eventually became synonymous with African American space. See Louis Wirth, *The Ghetto* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928), including Robert Park’s introduction; Franklin E. Frazier, “Negro Harlem: An Ecological Study,” *American Journal of Sociology* 43, no. 1 (July 1937): 72–88; St. Clair Drake, “Profiles: Chicago,” *Journal of Educational Sociology* 17, no. 5 (January 1944): 261–71; St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945); Robert Weaver (secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), *The Negro Ghetto* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948).
- 37 For discussions linking the culture of poverty to pathologies of the ghetto, see Gilbert Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto—Negro New York, 1890–1930* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); Ulf Hannerz, *Soul Side: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Kenneth B. Clark,

Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power (New York: HarperCollins, 1966).

- 38 For examples of work that shifted the discourse on the ghetto from social pathology toward structural racism, see Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto*; Adam Bickford and Douglas S. Massey “Segregation in the Second Ghetto: Racial and Ethnic Segregation in American Public Housing, 1977,” *Social Forces* 69, no. 4 (1991): 1011–36; Mohl, *The Making of Urban America*. More recently, Loïc Wacquant has theorized the transformation of the traditional ghetto into a space of advanced marginality and has argued that the contemporary American prison system is the new ghetto. Loïc Wacquant, *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008); Wacquant, “Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh,” *Punishment & Society* 3, no. 1 (January 2001): 95–133; Wacquant, *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2009).
- 39 Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (London: Macmillan, 1978).
- 40 Keith, *After the Cosmopolitan?*
- 41 John L. Jackson Jr., *Real Black: Adventures in Racial Sincerity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
- 42 Mario Luis Small, “Is There Such a Thing as ‘the Ghetto’? The Perils of Assuming That the South Side of Chicago Represents Poor Black Neighborhoods,” *City* 11, no.3 (December 2007): 413–21.
- 43 The term *suburban ghetto* has been used to refer to poverty and nonwhite ethnicity for at least four decades and has more recently become part of the urban lexicon. For examples, see Richard Koubek, “Wyandanch: A Case Study of Political Impotence in a Black Suburban Ghetto” (master’s thesis, Queens College, New York, 1971); Mark Gottdiener, “Politics and Planning: Suburban Case Studies,” in *Remaking the City: Social Science Perspectives on Urban Design*, ed. John S. Pipkin, Mark La Gory, and Judith R. Blau (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983); Alexandra K. Murphy, “The Suburban Ghetto: The Legacy of Herbert Gans in Understanding the Experience of Poverty in Recently Impoverished American Suburbs,” *City and Community* 6, no. 1 (March 2007): 21–37; Ronald E. Wilson and Derek J. Paulsen, “Foreclosures and Crime: A Geographical Perspective,” *Geography & Public Safety* 1, no. 3 (October 2008): 1–2; Brad Tuttle, “Suburban Ghetto: Poverty Rates Soar in the Suburbs,” *Time*, September 26, 2011.
- 44 For a concise discussion of this history, see Gordon, *Mapping Decline*, chap. 1. See also E. Terrence Jones, *Fragmented by Design: Why St. Louis Has So Many Governments* (St. Louis: Palmerston and Reed, 2000).
- 45 For an in-depth discussion of the rhetoric of decentralization, see Michan Andrew Connor, “‘Public Benefits from Public Choice’: Producing Decentralization in Metropolitan Los Angeles, 1954–1973,” *Journal of Urban History* 39, no. 1 (2013): 79–100.
- 46 Bryan Downes, Joan Saunders, and John Collins, “Local Government Intervention in the Face of Mortgage Disinvestment: The Case of Normandy” (report, University of Missouri–St. Louis study, January 1976); Tom Dyer, “Factors in Suburban Blight: A Study of Housing in Northwoods, Pine Lawn, and Hillsdale” (report, study conducted by Rick Corry and Tom Dyer, University of Missouri–St. Louis, June 1973); Normandy Municipal Council, “Citizens’ GOALS Project Report,” Don Moschenross, director (November 1973).
- 47 Key-informant interviews.

-
- 48 Gordon, *Mapping Decline*.
- 49 As cited in *ibid.*, 89.
- 50 Solomon Sutker and Sara Smith Sutker, *Racial Transition in the Inner Suburb: Studies of the St. Louis Area* (New York: Praeger, 1974), 32; emphasis added.
- 51 E. Terrence Jones, "The Municipal Market in the St. Louis Region: 1950–2000," in *St. Louis Metromorphosis: Past Trends and Future Directions*, ed. Brady Baybeck and E. Terrence Jones (St. Louis: University of Missouri Press, 2004).
- 52 Quoted in Gordon, *Mapping Decline*, 25.
- 53 Developer's advertising pamphlet circa 1948, Missouri History Museum Archives.
- 54 See James R. Barrett and David Roediger, "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality and the 'New Immigrant' Working Class," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16, no. 3 (Spring 1997): 3–44; David Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1991).
- 55 See, for example, John A. Wright Sr., *Discovering African American St. Louis: A Guide to Historic Sites* (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 2002); Scott Cummings, "African American Entrepreneurship in the St. Louis Metropolitan Region: Inner City Economics and Dispersion to the Suburbs," in Baybeck and Jones, *St. Louis Metromorphosis*.
- 56 Key-informant interviews.
- 57 U.S. Census data, 2010.
- 58 Key-informant interviews.
- 59 Pagedale resident, interview by author, April 11, 2011.
- 60 Cheng, "The Changs Next Door to the Diazes," 22.
- 61 As recorded in municipal ordinances (past and present) of the cities of Pagedale, Hillsdale, and Pine Lawn.
- 62 "St. Louis Stabilization Effort," NeighborWorksAmerica, video, YouTube, December 17, 2009, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nHXu8B7yVfA>.
- 63 Key-informant interviews.
- 64 Key-informant interviews.
- 65 "St. Louis, You See Me," Murphy Lee, video, YouTube, March 28, 2010, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hSvo24UBfpg>.
- 66 "Get to Know a Nigga," Aye Verb, Street Status DVD, video, YouTube, November 5, 2008, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2nDHWx3Nwps>.
- 67 "Luv My Hood," Gangsta Bubs, Dub Block Entertainment, video, YouTube, April 20, 2010, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jg0Pu5EtgBU>.
- 68 Key-informant interviews.
- 69 Elijah Anderson, *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999); Nikki Jones, *Between Good and Ghetto: African American Girls and Inner-City Violence* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2010); Keith, *After the Cosmopolitan?*