We all are profoundly indebted, and I personally am extremely grateful, to Elizabeth Ellis, Symposium Editor of the Indiana Law Review, for her meticulous, long-term, effective work on this volume and live Symposium. I thank also librarian Richard Humphrey; faculty assistant Mary Ruth Deer; Keith Berlin, the Editor-in-Chief of the Indiana Law Review; Executive Articles Editor Oni Sharpe; Volume 42 Symposium Editor Ellen Hurley; and Editorial Specialist Chris Paynter.

This Article is dedicated to my beloved granddaughter, Cassandra Julieann Roisman, with the ardent hope that she and her contemporaries will mature in a much more just, peaceful, and civilized world than that into which they were born.

1. W.H. Auden, *September 1, 1939*, in *ANOTHER TIME: POEMS BY W.H. AUDEN* 112, 114 (1940). *Cf. EDWARD MENDELSON, EARLY AUDEN* 325-26 (1981) (stating that Auden later omitted this stanza from his collected poetry and still later changed the last line to “We must love one another and die”).

Although the 1968 Fair Housing Act has prohibited residential racial discrimination and segregation for forty years, and the 1866 Act has prohibited them for more than a century, the United States still is characterized by substantial racial discrimination with respect to the sale, rental, and occupancy of housing and by pervasive racial residential segregation. Recognizing this, the Indiana Law Review determined to devote its 2008 Symposium Issue to exploring this matter. The editors invited some of the leading scholars and practitioners in the field to contribute papers and to participate in a live discussion on April 3-4, 2008. We were honored that Theodore Shaw, retiring as Director-Counsel and President of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. and now a professor at Columbia Law School, agreed to open the Symposium with a keynote address and close it with his vision of the future in a “Post-Affirmative Action America.” We also were honored by the willingness of other distinguished researchers, academics, and practitioners to write for this Issue. Most, though not all, were able also to present their papers in April.4

Professor Monroe H. Little, Jr. sets the context for the Symposium with his perceptive tribute to Dr. King. Professor Little writes that Dr. King “has been reduced to a mere dreamer” who allegedly advocated a color-blind society, a “one-dimensional caricature of the real King” who fought against war, white privilege, and economic injustice.5 Professor Little reminds us that the real Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. admonished that “[a] society that has done something special against the Negro for hundreds of years must now do something special for him, in order to equip him to compete on a just and equal basis.” He renews Dr. King’s urging that whites “reject[] . . . white privilege and the normed inequities of the white polity . . . [to] be able to stand together with non-whites in speaking out, struggling against and dismantling the politicoeconomic system of white supremacy” that perpetuates racial discrimination and segregation with respect to housing and all other resources and services.6

One point is common ground for the participants in this Symposium: all...
agree that the Fair Housing Act was intended to end both discrimination and segregation and has not been fully successful in either respect. 3 Margery Austin Turner summarizes the most recent evidence on these topics, showing (among other things) that there still is substantial discrimination against minorities seeking to acquire housing, mortgage loans, and home insurance, and that levels of racial and economic segregation continue to be high, especially in large urban areas with large minority populations. 9 John Powell emphasizes one especially shocking result of the studies: that a particular form of discrimination, steering, “‘does not appear to have decreased since tougher fair housing’” enforcement requirements were imposed by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988. 10 “‘In fact,’ he writes, ‘the incidence of Black/White segregation steering appears to have increased.’” 9, 11 Jeannine Bell provides a chilling discussion of both old and recent cases in which whites used violence to prevent minorities from living in neighborhoods that whites had claimed as their own. 12


9. Turner, supra note 3, at 800-03; see also Julian, supra note 8, at 555-59; Powell, supra note 8, at 620-27.


11. Powell, supra note 8, at 613 (quoting Galster & Godfrey, supra note 10, at 253); accord Turner, supra note 3, at 803-06.

12. See generally Jeannine Bell, The Fair Housing Act and Extralegal Terror, 41 IND. L. REV. 537 (2008). Note in this connection Arnold R. Hirsch, Choosing Segregation: Federal Housing Policy Between Shelley and Brown, in From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth-Century America 206, 209 (John F. Bauman et al. eds., 2000) (quoting Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1944) for the proposition that New Deal programs extended “‘protection’ to areas and groups of white people who were earlier without it’ and stating that “[t]he result was that the emergent sense of entitlement that appeared after World War II embraced not merely the fact of property ownership, but a broader conception of homeowners’ rights that included the assumption of a racially exclusive neighborhood’); see also James W. Loewen, Sundown Towns: A Hidden Dimension of American Racism passim (2005); Thomas J. Sugrue, The Origins of the Urban Crisis 209-58.
Given that the goals of the statute have not been achieved, the obvious questions are: Why not? and What can we do to improve the situation? To what extent and in what ways do we need improved enforcement of the Fair Housing Act? To what extent and in what ways do we need changes in judicial interpretation of the Act? To what extent and in what ways do we need legislative changes in the Act itself? What other kinds of changes are required if we are to eliminate residential racial discrimination and segregation in the United States?

Our contributors provide a basis for answering these questions. They consider the creation of the Fair Housing Act, the inevitable political compromises that marked its enactment, and the consequences of those agreements. They offer a menu of suggested improvements in the battle for truly fair and open housing and access to opportunities.

We begin with an exploration of the relationship between the enactment of Title VIII and the Chicago Freedom Movement (“CFM”) of which Dr. King was a leader.13 Leonard Rubinowitz and Kathryn Shelton conclude that while reactions to the CFM probably contributed to the defeat of federal fair housing legislation in 1966, the CFM—and Dr. King’s assassination—may well have helped to persuade Congress to enact such legislation in 1968.14 The analysis of this legislative activity should inform proposals to amend the Fair Housing Act now.15

---

13. Leonard S. Rubinowitz & Kathryn Shelton, *Non-Violent Direct Action and the Legislative Process: The Chicago Freedom Movement and the Federal Fair Housing Act*, 41 IND. L. REV. 663, 663-64 (2008); see also Julian, supra note 8, at 559 (suggesting that “the difficult compromises involved in securing” the adoption of Title VIII may have caused its relative ineffectiveness); Schwemm, *Discriminatory Municipal Services*, supra note 8, at 756-78 (providing an analysis of the legislative history of the statute, particularly with regard to the two issues Professor Schwemm addresses).

14. See generally Rubinowitz & Shelton, supra note 13. It also is reasonable to infer that Dr. King’s assassination and the riots it caused significantly influenced the Supreme Court in its decision in *Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co.*, interpreting the 1866 Civil Rights Act to apply to private action. See *THE SUPREME COURT IN CONFERENCE* (1940-1985): *THE PRIVATE DISCUSSIONS BEHIND NEARLY 300 SUPREME COURT DECISIONS* 731 (Del Dickson ed., 2001) (referring to the decision as “[a] dramatic reinterpretation of § 1982”); id. at 729 (noting that the Justices’ first discussion of the case in conference took place on the day after Dr. King’s assassination and stating that “[a]s the Justices deliberated, much of Washington, D.C., was beset by violent race riots”). The case was decided on June 17, 1968, less than two weeks after the June 5 shooting and June 6 death of presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy. *WITCOVER*, supra note 2, at 259. The Supreme Court’s conferences on the case, however, were held on April 5 and April 19, before the murder of Senator Kennedy. *THE SUPREME COURT IN CONFERENCE*, supra, at 729-30.

One of the principal problems with enforcement of the Act, identified by several participants, has been the fair housing movement’s “relatively singular focus . . . on individual acts of discrimination.”[16] Margery Austin Turner, for example, reviews studies of knowledge and exercise of fair housing rights. She reports that most people seem to know what rights are established by fair housing laws, but “most people who experience discrimination fail to act.”[17] “Only 1% of the people who believed that they experienced discrimination went to a fair housing group; 1% filed a complaint with a government agency; and 2% consulted a lawyer.”[18] Most of these people thought that complaining “would not have been worth the effort . . . or . . . would not have helped” much.[19]

Such findings as these show that reliance on individual complaints cannot be expected to lead to the elimination of residential racial discrimination and segregation.[20] Turner prescribes more enforcement that does not rely on complaints from individuals, such as increased government funding for “proactive paired testing” of housing providers, lenders, brokers, and insurance providers.[21] Similarly, John Powell urges the Department of Justice to increase testing, “pattern or practice” claims, and all forms of housing enforcement, noting that in recent years the Department of Justice has filed far fewer cases than in the past.[22] Others have proposed structural changes in the statute.[23]

Robert Schwemm, John Relman, and John Powell address judicial enforcement of the Fair Housing Act.[24] As Professor Schwemm reminds us,

---


17. Turner, supra note 3, at 803-06.
18. Id. at 805.
19. Id. at 806 (citing MARTIN D. ABRAVANEL, U.S. DEP’T OF HOUS. & URBAN DEV., DO WE KNOW MORE NOW? TRENDS IN PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE, SUPPORT AND USE OF FAIR HOUSING LAW 36 (2006)).
20. Id. (citing ABRAVANEL, supra note 19, at 36-37); see also TOI DERRICOTTE, THE BLACK NOTEBOOKS 67 (1997) (describing the decision of sophisticated victims of discrimination not to challenge it).
24. See Boger, supra note 21, at 1601-15 (proposing a federal “fair share” plan to promote residential racial integration).
25. See Schwemm, Discriminatory Municipal Services, supra note 8; John P. Relman,
although the Supreme Court in the past admonished that the Fair Housing Act implements "a policy that Congress considered to be of the highest priority," and that [the Act] should be given a "generous construction,"26 some post-1968 presidents have appointed to the federal bench many who are not proponents of civil rights, so that "the modern federal judiciary has grown so hostile to civil rights that decisions narrowing the coverage of the Nation’s anti-discrimination laws have become the norm."27

Against this background, Professor Schwemm analyzes two important issues being re-interpreted by conservative federal courts. The first issue is whether homeowners in a predominantly Black neighborhood may maintain claims under the Fair Housing Act if municipal services provided to them are grossly inferior to the services provided to white neighborhoods.28 The Fifth Circuit held in Cox v. City of Dallas, Texas29 that such suits may not be maintained under the Fair Housing Act, except perhaps where the lack of services constitutes constructive eviction.30 The second issue is broader—whether people already in their homes, as distinguished from people who are seeking homes, ever have claims cognizable under the Fair Housing Act.31 In Halprin v. Prairie Single Family Homes of Dearborne Park Ass’n,32 the Seventh Circuit held that they do not.33 Professor Schwemm, after a detailed examination of other cases involving these issues and the language, legislative history, and administrative interpretation of the 1968 Act, concludes that the analyses in Cox and Halprin "are so flawed—and . . . have so misconstrued § 3604(b) of the [Fair Housing Act]—that they should be rejected by other federal and state courts."34

Both John Relman and John Powell write about the application of fair housing principles to the predatory lending crisis.35 Relman urges the use of "creative litigation strategies to break down barriers to spatial and racial mobility, and shore up transitional minority neighborhoods struggling to hang on
in the face of rising foreclosures.  His article focuses on litigation in which he represents the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Maryland, in a suit challenging a major lender “for targeting [Baltimore’s] minority communities for discriminatory lending practices that [Baltimore] alleges have resulted in unnecessarily high rates of foreclosure.” Powell writes about both the Baltimore suit and litigation in Cleveland that invokes public nuisance doctrine against those it charges with responsibility for the foreclosure crisis in that city. Powell’s article discusses the background to and theory of the suit and concludes with consideration of “the implications that the remedies sought by Baltimore have for the broader struggle to promote integration.”

The “broader struggle to promote integration” provides the basis for substantial and important discussion among the contributors. Several write about the importance of achieving both racial and economic integration. Margery Austin Turner reports on recent studies that show that residential segregation severely limits access to economic opportunity with respect to employment, education, and home values. The merits of residential racial and economic integration are documented also by James E. Rosenbaum and Stefanie DeLuca, who discuss some of the lessons to be learned from two major programs that have allowed poor families of color to move to neighborhoods with less poverty—the Gautreaux Housing Mobility Program and the Federal Moving to Opportunity (“MTO”) experiment. The Gautreaux program enabled poor, Black families living in or eligible for Chicago public housing to move to predominantly white, suburban communities outside Chicago where schools, employment opportunities, and safety were much better than in city neighborhoods. MTO allowed some public housing families to move to areas with less poverty, though the areas still might be predominantly minority. Many of the MTO children attended “schools in the same school district (often the same schools), and even when they changed schools, the new schools were not much better than the original schools.” Continuing more than

36. Relman, supra note 25, at 630.
38. Powell, supra note 8, at 620-27.
39. Id.
40. Turner, supra note 3, at 809-13 (noting, inter alia, that “high levels of segregation have been shown to increase high school drop-out rates among blacks, reduce employment among blacks . . ., and widen the gap between black and white wages”).
42. Id. at 654; see also Powell, supra note 8, at 616-17 (stating that there no longer is a clear division between suburbs with high opportunities and central cities with low opportunities, because more poor people live in the suburbs than in the cities).
43. Rosenbaum & DeLuca, supra note 41, at 660. For more information about MTO, see
two decades of research, Rosenbaum and DeLuca describe both quantitative and qualitative studies, concluding that “[t]he Gautreaux findings suggest that it is possible for low-income black families to make permanent escapes from neighborhoods with concentrated racial segregation, crime, and poverty and that these moves are associated with large significant gains in education, employment, and racially integrated friendships, particularly for children.”

They also describe research they believe should be undertaken to explore further the possibilities of these housing mobility programs. That the results of MTO were less encouraging than the results of the Gautreaux program strongly suggests the importance of using race-conscious remedies. As Justice Blackmun wrote in 1978, “[T]o get beyond racism, we must first take account of race.” Julian criticizes the use of MTO research “to argue against policies that support racial and economic integration” and states that this use of the research “reflects less a policy concern that housing mobility will not succeed than a political concern that it will.”

These articles make a strong case for the development of more housing mobility programs designed to promote racial as well as economic integration. Margery Austin Turner builds on this by recommending specific incentives for pro-integrative moves, including downpayment assistance, low-interest loans, equity insurance, and improvements for schools, police protection, and recreational and other facilities in integrated neighborhoods. These articles make a strong case for the development of more housing mobility programs designed to promote racial as well as economic integration. Margery Austin Turner builds on this by recommending specific incentives for pro-integrative moves, including downpayment assistance, low-interest loans, equity insurance, and improvements for schools, police protection, and recreational and other facilities in integrated neighborhoods.


45. Rosenbaum & DeLuca, supra note 41, at 661-62.


47. Julian, supra note 8, at 563.

48. Id. at 564.

49. Turner, supra note 3, at 815-16.
and perpetuated discrimination and segregation, including “federal homeownership assistance, public housing, urban renewal, and exclusionary zoning and land use regulations.” Julian writes about the HOPE VI public housing program, which has been used to exacerbate racial segregation, and urges that it be redesigned to satisfy the statutory directive that HUD “affirmatively further” the purposes of the Fair Housing Act. Both she and John Powell focus on the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (“LIHTC”) program, administered by the Treasury Department and state housing finance agencies, urging that it be administered in a way that promotes residential desegregation. Julian also discusses the importance of land use regulation as a tool of racial exclusion. To redress the segregatory effect of past zoning and other land use strictures, and to turn such controls into tools for residential integration, we must look to federal and state rather than local governance of land use, so that decisions are made on the basis of the general welfare rather than on the basis of the perceived welfare of a small, self-centered community. Inclusionary zoning ordinances hold much promise as tools for promoting economic and racial inclusion.

Two articles provide broad visions of the past forty years and proposals for the future. In one, James Kushner surveys urban evolution in the United States from 1945 through 2008, identifying four past phases, the most recent (1990-2008) characterized by the hypersegregation named by Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton in their seminal book, American Apartheid. Kushner hypothesizes that the United States may be entering a fifth phase of “Smart

50. Id. at 807 n.66.
51. Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3608(d), 3608(e)(5) (2000); Julian, supra note 8, at 566-69; see Roisman, supra note 15, at 353-68 (discussing the meaning of the “affirmatively further” obligation).
52. Julian, supra note 8, at 569-71; see also Powell, supra note 8, at 618-20; Myron Orfield, Racial Integration and Community Revitalization: Applying the Fair Housing Act to the Low Income Housing Tax Credit, 58 Vand. L. Rev. 1747 (2005); Florence Wagman Roisman, Mandates Unsatisfied: The Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program and the Civil Rights Laws, 52 U. Miami L. Rev. 1011 (1998).
53. Julian, supra note 8, at 571-73; see also Kushner, supra note 23, at 602 (noting that “traditional urban planning and land regulation have rendered the nation more segregated by race, ethnicity, and class”); Powell, supra note 8, at 614 (discussing inclusionary zoning).
54. See Village of Euclid, Ohio v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365, 390 (1926) (“It is not meant by this, however, to exclude the possibility of cases where the general public interest would so far outweigh the interest of the municipality that the municipality would not be allowed to stand in the way.”); Florence Wagman Roisman, Opening the Suburbs to Racial Integration: Lessons for the 21st Century, 23 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 65, 95-98 (2001).
56. See generally Kushner, supra note 23.
57. Massey & Denton, supra note 3.
Growth.”  Kushner, while emphasizing that he “remains an unadulterated integrationist,” identifies three developments that he says provide “reason to question the value of integration and diversity in contemporary American culture.” These are (1) a study showing that some Black people prefer neighborhoods in which other Black people live, (2) a study by Edward Glaeser and Joseph Gyourko suggesting “that greater ethnic diversity in the United States is the reason for significantly lower social welfare spending in America as compared to Europe,” and (3) reports about recent research by Professor Robert Putnam, who writes that “[i]n the short to medium run, . . . immigration and ethnic diversity challenge social solidarity and inhibit social capital.”

In the other article, Betsy Julian takes us back to the 1968 Kerner Commission report, whose “basic conclusion” was that “[o]ur nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.” The Commission warned that “[t]o continue present policies is to make permanent the division of our country into two societies; one, largely Negro and poor, located in the central cities; the other, predominantly white and affluent, located in the suburbs and in outlying areas.” Responding to the concerns expressed by the Kerner Commission, the Fair Housing Act was designed to undo racial and economic segregation and “to address the twin evils of Jim Crow: separate and unequal.” That effort produced two movements, she writes—fair housing and community development—but each came to focus on only one of the evils and therefore ended by perpetuating both. Her call is for “advocates from the fair housing and community development movements [to] overcome their longstanding divide” in order to end both evils at which the Kerner Commission Report and the Fair Housing Act were aimed.

59. Id. at 599.
60. Id.
64. REPORT OF THE NAT’L ADVISORY COMM’N ON CIVIL DISORDERS 1 (1968) (commonly known as the Kerner Commission Report). The Commission was appointed by President Johnson in 1967 to investigate the causes of civil disorders.
65. Id. at 22.
66. Julian, supra note 8, at 558.
67. Id. at 557-58.
68. Id. at 565.
As Julian details, the struggle for racial and economic integration has been “both socially uncomfortable and politically difficult,” leading many to seek to avoid it.⁶⁹ She points out that current legal and academic developments have “reinvigorated those who would argue that the goal of an integrated society is utopian at best and undesirable or even illegal at worst.”⁷⁰ She refers principally to the Supreme Court’s decision in the Seattle and Louisville voluntary integration cases,⁷¹ to the use of MTO research results to cast doubt on the successes of Gautreaux, and to commentary about Professor Putnam’s research.⁷²

The anti-integration attacks cited by Kushner and Julian focus our attention on a fundamental problem with achieving the goals of the Fair Housing Act: that many people who possess—or perceive that they possess—power and privilege do not support any action they fear might reduce their power and privilege. As Margery Austin Turner reports, “considerable evidence suggests that the fears of white people perpetuate neighborhood segregation,” the fears being “that an influx of minorities into their neighborhood will inevitably lead to a downward spiral of declining property values, rising crime, and white flight.”⁷³

There are dispositive responses to each of the anti-integration arguments cited by Kushner and Julian. As to “Black preference,” while there is no doubt that some Blacks demonstrate a preference for neighborhoods with significant Black occupancy, it also still is true that, as Kenneth Clark noted decades ago, because Blacks well know that they will meet hostility in many white neighborhoods, no study can show what Blacks would choose if they were truly free to make a choice.⁷⁴ Moreover, virtually all studies agree that Black choice

---

⁶⁹. Id. at 556.
⁷⁰. Id. at 561.
⁷². Julian, supra note 8, at 561 (discussing Parents Involved in Cnty. Schs., 127 S. Ct. 2738); id. at 563-65 (discussing MTO and Gautreaux); id. at 562 (discussing Putnam’s research).
⁷³. Turner, supra 3, at 814.
⁷⁴. See KENNETH B. CLARK, DARK GHETTO: DILEMMAS OF SOCIAL POWER 234 (1965) (stating that “many liberal whites believe that Negroes prefer to live together. . . . No one will ever, in fact, know whether Negro culture does bind its members together until Negroes have the freedom others have to live anywhere”); accord SHERRYL Cashin, THE FAILURES OF INTEGRATION: HOW RACE AND CLASS ARE UNDERMINING THE AMERICAN DREAM 17 (2004) (“Knowing the history of discrimination and hostility against them, it is not surprising that many blacks would consider an overwhelmingly black neighborhood more attractive than an overwhelmingly white one.”); Sheryll Cashin, Dilemma of Place and Suburbanization of the Black Middle Class, in THE BLACK METROPOLIS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: RACE, POWER, AND POLITICS OF PLACE 87, 89 (Robert D. Bullard ed., 2007) (stating that middle-class Black families “are frequently forced to choose between a black enclave that comes with some costs but provides a spirit-reviving balm against the stress of living as a black person in America, or a community that offers a wealth of opportunities and benefits but where they would be vastly outnumbered by whites, a kind of integration they may not want” (footnotes omitted)); see also Bell, supra note 12, passim; John O. Calmore, Spatial Equality and the Kerner Commission Report: A Back-to-The-Future Essay, 71 N.C. L. REV. 1487, 1492 (1993) (“offer[ing] a critique of residential integration as tokenistic,
is a relatively small part of the explanation for residential racial segregation.  

As to the point that the goal of racial integration reduces the amount of money spent on social programs, this is not a surprise; indeed, it is part of the problem for which integration is a solution. As Betsy Julian writes, the white majority in the United States long has offered a deal with the Devil—if advocates for social justice want resources devoted to social programs, they will have to allow those programs to be racially separate. But history and social science show that separate is inherently unequal with respect to housing, healthcare, recreation, and the environment—with respect to everything, not simply with respect to education. This is precisely why Julian urges that those concerned with improving the housing and neighborhood conditions of Blacks and other minorities insist upon recognition that the origins of and solutions for those problems lie in race consciousness.

The story of the reports about the Putnam research provides a particularly important object lesson for us. The Putnam research is about diversity created by immigration, not by racial difference, and its methodology and conclusions, though only preliminary, have been the subject of significant criticism. Robert
Putnam himself has emphasized that "[i]ncreased immigration and diversity are not only inevitable, but over the long run they are also desirable. Ethnic diversity is, on balance, an important social asset . . . ." He cautions that "[i]t would be unfortunate if a politically correct progressivism were to deny the reality of the challenge to social solidarity posed by diversity. It would be equally unfortunate if an ahistorical and ethnocentric conservatism were to deny that addressing that challenge is both feasible and desirable."

Nonetheless, precisely what Professor Putnam has warned against has happened: his article has been seized upon as a purported justification for rejecting the goal of integration. David Brooks wrote in the New York Times: "[I]t could be the dream of integration itself is the problem. It could be that it was like the dream of early Communism—a nice dream, but not fit for the way people really are." And David Brooks is not alone. As Professor Kushner reported, other "opinion makers" used the Putnam article as a basis for challenging the goal of integration. The New York Times Magazine recently gave more credence to this idea, citing the Putnam research and reporting the suggestion "that living in close proximity to other races—sharing industries and schools and sports arenas—actually makes Americans less sanguine about racial harmony rather than more so."

This campaign against integration is not an accident. The identification of integration with Communism is not an accident. These articles all reflect a broad-ranging attack on the goals of integration, an attack in every forum—courts, legislatures, agencies, media, and, most importantly, the public mind. David Brooks speaks for this campaign when he writes: "[M]aybe integration is not in the cards. Maybe the world will be as it’s always been, a collection of insular compartments whose fractious tendencies are only kept in check [sic] by constant maintenance."

---

forthcoming book by Sheila Suess Kennedy analyzes the Putnam findings and questions their persuasiveness. SHEILA SUESS KENNEDY, DISTURST, AMERICAN STYLE: DIVERSITY AND OUR CRISIS OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE (forthcoming 2009) (manuscript on file with Indiana Law Review) (citing other critical analyses of Putnam’s thesis and pointing out, inter alia, that the fact that increased diversity and decreased trust may have occurred at the same time certainly does not prove that one causes the other; that the vast array of trust-depleting events in the United States suggests that trust would have diminished regardless what happened with respect to diversity; and that “trust” is not the most important quality for us to seek, our democracy being founded not on trust but on distrust—distrust expressed in such doctrines as checks and balances, separation of power, and federalism).

79. Putnam, supra note 63, at 138.
80. Id. at 165; see also Xavier de Souza Briggs, On Half-Blind Men and Elephants: Understanding Greater Ethnic Diversity and Responding to “Good-Enough” Evidence, 19 HOUSING POL’Y DEBATE 218 (2008).
82. Kushner, supra note 23, at 599.
84. Brooks, supra note 81.
As Betsy Julian says, however, none of this can justify abandoning our efforts to achieve an inclusive community. She poses the central question: “Can we continue to honor the principles of our Constitution and laws, and acknowledge the mistakes of our past, if we embrace segregation as a goal for our future?”

The answer to her question is and must be: No. Racial and economic integration must continue to be our goal, and we must do much better at reaching that goal. This certainly requires better enforcement of the Fair Housing Act and a return to the generous, remedial interpretations of the Act by the courts. It would be aided by structural improvements in the Act itself. But the most fundamental changes need to be made in our own understandings of the moral and practical evils that segregation causes. How can this be achieved? Turner prescribes education to overcome fears and stereotypes. Schwemm, in an earlier article, discussed the importance of changing our national attitudes and, in the article for this Symposium, shows that integration itself can be a cure for discrimination and segregation, for when people do live together they learn to move beyond stereotypes. Strong leadership unquestionably is another and very important way of promoting and achieving integration. Each of us, in many ways, individually and institutionally, with research and advocacy and art, with courage and perseverance, with imagination and creativity and determination, must devise new and ever more effective ways to achieve the goal of truly open and integrated communities. We must heed the call of Langston Hughes:

America!
Land created in common,
Dream nourished in common,
Keep your hand on the plow! Hold on!
If the house is not yet finished,
Don’t be discouraged, builder!
If the fight is not yet won,

85. Julian, supra note 8, at 562; see also Kushner, supra note 23, at 601 (stating that he “believe[s] it is essential to overcome fear, distrust, and the walled metropolis as an essential component of community”).
86. Turner, supra note 3, at 815-16.
87. Robert G. Schwemm, Why Do Landlords Still Discriminate (and What Can Be Done About It)?, 40 J. Marshall L. Rev. 455, 500-07 (2007); but see Bai, supra note 83, at 16 (stating that “those living in the shadow of postindustrial atrophy seem to have a harder time detaching from enduring stereotypes”).
88. See generally Schwemm, Discriminatory Municipal Services, supra note 8.
Don’t be weary, soldier!
The plan and the pattern is here,
Woven from the beginning
Into the warp and woof of America:

ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL.

NO MAN IS GOOD ENOUGH
TO GOVERN ANOTHER MAN WITHOUT
THAT OTHER’S CONSENT.

BETTER DIE FREE,
THAN LIVE SLAVES.

Who said those things? Americans!
Who owns those words? America!

Who is America? You, me!
We are America!
To the enemy who would conquer us from without,
We say, NO!
To the enemy who would divide
and conquer us from within,
We say, NO!

FREEDOM!
BROTHERHOOD!
DEMOCRACY!

To all the enemies of these great words:
We say, NO!"}

To paraphrase W.H. Auden, we must all live together, or die—spiritually, if not literally."