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IN AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY PUBLISHED IN 1979, JOSEPH ZIKMUND II and Deborah Ellis Dennis characterized much of the scholarship on suburbia as “fugitive, faddish, and doctrinaire.” In their view too many works are not clearly labeled, and those that are too often address issues of immediate concern that bear little relation to earlier studies and that prompt scholars to bias their findings.1 Yet if we concentrate on those studies considered lasting contributions and add several others published in the 1980s, a coherent core of suburban scholarship emerges. Despite the fragmentary nature of most research, historians, anthropologists, sociologists, and geographers have all attempted to analyze suburban patterns of land use and social class and the mosaic of differing class cultures that these patterns have created.

Although suburban life has a number of visible symbols, such as the detached house surrounded by lawn and the commuter car and freeway system, the assumption that a uniform suburban culture exists has never received much support among scholars, except in a few works published in the 1950s. One of these, The Organization Man (1956) by William H. Whyte,2 proved especially influential, providing an air of authenticity to what Scott Donaldson has called the suburban

1Joseph Zikmund II and Deborah Ellis Dennis, Suburbia: A Guide to Information Sources (Detroit: Gale Research, 1979), xi-xiii. With thoughtful descriptions of over 400 books and articles, this bibliography is an essential reference work for scholars in the field. Works are divided into the following categories: general studies; metropolitan growth and development; community case studies; suburban demography; blacks in suburbia; political considerations; education in the schools; economic considerations; sociological factors: race, housing, and zoning; and new towns.

myth. The myth implies that all suburbs are middle-class, residential communities populated by harried commuters, their frustrated wives, and spoiled children. This view contributes to the humor of Erma Bombeck’s The Grass Is Always Greener Over the Septic Tank (1976). It pervades such novels as Sloan Wilson’s The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit (1955) and Marilyn French’s The Women’s Room (1977). It serves as the basis for Malvina Reynolds’s song, “Little Boxes” (1963),

And the people in the boxes
All went to the university
Where they were put in boxes
And they came out all the same,
And there’s doctors and there’s lawyers
And there’s business executives,
And they’re all made out of ticky tacky
And they all look just the same.

Finally it underlies a parody, “Chicago Suburb,” that appeared in Mad magazine in 1974,

Hog Barbecuer for the World,
School Segregator, Mower of Lawns,
Player with Golf Clubs and the Nation’s Wife Swapper;
Bigoted, snobbish, flaunting
Suburb of the White Collars.

Perhaps, as Bennett M. Berger has argued, the suburban myth developed in the post-World War II era because it served the purposes both of the right which loved the suburbs and of the left which loathed them. It did not, however, reflect the complexity of suburban society either in the 1950s or in the decades before or since.

Far more common among serious observers, including myself, is the notion

3Scott Donaldson, The Suburban Myth (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1969). Although its defensive tone now seems dated and although it would be possible to write a new book on the subject based on materials from the 1970s and 1980s, Donaldson’s study provides the one outstanding analysis of both popular and scholarly images of suburbia.


5As quoted in Donaldson, The Suburban Myth, 62.


that while a single class and its way of life might dominate one suburb and even a part of a metropolitan region, other suburbs vary in the class composition and culture of their inhabitants. With the increasing urbanization of suburbia, this view has made its way even into popular magazines. Indeed, *Time* devoted a cover story to the topic, ‘“Suburbia: A Myth Challenged,’” in 1971. Among scholars, however, the view that suburbia consists of very different types of communities dates back to the early twentieth century. This assumption is implicit in Graham R. Taylor’s *Satellite Cities* (1915), which focuses on the conditions of workers in industrial suburbs like Gary, Indiana; Norwood, Ohio; and East St. Louis, Illinois. It is central to Harlan Paul Douglass’s *The Suburban Trend* (1925), which distinguishes among “‘industrial,’” “‘residential,’” and “‘mixed’” suburbs; “‘workers’ suburbs and bosses’ suburbs,’” and “‘strikingly American suburbs’” and “‘foreign and Negro suburbs.’” And it is a key organizing principle of George A. Lundberg, Mirra Komarovsky, and Mary Alice McInerny’s *Leisure: A Suburban Study* (1934), which divides the major communities of Westchester County, New York into three categories: “wealthy residential suburbs,” “middle class and poor residential suburbs,” and “satellite cities or mixed suburbs.” Thus all of these early observers note the existence of relatively homogeneous local units within heterogeneous suburban regions.

The pioneering research on how this sorting out occurred belongs to a later era of the scholarship on the suburbs, but examines an earlier phase of the migration to them. In *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870–1900* (1962), Sam Bass Warner, Jr., looks at suburban development well before zoning laws and mass builders determined the character of whole communities. Nevertheless, he finds within each of the three suburbs he studies, a striking degree of uniformity of class structure and land-use patterns.

Warner ascribes this cohesiveness to two major causes: the economic requirements of those moving to the suburbs and the economic imperatives of those who built them. He argues, for example, that the strict transportation needs of the lower-middle class restricted it to Boston’s innermost suburbs. Because

---


the work locations of many members of this group changed frequently and because a number of families depended upon multiple employment for their advancement, the lower-middle class required not only linear streetcar transportation but crosstown transportation as well. As a result, this class could move only to limited sites in the suburbs, later than wealthier groups, but in such large numbers that they had to pay a premium for their land. In order to offset the high cost of their land, they converted single-family houses into multiple dwellings, and, subdividing spare lots, erected three-decker tenements, two-family houses, and very small singles. Under these circumstances, Warner explains, the arrival of the lower-middle class in a neighborhood drove out the central- and upper-middle classes who could afford less crowding. As for the builders, Warner shows how the financial pressure of meeting short-term mortgages combined with aspects of their personal backgrounds to produce conformity to popular styles and adherence to neighborhood class patterns. Even though more than 9,000 builders erected the 22,500 new dwellings of Roxbury, West Roxbury, and Dorchester, Warner says that “from the extreme individualization of agency . . . came great uniformity of behavior.” He describes the impact of this admittedly paradoxical process as “a kind of regulation without laws.”

No synopsis of major themes can adequately convey the richness of Streetcar Suburbs. Based on extensive research in such sources as city directories, real estate deeds, building permits, and transit records, the book contains numerous charts, tables, and maps that support Warner’s text without encumbering it. In addition, there are sixty-six photographs, many taken by the author himself, that portray shifts in architectural style and differences in the type and scale of houses for members of varying income groups. Yet while Warner is sensitive to the telling detail, he is alert to the broadest implications of his subject. Because suburbanization broke down patterns of ethnic discrimination and brought improved living conditions to half the population of the metropolis, Warner sees it as having benefited society at least in the short-run. Yet once most suburbs—unlike Roxbury, West Roxbury, and Dorchester—began to resist annexation to the city proper, then the existence of politically independent units segregated by class undermined the sense of there being “one great city,” created barriers of mutual fear, and prevented the people of the metropolis from uniting to solve their problems.12

If some of Warner’s conclusions sound commonplace today, it is because this book, written a generation ago, helped create the accepted wisdom. Yet while widely applauded, the book’s theories were little tested. Only recently have a few historians begun to analyze whether Warner’s arguments seem valid in other settings, and as is often the case, these scholars arrive at different conclusions.

---

11Warner, Streetcar Suburbs, 56-58, 117.
12Ibid., 157, 163-68.
For example, Robert J. Jucha finds that the evidence for the Shadyside district of late-nineteenth-century Pittsburgh substantiates Warner’s view that the multiplicity of participants in the building process helped produce neighborhoods segregated by class and uniform in architectural appearance. Timothy J. Sehr, however, looking at three suburbs of Indianapolis, takes issue with Warner’s argument. Sehr credits the decisions of the founders of Irvington, Brightwood, and Woodruff Place—rather than economic forces and shared class values—with determining the distinctive layout and class appeal of each of these neighborhoods. Yet though Sehr’s Gilded Age focus is chronologically similar to Warner’s and Jucha’s, it is technologically awry. Irvington, Brightwood, and Woodruff Place were founded before the advent of streetcar service in Indianapolis. As Sehr says, this fact helps correct the misimpression that suburbanization began with the invention of the streetcar. Yet it also throws off the comparability of his study, for he is focusing on a period when suburbanization was not as intense. Still, with its analysis of three suburbs—one upper-class, one middle-class, and one working-class, this is an exceptionally ambitious and interesting article. Sehr’s discussion of articles of incorporation, plat maps, and real estate covenants goes far to explain how homogeneous neighborhoods developed in a varied suburban setting.13

Another author who has built on the insights of Streetcar Suburbs is Ronald Dale Karr. Looking at the Boston suburb of Brookline, Karr explains why it evolved into a more elite community than the suburbs Warner studied, located just to the south. According to Karr the upper-middle-class background of most developers, their willingness to adopt restrictive covenants, and a local tradition of elite rule and activist government worked to modify the influence of market forces in Brookline.14 With regard to the last point, Karr shows how, even before extensive regulation of building, a town exerted pressure on developers. If the town selectmen considered a subdivision to be below standard, they could create costly delays by withholding connection of the tract to the town’s water, sewerage, street lighting, and gas systems. This occurred in the case of John J. McCormack’s attempt to sell one hundred building lots of five thousand to seven thousand square feet, proportions deemed too small for their location next to the country club. A more modest subdivision, promoted by two other Irish Catholics but located near a streetcar barn, was accepted by the selectmen, however. Not even elite


Brookline could insist on expensive development in substandard locations. As these comments suggest, Karr’s article illumines the building patterns, political pressures, status differences, and ethnic antagonisms that prevailed in Brookline and, we surmise, similar communities.

In addition to the analyses of nineteenth-century suburbs, the historical literature includes two books and an article that examine communities that developed in the twentieth century. One of these is Zane L. Miller’s study of Forest Park, a community whose history could not be further from that of Warner’s streetcar suburbs. Rather than thousands of participants in a building process that followed unconscious patterns, Forest Park had one developer, the Warner-Kantner Corporation, which proceeded according to a series of plans. Yet the growth of Forest Park was not the straightforward matter we might assume. Instead many participants influenced the shape of the corporation’s plans, and many factors affected their income.

As befitted an area originally intended as part of the greenbelt program of the New Deal, the plans for Forest Park aimed for a balance in industrial, commercial, and residential development. Yet while all of the parties interested in Forest Park’s future agreed on this premise, they disagreed on the amounts of land to be allotted for various uses and particularly on the provision for multifamily, as opposed to single-family housing construction. In other words, they differed regarding the mixture of income groups in Forest Park’s population. Throughout the book Miller effectively describes the clash of interests among planners, developers, citizens, and municipal officials, but his analysis becomes especially absorbing in the chapters on the 1970s, when issues of class and race combined with the impact of inflation and a downturn in the housing market to aggravate the differences among groups in the community.

As these comments suggest, Miller’s book emphasizes the role of urban planning in Forest Park. Nevertheless, it contains useful insights on other issues such as the developers’ early interest in creating a sense of community and the significance of the later establishment of a tax on earnings. Moreover, the work is informed by Miller’s sure sense of broader developments in the Cincinnati metropolitan region, of which Forest Park is a part. Thus the reader is always aware that Forest Park is only one of many new suburbs vying to attract a limited number of clean industries, handsome office complexes, prestigious stores, and middle-class homebuyers wanting to purchase sites on Cincinnati’s circumferential interstate highway.

The intensive uses a community like Forest Park seeks to attract, an older group of more elite suburbs has been anxious to exclude. In “The Enduring Affluent

Suburb” (1980), historical geographer Elizabeth K. Burns provides an introduction to the ways wealthy residential districts use such devices as local government incorporation, restrictive zoning, traffic planning, and architectural review boards. Her discussion focuses on Hillsborough, on the San Francisco peninsula, with references to Lattingtown on Long Island, Scarsdale in Westchester County, Bryn Mawr on the Main Line, and Montecito near Santa Barbara.

A closer look at the reasoning behind and functioning of these devices can be found in my study, A Sort of Utopia: Scarsdale, 1891-1981 (1983). From early in its suburban history, Scarsdale’s residents had a sense of its being “a high class residential [suburb],...an almost unique community.” To preserve this sense of community identity, they zoned out industry in the 1920s, restricted ninety-seven percent of the area of Scarsdale to the development of single-family houses, and regulated the quality—and indirectly—the cost of construction. Later, when mass-production techniques threatened to open Scarsdale to a cheaper standard of construction, they added minimum acreage requirements and established an ordinance that prohibited excessive similarity of appearance in any neighborhood. Many of the community’s other policies in areas as diverse as sanitation, education, and municipal finance reflected its domination by the upper-middle class. Yet while my study uses local institutions, policies, and events to explicate the character of the community, it also pays attention to discordant elements: the pecking-order of Scarsdale’s subdivisions; the tensions among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews; and the relationship of the servant population to the rest of the community. In addition, my book consistently sets local events in the context of national developments—from progressivism, which was viewed favorably in Scarsdale; to the New Deal, which was loathed; to McCarthyism, which pointed to the liberalism of the majority of Scarsdale’s residents; to the fractures of the 1960s, which ultimately defined the limits of that liberalism. Often these discussions enlarge our understanding of the mood of the era.

Though the residents of Forest Park and Scarsdale differ markedly in their views of commercial and industrial development, they share an affection for the single-family detached house and an aversion to any type of residential development that deviates from it. In Everything in Its Place: Social Order and Land Use in America (1977), anthropologist Constance Perin explores the cultural values underlying such attitudes. Based on extensive interviews with twenty-five people involved with land development, either as public officials or as business executives,
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18Ibid., 15.
19Ibid., 30-42.
20Ibid., 159-65.
and enriched by broad reading in the economics, sociology, and law of American land use, her arguments are always interesting and often persuasive.

The major contribution of Perin’s book lies in its analysis of the renter/owner dichotomy. Even though nearly all Americans are renters at some point in their lives, it is commonly thought that renters “live differently,” “don’t care about the community,” “are socially undesirable,” and are “just keeping afloat [financially].” Homeowners, on the other hand, are seen as good citizens who “take better care of their property” and are “a step up the ladder of social as well as economic standing.” In addition to calling attention to the fallacies behind some of these assumptions, Perin explains the reasons why people cling to them. In her view the very fluidity of American society hardens people who were once renters against the group they came from. Moreover, the very large investment most people have in their single-family houses causes them to oppose changes in the type of dwelling permitted in the community. Such opposition is not always maintained, however. Pointing out the discrepancy between the limited acreage some communities allot for apartments and the actual amount of land they devote to them, Perin suggests that developers often receive zoning variances, not because they bribe municipal officials, but because, given time and some concessions on the part of the developer, the already established residents adjust to the probable changes a new type of dwelling will make. Once allowed the role of “gatekeeper” through the ritual of a zoning appeal, the residents of a community, often as not, decide to “unlatch it.”

24 Perin, Everything In Its Place, 70-72, 77-80.
best single article on the distinctiveness of suburbanization in the United States, Jackson highlights the role of the Internal Revenue Code in financing the growth of suburbia.\textsuperscript{25} By allowing taxpayers to deduct mortgage interest and property taxes but not rent from their income, the code provides, in Jackson’s words a “[staggering] subsidy to home ownership...[that] exceeds by four or five times all the direct expenditures Congress grants to housing.”\textsuperscript{26} Moreover, as Jackson shows in “Race, Ethnicity, and Real Estate Appraisal” (1980), federal programs of long-term low-interest loans have also made it “cheaper to buy than to rent.”\textsuperscript{27} Yet these loans have not been equally available for all sites and all citizens. Rather, “FHA guidelines and actual FHA assistance,” at least to the mid-1960s, “favored new construction over existing dwellings, open land over developed areas, businessmen over blue-collar workers, whites over blacks, and native-born Americans over immigrants.”\textsuperscript{28}

The move to the suburbs of millions of Americans in the 1950s and 1960s, and the sociological literature it spawned, should be reconsidered in the light of these government policies. Especially interesting is the fact that writers who disagree on other matters find that their subjects moved where they did primarily for practical economic reasons. Even William H. Whyte, whose famous study of Park Forest, Illinois, helped create the suburban myth by presupposing a wide gulf between urban and suburban living, says, “The people who went to Park Forest went there because it was the best housing for the money.” Still, Whyte dispenses with this “eminently sensible” concern in a paragraph, devoting the rest of his study to the “significant extra”—a sense of belonging—that Park Forest provided to the transient “organization man” and his family.\textsuperscript{29}

Other sociologists often give extended coverage to the practical economic concerns Whyte passes over so quickly. For example, S. D. Clark, who devotes an entire chapter of The Suburban Society (1966) to “The Choice of a Suburban Home,” finds that the people who moved to the suburbs in the postwar era came from “old established residential areas” in the city, but, he says, “they wanted a house, and the only place they could find a house was in the suburbs.” In Class in Suburbia (1963), William M. Dobriner puts the situation more bluntly. For the newly married veteran, he says, “suburbia...was simply survival and had very little to do with psychological selection or the pursuit of a conscious value.” And in his monumental study, Herbert J. Gans lists the “best house for the money”

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25}Kenneth T. Jackson. “A Nation of Suburbs.” Chicago History, 13 (Summer 1984), 6-25.
\item \textsuperscript{26}Ibid., 17.
\item \textsuperscript{28}Jackson, “Race, Ethnicity and Real Estate Appraisal.” 447.
\item \textsuperscript{29}William H. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man, 313-14.
\end{itemize}
as the major reason why buyers chose Levittown.\textsuperscript{30} The fact that all of these authors agree that housing, not the social environment, attracted people to suburbia lends support to Kenneth Jackson’s claim that federal government programs “hastened the decay of inner-city neighborhoods by stripping them of much of the middle-class constituency.”\textsuperscript{31}

Although the loss of middle-class residents might have had an especially damaging effect on big cities, more than the middle class moved to the suburbs in the 1950s and 1960s. Indeed, the fundamental contribution of the sociological literature of the era was to describe in detail what most serious observers had long assumed—namely, that the culture of suburbs varied according to the class composition of their inhabitants. Again, William Whyte’s \textit{Organization Man} (1956) is a key work, not because the values of Park Forest have turned out to be, as he claims, “harbingers of the way it’s going to be,” but because the intensive neighboring, intensive voluntarism, and intensive conformity he describes are now seen as characteristic of upper-middle-class communities with relatively young populations. Similarly, in \textit{Crestwood Heights} (1956), John R. Seeley, R. Alexander Sim, and Elizabeth W. Loosley have presented not “a study of the culture of suburban life,” as they suggest in the book’s subtitle, but a study of the values of upper-middle-class suburban residents. Neither Bennett W. Berger’s \textit{Working-Class Suburb} (1960) nor William M. Dobiner’s \textit{Class in Suburbia} (1963) require any change of title. The former, challenging Whyte’s assertions about the impact of the suburban environment, shows how a group of auto workers, transferred from an urban to a suburban location, retained their political and religious identities and their working-class culture. The latter contrasts certain aspects of life in a recently built, increasingly working-class suburb—Levittown, New York—to an established community turned upper-middle-class suburb—“Old Harbor” (really Westport), Connecticut.\textsuperscript{32}

Undoubtedly the most important work in this group is Herbert J. Gans’s \textit{The Levittowners} (1967). Based largely on the author’s experiences as a participant-observer in this New Jersey suburb, and supplemented by interviews, surveys, and broad reading, the book describes how Levittown evolved from the plans of its developers, through building and settlement, to the emergence of local institutions such as churches, schools, and political parties. As the subtitle suggests, this book analyzes “the ways of life and politics” in a single suburban community, not the way of life in all suburbs. Although, at the time of Gans’s study, the


\textsuperscript{31}Jackson, “Race, Ethnicity, and Real Estate Appraisal,” 433.

predominant culture in Levittown was lower-middle class, some residents were working-class in occupation and lifestyle, and a few upper-middle class. Gans’s shrewd observations allow him to compare the values and experiences of these three groups within a common community setting.33

Since the publication of The Levittowners, sociologists have turned away from suburban community studies and the subject of the quality of suburban life to examine the experiences of racial and ethnic minorities in the suburbs, the impact of suburban policies on the central city, and the question of change versus persistence in the status of suburban communities.34 Of these topics the position of blacks in suburbia has received the most attention from scholars. Indeed, Zikmund and Ellis have devoted two chapters of their 1979 bibliography and subsections of two additional chapters to this and other closely related topics.35 Moreover, scholarly interest in the role of blacks in the suburbs has continued in recent years. The volumes of America: History and Life from 1980 to 1983 list sixteen articles on the subject, and a major study by Purdue University’s John Stahura of blacks in 825 suburbs over thirty years is due out in 1985.36 Most researchers have found that nearly all moves by blacks, including those of the middle class, have been to predominantly black areas. Despite the existence of laws barring discrimination in the sale of real estate, blacks, according to Stahura, number only two percent or less of the population in seventy percent of the nation’s suburbs.

A book that draws on both the community studies of the postwar era and the more metropolitan scholarship of the 1970s is Contemporary Suburban America (1981) by geographer Peter O. Muller. While Muller’s primary interest lies in the process of counterurbanization discussed elsewhere in this issue, he has also
addressed the human consequences of “this momentous transformation.”37 Regarding this topic, Muller’s views are mixed. On the one hand, he criticizes suburban zoning laws and discriminatory practices that limit the access of the poor and blacks to area housing and consequently to the growing proportion of the metropolis’s jobs that are now located in suburbia. On the other hand, he applauds the suburbs for providing “the most comfortable mass-living conditions ever achieved” and doing so for an increasingly heterogeneous population.38 Muller’s book is at its best in discussing the patterned diversity or mosaic culture of contemporary suburbia. Dividing suburban communities into eight categories ranging from exclusive upper-income districts to satellite cities and black spillover suburbs, he argues that these types of communities can be found in metropolitan regions throughout the United States, and he implies that a resident of a metropolitan suburb like Princeton, New Jersey, would be likely to choose a similar suburb—say, Evanston—in the event of a move to Chicago. In addition, Muller calls attention to the recent proliferation of specialized subdivisions such as retirement compounds and singles-oriented apartment complexes. These challenge the old myth of suburbia as a place strictly for families with children.39 Yet in Muller’s excitement over the dramatic urbanization of suburbia that has recently occurred and the intensifying heterogeneity this change has brought about, there is a danger that readers might overlook a fact that Muller acknowledges, but I would stress—namely, the differences that have always existed among suburbs. With the possible exception of black spillover suburbs, the community types Muller describes probably existed in the earliest days of suburbanization; and while retirement compounds and singles complexes might be new phenomena, “old people’s suburbs and young people’s suburbs” existed at least as far back as the 1920s.40 Not only has there always been considerable diversity among suburbs, but it is possible that individual suburbs, especially at the more elite end of the scale, used to be more heterogeneous than they are today. Certainly this was true of nineteenth-century Brookline, where the Irish half of the population worked as day laborers and domestic servants for the upper-middle-class Yankees and upper-class Brahmins. It was also true of Scarsdale in the days before World War II when live-in servants composed eighteen percent of the population and the cost of houses in some neighborhoods was within reach of members of the lower-middle class.41 As for the ethnic diversity of contemporary suburbia, it is likely that what we are witnessing now is merely the latest stir of Sam Bass Warner’s “selective melting pot.”42 Just as second- and third-generation Irish

37Muller, Contemporary Suburban America, x.
38Ibid., 81-114, 15-16, 80-81.
39Ibid., 62-81.
42Warner, Streetcar Suburbs, ch. 4.
succeeded in moving into Roxbury, West Roxbury, and Dorchester in the late nineteenth century, so second- and third-generation Italians and Jews moved to the suburbs in the years after World War II.

To understand the degree to which contemporary suburbia builds on the patterns of the past we need more studies that are both longitudinal and cross-sectional. Michael H. Ebner’s work-in-progress on the evolution of Chicago’s North Shore from 1831 to 1900 is a significant step in this direction. Since his research design takes in not only the eight upper and upper-middle-class communities traditionally designated “the North Shore suburbs,” but also industrial Waukegan, two federal defense installations, and the working-class communities of Highwood and North Chicago, his study promises to provide a sense of both the subtle differences among the eight contiguous suburbs and their relationship to their less affluent neighbors along the shoreline. Ebner’s work, placing the North Shore in its metropolitan context, is just the beginning, however. A study of Fairfield County, Connecticut, or Westchester County, New York, especially in the years since World War II, could tell us much about the urbanization of the suburbs as well as test the selective melting pot theory. The same could be said of studies of any number of suburban counties in major metropolitan areas.

As Kenneth Jackson has shown, suburbia is one of the most distinctive aspects of American society. Scholars seeking to understand the nexus between this nation’s abundant land, democratic ideals, and exclusionary practices can find no better field for study.


44Jackson, “‘A Nation of Suburbs,’” 10-25.