This Article describes four distinct phases that urban neighborhoods have passed through in the last sixty years. The first phase, from World War II until 1968, followed a pattern of decentralization, investment in suburban infrastructure, and strict segregation. The second phase, 1968 to 1975 was marked by hyper-sprawl, the loss of the central city economic base and population, and hyper-segregation. The third phase, 1975 to 1990, was characterized by class segregation, increased cost to access the suburbs, and increased class and racial separation. The fourth phase, 1990 to 2008, witnessed hyper-segregation; voluntary class, racial, and ethnic separation; and persistent racial discrimination. The Article suggests that the United States may be entering a fifth post-war phase of Smart Growth, public transport, infill strategies, and New Urbanist and suburbanist designs producing greater diversity.
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Introduction

America’s urban centers have evolved through four distinct phases in the last fifty years. The first phase, from World War II until 1968, followed a pattern of decentralization and was marked by extraordinary investment in suburban infrastructure including federally subsidized highways, utility extension, and rapid suburbanization. During this period, development was strictly segregated.
on the basis of race. The principal regulatory model was zoning, particularly suburban exclusionary zoning requiring detached, single-family homes on relatively large lots. This phase concluded with passage of the Federal Fair Housing Act known as Title VIII.¹

The second phase, 1968 to 1975, was marked by hyper-sprawl. During this period, cities lost jobs as manufacturing shifted to the sun belt, the suburban belt, or went offshore. The city became more unattractive and lost its tax base because retail and businesses moved to the suburbs. Public services in the city declined as suburban services improved with the support of an enhanced tax base. As public schools were faced with broad desegregation remedies, whites left the city causing the further decline of the structure and tax base of the city. Finally, subdivision regulation resulted in expensive suburbs based upon a model of attractive, single-family, automobile-based lifestyles.

The third phase, 1975 to 1990, was characterized by class segregation. As suburbs increased access costs through regulation, inflated demand-push land prices, exclusionary zoning and growth management, the suburbs and city became distinguished from one another by class. The poor were concentrated in the city and the affluent in the suburbs.

The fourth phase, 1990 to 2008, can be described as hyper-segregation. This period was marked by an increase in voluntary class, racial, and ethnic separation as more ethnic and racially concentrated neighborhoods grew or were established. Although residential segregation in the United States is largely the result of both government and private discrimination, voluntary segregation by whites marked the geography between 1945 and 1975, and since that time, voluntary separation has been a phenomenon of both whites and non-whites with a relatively small number of non-whites choosing assimilation and residential integration for which there exists limited opportunities. Even where integration occurs according to census data, however, minorities frequently concentrate in small suburban or urban enclaves masking the extent of separation and the lack of social cohesion. Neighborhoods were increasingly regenerated through gentrification and the investment of public and private funds. The divide between many minority communities (now in the city and the older suburbs) and the more affluent, predominantly white and newer suburbs became more pronounced.

The United States may be entering a fifth post-World War II phase. This phase would be one of actual Smart Growth. Truly Smart Growth involves migrating away from automobile-based transport to a greater use of public transport and developing transit-served urban and suburban communities that incorporate infill strategies, are denser, and utilize New Urbanist designs. The results will be the creation of pedestrian-friendly models of the European compact city and a recreation of pre-war, small, industrial towns and streetcar neighborhoods and suburbs. The increase in density, accessibility, and choice between homes of different sizes and costs may stimulate greater racial and ethnic diversity and assimilation. The four post-World War II phases of urban

evolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASES</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1968 Decentralization</td>
<td>Apartheid</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1975 Hyper-Sprawl</td>
<td>White Flight</td>
<td>Concentrated Poverty</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1990 Class Segregation</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Revitalization</td>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2008 Hyper-Segregation</td>
<td>Voluntary Separation</td>
<td>Gentrification and Regeneration</td>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. PHASE ONE—DECENTRALIZATION: 1945-1968

At the end of World War II, pent-up housing demand and returning soldiers sent the public looking for new housing in the newly developing suburbs. The period between 1945 and 1968 was marked by extraordinary national investment in suburban infrastructure including federally subsidized highways, utility extension, and rapid suburbanization. Suburbanization resulted from demand


fueled by the availability of low-interest loans for the purchase of modestly priced houses in new suburban subdivisions. Loans were insured by the Federal Housing Administration and often made through the Veterans Administration. During this period, development was strictly segregated on the basis of race as mandated by federal government loan requirements, i.e., the federal government conditioned the availability of mortgage insurance to entire housing developments on the adoption of racial covenants or equitable servitudes—covenants inserted into subdivision deeds or in the subdivision plat filed with the deed and binding future lot purchasers as compared to covenants entered into between neighbors or those attached to deeds—and often local zoning, private covenants, or simply violence by local police or white supremacists. The basis of the requirement was the belief that a one-race community would stabilize housing values and assure marketability by adhering to the American custom of racial segregation. The principal regulatory mechanism used was zoning, particularly suburban exclusionary zoning


8. See City of Richmond v. Deans, 281 U.S. 704, 713 (1930); Harmon v. Tyler, 273 U.S. 668, 668 (1927) (permitting Negro residence only upon consent of majority of neighborhood); Buchanan v. Warley, 245 U.S. 60, 80-92 (1917) (invalidating the practice as interfering with the white seller’s freedom of contract); Jack Greenberg, Race Relations and American Law 276-79 (1959); Kushner, Apartheid in America, supra note 2, at 15-16.


10. See Loewen, supra note 7, at 227-79.

11. See Kushner, Apartheid in America, supra note 2, at 20-30; see also Ira Katznelson, When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth Century America 115-41 (2005); Kimble, supra note 7, at 20-30 (describing proactive FHA segregationist policy); Rajeev D. Majumdar, Comment, Racially Restrictive Covenants in the State of Washington: A Primer for Practitioners, 30 Seattle U. L. Rev. 1095, 1102 (2007).

requiring detached, single-family homes on relatively large lots.\textsuperscript{13} Communities often required in excess of an acre per home\textsuperscript{14} with broad street setbacks for lawns.\textsuperscript{15} Virtually no lots were zoned for mobile homes\textsuperscript{16} or apartments.\textsuperscript{17} Where apartments were provided, sites were often unattractive, and bedrooms were limited to exclude families and attract senior citizens and single adults.\textsuperscript{18} The period ended with the dawn of the War on Poverty,\textsuperscript{19} the Great Society,\textsuperscript{20} and passage of the Federal Fair Housing Act, known as Title VIII,\textsuperscript{21} which reflected the policies of President Lyndon Johnson.

258-59 (2004).


\textsuperscript{14} See Nat’l Land & Inv. Co., 215 A.2d at 600.

\textsuperscript{15} See Gorieb v. Fox, 274 U.S. 603, 604-05 (1927) (sustained over taking claim); V. Woerner, Annotation, Validity of Front Setback Provisions in Zoning Ordinance or Regulation, 93 A.L.R. 2d 1223 (1964).


\textsuperscript{18} Kushner, Apartheid in America, supra note 2, at 44-52.


II. Phase Two—Hyper-Sprawl: 1968-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-1975</td>
<td>White Flight Concentrated Poverty</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the period from 1968 to 1975, urban and regional development was defined by hyper-sprawl.\(^{22}\) Urban centers were developing circumferential highways\(^ {23}\) that circled the city on the edge of older suburbs generating an enormous supply of accessible land to build new housing subdivisions.\(^ {24}\) Along with interstate and state highways, the local highway systems provided the access for a stampede toward suburban development.\(^ {25}\) Also attracted were the big-box retailers,\(^ {26}\) the mega-malls,\(^ {27}\) and the new industrial and office centers that made


up the “edge cities”—some as far as twenty to fifty miles from the old city centers. Farmland disappeared as fast as sales of automobiles increased. During this period, when cities lost jobs because manufacturing shifted to the suburbs, causing cities to lose jobs as well as people. The following figures indicate the eighteen largest cities in America which suffered population losses between 1950 and 1990 (ranked from highest to lowest according to 1950 figures):

New York (from 7,891,957 in 1950 to 7,322,564 in 1990), Chicago (from 3,550,404 in 1950 to 2,783,726 in 1990), Philadelphia (from 2,071,605 in 1950 to 1,585,577 in 1990), Detroit (from 1,849,568 in 1950 to 1,027,974 in 1990), Baltimore (from 949,708

(last visited Apr. 15, 2008) (45,721 shopping centers in the United States account for over half of all retail sales)).


31. Michael E. Lewyn, The Urban Crisis: Made in Washington, 4 J.L. & Pol’y 513, 513-15 (1996) (citing The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1996, at 381, 390, 425 (Robert Farighetti ed., 1995) [hereinafter 1996 Almanac] and The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1954, at 292, 294 (Harry Hansen ed., 1954) [hereinafter 1954 Almanac]) (between the 1950s and 1980s, eighteen of the nation’s twenty-five largest cities suffered a population loss, and by contrast, during the same years, the population of the nation’s independent suburbs gained more than sixty million persons, and in recent years businesses have also followed their employees to the suburbs causing cities to lose jobs as well as people). The following figures indicate the eighteen largest cities in America which suffered population losses between 1950 and 1990 (ranked from highest to lowest according to 1950 figures):
sun belt, the suburban belt, or went offshore, the city became more unattractive and lost its tax base\(^\text{32}\) as retail and businesses moved to the suburbs.\(^\text{33}\) Public services declined in the city as the enhanced suburban tax base generated improved suburban services.\(^\text{34}\) As public schools were faced with broad

in 1950 to 736,014 in 1990), Cleveland (from 914,808 in 1950 to 565,616 in 1990), St. Louis (from 856,796 in 1950 to 396,685 in 1990), Washington, D.C. (from 802,178 in 1950 to 606,900 in 1990), Boston (from 801,444 in 1950 to 574,283 in 1990), San Francisco (from 775,357 in 1950 to 723,959 in 1990), Pittsburgh (from 676,806 in 1950 to 369,879 in 1990), Milwaukee (from 637,392 in 1950 to 628,088 in 1990), Buffalo (from 580,132 in 1950 to 328,175 in 1990), New Orleans (from 570,445 in 1950 to 496,938 in 1990), Minneapolis (from 521,718 in 1950 to 368,383 in 1990), Cincinnati (from 503,998 in 1950 to 364,114 in 1990), Kansas City (from 456,622 in 1950 to 434,829 in 1990) and Newark (from 438,776 in 1950 to 275,221 in 1990).

Id. (citing 1996 Almanac). Of the cities which ranked among the twenty-five largest in 1950, only seven (Los Angeles, Houston, Seattle, Dallas, Denver, Indianapolis, and San Antonio) had a larger population in 1990 than in 1950. \(\text{Id.}\) For example, St. Louis’s population nose-dived from 856,796 in 1950 to 396,685 in 1990, while during the same period suburban St. Louis County’s population soared from 406,349 to 993,508. \(\text{Id.}\) (citing 1996 Almanac). Similarly, Washington, D.C.’s population declined from 802,178 in 1950 to 606,900 in 1990, while the population of suburban Montgomery County, Maryland increased from 164,401 to 757,027 during that period. \(\text{Id.}\) (citing 1996 Almanac and 1954 Almanac); see \(\text{Jackson, supra}\) note 4, at 283; Clarence Lusane, Persisting Disparities: Globalization and the Economic Status of African Americans, 42 \(\text{Haw. L.J.}\) 431, 443 (1999) (observing “Chicago lost 79,744 manufacturing jobs during the 1980s directly due to plant closings and relocations and an additional 106,200 jobs in the city and surrounding areas as reverberations from those initial job losses. In the rest of the state, another 68,000 jobs were eliminated as firms relocated jobs to Mexico’s Maquiladora industries which operate along the Mexican-Texas border.”) (citing \(\text{David C. Ranney & William Cecil, CTR. FOR URBAN & ECON. DEV., TRANSNATIONAL INVESTMENT AND JOB LOSS IN CHICAGO: IMPACTS ON WOMEN, AFRICAN AMERICANS, AND LATINOS 2 (1993)}\)).


33. \(\text{F. Kaid Benfield et. al., Natural Res. Def. Council, Once There Were Greenfields: How Urban Sprawl Is Undermining America’s Environment, Economy and Social Fabric 14 (1999)}\) (stating “around 95 percent of the 15 million new office jobs created in the 1980s were in low-density suburbs,” and suburbs “captured 120 percent of net job growth in manufacturing”); Freilich & Peshoff, supra note 22, at 190-92; Lewyn, Suburban Sprawl, supra note 25, at 302 (stating that jobs as well as people have fled to suburbia); Audrey G. McFarlane, Race, Space, and Place: The Geography of Economic Development, 36 \(\text{San Diego L. Rev.}\) 295, 349 (1999); Anne Gearan, Clinton to Help Needy Own Car, \(\text{Atlanta J. Const.}\), Feb. 24, 2000, at C1 (stating two-thirds of all new jobs are created in suburbs).

34. \(\text{Kushner, Apartheid in America, supra}\) note 2, at 56-63; Emel Gökyigit Wadhwani,


40. Been, supra note 13, at 1110-14; Annette B. Kolis, Citadels of Privilege: Exclusionary Land Use Regulations and the Presumption of Constitutional Validity, 8 HASTINGS CONST. L.Q. 585 (1981); Sager, supra note 17, at 767. See generally AM. BAR ASS’N, supra note 13, at 33-47; Fiscal Zoning, supra note 13, at 33-47; Morris, supra note 13, at 104-07; see also Lundgren,
resulting in the suburbs becoming expensive and following a strict model of attractive, single-family, automobile-based lifestyles. Avoidance of service-demanding, lower-income residents and use of expensive parking conditions and low density zoning discouraged or outlawed the development of suburban apartments. More expensive homes required infrastructure and amenities, and higher quality homebuilders dramatically increased the cost of a home.42

III. Phase Three—Class Segregation: 1975-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-1990 Class Segregation</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Revitalization</td>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the suburbs expanded in size and prestige, housing costs increased. Cost-generating regulation,43 such as exclusionary zoning43 and growth management,45 and a steady demand that inflated land and home prices led to dramatic economic class segregation between city and suburb.46 The poor became concentrated in

supra note 13, at 104-07 (arguing conversion of local zoning to regional planning).


44. Been, supra note 13, at 1110-14; Sager, supra note 17, at 767; see also Lundgren, supra note 13, at 101-03 (arguing conversion of local zoning to regional planning). See generally AM. BAR ASS’N, supra note 13, at 33-47; FISCAL ZONING, supra note 13, at 31-100; MORRIS, supra note 13, at 236-38.

45. KUSHNER, SUBDIVISION LAW, supra note 41, § 4:05 (discussing housing price inflation); Robert C. Ellickson, Suburban Growth Controls: An Economic and Legal Analysis, 86 YALE L.J. 385 (1977); see generally Lawrence Katz & Kenneth T. Rosen, The Interjurisdictional Effects of Growth Control on Housing Prices, 30 J.L. & ECON. 149 (1987).

the city and the affluent in the suburbs. Although minority racial and ethnic groups entered the suburban housing market as part of assimilation, class separation increased.\textsuperscript{47} Neighborhoods became characterized by the average resident income. The most affluent resided in neighborhoods with the best amenities and facilities, such as clean air, access to recreation, and green spaces, or in urban neighborhoods such as the old city center or around university campuses and trendy communities where investment and gentrification displaced the poor. Most of the wealthy, however, settled in the affluent suburbs.\textsuperscript{48} The poor and lower income workers largely resided in poor census tracts in the center city and depressed suburban communities.\textsuperscript{49} During this period, broad efforts to
revitalize attractive city neighborhoods and declining older suburbs also existed.50 Although separated by strict class identity, neighborhoods in the city and older suburbs—and to a lesser extent the newer edge suburbs—reflected an increasingly racial and ethnic diversity and assimilation.51 Such revitalization typically generated gentrification whereby the wealthier new residents and shops displaced lower-income residents52 and locally supporting commercial facilities53 thereby reducing the supply of affordable housing.54 The national strategy to achieve residential equal opportunity through affirmative action and civil rights laws ultimately proved Pyrrhic.55 Minority group members did benefit from employment discrimination laws; more jobs in nontraditional work and the


51. Cashin, Middle-Class Black Suburbs, supra note 46, at 736-37, 740.


56. Jonathan S. Leonard, Antidiscrimination or Reverse Discrimination: The Impact of
professions were opened, and a burgeoning middle class was created. However, housing discrimination laws failed to be administered or utilized to advance racial integration. Voting rights laws, although effective in extending the vote to minority group members, may have had the effect of discouraging assimilation as political power required compact minority communities. Affirmative action was ineffective as it engendered majority public hostility and was limited by conservative courts ruling that racial considerations were largely prohibited in voting district drawing. Limited to a class of victims and group members of proven discrimination in employment and public contracting, limited to the extent of the proven bias, and simply invalidated in the case of housing discrimination. In the housing discrimination arena, most cases were brought

Changing Demographics, Title VII, and Affirmative Action on Productivity, 19 J. HUM. RES. 145, 145 (1984) (arguing that Title VII has played a significant role in increasing black employment).


by individuals. Even where the Justice Department brought litigation, affirmative action remedial obligations were rarely sought.65 Affirmative action in primary, secondary,66 and higher education67 were largely limited and symbolic. Efforts to mandate suburban development of affordable or racially-integrated housing were limited to a few jurisdictions and rarely implemented in


66. See Parents Involved in Cnty. Schs. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1, 127 S. Ct. 2738, 2746 (2007) (The Supreme Court rejected school actions in Seattle, Washington and Jefferson County, Kentucky, that voluntarily adopted student assignment plans relying on race to assign which school children would attend for the purpose of advancing racial integration. Justice Kennedy, however, along with the dissent constitute the majority in identifying diversity as a compelling educational goal. Moreover, the majority recognizes a compelling interest in avoiding racial isolation; race, according to Justice Kennedy and the majority, can be a factor in pursuing diversity in a multi-racial and ethnic society; school districts need not ignore the problem of de facto resegregation in schooling. School boards may pursue the goal of bringing together students of diverse backgrounds and races through other means, including strategic site selection of new schools; drawing attendance zones with general recognition of the demographics of neighborhoods; allocating resources for special programs; recruiting students and faculty in a targeted fashion; and tracking enrollments, performance, and other statistics by race.); Kushner, Government Discrimination, supra note 55, § 8:15; Deborah N. Archer, Moving Beyond Strict Scrutiny: The Need for a More Nuanced Standard of Equal Protection Analysis for K Through 12 Integration Programs, 9 U.PA.J. CONST. L. 629, 640-55 (2007) (arguing for desegregation jurisprudence rather than affirmative action jurisprudence in reviewing voluntary desegregation policies in elementary grades and applying less than strict scrutiny).

67. See Grutter, 539 U.S. at 334-41 (sustaining law school admission policy that considers race and ethnicity among a number of unique characteristics in pursuit of a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body); Gratz v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 244, 271-76 (2003) (rejecting automatic advantage and preference to racial minority applicants to undergraduate college); Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265, 319-20 (1978) (invalidating setting aside of a number of seats for qualified minorities in medical school admission process).
a meaningful manner.  

IV. PHASE FOUR—HYPER-SEGREGATION: 1990-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-2008</td>
<td>Voluntary Separation</td>
<td>Gentrification and Regeneration</td>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth phase, from 1990 to 2008, is hyper-segregation and was marked by voluntary class, racial, and ethnic separation as more ethnic and racially concentrated neighborhoods grew or were established. This is not to say that discrimination has significantly abated but that the dominant force yielding separation is voluntary decisions of members of all races and ethnic groups. One of the most dramatic changes in cities in the 1990s was that most city centers became majority “minority” for the first time in American history.

68. See S. Burlington County NAACP v. Twp. of Mount Laurel, 336 A.2d 713 (N.J. 1975) (unique ruling requiring each community to provide its fair share of affordable housing); see also Sheryll D. Cashin, Building Community in the Twenty-First Century: A Post-Integrationist Vision of the American Metropolis, 98 Mich. L. Rev. 1704, 1719 n.34 (2000) (noting that the racial integration experience of affordable housing in the developing suburbs is disappointing with more than eighty percent of New Jersey’s suburban affordable housing units occupied by whites) (reviewing Gerald E. Frug, City Making: Building Communities Without Building Walls (1999)); Josh Getlin, Home is Where the Hurt Was: After a Bruising Legal Fight, an Affluent New Jersey Town has Housing for the Poor. But It’s Still a Struggle to Keep Doors of Acceptance Open, L.A. Times, Nov. 5, 2004, at A1 (describing how Mount Laurel finally developed an affordable housing project, but one that is a virtual all-minority “project” segregated from the now exclusive highly affluent suburban community).


Neighborhoods increasingly were regenerated through gentrification and the investment of public and private funds. 72 “Between 1960 and 2000, the number of African Americans living in suburbs grew by approximately 9 million, representing a migration as large as the exodus of African Americans from the rural South in the mid-twentieth century. More than one-third of African Americans—almost 12 million people—lived in suburbs.” 73 The divide between many minority communities, which were now in the city and the older suburbs, and the more affluent communities, predominantly in white newer suburbs, became more pronounced 74 despite back-to-the-city moves, 75 investment, the gentrification of attractive neighborhoods, 76 and despite the fact that segregation between blacks and non-blacks is at its lowest level since 1920. 77 Although minorities increased their presence in the suburbs 78 and the affluent were


73. Wiese, supra note 39, at 1.

74. Cashin, Middle-Class Black Suburbs, supra note 46, at 737-41.


76. See Betancur, supra note 52, at 1-8; Freeman & Braconi, supra note 52, at 39; Levy et al., supra note 52, at 238-40; McGee, Seattle’s Central District, supra note 52, at 169-73, 208-22 (describing gentrification and redlining in a traditional minority neighborhood transitioning to a predominantly white enclave).


78. See Malamud, supra note 58, at 969-70, 978-79 (middle-class blacks segregated in older enclave neighborhoods adjacent to central cities); see also Elizabeth D. Huttman & Terry Jones, American Suburbs: Desegregation and Resegregation, in URBAN HOUSING SEGREGATION OF MINORITIES IN WESTERN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES 335, 335-37 (Elizabeth D. Huttman et al. eds., 1991); Douglas S. Massey & Nancy A. Denton, Suburbanization and Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 94 AM. J. SOC. 592, 613 (1988) (noting that blacks are less suburbanized than
returning to certain neighborhoods in the city, the divide between neighborhoods during this period was still characterized by hyper-segregation. Thus, while black-white segregation in metropolitan areas has declined in the past two decades and diversity has increased, the nation must nevertheless be characterized as having a high degree of racial separation. Majority-black suburban neighborhoods generally provide fewer economic opportunities in terms of rising home values and access to good schools and jobs, making it harder for blacks to catch up and keep up financially with whites. In 2005, “the average white person in the United States live[d] in a neighborhood that [was] more than 80 percent white, while the average black person live[d] in one that [was] mostly black.” African Americans are the most residentially segregated group in the United States. Black suburbanization did little to desegregate metropolitan areas, for while the movement of blacks to the suburbs signaled the lifting of the suburban-urban barrier, any optimism about greater residential integration between whites and blacks was short-lived. The suburbs engaged

79. See Betancur, supra note 52, at 1-8; Freeman & Braconi, supra note 52, at 39; McGee, supra note 52, at 167-73, 208-22 (describing gentrification and redlining in a traditional minority neighborhood transitioning to a predominantly white enclave).


in Smart Growth regulatory policies to slow development and reduce sprawl, using approaches such as urban growth boundaries; conservation easement purchases; and, in Maryland’s urban service districts where public subsidies are targeted to designated growth areas and corridors, incentives for infill development, home purchases, and the transfer of infrastructure costs to new


87. See FREILICH, supra note 22, at 15-29, 167-202 (noting the need for Smart Growth policies because of the costs associated with sprawl and describing Smart Growth in counties in Utah, Florida, Colorado, and California); George Galster et al., Wrestling Sprawl to the Ground: Defining and Measuring an Elusive Concept, 12 HOUSING POL’Y DEBATE 681, 687-98 (2001) (offering alternative definitions based on low value density, continuity, concentration, clustering, centrality, nuclearity, mixed uses, or proximity).

88. See Michael Lewyn, Sprawl, Growth Boundaries and the Rehnquist Court, 2002 UTAH L. REV. 1, 4-8 (hereinafter Lewyn, Sprawl) (describing Oregon’s urban growth boundary program); Robert Stacey, Urban Growth Boundaries: Saying “Yes” to Strengthening Communities, 34 CONN. L. REV. 597, 597-609 (2002) (examining the urban growth boundary program in Portland, Oregon).


residents. The result of all of these influences was typically higher cost housing and even greater sprawl as developers often leap-frog jumped over regulating communities to develop even farther out. This period was the time of excessive traffic congestion, air pollution, obesity, diabetes, and

State=21 (last visited Apr. 16, 2008).
93. Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 374, 378 (1994) (invalidating dedication of land for floodplain and pedestrian/bicycle pathway as no individualized evidence that exaction roughly proportional to impact of proposed development); J.W. Jones Cos. v. City of San Diego, 203 Cal. Rptr. 580, 582 (Ct. App. 1984) (sustaining facilities benefit assessment districts where impact fees can be paid for each home at time of building permit application); N. Ill. Home Builders Ass’n v. County of DuPage, 649 N.E.2d 384, 397 (Ill. 1995) (sustaining transportation impact fee);
prohibitively costly health care which was made worse by motor vehicle crashes, the largest cost of care. Smart Growth fell short of its goal; sprawl

over the last three decades and 64.5% of Americans over age twenty were overweight and 30.5% were obese in 1999-2000, up 8% from 1988-1994, while 15% of children aged six to nineteen years of age overweight, a 4% increase); NAT'L CTR. FOR HEALTH STATISTICS, U.S. DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., PREVALENCE OF OVERWEIGHT AND OBESITY AMONG ADULTS: UNITED STATES, 1999-2000, available at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/pubs/pubd/hestats/obese/obese99.htm (reporting that nearly two-thirds of United States adults aged twenty to seventy-four are overweight, and 31% are obese); OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GEN., U.S. DEP’T HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., THE SURGEON GENERAL’S CALL TO ACTION TO PREVENT AND DECREASE OVERWEIGHT AND OBESITY 2001, at 2 (2001), available at http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/topics/obesity/calltoaction/Cal11toAction.pdf (reporting that at least 60% of adult Americans fail to meet the Surgeon General’s minimum targets for physical activity, defined as thirty minutes of moderate-to-vigorous activity most days of the week).


100. Kevin Kinsella & Victoria A. Velkoff, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, AN AGING WORLD: 2001, at 10, 126-27 (2001), available at http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p95-01-1.pdf (reporting America’s population of those older than age sixty-five will double by the year 2030 from 2006); Kushner, Healthy Cities, supra note 97, at 141-51 (noting challenge reflected by rapidly escalating health care costs shows no sign of abating since numerous pressures such as emerging diseases, threats of bioterrorism, new technology and discoveries, shortages of caregivers, increasing life expectancy, immigration, adverse environmental health consequences, and others, all significantly impact the demand for services); NAT’L CTR. FOR HEALTH STATISTICS, U.S. DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., HEALTH, UNITED STATES, 2003—WITH CHARTBOOK ON TRENDS IN THE HEALTH OF AMERICANS 306 tbl. 112 (2003), available at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus03.pdf (reporting taxpayer cost of this rapidly inflating system in 2001 was $1.4 trillion annually); Gerald F. Anderson et al., Health Spending and Outcomes: Trends in OECD Countries, 1960-1998, 19 HEALTH AFF. 149, 150-51 (2000) (noting health care system accounted for 5.2% of the gross domestic product in 1960); Gerald F. Anderson et al., Health Spending in the United States and the Rest of the Industrialized World; Examining the Impact of Waiting Lists and
expanded.\textsuperscript{102} “Rather than disappearing, residential segregation is extending beyond the city limits and adding new colors, and it promises to persist as an American dilemma well into the twenty-first century.”\textsuperscript{103}

This Article was prepared for a symposium and conference celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the enactment of Title VIII. This Author was honored to participate in the celebrations of the twentieth\textsuperscript{104} and thirtieth\textsuperscript{105} anniversaries of


\textsuperscript{101} \textsc{Kushner, Healthy Cities, supra} note 97, at 85-91; \textsc{Kushner, The Post-Automobile City, supra} note 2, at 41-44; Ctr. for Disease Control, U.S. Dep’t Health & Human Servs., \textit{Motor-Vehicle Safety: A 20th Century Public Health Achievement,} 48 MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY WKL. REP. 369, 372 (1999) (noting crashes cost the United States $200 billion annually); \textit{Costs of Treating Trauma Disorders Now Comparable to Medical Expenditures for Heart Disease,} AHRQ NEWS & NUMBERS, Jan. 25, 2006, http://www.ahrq.gov/news/nn/nn012506.htm (reporting agency for Healthcare Research and Quality reports spending for trauma from automobile crashes and violence nearly doubled from 1996 to 2003 to $71.6 billion, the largest component of medical cost involving forty million trauma victims annually as compared to $67.8 billion for heart disease and $48.4 billion for cancer).


\textsuperscript{103} Logan, supra note 81, at 235, 255.

\textsuperscript{104} The Fair Housing Act After Twenty Years, Conference at Yale Law School, New Haven, Mar. 25-26, 1988. See James A. Kushner, \textit{An Unfinished Agenda: The Federal Fair Housing
that enactment. Having advocated the use of Title VIII to achieve the dream of an integrated and colorblind society,\textsuperscript{106} including more than twenty years maintaining a treatise on fair housing\textsuperscript{107} and volunteering as an activist in the fair housing movement,\textsuperscript{108} the Author of this Article is unfortunately ready to declare that the effort was ineffective. It appears that housing discrimination and racial segregation are continuing and largely unabating.\textsuperscript{109} Despite statistical reductions in separation between whites and certain non-white groups, economic, racial, ethnic, and social segregation is still the pervasive geographical pattern, often masked by vague definitions of race such as characterizing ethnic minorities as white for census purposes. In addition to discrimination in sales and rentals, African Americans are denied mortgages and home improvement loans at twice the rate of whites. After forty years Title VIII, although a useful tool for the occasional victim or agency willing to battle the isolated housing provider, never

---


\textsuperscript{106} KUSHNER, \textit{Apartheid in America}, supra note 2, at 37-44; Kushner, \textit{The Fair Housing Amendments, supra} note 59, at 1062; Kushner, \textit{Federal Enforcement, supra} note 59, at 537.


\textsuperscript{108} Fair Housing Congress of Southern California (Chairman of the Board of Directors 1985-86, President 1984-1985, member of Board 1983-1986).

\textsuperscript{109} Robert G. Schwemm, \textit{Why Do Landlords Still Discriminate (And What Can Be Done About It)?}, 40 \textit{J. Marshall L. Rev.} 455, 456-57 n.6 (2007) (Whites were favored over blacks 21.6% of the time and over Hispanics 25.7% of the time. The rate of rental discrimination against Hispanics was actually higher than had been shown in a similar study in 1989, and the 2000 figure for blacks was down only a few percentage points compared to its 1989 counterpart. Additional phases of this study found similar rates of rental discrimination against other ethnic minorities (citing \textit{MARGERY AUSTIN TURNER ET AL., DISCRIMINATION IN METROPOLITAN HOUSING MARKETS: NATIONAL RESULTS FROM PHASE I HDS 2000, at i-iv (2002)})). See \textit{MARGERY AUSTIN TURNER & STEPHEN L. ROSS, DISCRIMINATION IN METROPOLITAN HOUSING MARKETS: PHASE 2-ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS} iv (2003) (reporting that Asians and Pacific Islanders experienced adverse treatment compared to whites in 21.5% of rental tests); \textit{MARGERY AUSTIN TURNER & STEPHEN L. ROSS, DISCRIMINATION IN METROPOLITAN HOUSING MARKETS: PHASE 3-NATIVE AMERICANS} iii (2003) (reporting that Native Americans experienced consistently unfavorable treatment compared to whites in 28.5% of rental tests).

received administrative and enforcement leadership or adequate funding and is
unfortunately a relic of Phase II community development in the United States.

V. TOWARD PHASE FIVE—SMART GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2020</td>
<td>New Urbanism</td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Densification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
<td>New Suburbanism</td>
<td>Tax Sharing</td>
<td>and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The future will be about sustainability, health, and fairness. Smart Growth is growth that supports environmental, economic, and social sustainability. Sustainability refers to policies that allow future generations to enjoy the resources and quality of life of today. Really Smart Growth, as compared to the vague notion of improved urban design that has been advanced and implemented through variations of traditional development patterns, is growth based on urban design for the pedestrian rather than for the automobile. Connectivity through public transport is a critical component. Government priorities must shift to improved public transport, alternative energy sources, and


114. See generally John C. Dernbach, Sustainable Development as a Framework for National Governance, 49 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 1, 3 (1998); see also Beatley & Collins, supra note 111, at 297-99.


efficient building technology, sustainable infrastructure, and agricultural policies. Truly Smart Growth emphasizes public transport, with transit-served urban and suburban communities developing in a model of heightened densification, infill, and access. Urban growth boundaries would be established, and development would focus on infill, brownfields and areas of the city that are lying fallow such as rail yards, former industrial sites, and high-rise farms that involve green architecture.

Despommier of Columbia University suggesting that the future of agriculture may call for urban Skyfarming. The research of Dickson Despommier of Columbia University suggesting that the future of agriculture may call for urban high-rise farms that involve green architecture.


See Kushner, Healthy Cities, supra note 97, at 61-66; Kushner, The Post-Automobile City, supra note 2, at 63-65, 71-75; Kushner, Smart Growth, supra note 94, at 48-61.

See generally Lewyn, Sprawl, supra note 88; Stacey, supra note 88.

parking lots.

New Urbanism, largely led by developers, may influence and shape this phase.\textsuperscript{124} New Urbanism calls for higher density, walkable communities developed at human scale to accommodate and enhance the experience of pedestrians.\textsuperscript{125} Mixed-use higher density community design is an imperative of escalating population, fuel and commuting costs, and the rising cost of utilities that are making the single-family detached home—the icon of the twentieth century—the horse and buggy of the twenty-first century. Smart Growth would utilize New Urbanist designs to create pedestrian-friendly models of the European compact city, street car neighborhoods and suburbs, and the small industrial and mill towns that thrived prior to World War II. Linking destinations through public transit, increasing density, improving accessibility, and choices in the size and cost of homes would stimulate racial and ethnic diversity.\textsuperscript{126} The Portland experience indicates that greater integration occurs if apartments are dispersed and available along convenient transit lines.\textsuperscript{127}

Although the Author remains an unadulterated integrationist, there is reason to question the value of integration and diversity in contemporary American culture. The questions of racial and ethnic cohesion, integration, and assimilation require a very different analysis from the simplistic segregation-integration dichotomy of the twentieth century. Robert Putnam, the author of the best selling book \textit{Bowling Alone},\textsuperscript{128} an inquiry into the reasons for the withdrawal of Americans from community activities and civic participation, has recently published a massive study on the effects of community diversity. His study, which he was reluctant to release given given testing results he was unhappy to find, concluded that the greater the diversity in a community, the fewer people vote,
the less they volunteer, the less they give to charity, and the less they work on community projects. Additional findings were that ethnically and racially diverse neighborhoods lower social capital, generate distrust among neighbors, and increase television viewing. Like myself, Putnam hopes and anticipates that this unsatisfactory phenomenon is transitory on the way to assimilation. Scott Page, a University of Michigan political scientist and author of the book The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies, does not question the Putnam findings but suggests that, despite civic withdrawal, diversity has a positive impact on productivity and innovation because a greater likelihood of solving problems exists when utilizing different ways of thinking among people from different cultures. Another study by economist Edward Glaeser of Harvard suggests that greater ethnic diversity in the United States is the reason for significantly lower social welfare spending in America as compared to Europe. This “diversity paradox,” or simply continued racial hostility, suggests that the politically correct rhetoric that we celebrate diversity fails to reflect the Nation’s beliefs and a serious review of integration and immigration policies should be undertaken rather than avoided. A study by Patrick Bayer, Fernando Ferreira, and Robert McMillan, while finding that the college-educated are willing to pay $58 more per month to live in a neighborhood that has 10% more college-educated households, observed that blacks are willing to pay $98 more per month to live in a neighborhood that has 10% more black households. Thus, African Americans are no more enthralled with integration than whites appear to be. The failure of civil rights strategies to generate class and racial integration argues for higher density, mixed tenure of home occupancy, and income as the more attractive strategy to generate increased class and ethnic integration.

130. Id.
132. See Jonas, supra note 129.
Despite the ostensible lack of enthusiasm for diversity, I believe it is essential to overcome fear, distrust, and the walled metropolis as an essential component of community. Walkable and diverse urban neighborhoods are popular with a wide array of income, age, and ethnic groups suggesting that New Urbanism as a choice for community design will be popular. However, the New Urbanism in this new phase might differ from prior urban design improvement strategies in that it may be market-driven and promoted by developers. Presently, the spread of New Urbanist, walkable communities is constrained by unsound policies that discourage adequately funded public transit and by zoning codes written after World War II that have long ceased to serve health, welfare, or safety. Yet, Putnam’s work would suggest that a dispersed population does not necessarily generate an assimilated, socially cohesive society.

Current tax policies generate quality infrastructure for affluent communities, but inadequate services for those neighborhoods that are not wealthy. Communities segregated by income result in unsustainable and unstable districts housing the poor and prevent stability, economic growth, and regeneration. The antidote may be mixed-income neighborhoods. A regional tax base could further aid in equalizing infrastructure and reducing other barriers to an enhanced quality of life. If accomplished, suburbs would no longer need to compete with one another for retail centers nor exclude apartments. A shared tax base could encourage communities to aggressively pursue Smart Growth, transit-oriented development, and housing densification with sufficient tax proceeds to fund adequate infrastructure. Cities that have lost their tax base could be regenerated in part by conversion to a regional shared tax base. This Article suggests that the United States may be entering a fifth post-World War II phase of community evolution—one of true Smart Growth.

note 85, at 200, 200-12 (finding less diversity with functional specialization although the research is inadequate and the relationship unclear); Rolf Pendall, Does Density Exacerbate Income Segregation? Evidence from U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1980-1990, in DESEGREGATING THE CITY, supra note 85, at 175, 175-99 (acknowledging that density is less important than other factors and arguing that higher density can generate greater class and ethnic segregation as the community becomes more desirable absent additional policies including inclusionary zoning).

137. See e.g., Chad D. Emerson, Making Main Street Legal Again: The SmartCode Solution to Sprawl, 71 Mo. L. Rev. 637, 637 (2006) (using current zoning schemes across America it would be illegal to build classic communities such as Charleston, Savannah, Key West, or Alexandria as well as traditional neighborhoods); Daniel R. Mandelker, Reversing the Presumption of Constitutionality in Land Use Litigation: Is Legislative Action Necessary?, 30 Wash. U. J. Urb. & Contemp. L. 5 (1986).

CONCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASES</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1968</td>
<td>Apartheid</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1975</td>
<td>White Flight</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Sprawl</td>
<td>Concentrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1990</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Revitalization</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2008</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Gentrification</td>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Segregation</td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>and Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2020</td>
<td>New Urbanism</td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Densification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
<td>New Suburbanism</td>
<td>Tax Sharing</td>
<td>and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have seen phases of urban evolution over the past fifty years: The first phase, from World War II until 1968, followed a pattern of decentralization marked by extraordinary investment in suburban infrastructure and strictly segregated, rapid suburbanization. The second phase, 1968 to 1975, was marked by hyper-sprawl as jobs shifted to the suburbs, and the cities lost their population and tax base. The third phase, 1975 to 1990, was characterized by class segregation; the poor were concentrated in the city and the affluent in the suburbs. The fourth phase, 1990 to 2008, can be described as hyper-segregation; voluntary class, racial, and ethnic segregation generated more ethnic and racially concentrated neighborhoods. The observations and lessons learned from reviewing these phases of urban evolution have been that traditional urban infrastructure and land regulation have failed to generate neighborhood class, racial, or ethnic diversity; traditional urban planning and land regulation have rendered the nation more segregated by race, ethnicity, and class; and that civil rights initiatives as well as Smart Growth reforms have failed to generate improved living conditions through urban evolution. Today we are living with the challenges of decentralization, hyper-sprawl, class segregation, and hyper-segregation, and we must address the negative consequences of strategies undertaken and strategies not undertaken during that time. The models of Smart Growth and New Urbanism; policies supporting expanded public transport, health, affordable housing, and walkable, safe, accessible communities; and leadership knowledgeable in these areas could lead to communities that are healthful, satisfying, and more diverse. Smart Growth is growth that supports environmental, economic, and social sustainability. It is growth based on urban design for the pedestrian rather than the automobile. Global warming, climate
change,\textsuperscript{139} and the arrival of peak oil,\textsuperscript{140} at a time when the world’s fossil fuel demand is reaching unsatisfiable levels,\textsuperscript{141} coupled with the increasingly recognized failure of the twentieth century American urban model,\textsuperscript{142} require a new, more sustainable regeneration of neighborhoods and urban community design—one that generates improved access, opportunity, and quality of life.


\textsuperscript{141} See id. at x, 21-40 (projecting that China will require ninety-nine million barrels of oil daily by 2031, compared to the current world production of eight-four million barrels); David Goodstein, Out of Gas: The End of the Age of Oil 15-19 (2004); Richard Heinberg, Power Down: Options and Actions for a Post-Carbon World 17-54 (2004).

\textsuperscript{142} Kushner, Healthy Cities, supra note 97.