A Walled Academic Urban Fortress
Using Neoliberal Urban Policies to Redesign and Maintain Chicago’s Hyde Park Neighborhood

MOHAMMAD CHAICHIAN

Mohammad Chaichian, Mount Mercy University, USA

Abstract: In this article, I examine the historical metamorphosis of Hyde Park, home of the University of Chicago (UC) which has evolved from an almost exclusively “white” middle- to upper-class railroad suburb of Chicago into a carefully controlled multi-racial, fortress-like academic-corporate neighborhood dominated and shaped by UC’s economic and political clout. For several decades, racially restrictive covenants supported by the UC kept blacks out until the Supreme Court’s ban of the covenants in 1948 eventually brought more lower-income blacks to Hyde Park. This in turn led to white flight, overcrowding, and further neighborhood deterioration. Using the social Darwinist human ecology approach, in the 1950s the UC sponsored one of the largest urban renewal plans in the nation in Hyde Park with the goal of combatting urban blight and creating an elite, middle class multi-racial community. As a consequence Hyde Park’s lower-income African American population fell by forty percent, its average household income soared by seventy percent; and with the remaining large population of well-to-do black residents it became one of Chicago’s most racially diverse yet segregated neighborhoods. Despite these efforts, by 2000 Hyde Park lost almost half of its pre-urban renewal population, resulting in further deterioration of residential and commercial areas. Once again, with substantial financial backing of the UC during the last ten years community movers and shakers joined forces to save the neighborhood. In what some have dubbed as Hyde Park’s “second urban renewal,” and using Neoliberal urban governance principles, these efforts culminated in development of Harper Court, a mixed-use, academic/corporate-commercial neighborhood block with the objective of revitalizing a blighted retail district several blocks northeast of campus. In the final analysis, Hyde Park’s movers and shakers have adopted a policy of eliminating urban blight within their neighborhood, and cordoning/sealing blight that is taking place in neighboring communities. The success of the second urban renewal plan is yet to be seen, but using comparative crime reports and socio-economic data for South Side Chicago neighborhoods I make the case that although racially mixed, Hyde Park continues to remain a physically and socially separate academic urban fortress surrounded by poor and racially segregated black neighborhoods.
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Introduction

In the late nineteenth century, Chicago experienced a rapid population growth and subsequent congestion of factories and working class residences in the city proper. The advent of streetcars and rail transportation allowed middle- and upper-class residents to escape an increasingly congested and polluted city and resettle in Chicago’s suburbs. One such suburban area was the commuter village of Hyde Park-Kenwood, developed on 300 acres of vacant lakefront land south of Chicago in the 1850s by real estate developer Paul Cornell (The UC’s Centennial Catalogues n.d., 1).

An affluent suburb, the Hyde Park community was mostly comprised of single family homes and mansions built by wealthy Chicagoans between 1885 and 1895. Plans to bring the 1893 Columbian Exposition to South Side Chicago on Hyde Park’s southeastern borders led to a real estate bonanza and building boom, when many spacious walk-up apartment buildings were added to this neighborhood. Later in the 1920s, more apartments and new hotels were built to meet the needs of “an increasing number of elderly people and single men and women” (HPKCC 1995, 1). However, Hyde Park’s reputation and status as a distinct, upper-middle class, segregated...
‘white’ district was seriously threatened in the late 19th century, when Chicago’s meatpacking district which included the Union Stock Yards and the surrounding neighborhoods known as “Packing town” or “Back of the Yards” encroached on its western boundaries (Layson and Barrett 2013).

By the early decades of the 20th century Chicago’s urban fabric was comprised of relatively stable enclaves of ethnic neighborhoods:—”Germans lived on the North Side, Irish on the South and Northwest Sides, Jews on the West Side and in Hyde Park, Bohemians and Poles on the Near Southwest Side and Near Northwest Side and a very small number of blacks in the South Side Black Belt” (UC n.d., 1; see Figures 1 and 2). The Black Belt was a narrow stretch of land at the center of South Side Chicago situated between Hyde Park and the Union Stock Yards, and up until the end of WWI only a tiny number of long-time African American residents lived there. But this changed drastically during the War years, as between 1916 and 1918 more than 50,000 blacks escaped the miserable conditions under which they were living in the South, many settling in the Black Belt area. This new wave of poor black migrants immediately became a threat not only to the livelihood of Irish working class neighborhoods of Bridgeport and Canary Ville west of the Black Belt in South Side, on the north and east of the meatpacking stockyards; but also posed an existential threat to Hyde Park to the east. As Dan Bryan explains, competition for limited jobs at the Stock Yards, the “quest for political power” in the city, and racial prejudice pit newly arrived blacks against the Irish and set the tone for the Chicago Riots of 1919 (Bryan 2012). The Great Migration eventually brought over half a million blacks to Chicago.

Figure 1: The Chicago Union Stockyards, Irish Neighborhoods, and the “Black Belt” in South Side Chicago 1919. Note the “color line” set by the Irish along Wentworth Avenue.


3 Concentration of Chicago’s meatpacking industry in the Union Stock Yards on the South Side began after the conclusion of the Civil War in 1865. By the late nineteenth century the industry had transformed from scattered, inefficient, and cost-inhibitive livestock markets and slaughter houses operated by skilled and well-paid butchers into a more rational, cost-effective “disassembly lines” operated by mostly unskilled and poorly paid immigrant workers.

University of Chicago’s Presence and Influence on Hyde Park’s Development: A Historical Overview

UC was established in 1892 on ten acres of land in the Hyde Park District which was donated by retail merchant Marshall Field. UC’s first President, William Rainey Harper was instrumental in transforming Hyde Park into a tight-knit community of distinguished scholars who were devoted to research and scholarship; and Harper’s efforts led to the establishment of “one of the most influential sociology departments in the nation” (Bachin 2005, 1.). With the help of Ernest Burgess and Robert Park, in the 1920s the Chicago School of Sociology spearheaded cutting edge, field-based research in the city on issues of immigration, race and ethnic relations and community studies (Bachin 2005, 2). From the very beginning, many of the sociology faculty and their students at the UC were actively involved in progressive reform movements particularly pertaining living and working conditions for factory workers and the poor in the city. For example, Charles J. Bushnell wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Union Stock Yards and surrounding communities, which was published in 1901 in the American Journal of Sociology. Accompanied by maps and tables, his study is one of the first detailed and fact-based accounts of migrant workers’ living and working conditions in South Side Chicago. For instance, in one map he identifies a north-south corridor in Chicago that housed major industries and the squalid conditions of residents and workers in surrounding neighborhoods, signified by “greatest child

---

mortality, overcrowding, foreign population, lack of sanitation, criminality (as shown by arrests), ignorance, and economic distress” (Bushnell 1901, 2). Bushnell’s focus area, however, was the South Side, which was “bounded on the north by Thirty-ninth street, on the west by Western boulevard, on the south by Fifty-fifth street or Garfield Boulevard, and on the east by Lake Michigan” (Bushnell 1901, Figures 3 and 4) However, he also included Hyde Park in his study, and to his own admission this was merely for the purpose of comparison.

Figure 3: Hyde Park’s Location East of the Union Stock Yards District in South Side Chicago
Note: Black dots indicate the location of major industries, and dark shaded areas the crime-saturated parts of the city.

As indicated in Table 1, Chicago’s racial and ethnic diversity at the turn of the twentieth century was mostly based on immigrants of European origin; while African Americans comprised less than 2 percent of the city’s population. Furthermore, residents of European origin were for the most part not considered “whites” of equal status vis-à-vis “Americans” in Bushnell’s analysis. His observation reflects the prevalent notion of “whiteness” based on an ethnic stratification of European immigrants and their respective socio-economic status. His analysis also places all newly arrived (first- and second-generation) immigrants on lower rungs of “whiteness,” vis-a-vis established immigrants who had come earlier (“Americans”). This clearly designates Hyde Park District as a distinctly “white” neighborhood at the turn of the past century (with 60 percent of its residents identified as “Americans”) vs. the Union Stock Yards and Chicago proper (19 and 26.39 percent, respectively). Thus despite its proximity to Chicago’s South Side “Black Belt” communities, up until the late 1940s Hyde Park remained as an almost exclusively white neighborhood with an unusually high percentage of upper- and middle-class professionals, including faculty and staff of the UC.

Table 1: Comparative Ethnic/Nativity Data for Chicago’s Hyde Park and Stock Yard Districts, c. 1898

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number…</th>
<th>Proportion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park District</td>
<td>28,542</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,966</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,668</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,67</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Yard District</td>
<td>21,817</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,021</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,048</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,694</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,55</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire City</td>
<td>458,683</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490,542</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,237</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,097</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241,362</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196,840</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214,089</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259,814</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132,484</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,851,588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, neighborhoods to the north, west, and south of Hyde Park-Kenwood were largely populated by African Americans. All along, the UC was instrumental in using its financial resources to enforce racially restrictive covenants in Hyde Park neighborhood and immediate adjacent areas. For example, in the 1930s it supported the Washington Park Owners’ Association “to ensure that the small section of Woodlawn immediately south of Washington...
Park remained ‘white’” (Plotkin 2001, 42). These racially restrictive covenants effectively kept blacks out of the Hyde Park neighborhood until the Supreme Court’s ban of racially restrictive covenants in 1948 eventually brought more lower-income blacks to Hyde Park. This in turn led to white flight, overcrowding, and further neighborhood deterioration (Plotkin 2001). Based on one estimate, “ninety percent of the University’s faculty lived within walking distance of campus.” However, after 1950 a sizeable number of faculty left the neighborhood, and by 1964 only seventy percent resided in Hyde Park (The UC Centennial Catalogues n.d., 5).

Post-WWII Intellectual and Theoretical Origins of Fighting “Urban Blight” in Southside Chicago and Hyde Park

In the aftermath of the Great Depression the Roosevelt Administration introduced the Housing Act of 1934 to save two main sectors of the American economy; housing/real estate and banking. In brief, it obligated the federal government to provide funding for urban slum clearance in central cities and low-income housing in major urban enclaves. Later, in post-WWII years the American cities experienced urban blight both as a result of an influx of newly arrived “non-white” immigrants (mostly working class or low-income), and an outflow of a more affluent, middle-class, and predominantly “white” residents to the suburbs. The latter group’s exodus was further facilitated by the 1956 interstate highway program that “acted in the name of national defense to subsidize the construction of over 40,000 miles of roads” (Muller 1981, n.p.). This white flight to the suburbs led to deterioration of housing stock in inner cities, while downtown business retailers and department stores experienced declining business and were “in danger of having shut down” because of suburban shopping malls that began to dot the American suburbia (Gottdiener 1994, 320). Meanwhile, downtown business leaders realized the fact that private sector developers neither had the needed capital; nor did they want to bear the costs to purchase land, tear down dilapidated structures, and rebuild in the inner city areas.

The Housing Act of 1949 came to downtown businesses’ rescue. One of its main provisions was allocation of federal funds for slum clearance in American cities as part of the urban renewal projects. But as Palen points out, conservatives in Congress had to compromise to gain liberals’ support; hence funding urban development projects became contingent on the latter group’s demand for provision of funds for public housing in its budget. However, the Housing Act of 1949 was more accommodating to the needs of private businesses than those of public housing advocates. First, it stipulated that new occupants of urban renewal housing projects should have higher purchasing power than those being displaced due to slum clearance, and hence would stimulate retail trade. Second, the urban development section of the 1949 Urban Renewal Act authorized and allowed “the use of public funds to buy, clear and improve the renewal site, after which the ownership of the land would again revert to the private sector.” Finally, with the government’s blessing, for the first time the municipalities/planners were also authorized to buy properties from residents for urban renewal, and in cases where “the owner refused to sell at a market price, to have the property condemned through the government’s right of eminent domain, with compensation paid” (Palen 2002, 242).

During World War II Chicago also experienced a sharp increase in its population due to a growing demand for workers in the defense industries. This led to a housing shortage, the effects of which were also felt in Hyde Park. Reportedly, “many of the large private homes and spacious apartments in the [Hyde Park] area were converted into smaller rental units.” Most conversions were made illegally by speculators in search of short-term gains, who had no desire in lowering...
their profits by maintaining their properties. Most of the newcomers were also lower-income families who moved to Chicago and Hyde Park in search of jobs, with neither time nor money to properly upkeep their residences. This subsequently led to deterioration of the housing stock and overall plight of the neighborhood during the 1940s. As the density of poor residents rose in Hyde Park, so did the problems of poverty and crime (HPKCC 1995). Consequently, an influx of working class and poor African Americans into traditionally white, middle- and upper-class Hyde Park-Kenwood led to white flight and what some observers dubbed it as “panic peddling” (The UC Centennial Catalogues n.d., 6).

Neighborhood deterioration and urban blight were not just Hyde Park’s problems, and were even more acute in Southside Chicago in general and areas surrounding Hyde Park and Kenwood in particular. One of the first groups to address the issue was the South Side Redevelopment Agency that was established in 1945 by the administrators of Michael Reese Hospital located on 29th Street and Ellis Avenue. Concerned about losing its $10,000,000 investment to urban blight that was encroaching on its property, the hospital “reached out to other area institutions, organizations, and individuals also concerned with the viability of south side stability and development” (Carriere 2012, 414). By 1946 the group changed its name to the “Southside Planning Board and as a nonprofit organization” (Carriere 2012, 414). A closer look at SSPB’s board members indicates that they represented a wide spectrum of civic, academic, professional and corporate interests. Of note, is the presence of the UC as well as many corporate entities with vested interests in Chicago and Southside communities. SSPB’s first report, “Neighborhood—Basics of Social Organization” was authored by its acting Executive Director and an urban planner, Wilford Winholtz. He proposed that social organization “is vital to the understanding and elimination of [urban] blight” (Winholtz 1947, 4). Several UC urban sociologists provided theoretical bases for Winholtz’s argument. First, the human ecology argument set forth by the Chicago School adopted a social Darwinian approach and viewed cities as functioning similar to natural ecological environments based on three principles of invasion, competition/dominance and succession (Park and Burgess 1921). It also posited that early stages of competition between existing residents and newcomers (in Chicago’s case mostly European immigrants and later African Americans) would lead to social disorganization such as breakdowns in the normative structure of communities that at times may lead to deviance and crime: “Many, if not most, of our present social problems have their source and origin in the transition of great masses of population—immigrants, for example—out of a society based on primary group relationships into the looser, freer, and less controlled existence of life in great cities” (Park and Burgess 1921, 56–57).

While Park considered the neighborhood as an urban enclave to educate and prepare white ethnic Europeans for their journey to full assimilation into the American society, he remained uncertain to the end on the outcome for African Americans. As Carriere has observed, “On the planning side, the neighborhood unit, with its emphasis on homogeneity and ‘natural’ boundaries, also seemed to have little to offer African Americans” (2012, 417). This was precisely the approach adopted by Winholtz and the SSPB in tackling urban conditions in South Side Chicago. Furthermore, Reginald Isaacs, another SSPB leader questioned the utility and practicality of self-contained neighborhoods in the context of modern urban landscapes and considered the “formula” simplistic, “derived from janus-headed planners’ nostalgic and sentimental views backward to the days before good transportation, communication, industrial development and growth of large cities” (Isaacs 1947).

To sum up, SSPB and its leaders considered “blight” as a combination of physical and social deterioration of neighborhoods in South Side Chicago. In their plans to deal with urban blight, SSPB leaders weighed two options: segregate and cordon off the blighted areas, or completely

---

9 According to this model, one social group (in Chicago’s case various ethnic groups and immigrant populations) moves into a neighborhood/urban zone and competes with existing residents/groups until they dominate the area. But the cycle continues when another group later invades and pursues dominance in the neighborhood.
erase and eliminate them—and they opted for the former. Yet, as I will discuss in the following section, Hyde Park’s movers and shakers opted to choose the latter strategy to deal with ‘blight’ during the first urban renewal efforts, and the former to achieve the main objectives of the second (Carriere 2012, 415).

Hyde Park’s First Urban Renewal

SSPB leaders’ concern about urban blight was more at a regional scale in South Side Chicago; while concerned citizens in Hyde Park were determined to prevent their community’s decline and believed that it could remain and prosper as a multi-racial neighborhood. This led to the formation of a new group in 1949, the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference (HPKCC), which aimed at building and maintaining “a stable interracial community of high standards” (HPKCC 1995). HPKCC leaders helped residents to form block organizations in order to facilitate dialogue and cooperation among Hyde Park’s multi-ethnic residents; and in 1950 conducted an extensive survey in order to identify problems and find solutions as a community. Survey findings identified major areas of concern and recommended the following five courses of action:

1. the panic and fear of the white residents, and the block busting techniques of unscrupulous real estate brokers needed to be combated through a program of education and through presentation of facts; (2) a self-help program to arrest continued deterioration in the community through strict enforcement of zoning and building code laws needed to be developed; (3) additional space for overcrowded school facilities and for playground and recreational facilities needed to be found; (4) improvement of city services (such as street cleaning, garbage collection and street lighting) was needed; and (5) redevelopment of pockets of slums and a conservation program were needed (HPKCC 1995, 2).

Despite HPKCC’s ground work to ease Hyde Park residents’ legitimate concerns, the UC leadership was a late-comer in dealing with the neighborhood’s problems, and the University remained indifferent until residents’ indignation about the rising crime rate and the abduction and attempted rape of a university faculty’s wife in 1952 alarmed its top administrators: “At the University, administrators faced a sixty percent drop in student applications in the early 1950s and increasing difficulties in recruiting faculty. Rumors spread that the University was considering moving its campus out of Hyde Park. The Board of Trustees and administrators decided to intervene aggressively in the neighborhood before, as President George W. Beadle was to put it, ‘they...ended up with a $200 million investment in a slum, without anybody to do research or any students to educate’” (The UC Centennial Catalogues n.d., 6).

It was at this point that with the help of Hyde Park’s conservative leaders of business and real estate interests the UC supported the formation of a “Committee of Five,” the South-East Chicago Commission (SECC). However, SECC’s major concerns at that point were improving law enforcement and increasing police protection, enforcing zoning laws to prevent illegal building conversions, and preserving real estate interests.10 SECC leadership also was at odds with HPKCC’s plans to reinforce and maintain Hyde Park’s multi-racial composition, which in their views was “idealistic” (HPKCC 1995). Notwithstanding an ongoing conflict and disagreements between UC leaders and grass roots organizations, SECC and HPKCC worked together to devise plans to revitalize their neighborhood. In an interesting article discussing the ongoing debate about revitalization of cleared lands in Hyde Park in the late 1980s, Joravsky explains the community’s mood in the 1950s right before the implementation of urban renewal

10 As I will discuss in the conclusion, emphasis on security and beefing up law enforcement forces later became a mantra for Hyde Park’s second urban renewal project.
projects: “In those days, the big issue in Hyde Park was economic disinvestment and decay. Poor people (many of them black) were moving into many of the apartments on the community’s western fringes. One major business artery, 55th Street, was a seedy strip, filled with bars and taverns and their unsavory patrons. As crime rose--or, perhaps more important, the fear of crime rose--word got out that the UC, the bedrock institution of the neighborhood, might leave. Without a major renovation, the community would be lost.” (Joravsky 1988, 2).

The first neighborhood revitalization project was a slum/urban blight clearance plan called “Hyde Park A and B,” with a focus on 55th Street and Lake Park Avenue. By 1954, the Chicago Land Clearance Commission designated 47 acres of land for total clearance. A local historian explains the extent of land clearance and its devastating effect on Hyde Park’s low-income housing stock: “Buildings that stretched along the Illinois Central tracks from 54th to 57th streets, east on 55th Street from Lake Park Street to Kimbark Avenue, and a small section on 54th Street at Dorchester Avenue were demolished. The cleared acreage represented 6.5 percent of the total area of Hyde Park and contained 9 percent of the community’s dwelling units. However, this area contained 41 percent of the total substandard housing units within the entire Hyde Park community” (O’Connor Davis 2014, emphasis mine).

Once the worst pockets of “blight” were removed by SECC to slow down the “white flight” from Hyde Park, the city then approved the Hyde Park-Kenwood urban Renewal Project in 1958 (Figures 5 and 6). The plan called for a clearance of 101 acres of land, or about 20 percent of total neighborhood; as well as rehabilitation of about 2,400 structures deemed substandard (HPKCC 1995). Eventually about 250 townhouses, several high rise apartments and the Hyde Park Shopping Center were built on the cleared land (Figure 7). The plan however did not go unchallenged, as the Archdiocese of Chicago, backed by concerned citizens became alarmed what urban renewal meant for low-income working class residents who in most part lived in rental units. According to one account: “Their opposition centered on the failure to provide public housing in the plan, and to secure definite commitments for new middle-income housing. The destruction of sound buildings, the prospect of displaced families being relocated into crowded neighborhoods, and the ambiguity of rehabilitation standards were also questioned” (HPKCC 1995).

As historian Arnold Hirsch has noted, “while whites were among those uprooted in Hyde Park and on the North and West Sides, urban renewal in this context too often meant, as contemporaries noted, ‘Negro removal’” (Hirsch 2005, xiv). The idea was, wrote Hirsch, to “generate real estate prices high enough” in order to “regulate both the number and quality” of remaining black residents (Hirsch 1998, 170). As a consequence Hyde Park’s lower-income African American population fell by forty percent, its average household income soared by seventy percent; and with the remaining large population of well-to-do black residents it became one of Chicago’s most racially diverse yet segregated neighborhoods (Napoles 2013, Table 2 and Figure 8). As is illustrated in Table 2, data for 1960 (reflecting ethnic-racial demographics during first urban renewal phase) and 1970 (project’s conclusion) indicate that Hyde Park’s ‘white’ population remained almost steady (59.7% and 58.0%, respectively), while there was a considerable drop in African American population (37.7% and 31.1%, respectively), or a 2,779 decrease. Further-more, as Slevin notes in his commentary about Hyde Park’s urban renewal and race-based segregation, some residents jokingly argued that urban renewal was a clear example of “black and white together, working shoulder to shoulder against the poor.” (Slevin 2008, 2). The plan was apparently successful, as “sufficient numbers of middle-class whites and blacks stayed to preserve the community’s multiracial core.”
Figure 5: Hyde Park’s “Composite of Blight Factors,” Map no. 11 from South East Chicago Renewal Project No. 1 (Chicago: South East Chicago Commission, 1954). Note: Areas in black indicate “dilapidated or obsolescent deleterious use” buildings, and areas in gray identify “faulty design or excessive land coverage.”
Source: Modified from https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/spcl/centcat/city/city_img21.html
Figure 6: A view south on Lake Park Avenue taken from the Illinois Central tracks at 55th Street, ca. 1950. All of the buildings on the right in the image were demolished during the first phase of urban renewal, known as Land Clearance. Only the Pepper Land Apartments, on 57th Street and seen in the distance, remain.


Figure 7: An Example of Townhouses built on cleared land as part of Hyde Park’s Urban Renewal Plan, 1961. Newly-constructed Spartan two-story townhouses on 56th Street (designed by architect I.M. Pei), looking west from the Illinois Central railroad platform. (UC Special Collections).

Source: O’Connor Davis 2014
Ironically, during the 2008 presidential election season, Republican strategist Karl Rove likened Hyde Park to “un-American” parts of America (read ‘liberal’) such as San Francisco and Cambridge, Massachusetts, or what he labeled as “hotbeds of radical thought, moral relativism and organic vegetables” (Robert 2009, 1). But in an interesting report the Washington Post writer Peter Slevin questions Rove’s simplistic partisan characterization, and argues that “Hyde Park in real life is not so easily typecast. The political ethic is proudly progressive on matters of race and social justice, yet the community is anchored by the UC, an incubator for some of the nation’s most influential conservatives, from Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia to Nobel Prize-winning free marketer Milton Friedman” (Slevin 2008, 2). This interplay of two conflicting
views on social justice and community economic development was clearly part of the debate in Hyde Park between HPKCC and SECC leaders and advocates, when its first urban renewal plans were implemented. But despite the plan’s negative social consequences, the community managed to survive economically as well as maintain its multi-ethnic/racial character to the present time; whereas Hyde Park’s neighboring communities and the majority of Chicago’s neighborhoods have remained highly segregated in the past four decades (Figures 9 and 10).

Figure 9: Hyde Park’s Success in Remaining Multi-racial Amidst Persistence of Racial Segregation in Chicago Neighborhoods, 1970–2000
Note: (blue areas have 0–10 percent African American residents and green areas have 91–100 percent, with Hyde Park categorized as a neighborhood with 21–50 percent African American residents).
Source: Modified from Bogira 2011

Figure 10: Multi-racial Hyde Park Bordered by Predominantly Black Neighborhoods (in green), 2011
Source: Modified from Bogira 2011
In his evaluation of urban renewal programs, Palen considers the Hyde Park-Kenwood project as one of the “notable successes,” along with the “comprehensive renewal effort in New Haven, the Southwest Project in Washington, D.C., the Western Addition in San Francisco,” and “Society Hill in Philadelphia” (Palen 2002, 243). Another observation by O’Connor on the outcomes of Hyde Park’s first urban renewal is also very fitting here:

Despite the controversy, demolition and displacement, the Hyde Park–Kenwood neighborhood after urban renewal was a far cry from the New York Times declaration of the area at the height of process as resembling ‘German cities just after World War II.’ Although the neighborhood had to destroy parts of itself for the whole to survive, the plan achieved the University’s goal of creating a stable community. In the end, the Hyde Park–Kenwood urban renewal project became one of the largest ever undertaken in the United States. The neighborhood held up in the face of an enormous challenge and survived as a middle-class, racially integrated and architecturally significant community (O’Connor 2014, 6) (emphasis by Mohammad Chaichian).

Hyde Park’s Second Urban Renewal Plans: Neoliberalism in Action

Urban renewal programs of the 1950s and 1960s in the United States were the product of an economy mostly based on capital accumulation at local, regional and/or national levels. But WWII reconstruction era was a prelude to the emergence of a new phase of investment and capital accumulation at the global level: “By the 1980s cities were running out of options for economic development projects. The shift to a financial and service economy for the downtown had now turned global. Each place was in competition for limited investment that was attuned to worldwide opportunities” (Gottdiener 1994, 325; emphasis by Chaichian). In fact, economic policies of the 1980s were a response to the recession of the 1970s, which in turn influenced and shaped new forms of urban governance. At the heart of this new phase of urban governance, is what is dubbed as “neoliberal development and global city status strategy” that seeks to attract transnational capital investment, corporate-based services, tourism, and gentrification of large sections of working- and lower-class neighborhoods. This is done with the hopes that middle- to upper-class individuals/families will reclaim these neighborhoods and replace the mostly poor, “non-white” residents (Lipman 2009, 219; Smith 1996).

Neoliberal urban governance is based on “a host of ‘market-oriented’ policies” such as tax-increment financing (TIFs), public land clearance, and public housing reform initiatives controlled by a coalition of “builders, developers, financial institutions, community organizations and the local state” (Sternberg and Anderson 2014, 3). In his examination of neoliberal policies Lipmann identifies two key factors: 1) the long-established strategy of “creative destruction and reinvestment in the urban built environment” for capital accumulation; and 2) the real estate as the “key speculative activity” that is financed, controlled, and traded globally (Lipmann 2009, 220–21).

Within the above-discussed context, Hyde Park’s second urban renewal plan can be considered as a textbook example of implementation of neoliberal policies of urban governance and development; and its ideological and pragmatic principles can be traced back to the election of Richard M. Daley as Chicago’s Mayor in 1989. With the help and support of the city’s elite business and civic groups, Daley launched an aggressive campaign “to attract high-profile businesses and upper-income professionals to Chicago as a means of achieving ‘global city’ status through tax-base replenishment” (Wilson, as cited in Sternberg and Anderson 2014, 4). In addition, he aggressively promoted gentrification of many low-income, inner-city neighborhoods

---

11 Put in simple terms, Harvey defines neoliberalism as “…a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedom and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade.” (Harvey 2005, 2)
as part of his neoliberal urban development policy. As Sternberg and Anderson note, as a consequence of above policies, “deepening poverty, homelessness and [racial] segregation” afflicted the city from which many neighborhoods have not recovered to the present time (Sternberg and Anderson 2014, 4) (see Figure 11).

As part of Mayor Daley’s city-wide plans, in 2000 the City of Chicago commissioned a consulting firm, S.B. Friedman and Company, to conduct a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) eligibility study for Hyde Park’s 53rd Street and prepare a “Redevelopment Plan.” Interestingly, 53rd Street and a three-block area along Hyde Park Avenue north of 53rd Street that extends into the Kenwood community was outside the northern boundaries of Hyde Park’s first urban renewal plan in the 1950s. In a report submitted by the consulting firm in April 2000, the 53rd Street Redevelopment Plan Area (RPA) included a 24 block stretch encompassing more than 83 acres of land and consisting of “183 tax parcels and 63 buildings” (City of Chicago 2000, 1). In its Executive summary, the report concluded that the 53rd Street RPA is an eligible TIF-designated “construction area” because “50% or more of the structures in the area have an age of 35 years or more” with the following three problems: stagnant assessed values; below minimum code structures that occupy excessive land; and substandard utilities. In addition, the study depicted three eligibility factors, namely, “deterioration, deleterious land use or layout, and obsolescence” that if left unchecked will lead to the 53rd Street RPA’s gradual decline (City of Chicago 2000,
1). Although the report recognized the latter factors to be of a “minor extent,” it nonetheless designated most of the 53rd Street RPA structures as “below minimum code” and thus making them candidates for demolition and eligible for TIF (Figure 12).

![Figure 12: Proposed 53rd Street Tax Incentive Finance District: Structures below Minimum Code (gray shaded areas)

During the same year, a team comprised of local aldermen, SECC members, the Hyde Park Chamber of Commerce, the UC, representatives from the City of Chicago’s Department of Planning, and local Aldermen began their efforts to create a two-pronged action strategy to 1) “assess the competitive position of the Hyde Park Retail District and identify opportunities for new market driven development”; and 2) “identify potential new retailers and new uses for the Hyde Park District” (HPKCC 2000). They also published their report in March 2000 titled *A Vision for the Hyde Park Retail District*, in which they recommended to create a vibrant mixed-

---

12 The report defined *deterioration* as an “advanced state of despair or neglect”; *deleterious land use* as “existence of incompatible land-use relationships”; and *obsolescence* as “the condition or process of falling into disuse” (City of Chicago 2000, 15–17).
use center for the Hyde Park’s retail district and improve the streetscape in order to make Hyde Park more user-friendly (HPKCC 2000). However, nowhere in the report was any indication that Hyde Park’s retail districts were in a state of disrepair, or any recommendations for development of dilapidated and deteriorating structures. The central focus of the “Vision” was its emphasis on preserving existing structures, including the Harper Theatre building, and respecting the pedestrian/human scale of Hyde Park neighborhoods:

*Hyde Park’s retail streets have a great pedestrian scale, with vintage buildings that are mostly three or four floors high lining both sides of the street. Building facades are often animated with a variety of architectural elements, such as interesting masonry patterns, ornamental cornices, columns, and pilaster, generous windows at the street level and above, and colorful signs and awnings. Some taller buildings such as the Hyde Park Building on 53rd Street and the Deco Arts building on 55th Street, have significant historic facades that add to the unique charm and character of the streets (HPKCC 2000, 14, emphasis in original text).*

The Vision report also recommended “creative and high quality designs” that can complement existing structures and maintain “existing pedestrian scale”; a sound recommendation that eventually fell on deaf ears of planners for the final design. At the core of this report, was the recommendation to “expand Harper Court plaza by removing parking lanes from the Harper Avenue cul-de-sac, and create a stronger outdoor space.” Funded with bonds sold to the community, and built at 52nd Street and Harper Avenue with the adjoining parking lot at 52nd and Lake Park Avenue, Harper Court was intended to replace artists’ quarters lost during Hyde Park’s first urban renewal in the 1950s, and provide space for new galleries and creative enterprises (the UC Centennial Catalogues n.d., Figure 13). However, what was not clear was the nature and scope of Harper Court’s transformation and funding sources to accomplish this task.

![Figure 13: Bird’s Eye View of Original Harper Court, with 52nd Street in the Background and Lake Park Avenue (not pictured) Running parallel to the Parking Lot on the Right Hand Side, 2009. Source: http://www.uchicago.edu/features/20090413_53rd/](image)

In early 2004 the University of Chicago sponsored a conference on urban renewal and future of Hyde Park community, which was widely attended by UC administrators and community activists. Of note, was the UC President’s public admission that “the University had acted out of a moat mentality and made mistakes during urban renewal [of the 1950s-60s]”; and that it is committed to take a more proactive role in South Side’s urban development (HPKCC n.d., 14.).
Later in 2004, SECC, still representing the UC’s interests and those of the more affluent Hyde Park residents focused on “facilitating the TIF council and working with the Chamber of Commerce and University on business corridor revitalization and recruitment of varied businesses” (HPKCC n.d., 14).

Meanwhile, throughout the first decade of the New Millennium Hyde park witnessed a slow but steady decline and failure of small businesses to stay afloat and economically viable on one hand; and a creeping entry of corporate/chain businesses with plans to purchase the former entities, gentrify, and open their own branches in the neighborhood on the other. This subtle gentrification both set the tone for Hyde Park’s so-called “second urban renewal plan” as well as defined the nature of future economic development projects. In Table 3, I provide a brief account of small business closures as well as attempts/actions by corporate entities to take over the failed businesses during the 2000–08 period.

Table 3: Demise of Small Businesses and Corporate Investments in Hyde Park, 2000–08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Closure of Small Businesses</th>
<th>UC and Corporate Buy-outs/Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>- House of Tiki Restaurant and Bar</td>
<td>- Mobil-McDonald site 53rd St. proposal for 8-story development on 53rd St., but the developer walks away after community/ alderman ask for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Women’s Workout World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- World Gym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>- Hyde Park Theatre</td>
<td>- Borders Books plans to open on 53rd and Lake Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Anderson’s Hardware</td>
<td>- BP Connect to replace defunct Shell Station at 52nd and Lake Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>- Behind the scenes Harper Court Foundation starts negotiations to sell the shopping center.</td>
<td>- University of Chicago buys Harper Theatre, the Herald Bldg., along with leasehold on Women’s Workout World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>- The 47th St. Co-Op announces closing by early 2005</td>
<td>- CVS to tear down, replace Anderson’s Hardware and Tony’s sports in Kimbark Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Announcement for sale of Harper Court in the late 2005 and the prospects of demise of small businesses and art shops.</td>
<td>- UC considering future of Herald and Harper Theater bldgs. it bought, plans to bring Checkerboard blues lounge and a theme restaurant to Harper Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The former Eagle pub—a HQ for radical and other political groups in the 1960s–80s is threatened with demolition.</td>
<td>- Redevelopment of the Theater complex and the Mobil-McDonald’s site are considered crucial to develop incremental tax revenues (TIF) for other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2006</td>
<td>- On Lake Park, a new BP Connect and drive-through McDonald’s are completed on Lake Park</td>
<td>- The east side of Kimbark Plaza is torn down for a new CVS Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A plan to redevelop the Harper Theater properties as shops fails after the UC fires the developer (late 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>- Harper Court sold to the University of Chicago</td>
<td>- UC makes an arrangement with the city to bundle Harper Court with the city lot into a new mixed use planned development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vermilion Development and spinoff Harper Court Partners proceed to submit plans for input for a start of construction in late 2011: “The new Harper Court will have a UC office building with fitness across from the bank, a very wide street with retail-restaurant, public arena, hotel and residential, a Hyatt Hotel, parking, rental buildings and a possibly condo tower at the northeast end” (HPKCC n.d., 13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table Constructed Based on Information in HPKCC n.d.
Eventually, as part of a community-wide planning process to redevelop and revitalize the 53rd Street, in 2008 the UC purchased Harper Court from the Harper Court Arts Council for $6.5 million. At the same time, the University worked with the TIF Advisory Council and community groups on “how to make Harper Court smart, sustainable, and successful.” In response to Hyde Park residents and small business owners’ concerns about losing retail rental space Susan Campbell, UC’s Vice President for Civic Engagement offered a short-term solution for existing Harper Court tenants: “Since June 2008, the University has been working with tenants, the Chamber of Commerce, local landlords, and the city to assist with a smooth transition for both Harper Court businesses and their customers, while also maximizing developer interest. In order to show its understanding of the needs of community residents and existing businesses, the University has agreed to extend the leases of the businesses currently in Harper Court until June 30, 2009” (Woodley 2009, 3).

Yet, in March 2009, a local blogger and free-lance photographer took snapshots of Harper Court locally owned businesses’ storefronts that showed empty and vacant stores (such as I Love Hyde Park clothing and entertainment, and Dr. Wax Music store); with a Starbucks joint and few remaining retailers (such as Dixie Kitchen, Calypso and Checkerboard Lounge) still in business (Martin 2009). In a few months, the UC forced the remaining businesses to move out. A year later, Harper Court still remained abandoned with vacant stores, and in response to concerned residents’ question as to “why are viable businesses such as Dixie Kitchen and Calypso being moved out of Harper Court before there are new businesses to replace them?,” University officials provided the following rationale: “All agree that the Harper Court buildings (with the exception of the building housing Checkerboard Lounge and Park 52 restaurant, which have undergone extensive renovation) are in disrepair and have access and code challenges. We are working with the owner of Dixie Kitchen and Calypso and offering assistance we hope will allow her to consider re-opening in another location in Hyde Park” (UC 2010).

Thus the stage was set for outside investors to take advantage of the 53rd Street TIF-designated redevelopment area, but none were on the horizon. In addition to this planned obsolescence, by 2010 Hyde Park had also lost almost half of its pre-first urban renewal population, resulting in further deterioration of residential and commercial areas (Table 2). However, it did not experience the extreme economic depression and very high crime rates that occurred in the surrounding areas. Eventually, in October 2011 Canyon-Johnson Urban Funds (CJUF), one of the largest private real estate funds in the nation announced that it has teamed up with Harper Court Partners, LLC, to redevelop Harper Court on 3.3 acres of land at the corner of 53rd Street and South Lake Park Avenue in Hyde Park. The proposed 600,000 square foot, mixed-use project included $106 million of local investment funds (out of a total $250 million) from both private and public entities in order to build a nine story, 150,000 square-foot tower in its first phase providing commercial office and retail space; and 425 residential units in the second phase. The office tower was planned in conjunction with a three-story corporate fitness center (LA Fitness), a Hyatt Place hotel, and retail spaces designed to be leased to other chain-retailers including Chipotle, Starbucks, and Five Guys Burgers (Figures 14 and 15). CJUF also boasted about the project’s potential to create 350 permanent retail and 150 “hospitality” jobs (Canyon-Johnson 2011).

---

13 In its announcement, CJUF indicated that the funds are “a joint venture between Canyon Capital Realty Advisors and an entity of Earvin “Magic” Johnson’s Magic Johnson Enterprises,” and were “formed to identify, enhance and capture value through the development and redevelopment of real estate in densely populated, ethnically diverse urban communities” (Canyon-Johnson 2011, 2).
14 The office tower was leased by the UC and provided office space for 500 UC employees.
15 A promotional video produced by the contractor, Vermillion Development provides the context from developer’s perspective and that of the University of Chicago: http://www.chicagobusiness.com/section/multimedia0202?project=DealMakerssandtitle=A%20game-changer%20for%20Hyde%20Park.
The Harper Court complex was completed and opened for business in November 2013, and the project was rightly dubbed as Hyde Park’s “second urban renewal” (Urban Land Institute 2013, Figure 16). Just few days after the ribbon-cutting ceremony, the UC purchased Harper Court from its developers. A UC spokesperson provided the following rationale for this
unexpected turn of events: “When the university learned that Harper Development intended to sell the site, it opted to buy it so that by taking ownership, the university had a way to guide future planning for the site in terms of who it selects to purchase the site. We’ll be looking for a buyer with a long-term interest in Harper Court” (Bayliss 2013).

A final note is on the implementation phase of neoliberal policies in Hyde Park. In their review of neoliberal urban governance theories, Brenner and Theodore identify two major parameters related to social and spatial spheres. One is to delineate “the character of ‘appropriate’ policy choices, by constraining democratic participation in political life, by diffusing dissent and oppositional mobilization, and/or by disseminating new ideological vision of social and moral order in the city” (emphasis by Mohammad Chaichian). The second parameter for a neoliberal political strategy, is its “spatial selectivity,” meaning that urban policies are not implemented “uniformly across the urban landscape” (Brenner and Theodore 2005, 103, 106). In fact, compared with Hyde Park’s first urban renewal projects that opted for total destruction of a neighborhood, recent neoliberal urban development projects operated with pin-point, surgical precision and selectively chose their targets for urban economic development and revitalization. At the end, once again the UC emerged as the main agency for change, urban redevelopment and the most influential political and economic player in Hyde Park.16

![Artist’s Rendering of the Completed Harper Court Complex](Image Source: Bayliss 2013)

**Concluding Remarks: Urban Renewal Plans as a Tool to Keep Hyde Park Safe for the UC and the Business Community**

Urban politics in the United States have always been based on partisan rivalries and ideological divide. While liberal politicians promote and support the government’s role in providing guidelines for economic development and provision of basic services for the public, there is a common philosophical perception among conservatives in the United states that government should play a limited (or no) role and let the market forces and private sector find the best solutions. As Gottdiener argues, this matter becomes more complicated related to urban

---

16 Although a bit exaggerated, we can find parallels between total neighborhood demolitions with war-time carpet bombings, and neo-liberal spatially-selective urban development plans with precision bombing strategies.
development, as “under the federalist arrangements between the national government and the states the condition of cities is the responsibility of the states, yet many of the problems such as crime or health care, are national in scope” (Gottdiener 1994, 319). This has often resulted in the government playing an ambivalent role in urban development projects, which in most cases has compromised public interests in favor of those of the private sector. Of note, are two post-WWII planning processes that have shaped the American urban landscape, namely, the urban renewal programs of the 1950s–1960s, and the neoliberal policies implemented by urban governments since the late 1980s. Critics of urban renewal policies argue that they “seemed to be more effective in the removal of black/or poor residents than replacing slums with affordable housing,” so much so that urban renewal projects in the 1960s were dubbed as “Negro removal” projects (Flanagan 1990, 292; Robertson and Judd 1989, 307). As is discussed in the following sections, Hyde Park’s urban development projects from late 1940s to the early 1960s were a textbook case of implementing dominant conservative, business-oriented policies of urban development.

As historian Arnold Hirsch argues, in the post-depression years Chicago became a “pioneer in developing concepts and devices” for housing segregation, a practice that was also adopted by Hyde Park’s movers and shakers (Arnold Hirsch 1998, 2). The influx of black families to South Side Chicago in the 1940s generated fear among white residents in Hyde Park, who sought ways to stop the flow. It was at this point that the UC, in the guise of maintaining a safe campus community and its surroundings “backed restrictive covenants as well as white neighborhood groups’ intent on barring blacks” (Slevin 2008).

Hyde Park’s first urban renewal project that was dubbed as “slum clearance” and “negro removal” plan, was complemented by another urban design project: the perceived or real threat of Hyde Park being invaded by “undesirable” residents from its western and southern neighborhoods has also dictated Hyde Park’s spatial planning and micro-level urban design. The present Hyde Park-Kenwood Community stretches from Lake Michigan on the east to Cottage Grove on the west, and from 47th to 59th streets on the north and south, respectively. Northern boundaries encompass south Kenwood with Hyde Park ending at Hyde Park Blvd [51st street]; while Woodlawn neighborhood delineates its southern borders past 60th Street. Furthermore, Lake Michigan provides a natural barrier to its east; while Hyde Park is isolated and separated from its western and northwestern neighbors by Washington Park, a long north-south stretch of green space. Finally, a wide and long green space between 59th and 60th Streets (Midway Plaisance) that stretches from Washington Park on the West to the grounds of the Museum of Science and Industry on the shores of Lake Michigan provides an artificially created green buffer/barrier between Hyde Park and Woodlawn, a poor and predominantly black neighborhood to its south (Figure 17).17

17 An amateur video provides an aerial view of Hyde Park and its green buffer zones, as the chopper flies over from southwest of the neighborhood and then circles above Hyde Park-Woodlawn boundaries along Midway Plaisance (60th and 61st Streets), watch from minute 1:53-3:00): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-XXIWRZRHe.
This strategy of sealing the neighborhood through the creation of a green buffer zone and aggressive policing/profiling seems to have paid off, as Hyde Park’s crime rates in almost all categories are much lower than the surrounding neighborhoods. For example, my random comparison of crime reports for Hyde Park, Woodlawn, Kenwood, Washington Park and Grand Boulevard neighborhoods in 2014 clearly demonstrated that except for property crime, particularly auto theft, whereby the rates are relatively higher in Hyde Park (an indication of a higher income resident profile); the surrounding neighborhoods have much higher rates for “violent” and “quality of life” crimes. What is more, Woodlawn, Hyde Park’s southern neighbor that has been subjected to aggressive policing tactics has the highest crime rates in almost all categories (Table 4).

In addition to creation of several green buffer zones to seal the neighborhood to keep out “undesirables,” there is no question that Hyde Park owes its social and economic stability to the UC, and much of its security and public safety also depends on the UC Police Department (UCPD) that at present time has one of the largest campus police forces in the country (Fan 2014). Reportedly, UCPD does more than simply patrolling the neighborhood. Keeping Hyde Park safe is being accomplished by investigative squads and plainclothes officers who are dispatched into neighboring crime-infested, poor and mostly black communities to the south and west. There, they allegedly employ racial profiling and aggressive “stop and search” tactics in order to prevent “undesirable” elements to enter Hyde Park and thus erecting an invisible offensive wall around Hyde Park (Figure 18). This practice has a long-established history, and as Fan explains, “In 1968, one university official noted that “there’s a rumor that all Negroes coming across the Midway are stopped and frisked.” Alleged police profiling was not limited to the Midway [along 60th and 61st Streets]. One area resident recalled watching officers systematically search all of the black men on a public bus while seeking a suspect in 1977” (Fan 2014, 4).
Table 4: Crime Reports in Hyde Park and Neighboring Communities, September 6–October 26, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Hyde Park</th>
<th>Kenwood (North)</th>
<th>Washington Park (West)</th>
<th>Grand Blvd. (Northwest)</th>
<th>Woodlawn (South)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality-of-Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes (Total):</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 18: Map of Hyde Park and Its Southern Poor Black Neighborhood of Woodlawn, with UC Police Patrolling Main South-north Entrances to Hyde Park along 60th and 61st Streets
Source: Photos by Chaichian 2015
As Fan aptly states in his investigative reporting on this issue, the UCPD’s successful record of crime reduction in Hyde Park “has come at a heavy cost” for the area residents who are constantly subjected to police harassment and racial profiling, and provides several examples to make his point:

Brandon Parker, an eighteen-year-old Woodlawn resident, is careful not to cross 59th Street, where he says that University police “stop and check you.”

Christian Clark, a high school sophomore who lives in Kenwood, complains that UCPD officers “harass people for no reason.” Once, while biking through campus, an officer pulled him over and asked, “What are you doing over here?”

Andre Harmon, a twenty-one-year-old art student, avoids biking through the University after being pulled over several times by the University police. He built his bicycle himself, but UCPD officers have repeatedly asked him to explain where it came from, a question he views as accusatory and racially motivated (Fan 2014, 2).

The success of the second urban renewal plan is yet to be seen. Right after Harper Court’s opening in November 2013, a University of Chicago spokesperson boasted of the efforts made to ensure that developers attract “a mix of national, Chicago-based and locally owned businesses” to the 53rd Street corridor, and employ adequate number of minority- and women owned businesses during the construction period (Bayliss 2013). However, a 2014 report about the overall mood among Hyde Park’s business owners indicates that they have rather mixed feelings about Hyde Park’s second urban renewal. Some expressed dissatisfaction about not being adequately compensated when their small businesses were affected both during and after Harper Court’s construction. For instance, one small gift shop owner complained about financial burdens of being forced to relocate her business and pay higher rent (Schmidt 2014).

On the other end of the spectrum, some Hyde Park residents and outsiders who own small businesses in the neighborhood consider the second urban renewal projects and the UC’s leadership role as having a positive effect on their businesses. For example, co-founder and medical director of a Hyde Park Animal Hospital has found new business opportunities; and owners of a high-end boutique that were recruited by the University to the area are planning to “permanently keep their commercial roots in the neighborhood” due to their successful operations (Schmidt 2014). But in the final analysis one thing is clear: that Hyde Park’s ethnic diversity is maintained and kept in check by corporate interests, and so is its urban economic development that is dictated and guided by the advocates of neo-liberal policies of urban growth.
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