Urbanization has been rapidly transforming our planet for decades, from the global north to global south. Although urbanization has changed our society and our life, in the present day, many people find that they are now residing in the suburban community instead of inhabiting the urban community. Nevertheless, suburbs are the important activity space for a significant number of people in the world, suburban studies are not yet rich enough to expand the discourse and to establish arguments about how suburbs change residents’ lives and transform society. Suburban Planet, written by Roger Keil, proposes a new way of thinking about suburbs, which doesn’t only focus on the North American context and its urban–suburban dichotomy. This book makes the reader recognize which elements of the suburbs have been passed over by academia, and why it is necessary to revisit points that have been previously missed.

Suburban Planet consists of nine chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction explaining what the core limitations of suburban studies in its current stage are. Chapter 2, which is titled “Suburbanization Explained,” attempts to expand the suburban studies discourse away from the conventional approach counting suburbs as simply residential areas where the middle class can pursue the American Dream. Chapter 3, “Suburban Theory,” criticizes the single dimension of theory that describes suburbs as significantly oriented by global north contexts. Chapter 4, “Suburban Studies,” illustrates how prior studies have only focused on finding a normative theory for suburbs, which hinders our understanding of the distinctive feature of diversity in the suburbs. In Chapter 5, two homogenous suburbs, Lakewood and Ferguson in the United States, are used as case studies in order to delineate the diversified suburbs with the growth of immigrants and poverty. Chapter 6, “Beyond the Picket Fence,” claims that future suburban studies should address the different characteristics of suburbs in the global south, eastern Europe, and Asia, because of the different historical contexts of the emergence of suburbs in those places. Chapter 7, “Suburban Infrastructures,” addresses the role of infrastructure in suburbs, and the arrangement between cities and suburbs, in order to stress how North American suburbs and developing suburbs are now suffering a lack of infrastructure and unfair distribution of services to the suburbs. Chapter 8, “The Urban Political Ecology of Suburbanization,” describes power relations in the suburbs in terms of questions of density and boundaries. Chapter 9, “The Political Suburbs,” continuously stresses the political structure, arguing that suburban communities are necessary in order to make policies for solving the problems caused by mismatches of policies between their needs and supplies from municipalities.

With this book, the author attempts to break from the conventional discourse about suburban studies that mostly emphasized the Western-oriented perspectives as a way to describe the problems of suburbs. In chapter 2, the author employs globalization and neoliberalization in favor of explaining the process of suburbanization, and how globalization plays a role in attracting immigrants to the suburbs, such as ethnoburbs, and how neoliberalization accelerates the post-Fordist economy to build suburbs over the world. Furthermore, as a criticism of Western-oriented suburban theory, in chapters 3 and 6, the author points out how global suburbia is not fitted into the Western model, with the examples of Germany, which built significant amounts of social housing in the suburbs during the Cold War, and China, which has experienced rapid urbanization with a lack of land within city boundaries because of the strict constraints of city growth. For example, differently from the middle-class style of suburbs in North America, the Chinese usually do not favor living in the suburbs because of the relative shortage of cultural amenities, preferring instead fully developed urban communities, which indicates that China and other Asian countries’ suburbs are not the same as North American suburbs.

Suburban Planet contributes to answering questions that have been omitted in prior suburban studies. In the urban planning education system, still, conversations about suburbs and the urban dichotomy have been pushed out of academia. Suburban Planet provides the reasons for a dichotomous approach to defining suburban and urban that hinders planners in terms of remedying what is the cause of suburban problems and where exactly the causes come from. Also, previous urban studies accept the diversified urban form, but suburban studies still do not reflect the growing diversity in the suburbs. The prior urban studies also avoid a Western-biased approach. However, suburban studies still could not move beyond the Western-oriented viewpoint that does not explain global
societal issues such as squatters in the suburbs in India. This book criticizes the myopic approach of suburbs and suburban problems with an expanded comparative perspective on global suburbanization and an escape from classical suburban theory. Suburban Planet would be beneficial to both undergraduate students and graduate students in helping them to grasp emerging social problems in suburbs across the world. Additionally, students may be able to expand their insight regarding suburban poverty based on the rich examples provided in this book.
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Moving toward Integration by Richard Sander, Yana Kucheva, and Jonathan Zasloff argues that further progress toward reducing high levels of segregation in American metropolitan areas will require a proactive stance toward integration and not simply continuing the current emphasis on eliminating housing discrimination.

The book combines innovative census analysis, a thorough literature review with an account of the history of antidiscrimination policies. It provides a refreshing optimistic take on the prospects for greater neighborhood integration and is one of the first segregation studies to include a national prointegration plan.

Before the Great Migration to northern cities (1916–1970), a lesser migration occurred in the urban South (1870–1917). More than a dozen southern and border cities adopted racial zoning. But in Buchanan v. Warley, the US Supreme Court declared racial zoning unconstitutional. Ghettoization emerged in the North during the 1920s. Racial covenants were the one private legal mechanism available to maintain white racial homogeneity. But in 1948, the Supreme Court ended the use of racial covenants with Shelley v. Kraemer. Real estate brokers, however, took advantage of the resulting racial transition by engaging in blockbusting.

Sander et al. rebut the assertion made by others (e.g., Richard Rothstein in Color of Law) that government efforts to promote racial segregation were the driving force behind the “ghettoization of African-Americans” (p. 83). “Public housing rarely created ghettos, but instead reinforced patterns that already existed” (p. 92). Furthermore, the Federal Home Owners Loan Corporation—widely condemned because of its colored maps that identified ethnic neighborhoods and their mortgage loan risks—actually helped blacks as well as whites.

The rate of white-to-black transition increased during the 1960s, thus depleting the ghetto of low-income residents and decreasing the social mix of black residential clusters. Black ghetto expansion patterns were more complex than that have been indicated in previous scholarly work. For example, in contrast to the stereotype of “white flight,” racial change is primarily attributable to a drop in white demand for border areas perceived likely to undergo complete transition.

The Fair Housing Act (FHA) of 1968, which banned housing discrimination in the private housing market, would not have been enacted had it not been for the political savvy of President Lyndon Johnson. Once the FHA was enacted, the Department of Justice took up the task “of attacking institutional practices of discrimination . . . with gusto” (p. 136).

Housing audits showed a sharp drop in overt discrimination during the 1970s, indicating a change in the behavior of housing providers.

Whereas segregation declined slightly, if at all, in the largest metropolitan areas such as New York and Chicago, other metropolitan areas, especially in the west such as San Diego and Seattle, experienced substantial desegregation in the 1970s.

Black residential patterns facilitated desegregation: (1) the proportion of blacks in outlying areas increased sharply, (2) blacks who moved to border neighborhoods moved in a dispersed manner and, as a result, did not threaten the area’s ethnic identity, and (3) a meaningful number of Hispanics and Asians moved to the black districts.

The second generation of fair housing (1975–2000) went beyond overcoming housing discrimination to address socioeconomic discrimination, a product of exclusionary zoning. Under Mt. Laurel I and II, the New Jersey Supreme Court set up a fair share housing system for the state. It increased affordable housing in suburbs, but they did not increase racial integration.

Congress’s decision to require banks and savings and loan associations (S&Ls) to release individual-level data, including race of applicants, provided the impetus for Boston Home Mortgage Disclosure Act study (1992) which showed that although blacks were more likely to be denied loans than whites, most of the difference disappeared when background characteristics were controlled.

During the early 1980s, the political conversation remained focused on housing discrimination leading to the passage of the Fair Housing Amendment Act of 1985 that reflected the fact that “[fair housing] norms . . . had broadly diffused through American society” (p. 293). Housing audits carried out between 1977 and 2012 indicated that housing discrimination against blacks fell sharply. After 1980, racial transition slowed. However, the “slowing of resegregation was a necessary pre-condition to real integration . . . by no means [did this] provide a sufficient impetus for integration to actually occur” (p. 309).

Between 1968 and 2012, government-assisted housing programs shifted from housing subsidies to “people” subsidies (i.e.,