Article

Community Prejudice Is Also to Blame: Significant Causes and Effects of Residential Segregation in St. Louis

Tesa Rigel Hines[1]

Abstract

Recent discourse has emphasized the legal causes of racial segregation in the development of cities such as St. Louis, Missouri. Before and alongside these laws were a long history of community prejudicial beliefs, many of which have outlived the laws they produced. Prejudice propelled de facto community decisions made during the development of St. Louis, and later solidified into de jure practices of racial segregation, which ultimately shaped the metropolitan area. De facto and de jure processes of segregation and urban planning also shaped the experiences of black families in St. Louis, especially those living in ethnic enclaves or ghettos. This history of St. Louis provides evidence of the profound racial prejudice within its community, existing parallel to, and beyond laws enforcing racial segregation. This intense community prejudice ultimately formed the context of the race riots in the St. Louis surrounding municipality of Ferguson in 2014.

In our developing nation, racial segregation severely impacted black families and communities, contributing to their intergenerational poverty and many related social conditions. Among scholars, there is a debate over the most substantial cause of residential segregation: community prejudice and accompanying actions, or the policies and laws that ensured that segregation was enforced, especially along racial lines. Recently contributing to this debate is Richard Rothstein's *The Color of Law* (2017), which places less emphasis on the responsibility of de facto community actions resulting in racial segregation, and more emphasis on de jure government policies and law as responsible for segregation.[1]

When identifying de jure factors as the dominant force in the debate about segregation, rarely named in blame are specific community actors, despite the well-documented intergenerational benefits to families who were tied to acts of prejudice in the twentieth century and earlier. The stance of not assigning specific blame has caused a diminished community responsibility to make different choices in the future. A focus on de jure segregation has resulted in an overemphasis of the role and power of discriminatory laws, and a minimization of the community actions and prejudice that accompanied these discriminatory laws.[2]

[1]Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA

Corresponding Author:
Tesa Rigel Hines, Doctoral Program in Public and Social Policy, Saint Louis University, 1 Grand Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63103-2097, USA.
Email: tesa.rigelhines@slu.edu

This article concurs that racial segregation was accomplished primarily through law; however, governmental policy and officials are not solely to blame. The impetus for these prejudicial laws resides within our community, specifically with some of its white members vested with power. Furthermore, de facto and de jure explanations of segregation are complementary, not exclusionary. This article sets the history of racial segregation against the backdrop of the metropolitan St. Louis, Missouri, area to show the interlocked relationship between de jure and de facto segregation. The dominant forces contributing to segregation in each era of St. Louis are considered, alongside the effects of segregation on the lives of community members, some still enduring. The adverse outcomes and intergenerational struggle of many black residents against segregation in St. Louis are a testament to the coinciding influences and strength of both de jure and de facto causes of segregation. Thus, the community must share the blame.

Prejudiced Actions or Law: Which Is Most to Blame?

As our community has become conscious of the potential for policy and law to have ill intent and carry devastating consequences, there has been a willingness to discuss previously off-limits topics such as prejudice, discrimination, and segregation. As an argument of de jure segregation has emerged in the discourse, it has nearly eclipsed the earlier de facto understanding of segregation. Yes, the de jure argument of segregation should have prominence, as it declassifies the role of local, state, and federal governments in ensuring that our communities remained racially "separate and unequal" for as long as possible following the Civil War.[3] Nevertheless, de facto segregation, which exists outside of the law, but includes community actions, is not without power, nor motive, and has prejudice and fear of difference at its core.

De jure segregation was organized, powerful, and effectively destructive, especially with regard to the lives of blacks within urban environments. However, America is a democracy where our representatives are also community members who pursue "the will of the people" through legislation and other forms of policy. The members of government who have produced discriminatory policy, legislation, and judicial rulings over the course of their work do not cease to become community members. In fact, government representatives have a clear duty to represent the interests of their neighbors, whether these interests are fair or prejudiced.

Historically, white male property owners have had consistent access to and control over de jure procedures, and as a result, many of these procedures have benefited whites alone in numerous areas of life.[4] Government agents enact policy and law that represents the interests of their broader community, some of it prejudicial, and as a result, full access to the rights of citizenship, and equal benefit of the government's moral obligations have been denied to some members of our nation. Traditionally, citizens who have not benefited from equal access to national goods or protection of the law have usually been nonwhites and other members of demographic minority or disadvantaged groups.

A People's History of Segregation in St. Louis

Well into the twenty-first century, the scars of segregation in the St. Louis metropolitan area remain. Divisions among the mostly black north and mostly white south sides of the city persist along the boundaries of highways and major streets such as Delmar Boulevard. St. Louis County, which developed during the phenomenon of "white flight," remains separate and unequal in quality from the City of St. Louis, especially its north side. Most of the legal municipalities or suburbs of St. Louis County are wealthy in resources, amenities, property values, and population homogeneity.[5] In many ways, the characteristics of the St. Louis metropolitan area are similar to other urban areas nationwide, each shaped by related de jure processes of segregation prominent in the twentieth century. The characteristics of de facto segregation in St. Louis since its development are somewhat unique, however, and are among the reasons why St. Louis has long been considered one of the most incessantly segregated cities in the nation.

Early Decisions of a Major Metropolis

Attitudes and barriers of segregation before the twentieth century were primarily de facto in nature, in part, because the prejudicial desires and actions of the community carried so much weight that the force of law was not required to overcome resistance to this prejudice. In St. Louis and other cities, stigmatized as problematic were the existence and neighborly presence of families of racial and ethnic minorities, and those in poverty. The prejudicial and biased ways that the broader community has treated these families have contributed to their poor living and working conditions, which, in some cases, have persisted across generations.[6]

For geographic and economic reasons, cities such as St. Louis, Pittsburg, Louisville, and Chicago were frequent destinations for those migrating west at the beginning of the nation's history. The quality of the infrastructure and services provided by each city to its citizens was appealing to many who might not have otherwise lived in an urban environment.[7] Although each city is unique, there were some institutions common to each developing American city, including community associations, businesses, and government bodies, each to meet the complex needs of their population.[8] Unfortunately, some solutions to the problems of developing cities by these institutions have been unfair, corrupt, immoral, and harmful to citizens. The solutions to developing urban cities and populations, whether directly related to segregation or not, may be characterized as de facto or de jure in nature, or a mixture of both types of solutions.

For example, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a housing shortage faced many cities. Volunteer fire departments emerged as fires caused by overcrowding became a regular threat to structures and life in the cities. Police forces developed in early cities, in many cases, reacting to a public fear of blacks, immigrants, and vagrants. Private funding of infrastructure and other services became commonplace.[9] With a minimal civic structure in early cities, crime and social disorders grew, as did initial policy responses that separated the population by class, race, and ethnicity.[10] Community forces shaped new solutions to urban problems of infrastructure, and as formal city governments developed, they took on these initiatives.

Not lost in the spirit of early and developing urban government initiatives were the desire to physically compartmentalize and respond differently to the needs of blacks and other disadvantaged minorities in the growing city. These attitudes of city governments grew out of the proceeding community prejudice and early tendency toward de facto segregation based on race and other demographic categories.

Urban segregation has been a significant component of many developing American cities since their inception. Blacks, while still enslaved, lived with their masters in southern states, and those along the Mason-Dixon Line, like Missouri. Missouri was a slave state, before the Civil War, however, the City of St. Louis was only separated from the free state of Illinois by the Mississippi River, which borders downtown. Even so, in downtown St. Louis, public auctions of black human beings were held on the sites and steps of the State Courthouse, as late as 1861.[11] This courthouse was also a hub of the Underground Railroad and the site of the Dred Scott decision. In many ways, St. Louis was always a focus for expressions of both de facto and de jure racial prejudice, and their resistance due in part to its location and other characteristics.

If free, blacks resided in urban black enclaves that carried a degree of safety for them. Unfortunately, safety was not always guaranteed, as in the case of Dred Scott, who famously sued for, and lost his freedom in a Supreme Court case, partially decided in downtown St. Louis. The legal result of *Dred Scott v. Sanford* (1857) was that blacks born into slavery or whose ancestors were slaves were not citizens, and did not even have the standing to sue in court.[12] This posture of the Court, creating differential citizenship for blacks, has been practiced by some members of the St. Louis and broader community, even now. In Scott's case, ultimately, de jure actions determined his fate of enslavement for most of his remaining life; however, additional southern community de facto support for the maintenance of an institution of slavery undeniably played a part, especially in St. Louis where Scott lived with his family.

The community members who supported slavery also lived in St. Louis, of course, and many necessarily passed down, within their families, their attitudes about the inferior nature of black lives and neighbors within the St. Louis metropolitan region and beyond. As evidence of these lingering views in St. Louis, following the Civil War, the lives of blacks have been highly regulated, through formal de jure mechanisms such as Jim Crow laws, and informal de facto community actions and prejudice that accompanied them.[13]

American urban societies developed hierarchically, with rules, privileges, and obligations assigned to stratified groups, most often based on class, race, and ethnicity.[14] Many de jure and de facto actions subsidized, sanctioned, and ensured the patterns of racial segregation, which linger today.[15] Regardless of their skills or location, after the Civil War, free blacks were often relegated to the worst jobs in each urban economy. Immigrants also faced hardships in accessing appropriate work and housing in developing metropolitan areas, sometimes choosing to own businesses rather than to take on an already established job.[16] Among lower-class and racial and ethnic minority groups, economic stratification perpetuated poverty, and segregation, for generations to come, and as a result, a stable black middle-class did not emerge until the 1980s.[17]

Around the turn of the twentieth century, black migration to northern and border cities and states, including St. Louis, exploded with the Great Migration. In 1900, St. Louis had the second highest black population nationwide. Unfortunately, many former slaves found that they had not escaped segregation and racism with their migration. To prove their point, blacks migrating to St. Louis, over several waves, found that their new home was quickly becoming more racially segregated. During the period from 1910 to 1960, the black population in St. Louis more than tripled, while the white population in the city proper declined steadily with each decade.[18]

Once slavery was made illegal following the Civil War, the integration of blacks into the workplace and broader societies has come slowly, with racial segregation in many activities of life. Blacks have faced involuntary segregation in schools, employment, infrastructure, and housing through both de facto actions by community members, and through de jure Jim Crow laws.[19] Jim Crow laws, or those that require differential treatment of blacks, were not all statutory, and encompassed nearly all areas of black life, restricting their access to education, employment, housing, recreation, services, commerce, and transportation, among others.[20]

An example of the widespread reach of Jim Crow laws in St. Louis are the early attempts to educate black youth in integrated or equally resourced schools in this region, which began in earnest in the 1920s. This movement met with significant resistance, harassment, and violence, primarily de facto in nature, until 1980, when court-ordered desegregation began.[21] In St. Louis and beyond, many social and religious organizations that provided support to the black community developed in response to Jim Crow laws. Among these are the Freemason fraternal organization and segregated black churches with new denominations such as the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) and Baptist Churches.[22]

Biased beliefs and de facto community actions and prejudice about the nature and experience of poverty and racially segregated inner cities caused much of the internal stratification in churches nationwide. The perceived immorality of the inner city and its slums was feared by many moral reformers, although they felt compelled to work there as part of their civic and religious duties.[23] Some moral reforms existed to further "traditional American values," which were based on the exalting of middle-class, rural community lifestyles seen as untainted by the urban environment. Therefore, most moral reforms targeted the poor, immigrants, and racial and ethnic minority groups who were underrepresented in the segregated Church.[24]

Many moral reformers believed that urban growth brought a new way of living, including diversity, overcrowding, and social interactions that many considered immoral, or wished were illegal. Prostitution, gambling, and alcohol consumption were among activities targeted by moral reforms that attempted to utilize the law, but whose implementation was primarily de facto.[25] As fear of immorality and its consequences within the inner city grew, steps were taken within each

developing urban community to restrict the movement of those that resided within. Organized around demographic characteristics were certain neighborhoods in St. Louis and other cities, where blacks, the poor, and criminals were steered systemically. By the early 1900s, the boundaries and inability of some demographic groups to migrate out of the inner city was solidified and even codified with de jure mechanisms. In some instances, violence was used by the police and other community members to enforce resident compliance and the boundaries of ghettos, the inner city, or ethnic enclaves.[26]

Racial Residential Segregation through Prejudice, Policy, and Law

Segregation, especially along racial and class lines, developed as the growing population of historic American cities required structures, businesses, housing, and transportation. Early forms of transportation were only available to the wealthy and allowed them to live farther from their places of work in each city's center. Lower-class families who could not afford transportation had to live close to their workplaces in each city's center.[27] Suburbs formed as early as the 1800s and varied by region in physical design, services, governance, and demographic makeup. However, the bulk of suburbanization and its accompanying residential segregation occurred in the decades around World War II, aided in large part by special funding programs from the federal government, which excluded blacks through law.[28] Reinforced through each city's zoning codes was the segregation of nonwhites.[29] Racial segregation, including that in St. Louis, is a revolting but indelible part of our nation's history and has scarred the sociodemographic and physical landscape in most American cities and suburbs.

The creation of urban enclaves. Particularly on its north side, St. Louis is still home to many ghettos. Although there are multiple uses of the term "ghetto," including those that are flippant, loose, and pejorative, a true ghetto has a specific sociological definition. True ghettos have a poverty rate more than 40 percent, segregation with historical causes, and residents of primarily black race.[30] Communities with similar rates of poverty and population homogenization, with residents of races and ethnicities other than black, do exist, but these communities tend not to be called "ghettos." In this article, communities that have high rates of poverty, a homogenized population, and restricted mobility due to prejudicial and structural factors are referred to with the general term "ethnic enclaves," which is less pejorative, though it could also be substituted with the term "ghetto."[31]

When cars became an affordable purchase by those in the middle class, city, regional, and federal funds were allocated en masse to develop a network of highways and suburbs for the (white) middle class and wealthy to occupy. The government funding of highways and other aspects of suburban development benefited whites and directly disadvantaged and harmed blacks in St. Louis and similar communities, ultimately leading to the creation of ethnic enclaves. Highway projects in St. Louis mainly cleared black neighborhoods with no plan for resident displacement. Specifically, the Mill Creek Valley neighborhood, once described as a vibrant community of blacks, was demolished in 1959 to make way for Highway 40, which ultimately facilitated later waves of "white flight" in St. Louis. This project was both destructive to residents of the Mill Creek Valley community, and nicknamed "negro removal."[32] Thus, the construction of Highway 40 with government funds and statutory de jure authorization also carried an element of de facto racial prejudice in its site selection and project implementation.

The policy and funding stances of most developing American cities during the 1900s toward suburban transportation priorities carried enormous consequences for some families and communities, playing a part in ethnic enclave development. Families who worked in the city, but could not afford a car, were all but excluded from the suburban residence and its accompanying community opportunities through lack of transportation. Informal, formal, and

federally sanctioned housing discrimination covenants and related practices systematically excluded families of color from suburban and racially integrated living opportunities, regardless of their ability to afford them.[33]

The inability of many living in ethnic enclaves to access the suburbs of their city was limited by much more than the affordability of a personal automobile, however. For black families, there were many informal, formal, and codified community policies that restricted their housing. In the early 1900s, when the first blacks tried to move to the suburbs, they faced community backlash, which then solidified into segregation ordinances, public policies, and laws.[34] Segregation in housing within the St. Louis region began immediately before the Civil War, and some argue, continues to this day. Civic entities including the St. Louis Real Estate Exchange advocated against black migration, which was a sentiment echoed in different forms by other civic groups throughout the century.[35] These de facto actions occurred before, but undoubtedly influenced the first housing segregation ordinance passed in St. Louis in 1916.

Racial, restrictive covenants emerged simultaneously with segregation ordinances as terms within mortgages or other homeownership contracts, prohibiting homes in many neighborhoods from being sold to any nonwhite members of the community. These covenants were challenged in court in many communities, though not abolished as a policy of the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) until the 1960s. In fact, during the first half of the twentieth century, to prevent neighborhood integration, the FHA and other mortgage lenders would not insure mortgages without restrictive covenants. Developers and city planners were required to implement and abide by restrictive covenants, and those who refused often lost government and business funding alike. For many members of the neighborhoods with restrictive covenants, however, the exclusion of blacks was a welcome public policy.[36]

The actions of the FHA, which created, allowed, and demanded racially restrictive covenants in mortgages, indisputably possessed weight in the development of segregated cities during the first half of the twentieth century. In St. Louis and other cities, these de jure edicts were accompanied by the community support of the Saint Louis Realtor Association. Other prejudicial white civic groups lent de facto support to the actions of the FHA, including the Ku Klux Klan, who would threaten, with fire and other violence, anyone who dared to defy the spirit of segregated communities.[37] Perhaps the most potent weapon of segregation in the developing St. Louis metropolitan area was the nearly 100 new suburbs deciding to become municipalities with the capacity to create and enforce laws around permitted activities within their communities.[38] Here, de facto and de jure actions truly intertwined, often for the main purposes of segregation, and the maintenance of population homogeneity and corresponding property valuation.

Nationwide, the white community's stance toward blacks echoed with the introduction of legislation and policies requiring residential segregation through racial covenants. Simultaneously, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and others sought to fight against these policies and statutes, recognizing the harm being doing to black families.[39] Legal challenges were mounted against discriminatory housing laws in the St. Louis area, including *Shelly v. Kraemer* (1948) and *U.S. v. City of Black Jack*, *Missouri* (1974).[40] *Shelly*, named for the black family who tried to purchase a home in St. Louis with a restrictive covenant attached to it, did not prevail. Ultimately, the Supreme Court decided that racially restrictive covenants violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, but their private enforcement was legal.[41] In *Shelly*, the Court took a step toward making restrictive covenants illegal, while ultimately acquiescing to the will of the community to continue using them.

U.S. v. City of Black Jack, Missouri sought to sanction and further prevent the use of municipal zoning, which denied opportunities for nonwhites to live in this suburb within the metropolitan St. Louis area. In *U.S.*, the United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, ruled that neither a racially discriminatory motive nor effect was shown, thus the housing ordinance based on race

was not contradictory to the Civil Rights Act of 1968.[42] Again, in *U.S.*, the court did not make housing ordinances based on race illegal. Perhaps these decisions were activist, and due to community pressure, as support by community members was shown for the discriminatory policies and even funds donated by churches nationwide for their defense.[43] When attempting defiance of segregation through de jure mechanisms, residents of St. Louis and other cities clashed with community members including white supremacists protesting with de facto means. In these conflicts, white participants were often not sanctioned by police for their behaviors, sending a clear message about community, de facto, support for segregation.[44]

Beginning in the 1930s, with clear de facto and de jure support for racial segregation, realtors nationwide began to screen and segregate new developments, refusing to show or sell houses across entire neighborhoods to blacks and other nonwhite families. These practices were known as "redlining" and "blockbusting," because city maps from these times have large red lines drawn around black neighborhoods (where blacks must remain).[45] As a direct result of practices of segregation, nonwhite families were further crowded into ethnic enclaves. To those benefiting from segregationist policies, including suburban whites seeking to avoid integration, minority families who had limited choice about their opportunities for employment, education, resources, and a diverse community were merely "out of sight and out of mind."[46]

Facing diminished choices, many have felt forced to live in ethnic enclaves. For these families, the challenges of life have not changed substantially in the last two centuries. Within ethnic enclaves, the housing stock, infrastructure, services, jobs, schools, opportunities, amenities, and necessary provisions are of lower quality, lacking, or absent altogether.[47] Much of the housing stock in St. Louis and other inner cities consists of crowded multiple family units, sometimes owned by slumlords, with limited, older single-family housing stock. Suburbs, in contrast, are likely to contain single-family residences with yards, parks, and other amenities, built in the last few decades, and owner-occupied. Apartment complexes do exist in suburban communities, but these are in the minority of residences.[48]

Efforts at "urban renewal." Community members, businesses, agencies, courts, legislators, and local government officials actively enforced segregation practice in cities, and this ultimately created ethnic enclaves. Over a period of neglect and compartmentalization, inner-city ethnic enclaves and surrounding areas have deteriorated and were unattractive to new investors and almost unusable for their current purpose of housing blacks, the poor, and other disadvantaged minorities. In St. Louis and other cities, urban planners were employed to revitalize the urban landscape, although this often resulted in the maintenance of widespread racial segregation, even when no longer legal.[49] Harland Bartholomew was employed as an urban planner by the City of St. Louis from 1918 to 1954, the height of segregation nationwide. Bartholomew used the St. Louis metropolitan area as a platform to build a deeply divided community, using highways, infrastructure, zoning laws, and knowledge of neighborhood demographics to further segregate the city.[50]

Bartholomew was a model planner for the nation, influencing the urban landscape in Washington, D.C., and Newark, New Jersey. Bartholomew's approach was to use sociodemographic, infrastructure, recreation, and economic factors in his designs to shape the long-term nature of a city.[51] Some described Bartholomew's urban development plan for St. Louis as "triage," focused on the needs of its middle- and upper-class residents and refusing to invest any resources in black communities in near decay. Consequential to Bartholomew's planning focus, there was a neglect and decline of older housing stock by Bartholomew, which was occupied primarily by blacks and the poor. Bartholomew's plan to neglect neighborhoods of blacks and poor led to the further decline of these areas, and justified Bartholomew's planning choices to rehabilitate areas of blight, and demolish areas of severe decline, further impacting the spiral of neglect experienced by blacks and poor residents of St. Louis.[52]

Bartholomew's urban planning tools were primarily de jure in nature, and he also skillfully used them to further de facto prejudicial desires of himself and the community to maintain racial segregation in the St. Louis area. In addition to neglecting, scarring, and choking many black communities of resources, opportunities, and basic needs through his plans and use of zoning and restrictive covenants, Bartholomew engaged in "slum clearance" in many ethnic enclaves. Bartholomew saw the slums in ethnic enclaves as lacking in necessary resources for their residents but did not attempt to rectify this situation, only making the experience of black residents there worse.[53]

Bartholomew's slum clearance did not have a positive outcome planned for residents, usually black and poor, and often, no outcome was planned for them at all. Over the course of his career, Bartholomew facilitated the razing of many structures throughout the City of St. Louis, and the displacement of nearly 70,000 residents through his slum clearance projects. Some of these displaced residents eventually and haphazardly landed in public housing projects no better than the slums.[54] Like others of his time, Bartholomew saw blacks as the cause of their condition, and a potential threat to the success of other neighborhoods. Although Bartholomew was skilled in the circumvention of laws that prohibited formal segregation, he did not deny that his plans intended to create and maintain a racially segregated St. Louis city. In fact, well known was that Bartholomew's approaches to city planning would not meet the needs of black neighborhoods, and these approaches would propel further decline so that these areas could eventually be razed and redeveloped for other uses.[55]

Bartholomew was in the company of friends with his plans, as multiple interest groups and community organizations led the charge for slum clearance in the middle of the century. Prominently, the League of Women Voters was active in the planning of St. Louis from the 1930s to 1960s, explicitly advocating for the clearance of slums there. The *Post-Dispatch*, St. Louis's largest newspaper, also became a vehicle and sometimes advocate for slum clearance. Businesses who would benefit from a prime commercial landscape near downtown, too, championed slum clearance. While each of these advocates may have had other motives, city planning decisions in St. Louis always carry a racial element, especially when the residents of slums are primarily black.[56] In formal city plans by Bartholomew, he did not include race as a factor. However, officials were undoubtedly aware of the city's borders of segregation and how urban renewal plans fell within this grid. Thus, having a colorblind approach to urban planning kept the topic of residential segregation by race out of the view of the public.[57]

Like planner Robert Moses in New York City, Bartholomew had little oversight, and was allowed to achieve his agenda at the expense of the quality of life and mobility of thousands of black and needy families. After his departure, Bartholomew's vision was carried forward by the St. Louis City Plan Commission, and many in the community, showing that in the case of urban planning and segregation in St. Louis, both de jure and de facto forces of prejudice have been powerfully influential.[58] Indeed, much of Bartholomew's vision of a segregated St. Louis remains today, on a larger scale, with whites concentrated in the surrounding St. Louis County, St. Charles County, and South St. Louis City. Today, blacks continue to reside primarily in North St. Louis City, and within the inner ring of North St. Louis County, where Ferguson is located.[59] Extreme segregation such as is found in St. Louis also occurs to degrees in nearly thirty American cities, showing the gross power of de jure and de facto factors in creating segregation that impacts, most negatively, nonwhites throughout our nation.[60]

The Housing Act of 1949, also an initiative of urban planning, provided funds to raze poor, minority housing to make way for middle-class housing, however, provisions were never made for displaced families under the Act.[61] The Housing Act allowed continued segregation and was upheld by the courts, but by the time of its passage, some politicians had recognized that it was weakening the social structure and adding to poverty in specific communities.[62] In St. Louis, which is among the most segregated cities in the nation, public housing projects designed to keep

blacks and whites separate are known internationally. Given their statutory authority, management, and funding through the federal government, public housing projects are, too, examples of de jure segregation.

Funded through the Housing Act of 1949 to meet the needs of impoverished and displaced residents of St. Louis, the Pruitt-Igoe high-rises housed blacks and whites in separate towers. Soon after the project opened, whites left Pruitt-Igoe because the physical conditions of the projects quickly became dilapidated, and they had legal mobility. Poor design and construction, and the fact that tenants were financially responsible for their building repairs, including to the elevators, were the cause of the poor conditions of Pruitt-Igoe.[63] With the restrictions of racial covenants and poverty, many black residents had no choice but to remain at Pruitt-Igoe until the towers were razed because the project was such a disgrace to St. Louis.

Driven by the Housing Act, in the 1950s, the City of St. Louis invested money and resources in some neighborhoods for rehabilitation. Most of these investments were in primarily white neighborhoods in South St. Louis City. When this happened, Blacks argued that city rehabilitation efforts should be based on need instead of market potential, and saw the proposed direction of the city as one that neglected and tried to starve blacks of necessary resources. Furthermore, black labor was not hired for the civic projects as was promised.[64] Thus, the era of urban renewal in St. Louis had started with segregation and differential treatment of blacks through the instruments of government (de jure) policies, and the choices of its community actors, which appeared to be prejudicial (de facto).

As late as the 1970s, prejudice within city planning decisions by quasi-governmental actors in St. Louis was still occurring. Team Four, a planning firm hired by the City of St. Louis, issued a memo recommending different "triage" and treatment for the development of regions of the city. Depending on the level of triage, the treatment recommended would include infrastructure, business, and support for neighborhood association development. Within the Team Four plan, select areas designated for redevelopment were in South St. Louis. However, for the majority of black North St. Louis, the most that Team Four recommended were the maintenance of essential services. This triage approach was seen by many as utilitarian and in line with federal, state, and local planning laws. The Team Four approach was also in line with a diminished desire of the community to invest in, or even repair much of North St. Louis, and some argue that this remains the spirit of planning decisions in the City to this day.[65]

The long-term consequences to the region of both de facto and de jure justifications for racial segregation have achieved their goals if it is accurate that the contemporary attitudes of St. Louis residents toward its most historically ill-treated and neglected members are, to continue the medical metaphor, one of hospice. Furthermore, the responsibility for the existence and conditions of segregated communities lies squarely, though not exclusively, with the FHA and other agencies at the federal, state, and local levels of government. However, influential businesses and community bias, actions, and events also played a part in creating and maintaining a national structure of residential segregation, affecting many millions of families. Thus, the prejudice of the law and the community are both to blame.

The Ongoing Consequences of Community Segregation

Although the experiences of blacks and other residents of ethnic enclaves vary from those in St. Louis, there are some definite commonalities, including poor housing stock, and lacking infrastructure and essential services. Weak government resources, deep poverty, limited job opportunities, inadequate schools, and nearby toxic waste are also common characteristics of ethnic enclaves.[66] The fact that many families are still residing in these conditions is a direct result of segregation and its de jure factors of the past, and the de facto community actions, conditions, and prejudice that supported them. Some argue that the historical circumstances and structural

elements present in ethnic enclaves of inner cities such as St. Louis have the psychological consequence of showing residents of their inferiority within society. The belief by enclave residents that mainstream society perceives them as inferior may not be far from the truth, given the prejudicial de facto community decisions that have created ethnic enclaves.[67]

Segregation and isolation are a hallmark of ethnic enclaves, propelled by historical and current policy, community decisions, and economic inequalities.[68] This discrimination has continuing consequences for enclave residents who are not able to build enough intergenerational wealth and social and economic capital to become mobile. The multigenerational economic impact to the residents of ethnic enclaves is so profound that some argue that poverty has emerged over race as the most critical barrier to the upward mobility of these families.[69]

Effects of segregation. In St. Louis and similar cities, the multigenerational experiences of black and needy families residing within ethnic enclaves have been very different from those families that have been able to afford and were allowed access to residence in a suburban community. Due to multigenerational poverty, segregated housing, and inferior resources, adverse experiences of families residing within ethnic enclaves are disproportionately high. Residents of ethnic enclaves are more likely to be sentenced to prison than to obtain a college degree.[70] Residents of ethnic enclaves are also more liable to experience long stretches of unemployment, experience mental health issues, and lack a long-term partner or best friend.[71]

A life of poverty, discrimination, and adverse outcomes are unlikely to yield many people resilient enough to succeed in society at the level of those without such barriers. Thus, the overrepresentation of blacks within prison and gangs, and an underrepresentation of blacks and other historical residents of ethnic enclaves within higher education, prestigious employment, and with personal wealth is not surprising. However, the negative multigenerational consequences of ethnic enclaves are not a reflection of the character of the families residing within, they are structural, or another form of de facto segregation.[72]

Through the many decades when cities and their surrounding suburbs have been in some state of segregation, large scars have been left in our communities. In St. Louis, especially on the north side, our inner-city infrastructure is decimated, many of our schools are devastated, some highly segregated, severely underfunded, and unaccredited. Our housing stock, still primarily segregated, though not through de jure processes, provides shelter to those in poverty, and is degraded, with vacant units littering many blocks. Liquor stores and discount retail with small grocery sections thrive in North St. Louis neighborhoods, and sometimes, a drug deal can be observed outside during the day. St. Louis is a national leader in segregation, poverty, and structural violence, and is consistently ranked with Chicago, Oakland, and other similar cities with incredibly high murder rates.[73] Most of these killings occur within inner-city ethnic enclaves, also known as "black-on-black crime."

Given the dismal history of ethnic enclaves, many residents have sought to migrate out of these areas. Since the outlaw of formal racial residential segregation, this massive migration of nonwhites out of inner cities has occurred nationwide, has included middle- and upper-class families of all races and ethnicities, and has been given the term Second Migration. The Second Migration has made modern suburbs more diverse and less affluent than a century ago.[74]

Renewed discrimination. Families involved in the Second Migration seek better access to jobs, housing, education, and opportunities to build wealth. Blacks, most of whose ancestors were enslaved, have never had access to wealth through their inheritance or own work, and generations of blacks have been subject to many forms of employment discrimination, which are primarily de facto forms of prejudice. Conversely, many whites have benefited from intergenerational wealth, some the by-products of slavery. Most whites have had consistent access to well-paying work and other opportunities to grow their wealth, including through property and lower taxes.[75]

The segregation of our communities has created economic stratification along racial lines, including in St. Louis, where several of our suburbs (county municipalities), Ladue, Frontenac, and Town & Country, are among the wealthiest in the nation.[76] The wealth found in these communities surrounding St. Louis are consequences of both de facto and de jure forms of segregation, as beneficial to whites as they are damaging to blacks. Understandably, black families wish to have access to these same opportunities in the suburbs of St. Louis County, some of which are still 70 percent to 97 percent white.[77]

To address the needs of families in poverty to live in adequate neighborhoods, the Section 8, now Housing Choice Voucher Program, was created and is implemented by the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Department. Due in part to their lower median economic worth, many blacks have accessed Section 8 vouchers to rent and purchase affordable housing nationwide. With the implementation of this program over time, however, the refusal to honor Section 8 vouchers has become another way for some to discriminate against those in poverty.[78] In St. Louis, the number of black recipients of Section 8 vouchers is near twice the national average, and a housing applicant using this subsidy can be a red flag to a discriminatory property owner.[79] Because of the limited acceptance of Section 8 vouchers, many of the holders who survived segregation and other discrimination due to their race have no choice but to continue to reside in de facto segregated, low-income neighborhoods.[80]

Nationwide, other black families with more wealth could access traditional funding to purchase their homes in better neighborhoods, including in the suburbs, once housing discrimination was made illegal. However, mortgage lenders and other businesses saw the increased mobility of blacks as an opportunity to prey on black families. Major mortgage lenders including Wells Fargo have targeted nonwhite neighborhoods for subprime loans that were unaffordable, high-risk, and often designed to fail. Predatory mortgage lending by banks has cost the average black homeowner a surplus of $15,000 over the life of their mortgage.[81] Overall, homes in neighborhoods with a majority population of blacks have been charged higher rents and assessed higher taxes. Furthermore, in these neighborhoods, infrastructure, including schools, were maintained at a lower level than comparable neighborhoods with a majority population of whites.[82] These are examples of continued de facto attempts to maintain segregation.

De facto segregation, coupled with de jure segregation, is responsible for continued discrimination in housing, and numerous associated consequences against blacks. These factors have also contributed to the eroded trust between many in the black community and the broader white community. Historically, whites in government and other positions of power have engaged in atrocious acts of enslavement, genocide, violence, segregation, and discrimination against nonwhites. Whites who have not directly engaged in acts of prejudice have potentially derived a direct or diffused benefit from acts of prejudice, some compounded with interest over time. The fact that many of these acts have gone unpunished has only sent the message to the broader community that hate is tolerated and even supported in our nation. For these reasons alone, some blacks lack trust in authority, specifically police, and the feeling appears to be mutual.

Ferguson is a suburb/municipality in North St. Louis County and was one of the primary destinations of blacks in St. Louis during the Second Migration. As blacks have moved into Ferguson over the last fifty years, the population majority has tipped from white to black, with blacks now comprising nearly 70 percent of the full municipality. During the Second Migration, the racial tipping of Ferguson was not unique; however, it was not welcome, and the blacks who moved in propelled many whites to move out.[83]

In addition to racial conflict within their municipality, black residents of Ferguson were widely targeted by predatory mortgage lenders. Ferguson also has lower quality educational opportunities for their children, especially as compared with the wealthier, majority white suburbs in the St. Louis metropolitan area.[84] Recently, in a plan to increase the revenue available to Ferguson's local government, Ferguson police were told to increase tickets issued to citizens, even when

unwarranted. This scheme also targeted and disproportionately affected blacks in Ferguson. In 2013, blacks were issued 85 percent of the vehicular tickets and were 93 percent of the total arrests, despite being only 67 percent of Ferguson's population.[85]

A history of racial profiling by police, especially one specific to Ferguson, no doubt contributed to the interactions between the police and teen Michael Brown, whose fatal shooting led to multiple riots and the burning of parts of Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014.[86] Incidents of police shooting black men occur regularly within the St. Louis area, and large protests like the one in 2014 have responded, most recently in 2017, showing awareness within the St. Louis community of the scars of prejudice and segregation still unresolved.

Moving On from a Malicious Past

Prejudice in American society against citizens of racial and ethnic minorities and those living in poverty has been deep-seeded and is manifested through community choices made within developing American cities including St. Louis. Our broader community has not previously acknowledged the multigenerational consequences of prejudice and segregation. Until we adequately address the consequences of prejudice as a society, we are all denied the potential for a healthier community.

In both scholarly and community discourse on the topic of residential segregation and the discriminatory treatment of nonwhites, there is a tendency to minimize the impact of these events. Still, families and communities remain impacted. Our suburbs were created through discrimination, segregation, and violence, accurately categorized as both de jure and de facto. Past and current residents of majority white suburbs, in St. Louis and similar cities, have benefited by the schools, businesses, parks, and other opportunities there. The benefits of many suburbs developed primarily at the expense of nonwhites banned through law from living there and participating.

Some white citizens, suburban residents, and even civic leaders may not have been directly or indirectly responsible for segregation, discrimination, and slavery. Unfortunately, one of the consequences of our unresolved racial past is dual-ended racial profiling. Many people of color see nearly all whites as potentially discriminatory, unethical, hateful, dishonest, and cruel. Nationally and within each city, there are numerous individuals, families, and businesses that have participated in, facilitated, and benefited financially from a segregated community. Government actors have not taken substantial responsibility for creating the policies and laws of prejudicial segregation. It is easier for the community to blame the unjust laws than the forces, interests, and people behind the creation and maintenance of these discriminatory laws. However, undeniably, both the community and its laws are to blame.

Notes

1. Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* (Liveright Publishing, 2017); Richard Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson," *American Prospect*, 2014.

2. William A. V. Clark, "Race, Class, and Place: Evaluating Mobility Outcomes for African Americans," *Urban Affairs Review* 42, no. 3 (2007): 295-314; Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Harvard University Press, 1993); Douglas S. Massey, Jacob S. Rugh, Justin P. Steil, and Len Albright, "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell: A Qualitative

Analysis of Racial Discrimination in Mortgage Lending," *City & Community* 15, no. 2 (2016): 118-36; Melvin L. Oliver and Thomas M. Shapiro, *Black Wealth, White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality* (Taylor & Francis, 2006); Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson."

3. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Rigel C. Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson: Housing Discrimination and Segregation in St. Louis," *Missouri Law Review* 80 (2015): 1053-1075; Peter Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation: A St. Louis Case Study" (2016); Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Patrick Sharkey, *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress toward Racial Equality* (University of Chicago Press, 2013).

4. Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Massey et al., "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell"; Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson"; Clark, "Race, Class, and Place"; Camille Zubrinsky Charles, "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation," *Annual Review of Sociology* 29, no. 1 (2003): 167-207.

5. Mark Benton, "'Just the Way Things Are around Here' Racial Segregation, Critical Junctures, and Path Dependence in Saint Louis," *Journal of Urban History* (2017): 1-18. doi: 10.1177/0096144217696988.

6. Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design since 1880* (John Wiley & Sons, 2014); Richard C. Wade, *The Urban Frontier: The Rise of Western Cities, 1790-1830* (University of Illinois Press, 1996).

7. Daniel Joseph Monti, Michael Ian Borer, and Lyn C. Macgregor, *Urban People and Places: The Sociology of Cities, Suburbs, and Towns* (Sage, 2014).

8. Ibid.

9. Wade, *The Urban Frontier*.

10. Paul S. Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Harvard University Press, 1992).

11. City of St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I: Historic Contexts" (2017). Available at https://www.stlouis-mo.gov/government/departments/planning/cultural-resources/preservation-plan/Part-I-African-American-Experience.cfm

12. Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857); St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I."

13. St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I."

14. Monti et al., *Urban People and Places*.

15. Benton, "'Just the Way Things Are around Here.'"

16. Monti et al., *Urban People and Places*; Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*; Wade, *The Urban Frontier*.

17. Sharon Zukin, *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places* (Oxford University Press, 2009); Wade, *The Urban Frontier*.

18. Joseph Heathcott, "Black Archipelago: Politics and Civic Life in the Jim Crow City," *Journal of Social History* 38, no. 3 (2005): 705-736, 708.

19. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*.

20. St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I."

21. Heathcott, "Black Archipelago"; St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I."

22. Ibid.

23. Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*.

24. Zukin, *Naked City*; Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*.

25. Monti et al., *Urban People and Places; Boyer, Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*.

26. Monti et al., *Urban People and Places*.

27. Ibid.

28. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation"; J. Inwood, James A. Tyner, and Derek H. Alderman, "Remembering the Real Violence in Ferguson," *Society & Space* (http://societyandspace.com/material/commentaries/inwood-tyner-and-aldermanremembering-the-real-violence-in-ferguson/; 2014).

29. Monti et al., *Urban People and Places*; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*; Wade, *The Urban Frontier*.

30. Anmol Chaddha and William Julius Wilson, "Reconsidering the 'Ghetto,'" *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 384-88; Loic J. D. Wacquant, "Three Pernicious Premises in the Study of the American Ghetto," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21, no. 2 (1997): 341-53.

31. John R. Logan, Wenquan Zhang, and Richard D. Alba, "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles," *American Sociological Review* 67 (2002): 299-322.

32. St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I"; Patrick Cooper-McCann, "The Trap of Triage: Lessons from the 'Team Four Plan,'" *Journal of Planning History* 15, no. 2 (2016): 149-169; Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*.

33. Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation"; Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson"; Charles, "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation"; Rothstein, *The Color of Law*.

34. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*.

35. Heathcott, "Black Archipelago"; St. Louis, "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I."

36. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Massey et al., "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell"; Inwood et al., "Remembering the Real Violence in Ferguson"; Clark, "Race, Class, and Place"; Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."

37. Benton, "'Just the Way Things Are around Here'"; Heathcott, "Black Archipelago."

38. Benton, "'Just the Way Things Are around Here.'"

39. Heathcott, "Black Archipelago."

40. Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."

41. Shelley v. Kraemer, 334 U.S. 1 (1948).

42. U.S. v. City of Black Jack, Missouri, 508 F.2d 1179 (1974).

43. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson"; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Massey et al., "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell"; Charles, "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation"; Clark, "Race, Class, and Place."

44. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*.

45. Heathcott, "Black Archipelago."

46. Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation"; Flint, Anthony, Wrestling with Moses: How Jane Jacobs Took on New York's Master Builder and Transformed the American City (Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2011); Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*.

47. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Heathcott, "Black Archipelago."

48. Wade, *The Urban Frontier*; Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*; Joseph Heathcott and Maire Agnes Murphy, "Corridors of Flight, Zones of Renewal: Industry, Planning, and Policy in the Making of Metropolitan St. Louis, 1940-1980," *Journal of Urban History* 31, no. 2 (2005): 151-189.

49. Wade, The Urban Frontier; Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*.

50. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson."

51. Mark Benton, "'Saving' the City: Harland Bartholomew and Administrative Evil in St. Louis," *Public Integrity* (2017): 1-13. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317135091_Saving_the_City_Harland_Bartholomew_and_Administrative_Evil_in_St_Louis

52. Cooper-McCann, "The Trap of Triage."

53. Benton, "'Saving' the City."

54. Ibid., 7.

55. Benton, "'Just the Way Things Are around Here'"; Benton, "'Saving' the City."

56. Heathcott and Murphy, "Corridors of Flight, Zones of Renewal."

57. Cooper-McCann, "The Trap of Triage."

58. Benton, "'Just the Way Things Are around Here.'"

59. Masayoshi Oka and David W. S. Wong, "Spatializing Segregation Measures: An Approach to Better Depict Social Relationships," *Cityscape* 17, no. 1 (2015): 97-113.

60. Charles, "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation."

61. Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*.

62. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*.

63. Rothstein, The Color of Law; Clark, "Race, Class, and Place"; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*.

64. Cooper-McCann, "The Trap of Triage."

65. Ibid.

66. Michelle Wilde Anderson, "Cities Inside Out: Race, Poverty, and Exclusion at the Urban Fringe," *UCLA Law Review* 55 (2007): 1095; Thomas J. Cooke, "Geographic Context and Concentrated Urban Poverty within the United States," *Urban Geography* 20, no. 6 (1999): 552-66; Daniel T. Lichter and David L. Brown, "Rural America in an Urban Society: Changing Spatial and Social Boundaries," *Annual Review of Sociology* 37, no. 565 (2011): 565-92; John R. Logan, "Separate and Unequal in Suburbia" Census Brief prepared for Project US2010 (www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Data/Report/report12012014.pdf;2014); William Julius Wilson, "Studying Inner-City Social Dislocations: The Challenge of Public Agenda Research: 1990 Presidential Address," *American Sociological Review* (1991): 1-14.

67. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Charles, "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation"; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Massey et al., "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell"; Diego Vigil, "Barrio Geneology," *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 366-71.

68. Elizabeth Oltmans Ananat, "The Wrong Side(s) of the Tracks: The Causal Effects of Racial Segregation on Urban Poverty and Inequality," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 3, no. 2 (2011): 34-66; Andrew A. Beveridge, "A Century of Harlem in New York City: Some Notes on Migration, Consolidation, Segregation, and Recent Developments," *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 358-65; Herbert J. Gans, "Involuntary Segregation and the *Ghetto*: Disconnecting Process and Place," *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 353-57; Mario Luis Small and Katherine Newman, "Urban Poverty after the Truly Disadvantaged: The Rediscovery of the Family, the Neighborhood, and Culture," *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, no. 1 (2001): 23-45; William Julius Wilson, "Race, Class and Urban Poverty: A Rejoinder," *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 26, no. 6 (2003): 1096-1114; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*.

69. Chaddha and Wilson, "Reconsidering the 'Ghetto'"; Wilson, "Race, Class and Urban Poverty: A Rejoinder"; Wilson, William Julius, "Inner-City Dislocations," *Society* 35, no. 2 (1998): 270-77; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*; Ananat, "The Wrong Side(s) of the Tracks."

70. Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*.

71. Small and Newman, "Urban Poverty after the Truly Disadvantaged"; Loic J. C. Wacquant and William Julius Wilson, "The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501, no. 1 (1989): 8-25; Wilson, "Studying Inner-City Social Dislocations."

72. Small and Newman, "Urban Poverty after the Truly Disadvantaged"; Wacquant, "Three Pernicious Premises in the Study of the American Ghetto"; Wacquant and Wilson, "The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City"; Wilson, "Studying Inner-City Social Dislocations."

73. Clark, "Race, Class, and Place"; Inwood et al., "Remembering the Real Violence in Ferguson"; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson."

74. Monti et al., *Urban People and Places*; Daniel J. Monti, *Engaging Strangers: Civil Rites, Civic Capitalism, and Public Order in Boston* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2012).

75. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Inwood et al., "Remembering the Real Violence in Ferguson"; Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*; Oliver and Shapiro, *Black Wealth, White Wealth*; Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation"; Wilson, "Race, Class and Urban Poverty: A Rejoinder."

76. Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."

77. Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation."

78. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."

79. Molly W. Metzger, "Section 8 in the St. Louis Region: Local Opportunities to Expand Housing Choice," *CSD Policy Brief* 14 (2014): 29.

80. Ibid.

81. Massey et al., "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell," 134.

82. Rothstein, *The Color of Law*; Sharkey, *Stuck in Place*.

83. Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson"; Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."

84. Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."

85. Ibid., 1070.

86. Oliveri, "Setting the Stage for Ferguson."; Metz, "Race and Property Value Appreciation"; Rothstein, "The Making of Ferguson."

Bibliography

Ananat, Elizabeth Oltmans. "The Wrong Side(s) of the Tracks: The Causal Effects of Racial Segregation on Urban Poverty and Inequality." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 3, no. 2 (2011): 34-66.

Anderson, Michelle Wilde. "Cities Inside Out: Race, Poverty, and Exclusion at the Urban Fringe." *UCLA Law Review* 55 (2007): 1095.

Benton, Mark. "'Just the Way Things Are around Here' Racial Segregation, Critical Junctures, and Path Dependence in Saint Louis." *Journal of Urban History* (2017).

Benton, Mark. "'Saving' the City: Harland Bartholomew and Administrative Evil in St. Louis." *Public Integrity* (2017): 1-13.

Beveridge, Andrew A. "A Century of Harlem in New York City: Some Notes on Migration, Consolidation, Segregation, and Recent Developments." *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 358-65.

Boyer, Paul S. *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*. Harvard University Press, 1992.

Chaddha, Anmol, and William Julius Wilson. "Reconsidering the 'Ghetto'." *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 384-88.

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29, no. 1 (2003): 167-207.

Clark, William A. V. "Race, Class, and Place: Evaluating Mobility Outcomes for African Americans." *Urban Affairs Review* 42, no. 3 (2007): 295-314.

Cooke, Thomas J. "Geographic Context and Concentrated Urban Poverty within the United States." *Urban Geography* 20, no. 6 (1999): 552-66.

Cooper-McCann, Patrick. "The Trap of Triage: Lessons from the 'Team Four Plan.'" *Journal of Planning History* 15, no. 2 (2016): 149-69.

Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).

Gans, Herbert J. "Involuntary Segregation and the *Ghetto*: Disconnecting Process and Place." *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 353-57.

Hall, Peter. *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design since 1880*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

Heathcott, Joseph. "Black Archipelago: Politics and Civic Life in the Jim Crow City." *Journal of Social History* 38, no. 3 (2005): 705-36.

Heathcott, Joseph, and Maire Agnes Murphy. "Corridors of Flight, Zones of Renewal: Industry, Planning, and Policy in the Making of Metropolitan St. Louis, 1940-1980." *Journal of Urban History* 31, no. 2 (2005): 151-89.

Inwood, J., James A. Tyner, and Derek H. Alderman. "Remembering the Real Violence in Ferguson." *Society & Space* (2014).

Lichter, Daniel T., and David L. Brown. "Rural America in an Urban Society: Changing Spatial and Social Boundaries." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37, no. 565 (2011): 565-92.

Logan, John R. "Separate and Unequal in Suburbia." (2014).

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Harvard University Press, 1993.

Massey, Douglas S., Jacob S. Rugh, Justin P. Steil, and Len Albright. "Riding the Stagecoach to Hell: A Qualitative Analysis of Racial Discrimination in Mortgage Lending." *City & Community* 15, no. 2 (2016): 118-36.

Metz, Peter. "Race and Property Value Appreciation: A St. Louis Case Study." (2016).

Metzger, Molly W. "Section 8 in the St. Louis Region: Local Opportunities to Expand Housing Choice." *CSD Policy Brief* 14 (2014): 29.

Monti, Daniel J. *Engaging Strangers: Civil Rites, Civic Capitalism, and Public Order in Boston*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2012.

Monti, Daniel Joseph, Michael Ian Borer, and Lyn C. Macgregor. *Urban People and Places: The Sociology of Cities, Suburbs, and Towns*. Sage, 2014.

Oka, Masayoshi, and David W. S. Wong. "Spatializing Segregation Measures: An Approach to Better Depict Social Relationships." *Cityscape* 17, no. 1 (2015): 97.

Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. *Black Wealth, White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. Taylor & Francis, 2006.

Oliveri, Rigel C. "Setting the Stage for Ferguson: Housing Discrimination and Segregation in St. Louis." *Missouri Law Review* 80 (2015): 1053.

Rothstein, Richard. *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. Liveright Publishing, 2017.

Rothstein, Richard. "The Making of Ferguson." *American Prospect*, 2014.

St. Louis, City of. "A Preservation Plan for St. Louis Part I: Historic Contexts." 2017.

Sharkey, Patrick. *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress toward Racial Equality*. University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Shelley v. Kraemer, 334 U.S. 1 (1948).

Small, Mario Luis, and Katherine Newman. "Urban Poverty after the Truly Disadvantaged: The Rediscovery of the Family, the Neighborhood, and Culture." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, no. 1 (2001): 23-45.

U.S. v. City of Black Jack, Missouri, 508 F.2d 1179 (1974).

Vigil, Diego. "Barrio Geneology." *City & Community* 7, no. 4 (2008): 366-71.

Wacquant, Loic J. C., and William Julius Wilson. "The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501, no. 1 (1989): 8-25.

Wacquant, Loic J. D. "Three Pernicious Premises in the Study of the American Ghetto." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21, no. 2 (1997): 341-53.

Wade, Richard C. *The Urban Frontier: The Rise of Western Cities, 1790-1830*. University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Wilson, William Julius. "Inner-City Dislocations." *Society* 35, no. 2 (1998): 270-77.

Wilson, William Julius. "Race, Class and Urban Poverty: A Rejoinder." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26, no. 6 (2003): 1096-1114.

Wilson, William Julius. "Studying Inner-City Social Dislocations: The Challenge of Public Agenda Research: 1990 Presidential Address." *American Sociological Review* (1991): 1-14.

Zukin, Sharon. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Author Biography

Tesa Rigel Hines is a doctoral candidate in public and social policy at Saint Louis University, also holding a master of social work and a bachelor's degree in political science and philosophy. Tesa's experiences as a biracial native of St. Louis inspired her to explore the complex history of segregation in this city as addressed in her article.