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Introduction

Chicago, the city of neighborhoods. A sprawling commercial metropolis that attracts visitors from across the globe. Between the museums, Lake Michigan, and the nightlife alone, Chicago could keep any tourist busy for weeks. A city that has pulled itself up by the shoestrings of the blue-collar American industry to become a globally recognized city. Yet, the city’s reputation extends far beyond being some economic hub. With a total murder count of 762 and 3,500 shooting incidents in 2016, Chicago is always a name in the rumor mill for the title of murder capital of America. The murder capital claim is certainly a rumor, because homicide rates are measured on a 100,000 residents per-capita and since Chicago is so large, the city’s homicide percentage is 27.9 compared to St. Louis, MO’s 59.3% (Mirabile 2017). How does a city jump from one extreme to the other; from a positive perception to a horrifying reality? One does not have to look much further than Chicago’s nickname – the city of neighborhoods – to notice the city’s spatial segregation.

Throughout Chicago’s urban development history, minorities have been at the periphery of the capitalist focus. In 1914, at the beginning of World War I, European immigration came to a halt. Chicago, and many other American cities, faced a “manpower” issue as demand rose (Drake & Cayton, 1993). The labor gap became seen as this opportunity for black southerners - as if Chicago was some freedom frontier that offered livable wages and an escape from prejudice. However, even though the Great Migration of southern black folk fostered the industrial boom, black communities continued to reside in underprivileged, disenfranchised, and
constantly criminalized areas of the city. This inequality is able to sustain itself from the roots of segregation Chicago founded its urban development on. As Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton state “we hold that residential segregation is a global construct that subsumes five underlying dimension of measurement, each corresponding to a different aspect of spatial variation: evenness, exposure, concentration, centralization, and clustering” (283). These five dimensions of segregation will be introduced to some key post-colonial concepts to better understand how the discourse surrounding Chicago’s hyper-segregation can be furthered.

Much of the segregation that is still visible today can be traced back to legislation that was acclaimed for bringing equality to all Americans, specifically pointing to the Fair Housing Act of 1968 (FHA). Through housing practices such as redlining and tenant exploitation, Chicago became a city divided by class well before the arrival of the FHA. It is interesting to compare the discourse surrounding the knee-jerk legislation\(^1\) of the FHA and how it was supposed to ‘solve’ all the racial tensions of the 60’s to the arrival of the “post-racial era” narrative that circulated at the beginning of President Obama’s presidency. It seems that white supremacy is eager to drop the conversation of race at any glimpse of equality.

These theories on race and segregation came to be because scholars noticed a lack of representation in the body of work of critical legal studies. A field focused on power relationships that systemically, or legally, explained the hierarchy of class. However, the issue of race was not discussed. ASHE Higher Education Report explains “Critical race scholars recognize that racism is not a random isolated act …. It is so engrained in U.S. society that it seems natural and is often unrecognizable or invisible to most individuals” (7). The argument at

\(^1\) “Congress itself. Facing an anti-civil rights backlash in the wake of urban riots in 1966 and 1967, legislators resisted doing anything about housing segregation, and only relented in the wake of Martin Luther King’s assassination” (ZASLOFF, 248).
hand is not to discredit the work of legal studies, but through the help of critical race scholars, the field was able to expand to a better understanding of American life. Without these fields intersecting, there would not be the body of literature that exists on white supremacy, marginality, race as a social construct (not biological), and hegemonic structures that systemically oppress people of color. Current issues of race are commonly referred to in the lens of CRT to interpret the societal calamity and impact. The high rate of violence in Chicago can be better understood when CRT merges with the historical analysis of post-colonialism.

Although post-colonial theory was developed to examine the legacy of colonial powers, this project proposes that post-colonial theory can nonetheless fruitfully be used for a literary analysis of the Fair Housing Act to account for the typically non-colonial legacy of US segregation. Even though Chicago is not a city in the colonial context, the post-colonial discourse of violence, territorialization, and citizenship are useful tools for understanding the language in legislation that shaped American systemic segregation. Through a post-colonial lens, the research shifts the individual attention away from the marginalized offender and focuses on systemic othering that has shaped spaces suffering from overwhelming violence. The project argues that post-colonial theory offers a compelling account for the systemic violence against minorities, especially towards black citizens.

Most conversations about the violence in Chicago are hardly contextualized within the history of segregation, but by introducing post-colonialism, this project recognizes the continuity of oppression, rather than as separate occurrences. Whether it is Mayor Rahm Emanuel or Donald Trump addressing the violence (quotes to come later), major news networks, or even the local 5pm broadcast, Chicago’s violence is characterized as a black issue. Furthermore, the terminology and literature present in post-colonialism gives an account of the structural violence
that segregated Chicago, while at the same time acknowledging the hand-me-down white supremacist argument of “black on black crime” or violence as a black issue that has maintained the hegemonic representation of black people as “other.”

Aside from analyzing this historical continuity of marginalizing black people, post-colonialism is able to articulate the violence of othering within the legal rhetoric of the FHA. An approach to a piece of legislation intersects linguistic theory with post-colonialism to unpack the discrepancies of inequality that resulted in the segregation of American people. It can be argued this literary approach to a legal document can skew from the textual meaning the document stands for, but was this document, that was intended to bring housing equality to people of color, skewed when realtors exploited a community when black folks were focused on furthering themselves to the status of citizen? Through a literary analysis of the FHA, this paper shows the oppressive history of America in general, Chicago specifically, and how post-colonialism is a proper theoretical lens to contextualize issues of race today.

Contextualizing Post-Colonialism in Chicago

Before delving into the history of colonialism and what societal circumstances the field has been reserved for, it is worth unpacking the history of the word “colony” itself. According to the Etymology Dictionary, “colony” first appeared in the late 14C as an “ancient Roman settlement outside Italy.” This original understanding derived from the Latin word “colonia” which means “settled land,” from “colonus” meaning “husbandman,” from the “colere” meaning “to cultivate.” This etymology of “colony” is interesting when considering the act of colonization and the sense of entitlement and authority it has. The “colonus” definition of husbandman is even
more curious as colonialization embodies the privileges of masculinity, reflecting the problematic tendencies of both.

Colonialism has been reserved for the study of continents such as South America, Africa, and Asia, and while North America and Australia are no strangers to colonizing, the empirical powers have dominated their history to a silence when considering the Native American and Aboriginal erasure. A common example of segregation discussed in post-colonial studies is apartheid in the country of South Africa. Segregation based on race opens up the colonial discourse of separate development, whereas Chicago’s segregation stemmed more from a classist structure, which can be highlighted by how the blue-collar labor demand was primarily a black occupation. However, Chicago’s black population accounts for a majority of poverty. The cultural dominance of one’s race differentiates the typical experience of citizenship from that of someone of color. Apartheid shows the oppressor using naked violence to control the other, but in Chicago’s context, the violence is structurally subtle to the point where it goes unnoticed. One of the most interesting aspects of apartheid is how, even when the white population was in the minority, they still asserted themselves as the dominant. Even though these accounts of segregation might differ from one another, introducing the colonial description of apartheid to Chicago’s segregation, demands that these inequalities are recognized and engaged.

Ali Mazrui’s use of the term paradox, especially in the colonial context, to describe the othering of Africa as a continent has an overlapping relationship to how communities of Chicago are marginalized. As Mazrui mentions in “Reith Lectures 1979: The African Condition,” the notion of paradoxes is similar to that dialectic discourse that is used from Platonism to Marxism. However, the paradoxes help describe the complex structural violence in such a powerful way
that it hardly seems possible that it could be a reality. In the six paradoxes of Africa\(^2\), Mazrui is representing the Western image of Africa, where as the understanding of paradoxes can help to characterize the segregation of Chicago. For example, Chicago is presented as a global city, yet it is among the highest in homicide rate. The marginalized offender is criminalized before they even commit the crime, while structural violence is not largely acknowledged by the city. A community that represents 32.9\(\%\)^\(^3\) of Chicago’s population, yet is peripheral to the city’s urban space and image. White society is so eager to adopt the post-racial conversation, but at the same time, the black community continues to suffer from oppression, and has throughout generations in US history.

Another paradox of Chicago is that it is largely ignored in the colonial context, but with its history of the forced removal of Potawatomi Indians, Chicago would not be the city it is today without colonialization. Fort Dearborn was established along the Chicago River by Jacques Marquette and Louis Jolliet in 1803. The staked out territory colonized what was originally the land of the Potawatomi Indians. Discussing Fort Dearborn is important because it exposes the colonial roots of Chicago, as well as bringing up a post-colonial discussions of borders and citizenship. In order to further the conversation of citizenship, Victor Rios’ “Decolonizing the White Space in Urban Ethnography” notes how “the most conspicuous component of this white space is its ‘… racism is more commonly manifested in a pervasive attitude that all black people start from the inner-city ghetto, and before experiencing decent treatment or trusting relations with others, they must demonstrate that the ghetto stereotype does not apply to them’” (258). The

---
\(^2\) Those six paradoxes being 1. Africa was the birthplace of man, but the last to be made truly habitable 2. Africans have not been the most brutalized, but they have been the most humiliated 3. Africa is culturally distinct from the West, but westernizing rapidly 4. A continent so rich with resources, yet suffer from poverty 5. Africa is the second largest continent, but the most fragmented one 6. Geographically, Africa is central, but politically, it is peripheral
black image, in return, is territorialized by the hegemonic misconceptions of what it means to be black. They are already spoken for, and the silencing of identity is as violent, if not more, than any other structural aggression. And do not be mistaken, this is very much structural violence in the same way Chicago’s urban development of segregation is by how the toxic ideologies that surround race stem from political foundations rooted in hatred and oppression. A black person needs to prove themselves as a citizen before they can disassociate themselves from being a criminal. As Fanon says “Confronted with a world configured by the colonizer, the colonized subject is always presumed guilty” (16). All the while, the oppressor never stops to interrogate itself and the relationship it has to this violence, despite the body of work focused on its malevolent policies.

Beyond the early context of Chicago’s urban formation, the city is still properly represented when interpreted by a post-colonial frame. Reframing the narrative is possible when considering the Great Migration, which occurred during World War I in 1915, in the context of diaspora. The Great Migration fostered an overwhelming influx of black southerners, 65,000 over a five-year period, moving into the city for the hope of finding industrial work. Diaspora, as explained in Amanda Ross’s “The Role of Diasporas in Conflict” when working off the definition from Yossi Shain and Aharon Barth are “‘people with a common origin who reside, more or less on a permanent basis, outside the borders of their ethnic or religious homeland.” The term “diaspora” implies something different than the terms “immigrants” or “refugees,” indicating that members of the group in question maintain links to their country of origin; attempt to retain dual levels of identity; and preserve political, cultural, and religious interests in their homeland,” (290). The mass migration of black southerners was in response to the Jim Crow laws that explicitly segregated based on race. When moving to northern cities, black
southerners expressed a sense of freedom that was unheard of in the south. Yet, as most dialogues constructed around diaspora’s represent, exile becomes a reactionary response to leverage the migrant as the other, whether spatially or metaphorically, as seen later when explaining covenants. Exiling aims to alienate the colonized subject, and as seen in most cases of diaspora, exile is a recurring theme that problematizes the sentiment towards oppressed people.

Disassociating one’s self from guilt can be challenging for a person of color when the post-colonial context of borders is introduced to the argument, because being from a neighborhood of lower class and rising crime rate can categorize innocent folks as potential criminals. However, not only was there a housing crisis, but also a resistance towards accepting these migrants, a sentiment expressed by both white and black Chicago residents. Chicago found itself in a housing crisis as the overabundance of migrants became a challenge to accommodate. Chicago’s resolution to the migrant housing crisis manifested itself in a couple different ways. The first answer came in the form of the Black Belt, a historically black, segregated neighborhood of 20th century, located from 22nd Street to 35th Street. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton explain in *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City* how “In 1910 there were no communities in which Negroes were over 61 percent of the population … By 1920, 87 percent of the Negroes lived in areas over half Negro in composition” (176). With the Black Belt came a discourse around the notion of the ‘color-line’: a societal boundary, or border, intended to segregate groups “deemed undesirable for free association with white people” (101).

The color-line, like most borders, became a highly contested area of opposition against the black community, in specific, from seeping into white neighborhoods. During the five-year span of the Great Migration, European immigrants began to territorialize these color-lines as they

---

became the site of conflict, whether depicted in the fifty-eight house bombings or the Race Riot of 1919 that lasted for six days resulting in thirty-eight deaths. The Race Riot was initiated by an incident that occurred when “A colored boy swam across the imaginary line which was supposed to separate Negroes from whites at the Twenty-ninth Street beach … stoned by a group of white boys,” (66). In return, the color-line discourse created a territorial category where one is seen as safe and residential whereas on the other hand the undesirable margin is scapegoated as the ‘slums’.

From this categorizing of desirability, Chicago incorporated a housing technique that privileged white communities from being “invaded” by people of color, otherwise known as covenants. The post-colonial concept of borders enables a better understanding of the formation of this marginalized community by placing some imaginary line as the center of racial tensions, rather than the people that were casted as the ‘other’. As described in Black Metropolis these measures [by 1930] had become so widespread … that three-quarters of all the residential property in the city was bound by restrictive covenants,” (184). As much as a border can disenfranchise people, as seen with the Black Belt, it can also be used as a tool to leverage privilege against others. Using the term covenant creates a point of interest when considering the biblical context in which the word covenant is understood because it means to have a contract between God and his chosen people. By adopting this term to classify a neighborhood is to sanctify the white space and claim a “divine right” to the land. In this light, covenant is reflective of many colonial experiences by how the colonizer proclaims a God-given right to the space.

---

5 Social-distance scales rank-order of desirability as neighbors which places Northern Europeans at the top, and Negroes, Mexicans, and similar colored groups near the bottom (Drake & Cayton, 175).
6 Christopher Columbus, Letter to Santangel
Another resolution to the housing crisis that came to fruition between the World Wars\textsuperscript{7} is a topic commonly covered in CRT and whiteness studies: suburbanization. To begin with white flight, a social relocating to suburbia can be seen as a moral panic in reaction to people of color, specifically black folks, moving into primarily white neighborhoods. Whereas Old Settlers\textsuperscript{8} had resentment towards the migrant, as discussed with mimicry later, white folks had this reaction as if they were being invaded. White flight is an incident of naked violence, but subtler type of oppression. An “undesirable” reality was abandoned by white families, and in return doubled or nearly tripled the asking price on the market to the unassuming migrant who was elated to even have a taste of freedom.

Violence, in this context, is imperative to the discussion in that it addresses the current state of affairs in underprivileged communities. Whenever crime in Chicago is discussed, it always preoccupies itself with the question of what can we do to prevent this malicious behavior? How can we keep kids off the streets? But these questions fail to address the history that has shaped these communities, such as Englewood. Already there is violence happening because Chicago is forgetting its historical context, one that has segregated and displaced the black community. The city’s historical memory offers insight into the structural causes of violence.

It becomes essential to expand upon violence in the post-colonial context by referencing Frantz Fanon and his work. Fanon’s contributions on colonial violence has this adaptability with what is happening in Chicago. For example, Fanon details in the “The Wretched of the Earth” how “the colonist or police officer can beat the colonized subject day in and day out, insult him, and shove him to his knees, it is not uncommon to see the colonized subject draw his knife at the

\textsuperscript{7} White flight started to occur as a pattern around the late 1930s around the time of the second Great Migration

\textsuperscript{8} Commonly used to refer to the black citizens who lived in Chicago before the emergence of the Great Migration
lightest hostile or aggressive look from another colonized subject. For the colonized subject’s last resort is to defend his personality against his fellow countryman” (17). Fanon represents how the marginalized subject eternalizes the hatred and violence that is placed on them and, in return, reacts with a naked violence. To better understand the term naked violence, Fanon expresses how “colonialism is not a machine capable of thinking, a body endowed with reason. It is naked violence and only gives in when confronted with greater violence,” (23). Transitioning this back to the context of Chicago, a community that has been systemically segregated and oppressed is bound to react with same aggression that was imposed upon them. Here is where the violence of legitimizing comes into play, because consider the ideology behind black on black violence and how hegemonic notions warrant what is respectable and what isn’t.

Legitimation is a cornerstone to understanding not only contemporary Chicago, but even back to when the Black Belt was still prevalent. The Black Belt had become known for their vices, otherwise known as a brothel or red light district, which attracted people from all races to come south of Roosevelt. However, the city’s perception was one of intolerance towards the vices, as “Black Metropolis” quotes the Chicago Evening Post supporting the position that “it is not true in any sense whatever that the colored community is wholly and entirely responsible for the vice and crime … But these are disagreeable truths and we all shirk when we can … The colored problem cannot be solved by the colored man alone,” (56). The themes of “colored problem” or “black problem” have reoccurred throughout history, whether considering the sentiment of the War on Drugs or the characterization of the gun violence Chicago experiences today. These issues delegitimizes the citizenship of the other because they become scapegoated and seen as the problem, when it is the hegemonic forces that enable social inequality in the first place.
Playing off the idea of legitimizing, citizenship becomes a central concern when discussing Chicago’s segregated population. To take from Fanon again “The colonial context, as we have said, is characterized by the dichotomy it inflicts on the world” (10). In Chicago’s sense, the North vs. the South, Wrigleyville vs. Chiraq. Through these dichotomies, violence becomes articulated by leveraging one society over the other based on the connotations surrounding the two. But to expand quickly on the term Chiraq, it’s important to note that the term was coined through the emergence of drill music⁹, yet city officials refuse to recognize the marginalized community as “Chiraq.” What’s most important about the community’s adoption of the label Chiraq is that it’s pointing directly at the concept that the community has been othered. The label represents how the violence experienced by black neighborhoods has a war-zone-like characterization that feels almost “third world”¹⁰. Neighborhoods, such as Englewood and Chatham, embrace this categorization of being othered because their identity has been shaped by oppression, while the city refuses to continue any discourse on the term. Better yet, the city refuses to acknowledge the suppression of these communities.

Shifting the attention from the offender is crucial for this project, because it sets up the argument for structural violence. A critical post-colonial term to articulate that shift is the concept of mimicry. Homi Bhabha explains “the very emergence of the ‘colonial’ is dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or prohibition within the authoritative discourse itself” (86). Mimicry explains a way of understanding how a community can appear to have the benefits of freedom, but with limitations set in place, the colonial powers position the subject’s citizenship as less. These limitations, then, become a way of identifying the other and the spaces that they occupy. The FHA was designed to grant housing equality to minorities, yet

---

⁹ A genre of rap originating from Chicago’s south side defined by violent lyrics and dark beats
¹⁰ LeAlan Jones “Our America”
they were exploited through the acts of redlining and disinvestment that profited off loopholes in
the legislation. Through not ensuring ethical standards in housing, a metropolis, such as Chicago,
mimics the structure that citizenship depends on. An ambiguity exists between citizen and
resident, which equates to having property as a sign of citizenship. The black community that
was marginalized through unethical housing policies is equated to the space they occupy, and
connotations manifest to describe the ‘ghetto.’ Ideologies around Chicago’s South Side arise
from the vilification of this community. Mimicry is so important here, because the community
that is vilified, now has the gaze lifted and concentrated on the structural forces that marginalize.

To better illuminate the concept of mimicry all one needs to do is look back at the Great
Migration. As pointed to earlier, the native black Chicago community was not receptive to the
black southerners moving in, even resenting the fact that they had moved in at all. Old Settlers
had this bitter narrative of almost feeling equal to white people, but the southern migrants ruined
it. “Black Metropolis” quotes a “colored civil engineer’s” perspective on the post-Great
Migration Chicago: “As far as Negroes are concerned, there were very few here then, and the
ones that were here had been here for years. They were just about civilized and didn’t make apes
out of themselves like the ones who came here during 1917-18. We all suffer for what one fool
will do,” (74). Even though “There’s a Need for Restrictive Covenants” was published in 1948
by A.N. Fields in the Chicago Defender11 the aggression continued to be directed a lower-class,
black community when saying:

Words alone will not solve our problems. We have got to get down to business and let
this realm of decency and respectable living, go for himself, and no longer permit him to
be a drain upon those who are seeking to elevate themselves and their community life in a

11 Historical black owned newspaper that reported on issues concerning to the black community. Owner from
Georgia
manner comparable to other well thinking citizens. We must let the parasite Negro know that his ill-gotten gains do not make him either a social or political leader, because just so long as the better element of colored people allow that fellow to believe that he speaks for us, just so long will our voice be without force and effect.”

The testimonies given by countless old settlers expresses an evident portrayal of mimicry by how despite this fetishized illusion of nearly amounting to the white standard, native black Chicagoans were still under the same power structures that positioned them as the others in the first place, thus mimicking the role, or characteristics, of the ideal citizen without having all privileges that legitimizes citizenship. These accusations become a negotiated response of the dominant, hegemonic structures that oppress, marginalize, and disenfranchise the person giving this narrative. Mimicry is important to understanding how post-colonialism demystifies the position of the other, and is evident within the language of the FHA. If mimicry had a mascot, the Uncle Tom\textsuperscript{12} characterization of the black man who criticizes the black community and panders to the white community would have to be it.

Another post-colonial concept that demystifies the hegemonic structure is borrowed from Edward Said – Orientalism. Traditionally, this term helps to express the exoticism and romanticizing of the Eastern other in order to position western culture as superior. Edward Said explains how “The Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience. Yet none of this Orient is merely imaginative. The Orient is an integral part of European material civilization and culture,” (24). Even though orientalism is typically is used to acknowledge the Eastern other, “orientalism” can give a concrete understanding of the othering of black folks in contemporary Chicago. For example, consider

\textsuperscript{12} Harriet Beecher Stowe “Uncle Tom’s Cabin”
Chicago’s romanticization of the South Side and how the term has been coopted by the Chicago White Sox, instilling this “south side pride” into suburban fans. Moreover, the term Chiraq not only shrouds the South Side as some Middle Eastern country, but is capitalized upon through Spike Lee’s “Chiraq” or Young Jesus, a white suburban teen from Ohio who performs drill music. Despite sensationalizing the South Side, the dominant ideology of the space is still one of danger and fear, yet the fetishizing of it is widely consumed.

All the terms that have been discussed thus far fall under the rhetoric of colonial discourse. The purpose of colonial discourse is to position the dominant understanding above the imposing other sentiment. Colonial discourse mirrors the rhetoric used by critical whiteness scholars when articulating white supremacy in America. It is important to look at these discourses side by side to understand how the two inform one another of how othering occurs. Ruth Frankenburg explains in “Whiteness and Americanness” how “others are constructed in relation to whiteness, whiteness is simultaneously in part a residual category, constructed out of the process of positioning others at its borders,” (70). Whiteness, in return, is only recognized as a race when leveraging itself above people of color. Even though critical whiteness studies came after post-colonialism was well established, it is important to have this comparison of two similar discourses in order to highlight how the space of whiteness remains invisible in colonial discourse.

The overview of postcolonial theory and Chicago urban development history acts as guide for reference as we introduce these theoretical abstractions, historical context, and personal insights to the FHA, otherwise known as Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that was added in 1968. By framing Chicago’s history in a post-colonial lens we can interrogate the
colonial discourse embedded legislation that shaped urban development throughout America, such as the FHA.

Colonial Analysis of the FHA

A literary analysis of a legal document is not common practice because pieces of legislation, like the FHA, are filled with legal jargon that can be difficult interpret without the proper clarification of terms and procedures. Similar to theoretical texts, dense legal jargon can alienate others from reading or understanding the text correctly. As anticipation for the FHA was rising, a narrative was established that this piece of legal text would resolve the issue of segregation that had invaded the northern cities. However, this Act that directly impacted the future of colored people in the housing market was constructed in style that was not accessible for people without a proper education to articulate. As Young illustrates ““Languages, like classes and nations, exist in a hierarchy: as does translation itself, traditionally thought of in terms of an original and an inferior copy,” (140). Positioning through language becomes represented as a means of legal territorialization by establishing a body of rhetoric that displaces the people the FHA impacts from the conversation. Because legal documents can be hard to assess without the proper education, the space legality is uncontested. With that said, incorporating post-colonial analytic reading to the FHA, we can begin to deterritorialize a space that is otherwise absent from public discussion.

For the terms that are described in the beginning of the FHA, they are constructed with the connotation of seeming self-evident. Similar to the discussion on covenants, these terms take a position of objectivity to the point where their definitions are understood in this divine
articulation. One of the very first terms that the FHA defines in Sec. 802 (b) is “dwelling” “any building, structure, or portion thereof which is occupied as, or designed or intended for occupancy as, a residence by one or more families, and any vacant land which is offered for sale or lease for the construction or location thereon of any such building, structure, or portion thereof” (FHA, Department of Justice). In short, dwelling is commonly associated with any form of residency.

However, this definition erases the etymology behind the word that post-colonialism allows us to reclaim. The noun dwelling originates from the verb dwell, which in its formal definition means to live in a space, but the common understanding of dwell is harboring on a subject that results in dissatisfaction or anxiety. The Old English word “dwellan” which means “lead astray, hinder, delay” is a far cry from the quaint legal reading of dwelling as a form of residency. The connotations that surround this word are rooted in colonial discourse by representing the other’s presence as something that is lingering and subservient to white supremacy.

The next two terms that will be analyzed in the colonial analysis rely on the understanding of colonial discourse and how it acts to represent a dichotomy between the active vs. the passive. This positioning places agency with the active participant while the passive is spoken for on behalf of the active. The dichotomy is manifested in the two terms of the FHA when defining an “aggrieved person” versus the “respondent”. The “aggrieved person” is anyone who claims to be injured by discriminatory housing practices or will be, whereas the “respondent” is a person or entity accused in a complaint of unfair housing practice. The “aggrieved person’s” definition is connoted as being subjective, or rather placed as the emotive

---

subject that lacks the objective standpoint to reasonably assess situations. The “respondent”
assumes an objective stance, even though they are the ones accused of housing discrimination.
Categorizing a person who has faced discrimination as an “aggrieved person” is dismissive of
their oppressed experience. Furthermore, the two parties can settle on a “conciliation agreement”
meaning “a written agreement setting forth the resolution of the issues.” However, conciliation’s
definition outside of this document means “the action of stopping someone from being angry;
placation.” Even when the “aggrieved person” is in the right, they are still signified as being
distraught. These terms play into the rhetoric of colonial discourse because they position the
active party with the power, regardless of the discrimination that occurred.

When the FHA was introduced in 1968, many were hopeful that the document would be
the answer to ending inequality in America. Although this research is prioritized with
dismantling the colonial discourse in the FHA, it is important to be reflexive and acknowledge
the benefits that came with this piece of legislation. First and foremost, the FHA is an
acknowledgement of discrimination against people of color, specifically in regard to housing,
which is a major step in the right direction by systemically calling attention to a social inequality.
Furthermore, the FHA warranted social mobility through housing for groups of people that had
been largely been restricted from such privileges. However, the issue of social mobility was not
entirely eradicated with the FHA, and as this research argues the legislation added towards the
marginalization of the black community.

In sec. 804 of the FHA, the document outlines housing practices that are prohibited due
to discrimination towards “race, color, religion, sex, familial status, or national origin.” All of
sec. 804 are values that should be held self-evident, whether in regard to housing or not, but
towards the end of this section is where colonial discourse complicates housing equality. In f(9)
of sec. 804, the FHA describes that “nothing in this subsection requires that a dwelling be made available to an individual whose tenancy would constitute a direct threat to the health or safety of the other individuals or whose tenancy would result in substantial physical damage to the property of others,” (4). As discussed previously, the black body is already seen as criminal under the Western gaze. Having a section that is supposed to combat housing inequality, resorts back to negotiating with the white, hegemonic structures that other people of color. The entity who would assess the potential “threat” would be the respondent who is positioned as objective. Granting this power to the “respondent” is paradoxical, though, because they are determining whether to grant housing to a person based on their subjective interpretation of what they presume to be a threat. The only thing that stands objective in this situation of housing inequality is the power possessed by the “respondent.”

Personifying people of color as emotive is expressed through the use of a person’s “enjoyment” of a dwelling in the FHA. The term enjoyment first appears in section 804 when explaining necessary modifications that might be needed for full enjoyment of a dwelling. The use of enjoyment is most interesting, however, in sec. 818, which outlines how it is unlawful to interfere, coerce, or intimidate “any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by section 803, 804, 805, or 806 of this title,” (15). The term enjoyment is ambivalent because where white folks take these rights to be second nature, people of color are expected to “enjoy” the same freedoms of housing. As seen with invisibility of whiteness, or white privilege, white folks do not have to focus on their freedoms because they are evident to being American, whereas people of color are supposed to
enjoy the perception of what it means to be American, without actually having the same basic privileges.

Yet, the FHA clarifies in sec. 808 that the administration responsible for reporting on the adherence of the FHA is the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, commonly referred to as Secretary. Listed in the functions of the Secretary, they are responsible for compiling studies “with respect to the nature and extent of discriminatory housing practices in representative communities,” (5). However, these reports are more to present that the advances the FHA has made with housing, rather than addressing spaces of discrimination in order to ensure housing equality. The FHA states how the data collected is to analyze the “extent made nationally in eliminating discriminatory housing practices” or “otherwise benefiting under each community development” program. The data collected is made public, but the Secretary determines what is “necessary or appropriate” to publish, and as the FHA has already informed us, the data is focused on the advances made by said legislation.

When data collection is approached in the fashion expressed above, a subaltern narrative is constructed, because the values of the community affected by housing discrimination are not informing the data. Rather, the objective, or active, party conducts research in order to frame the FHA in a light that expresses the strides in housing equality made possible by the FHA. The data collection speaks on behalf of the community that has been marginalized, and even though there is hybridity at play because the data seeks to recognize the said community, but the ambivalence comes when the collected data is meant to serve the FHA, not the community.

It is also important to recognize the gendering evident in the FHA, similar to how the trait of masculinity is evident in the term colonial. The FHA frames the potential buyer of a property as gender neutral, for the most part, but not as mindful when describing someone who is deemed
to be selling property. For example, in Sec. 803 (c) of the FHA, it describes how “1. He has … participated in three or more transactions of a dwelling … 2. He has … participated as an agent … 3. He is the owner of any dwelling designed or intended for occupancy.” Gendering the owner of property as masculine expresses the dominant understanding of men being in the position of power. Trinh T. Minh-Ha explains in “Woman, Native, Other” how “She must learn not only to impersonalize the voice she stole or borrowed, but also to internalize gradually the impersonal generic interpretation of masculine pronouns and nouns. She must learn to paint her world with colors chosen more often than not by men for men to suit their realities,” (27). Colonialism is masculine by design similar to how the legislation that has been shown to weakly prevent housing inequality, ultimately benefits the realty, which is signified as masculine in the FHA.

To expand on how the FHA was more self-serving to the hegemonic structure rather than the communities the act was supposed to impact, throughout the entire FHA there is not a section that incorporates rent control. A housing act that does not mention rent control is a failed act, because these communities that have been affected by discriminatory housing practices are not ensured housing security if the neighborhood goes through a redevelopment phase, otherwise known as gentrification. This research topic will not dive into the issue of gentrification, but highlights the term to express how housing inequality is still evident with FHA in place and to also open the dialogue up of post-colonialism to other contemporary issues facing America.

Consequences in Contemporary Chicago

A literary analysis of the FHA would not be necessary if it had lived up to the hype surrounding it, however, that is not the case. A couple decades after the FHA was enacted,
Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton published “The Dimensions of Residential Segregation” which assesses the different dynamics that create the urban make-up of segregation, such as evenness, exposure, concentration, centralization, and clustering. “At a general level, residential segregation is the degree to which two or more groups live separately from one another, in different parts of the urban environment. This general understanding masks considerable underlying complexity, however, for groups may live apart from one another and be "segregated" in a variety of ways” (282-83). These five distinctions of segregation can be understood in the post-colonial context, based on the definitions by Massey and Denton. This essay, and in particular the works by Massey are important to the topic of segregation because his work is constantly referenced in this body of knowledge.

Evenness is “the differential distribution of two social groups among areal units in a city” (283). This dimension of segregation provokes the post-colonial context of territorialization by how spaces are dominated by a certain race. In Chicago, the South Side is commonly associated with neighborhoods that are primarily black. These neighborhoods are also some of Chicago’s poorest neighborhoods, not just in regard to personal wealth but the fundamental resources they lack as well. The Black Belt was seen in a similar light through low living standards, such as the dilapidated buildings that housed Chicago’s blue-collar workers. These spaces, both present and past, are subjected to the territorializing of hegemonic ideologies of what these locations represent. By not having integrated communities, the white space is able naturalize generalizations about communities because of the distance between them. Of course this distance could be measured physically, but it also presents the dichotomy between the two spaces.
The next dynamic of segregation is exposure as Massey describes it “Residential exposure refers to the degree of potential contact, or the possibility of interaction, between minority and majority group members within geographic areas of a city” (287). This notion of exposure leads perfectly into the spatially constructed dichotomy, because evenness discusses more of the abstraction of space where exposure is more of an experiential measurement, to paraphrase Massey, by how it depends on the amount of contact someone of color has with white people. However, this notion of exposure is problematic because of the social hierarchy it provokes. Massey engages the term between the interaction whites and blacks have with one another, but referring back to territorialized dichotomy, this dimension of segregation appears to be negotiating with the hegemonic forces. For as important as this discourse on segregation is, it is not free from the privileged point of view of the white space. Oxford Dictionary has listed that the definition of exposure 1.2 is the “experience of something,” typically harmful. In the white context, these people of a lower standard of living have the ‘opportunity’ to experience white space, yet they are subjected to this standardized assumption of black identity, or categorization of their community, because they are viewed as outsiders in their own city.
Concentration drives the idea of “outsiders in their own city” towards the colonial discourse on citizenship. As Massey describes “Concentration refers to relative amount of physical space occupied by a minority group in the urban environment” (289). As the city structuring condenses the black community, people of color gain their own mentality as to it means to be citizen of Chicago. The issues of police brutality, lack of education funding, and gang-related violence molds a drastically different citizen than the person who has easier access to resources in the white space. Both are citizens of Chicago, yet the two experience polar states of citizenship. For the black Chicagoan, their citizenship doesn’t seem to be held to the same merit a white citizen’s is, and the disparity of resources between the two backs this claim. Because of this failure to recognize their citizenship, the black community is marginalized into the category of the other.

Centralization continues the discourse of othering in considering “the degree to which a group is spatially located near the center of an urban area” (291). The farther from metropolitan nucleus, the less their presence seems to be welcomed. This distancing, yet again, constructs this dichotomy of black vs. white communities. Considering the distance between the Loop and Englewood, these areas are connoted by ideologies that deem certain behavior acceptable. Naked violence, such as homicide, is handled with more care and concern in an area like the Loop because these acts of aggression are represented in areas where violence is perceived as common as there being seven days in a week, not where tourists come to visit with their families. People who are not even Chicagoans, or even Cook County citizens, are prioritized over the violence that is endured in the black community. In return, black citizens inherit this identity of being inferior; this is depicted throughout Chicago’s urban development.
The final term from Massey is clustering, “the extent to which areal units inhabited by minority members adjoin one another, or cluster, in space” (293). Their social mobility is largely limited to these public housing options that provide less than what is adequate for neighborhoods around Roosevelt Street. The structuralization of clustering appears to be an attempt to control and contain numbers. These tenants, as redlining historically shows, are systemically targeted because of their vulnerability, while to the leasers the tenants become another financial endeavor to exploit. Comparing the representation of the black community as stats in the housing market to the dissimilarity index that Massey uses often to measure the different dynamics of segregation, they idealize the black community as a number, or serialization. Massey’s contributions are critical to understanding the complexity of US contemporary segregation, however, his approach to measurements stand objectively to segregation when these five categorizations need to be analyzed subjectively through the structural violence that has shaped Chicago’s cityscape as well as the white space that has largely contributed to this field of study. Criminology, the sociology of violence, also finds itself in an objective position, when actually, the common assertion of criminology is objective to the crime and the offender.

It is important highlight these terms within a colonial context, because understanding Chicago’s position of segregation is staggering. Massey explains that a hyper-segregated city is a location where these five categories are over sixty percent. Chicago is one of the highest segregated cities in all of America. Yet, this aspect of Chicago is hardly discussed in conversations focused on the city’s violence.

Conclusion
As seen through the history of Chicago and the legislation enacted by the government, colonial discourse has been perpetuated to contemporary views of society. Whether it is Rahm Emmanuel spouting how the South Side “isn’t a Chicago he recognizes” or Trump’s threat of “sending in the feds”, colonial discourse is still enacted by government officials that other an already marginalized community. The neighborhoods have even adapted colonial discourse when we look at contemporary Bronzeville vs. Bridgeport. When the Black Belt was demolished to make way for the construction of the Dan Ryan expressway, the two neighborhoods were divided. Today, Bronzeville is presented as the “historical black community,” whereas Bridgeport, the neighborhood Mayor Richard J. Daley called home, is known as one Chicago’s top diverse neighborhoods. This research looks to introduce the rhetoric of post-colonialism in order to interrogate societal issues prevalent today, whether in the form of gentrification, institutionalization, violence, or education inequality.
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