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Almost three years ago, when I decided to attend the Yale Law School, I visited New Haven during the summer to find housing. I found an apartment that I liked downtown, and rented it on the spot. I had never been to New Haven before, nor did I know anyone who had. When classes began several weeks later, I was surprised to find that very few of my classmates lived near me. Most lived across town, to the north of the Law School along two streets I had never heard of before—Whitney Avenue and Orange Street. I was later to learn that that this quarter of the city was referred to by law students and undergraduates alike as the "law student ghetto." The name was well-deserved. This neighborhood, more properly known as the East Rock neighborhood, was home to a large number of law students.

But this was not always the case. In 1948, only about one-tenth of the law students lived in what we now term the law student ghetto. By 1997, more law students lived in this neighborhood than in any other—students in this neighborhood outnumbered students living in other off-campus neighborhoods by a margin of two-to-one, and they made up a simple majority of the entire enrollment.

This paper examines the formation of this concentration. The evidence shows that the law student ghetto did not always exist in its current form, but rather that it is a product of housing developments of the last thirty years. This paper traces these developments. I discuss the demographic make-up of the student body, the housing distribution of the students, and events in New Haven or the wider world which affected either the demographics or the distribution.

1 Ghetto is defined as: "a section of a city, especially a thickly populated slum area, inhabited predominantly by members of an ethnic or other minority group..." RANDOM HOUSE UNABRIDGED DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1993). I use the term with some hesitation as it often carries a negative connotation,
Because the Yale Law School is located in New Haven, this paper also examines
the relationship between New Haven and Yale University, and the intertwined history of
these two communities. The story of New Haven and Yale is one of regular interaction
and yet mutual neglect. One alumnus lamented that Yale “does not have the luxury of
moving to South Carolina” unlike most other businesses in the Northeast.² And as one
scholar writing about Yale in New Haven and Trinity College in Hartford noted, the
“universities located in central cities . . . pretend that they [are] not really there.”³
Likewise, many scholars who have studied universities have ignored the environment that
surrounds the institution. According to what many consider to be “the basic institutional
history of American legal education,” “by and large . . . law schools are isolated from the
currents of their times.”⁴ This paper argues that this account, at least in the case of the
Yale Law School, is incorrect. The Yale Law School has been deeply and consistently
affected by the happenings in New Haven. Contrary to the image of the strict separation
of town and gown, events in New Haven have affected the population distributions of
Yale Law School students. The migration of law students to the law student ghetto has
been triggered by events in New Haven.

which I do not wish to imply. I use the term throughout this paper for lack of a better word, and because it
is the term actually used by members of the Yale Law School community.
⁴ Marc Feldman & Jay Feinman, *Legal Education: Its Cause and Cure*, 82. MIC. L. REV. 914, 918, 922
(1984) (reviewing ROBERT STEVENS, LAW SCHOOL: LEGAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA FROM THE 1850S TO
THE 1980S (1983)).
A Word About Methodology

The Yale Law School population study consists primarily of six samples, from 1947-48, 1957-58, 1967-68, 1977-78, 1987-88, and 1997-98. For shorter-term phenomena, these six main samples were supplemented with studies of other class years.

The class enrollments and addresses were obtained by examining the official Yale Law School or Yale University student enrollment rosters for each applicable academic year. I then cross-referenced the student enrollment rosters to Yale Law School, Yale University, or Yale Herald student directories which contained addresses. In the event of an inconsistency or conflict between a class roster and a student directory, the class roster was preferred. In the event of an inconsistency or conflict between various student directories, a Yale Law School directory took precedence over a University directory, and a University directory was preferred over a Herald directory.

Race and gender data were collected from a variety of sources. For the 1997-98 sample, official self-identification information from the Registrar was used. For the other samples, a combination of information from the Registrar’s office, the Yale Law School student directories (“facebooks”), membership rolls of various race and gender-specific organizations, and Reports of the Dean were used.

---


6 The 1947-48 addresses were taken exclusively from a Yale Law School student directory. The 1957-58, 1967-68, and 1977-78 addresses were taken primarily from official University student directories. The 1987-88 addresses were taken primarily from a Yale Herald directory. The 1997-98 student enrollment was obtained directly from the Registrar’s Office.
Racial Make-up of Sampled Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-White</td>
<td>477/11</td>
<td>512/26*</td>
<td>567/28</td>
<td>568/58</td>
<td>515/94</td>
<td>439/207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98%/2%</td>
<td>95%/5%</td>
<td>95%/5%</td>
<td>91%/9%</td>
<td>85%/15%</td>
<td>68%/32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Black</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td>17*/7</td>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>8/41</td>
<td>27/40</td>
<td>101/57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%/0.8%</td>
<td>3%/1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%/2.5%</td>
<td>1.3%/6.5%</td>
<td>4.4%/6.5%</td>
<td>16%/9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Other</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>27/0</td>
<td>36/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%/0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%/0%</td>
<td>1.3%/0.2%</td>
<td>4.4%/0%</td>
<td>6%/1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 16 foreign LLM students

The empirical evidence of the population studies has been supplemented with interviews of current and former Yale Law School students. Because these interviews occasionally touched upon sensitive or charged issues, in some cases interviewees were
promised anonymity. In cases where interviewees are not identified, I have provided some background information regarding him or her that may be helpful in providing some context for the person and their comments.

THE LAW STUDENT GHETTO TODAY

The Neighborhoods

New Haven has been generously described as a "City of contrasts." It is home to Yale University, a nationally-renown institution of higher learning, yet it has the highest drop-out rate for high school students in Connecticut. New Haven ranked thirty-ninth poorest out of the 190 major cities in America, while being located in the state with the highest per capita income in the nation and but a stone's throw from wealthy its suburbs. The neighborhoods of New Haven reflect these contrasts. Such contrasts may be apparent in any city, but it is especially true given the wide disparities in wealth and class among New Haven's population.

Orienting ourselves from the Yale Law School, the neighborhoods of New Haven can be broadly divided into two regions: north and south of the Yale Law School. The single largest population dispersion pattern among the off campus student population occurred along this north-south axis relative to the law school. For the purposes of this paper, I define "north of the Law School" as any residence north of Wall Street, and

---

7 CITY OF NEW HAVEN, COMPREHENSIVE AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY: FY 1994 at 3 (1994) [hereinafter CHAS].
8 See id.
9 See id. at 5.
“south of the Law School” as any residence south of Wall Street. This distinction
between north and south is not entirely arbitrary. There are significant differences
between the region to the south of the Yale Law School and the region to the north.

The Yale Law School sits in the center of census tract 1417, which includes most
of Yale University. Abutting Yale to the south are census tracts 1401 (the Central
Business District) and 1407 (the Dwight neighborhood). To the northeast of Yale are
census tracts 1419 and 1420 (the East Rock neighborhood), home of the law student
ghetto.

The Sterling Law Buildings is located in the northernmost margin of the original
Nine Squares pattern of New Haven, and the Law School is also located toward the
northern end of the Yale University’s traditional campus. The street layout to the south of
the Law School reflects the urban planning notions of the city founders. The streets are
laid out in a parallel and perpendicular fashion in a grid. All of Yale’s undergraduate
residential colleges are located to the south of the Law School, as are a majority of Yale’s
libraries and classroom buildings. Also south of the Law School is downtown New
Haven, built along the original Nine Squares pattern.

To the north of the Law School, the street layout is far more organic. Several
major streets lead from downtown New Haven to the northeast, and a series of smaller,
residential cross streets intersect with the major arteries. These arteries—Whitney
Avenue, Orange Street, and State Street—stretch north from the original Nine Squares,
connecting New Haven to the rest of Connecticut. Founded during colonial times, these
streets form the backbones of northern New Haven’s street layout. To the north of the
Law School New Haven is mostly residential. There are several major Yale properties,
including the Divinity School, School of Management, and the Mansfield Apartments, but the buildings are not found in the density or concentration that we see south of the Law School.

Housing options also differ between the region to the north and south of the Law School. There are several major apartment complexes to the south of the Law School. The single largest apartment complex are the New Haven Towers complex with over 400 units. The second largest apartment complex is the Ninth Square complex, numbering some 300 units. There is a greater variety of housing options to the north of the Law School, with both large apartment complexes and single family homes.

The neighborhoods to the north and south also have a very different look and feel. In her book on the architecture of New Haven, Elizabeth Mills Brown describes Whitney Avenue, one of the two major streets that run through the East Rock neighborhood, as “top-level residential, mostly of the 1890s and 1920s, now going to rented flats and offices.”10 The majority of the noteworthy structures in this neighborhood that merit a mention in Brown’s book are old, stately homes. It was, at its peak, “one of the city’s finest streets—an avenue of splendid proportions lined with great trees, forming a processional entrance into the city from the north.”11 Even today, Brown tells us that although it is “less pretentious” it still “maintain[s] the tone” and is “worth a drive.”12 The Central Business District, in contrast, is the “heart of the city’s civic and business life.”13 The buildings of note are modern urban redevelopment projects, interspersed with the occasional historic church. The Dwight area is described as a neighborhood with

---

11 Id. at 37.
12 Id.
13 Id. at 100.
"some wealth, some poverty" but one whose day has passed—"[t]oday the still-withdrawing tide [of prosperity] is marked by empty shops and messy little enterprises in once soignée quarters."\textsuperscript{14} The Law School straddles the border of these north-south neighborhoods.

These north-south regions underline the contrasts in New Haven. Looking at the data on the four census tracts, we also see significant differences in the census statistics. The two tracts to the south have much higher minority populations than the two to the north. Dwight and the Central Business District had minority populations equal to 61\% and 38\%, respectively.\textsuperscript{15} In contrast, in the two East Rock census tracts minorities made up only 17\% and 14\% of the population.\textsuperscript{16}

The anecdotal evidence in Brown about the East Rock neighborhood being "top-level" and the Dwight and Central Business District being less affluent is confirmed by the tremendous disparity in home values between the four census tracts. In the East Rock neighborhood, the median value of owner-occupied units is among the highest in the city; $248,100 and $275,000 in the two census tracts.\textsuperscript{17} In the Dwight neighborhood, the median value is $90,400.\textsuperscript{18} In the Central Business District, it is even lower—$87,500.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{Examining the Law Student Ghetto}

A majority of the law students live north of the Law School, rather than south of the Law School, outside of New Haven, or in Law School dormitories—335 students

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Id.} at 63, 65.
\textsuperscript{15} See CHAS, \textit{supra} note 7 at 1A-3.
\textsuperscript{16} See id.
\textsuperscript{17} See id. at 1B-5.
(51.8% of the total enrollment) to the north of the Law School, 117 (30.4%) to the south.
Forty-eight students, or 7.4% of the total enrollment, lived outside of New Haven proper,
and by 1997-98, only sixty-five students (10%) lived in the dormitories.

Those law students who did live downtown were concentrated in two or three
distinct apartment complexes. The New Haven Towers complex (Crown Towers,
Madison Towers, and Crown Court) accounted for the single largest concentration of law
students with sixty-nine residents, exceeding even the dormitories (sixty-five residents).
The Taft Apartments were home to twenty-nine law students, and the apartment building
at 1214 Chapel Street housed nineteen law students. These three apartment units alone
accounted for 117 out of 197 (60%) law students that live south of the law school.

This dispersion is surprising in contrast to the low population clusters found north
of the law school. Although a decisive portion of the law student population lives along
the Whitney-Orange corridor, by comparison to the students living downtown, there were
no large concentrations of law students to the north of the law school. The single largest
cluster was at the Mansfield Apartments, home to twenty-five law students, and the
apartment building at 37 Trumbull Street, which was home to seventeen law students. No
other single address north of the law school was home to more than eight law students.

This is surprising, given that there are several large apartment complexes to the
north of the Law School. The single largest apartment complex to the north of the Law
School are the Mansfield Apartments. These apartments, which are owned by Yale
University, can house over 300 students.\textsuperscript{20} The apartment and condominium complex at

\textsuperscript{18} See id.
\textsuperscript{19} See id.
\textsuperscript{20} Interview with Loretta Tremblay, Associate Director of Admissions, Yale Law School, (Oct. 14, 1998).
Per University housing policy, administrators at the Mansfield tracked capacity not by total living units, but
164 Linden Street numbers some sixty units. Other large apartment complexes are the
apartments are at 37 Trumbull Street and the apartments at 10 Livingston Street both of
which are made up of approximately forty units. Thus it would appear that the
dispersion of students to the north of the law school (or, conversely, the high
concentration to the south of the law school) cannot be explained entirely by housing
availability.

The population distribution along the north-south axis holds true for both sexes.
Of the 334 students north of the law school, 144 are women (43.1%); of the 197 students
south of campus, eighty-six are women (43.6%). These figures are comparable to each
other as well as to the fact that 41% of the law school enrollment is female. This would
indicate that at least for the downtown/suburban distinction, there would appear to be no
difference between the preferences of men and women. Likewise, there would appear to
be no differences between the preferences between men and women relative to living in
the dormitories and outside of New Haven

There is, however, a noticeable difference in residency patterns along the north-
south axis among students of different races. In 1997-98 whites accounted for 68% of the
total law school enrollment, but accounted for 74% of the students that lived to the north
of the law school and 59% of the students living to the south of the law school. Students
of color made up 32% of the law school enrollment. They made up 27% of the law
students residing in the north and 41% of law students to the south. This north-south
differential holds true across all students of color. Asians accounted for 16% of the law
school enrollment while accounting for 15% of the northern residents and 18% of the

by maximum number of residents. Unfortunately, this makes direct comparison difficult. I assume most
units at the Mansfield are home to two to three persons.
southern residents. Hispanics accounted for 6% of the law school student population while making up 4% of the residents to the north and 8% of the residents to the south. The differential is most noticeable with black law students; blacks made up 9% of the law school enrollment, but they made up only 4% of the students resident in the north while blacks made up 15% of students who live to the south of the Law School. In short, minority students across all groups were consistently more likely to live to the south of the law school in downtown New Haven than to the north. Conversely, whites made up a disproportionate portion of the northern residents relative to students of color.

While the small sample size for many minorities renders it difficult to reach any conclusions, the racial differences between students to the north and south are noteworthy for their consistency across all minority groups vis-à-vis whites. The population distribution must be juxtaposed to the racial composition and distribution of New Haven as a whole. As noted earlier, the areas to the south of the Law School has a significantly higher percentage of minority residents than the areas to the north. The two census tracts that abut Yale University to the south are 61.1% and 38.1% minority,22 where as the two tracts to the northeast are 17.3% and 14.9% minority.23

Note that the Yale Law student distributions resemble the overall racial distributions in New Haven. This distribution of Yale Law School students may indicate that contrary to the perception of students as a population apart from the wider community, student housing patterns may more closely correspond to the demographic patterns of the community in which they live than we would otherwise believe.

---

21 Interview with employee at Hadley, Inc. (Oct. 20, 1988).
22 See CHAS, supra note 7 at 1A-3.
23 See id.
Assuming that the uneven population distribution of minority and white students across a north-south axis is not coincidental or a statistical anomaly, what could cause the uneven distribution?

The first answer is that people like living near people like them. The self-segregation theory, simply stated, holds that “[i]f most black people prefer to live in neighborhoods that are largely black, then high levels of racial segregation may correspond to black desires for self-segregation and not discrimination or prejudice.”24

However, the simple answer that white students prefer living in white neighborhoods and that minority students prefer living in minority neighborhoods ignores social science studies which indicate that most minorities prefer living in integrated neighborhoods. Empirical data suggests that blacks, for example, prefer to live in integrated rather than all-black neighborhoods. One prominent survey of middle-class black households in Detroit, the blacks surveyed indicated that the ideal neighborhood would be fifty percent black and fifty percent white.25 Assuming the preferences of minority students mirror those of other middle-class minorities, the housing preferences of minority students probably cannot explain the uneven population distribution.

Most studies instead seem to point to white preferences as a more likely explanation of residential segregation. As Richard Muth hypothesized: “A much more reasonable explanation for residential segregation is that whites have a greater aversion to living among Negroes than other Negroes. If so, whites would offer more for housing in predominantly white neighborhoods than would Negroes, and separation of the

25 An integrated neighborhood that was 50% black and 50% white was chosen as the first choice in a preference ranking by 63% of the respondents. A 70% black and 30% white neighborhood was a distant second, with 13% of the respondents listing it as their first choice. See id. at 89.
residential areas of the two groups would result.\textsuperscript{26} Muth's hypothesis is born out by Massey and Denton's research. While a clear majority of blacks preferred living in a fifty percent black/fifty percent white neighborhood, most whites were averse to such a neighborhood composition. Where as 63% of blacks picked a fifty-fifty racially mixed neighborhood as most desirable, 72% of whites surveyed in Detroit responded that they would feel uncomfortable in a neighborhood that was 57% black, 64% of the white respondents stated that they would try to move out of such a neighborhood, and 84% of the respondents would not move into such a neighborhood.\textsuperscript{27} These sorts of individual white preferences can lead to segregation on a neighborhood level, as white residents are willing to pay greater rents to live in a predominantly white area and depart the neighborhood as it becomes too integrated.\textsuperscript{28} One can posit that the white residents of New Haven and the East Rock neighborhood might share the same preferences as the respondents in Detroit.

Further, there is also evidence in social science literature that indicates that the segregational effects created by Schelling's micromotives are directly related to the mobility of residents and the fluidity of the housing stock.\textsuperscript{29} The greater resident mobility, the higher the turnover rate of residences, the more quickly people's preferences for segregation can be realized as they can more easily exit undesirable neighborhoods and enter desirable neighborhoods. In his study, McDonald focused on new construction added to the housing stock and the changes in mobility this created.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{26} RICHARD F. MUTH, CITIES AND HOUSING 107 (1969).
\textsuperscript{27} See MASSEY & DENTON, supra note 24 at 93.
\textsuperscript{28} See THOMAS C. SCHELLING, MICROMOTIVES AND MACROBEHAVIOR (1978) (noting that individual motives—"micromotives"—can affect change on the neighborhood level).
\textsuperscript{29} See JOHN F. MCDONALD, ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF AN URBAN HOUSING MARKET (1979).
\textsuperscript{30} MacDonald, drawing on earlier studies, concludes that Schelling's segregation was most likely to occur in areas and during time periods marked by rapid new construction. Integration, in turn, was most likely to
Applying McDonald's findings to Yale law students in New Haven, although there is not regular addition to the housing stock, there is tremendous resident mobility. Students, as renters with one-year leases, can easily relocate. This ease of relocation may make it easier for white students to opt out of neighborhoods which they view as having an undesirable racial mix.

Another possibility which must be considered is that minority students simply have different housing preferences than their white counterparts, despite being of similar age and occupation. Some studies indicate that there may be a difference in housing preference between racial groups. In one study, two researchers in Oklahoma City asked a random sampling of residents how important it was for their neighborhood to have certain characteristics. The characteristics were divided into three categories: 1) characteristics pertaining to the proximity of certain goods or activities to the neighborhood, such as the proximity to shopping, jobs, family and friends; 2) characteristics pertaining to environmental quality such as appearance and safety; and 3) characteristics relating to children such as the quality of the local schools.

Unsurprisingly, they found great differences across social class. To the surprise of researchers, however, they found a significant difference between white and black respondents when it came to the first set of characteristics, even when controlling for all other factors such as household composition and social class. Blacks and whites expressed similar preferences when it came to the characteristics relating to environmental quality and children, but black respondents consistently rated proximity to

be maintained by older, low-income white immigrants who owned their homes—a markedly immobile group. See id. at 61.
certain desirables higher than the white respondents. At a loss to explain their findings, they hypothesized that "the importance blacks attach to local neighborhood orientation might result from past and present residential segregation that has excluded blacks from participation outside the black community, forcing their attention inward."

Although this study is imperfect, it does suggest the possibility a difference in housing patterns may simply reflect different housing preferences. Note that minority law students in New Haven are more concentrated in the downtown area, a neighborhood which is closer to many of the desirable goods or services in the first set, as the Oklahoma study would suggest.

A final possible explanation for the uneven population distribution between white and minority students along the north-south axis is the possibility that landlords and real estate agents steer white students to the East Rock neighborhood and steer minority students to the downtown area south of the Law School. Evidence of steering is elusive, consisting exclusively of anecdotes from personal interviews. Current and former white students recall being told by real estate agents and brokers that the East Rock neighborhood was "the place" for Yale students to live. A black student, in contrast, recounts that when he met several landlords in the Orange Whitney area, he felt that they

---

31 The characteristics in the first set were:
   have relatives in neighborhood, close to some relatives, have close friends in the neighborhood, close to places to be/meet with people, close to friends, close to public transportation, close to your church, have social services available, have job opportunities available in the neighborhood, close to places to shop, close to jobs.


32 Id. at 810.

33 The paucity of evidence regarding steering is not surprising, given that steering in its most invidious form (refusing to show a prospective renter or home buyer properties on account of race) is illegal under federal law. See 42 USC §3604 (1990).

34 Interview with Anne Alstott, member of the class of 1987 (Dec. 2, 1999); interview with white male member of class of 1999 (Dec. 3, 1999).
did not want to rent to him, and one suggested that he look into housing south of the Law School, specifically the Towers.\textsuperscript{35}

\textit{Cohabitation}

The area in which we see the greatest disparity along racial and gender housing patterns is cohabitation. For the purposes of this paper, I define cohabitation as two persons living at the same address and, if applicable, apartment or unit number.\textsuperscript{36}

I would argue that cohabitation is in many ways the most meaningful form of population clustering. Cohabitation is a decision of two or more persons to live in very close contact for an extended period of time. While one may not know one’s neighbors, it is almost unthinkable to not know one’s roommates. Living together reflects a closer relationship than just choosing the same neighborhood. Because of this intimate nature of cohabitation, I attribute great social significance to cohabitation patterns in my sample.

It is thus very disturbing to find stark great disparities along racial and gender lines in cohabitation. Indeed, it would not be an understatement to describe the population clustering patterns in cohabitation as segregation.

Of the 646 students in the 1997-98 sample, eighty-seven were not considered because they lived in the Law School dorms of other University housing where roommates were often randomly assigned rather than requested by the cohabitants.\textsuperscript{37}

Thus for the purposes of looking at cohabitation, this paper examines the living

\textsuperscript{35} Interview with black member of the class of 1999 (Dec. 15, 1999).
\textsuperscript{36} In common parlance, “cohabitation” often refers to members of the opposite sex who live together. In this paper, I use it to refer to persons living together regardless of sex.
arrangements of the remaining 559 students. Of these 559 students, 152 of them (23.5% of the pool of 559) cohabitated, and 407 did not. There were a total of sixty-one incidences of cohabitation, resulting in an average of 2.5 people per cohabitation set.

Of the 152 students who lived in cohabitation arrangements, seventy-eight were female (29.5% of the female enrollment) and seventy-four were male (19.4% of the male enrollment). Of the 152 students, 108 were white (24.6% of the white students in the Law School), thirty-one were Asian (30.6% of the Asian students), seven were Hispanic (19.4% of the Hispanic students), three were black (5% of the black students), and three were of an other ethnicity.

The differences in cohabitation rates along racial lines were great. Whites and Asians cohabitated at rates slightly higher than the average, whereas Hispanics cohabitated at a lower rate that the average. Blacks cohabitated at dramatically lower rates. Indeed, only three blacks cohabitated. Of the three blacks who cohabitated, two lived with each other. Thus there was only one incidence in the entire sample of a black student and a non-black student living together (the other cohabitant is a Hispanic).\textsuperscript{38} By contrast, whites and Asians cohabitated at much higher rates. Of the sixty-one cohabitation sets, an Asian or a white was present in all but four.

There was also a differential between men and women in cohabitation. Women in general tended to cohabitate at greater rates men (29.5% versus 19.4%). Finally, we see interesting data when we combine race and gender factors. Asian females were the most likely of any race and gender group to cohabitate. Sixteen Asian females cohabitated (39% of all Asian females), a greater percentage than any other race and gender group.

\textsuperscript{37} Interview with Loretta Tremblay, Associate Director of Admissions, Yale Law School, (Oct. 14, 1998). The majority, perhaps three-quarters of all student housing roommates are assigned rather than requested.
Likewise, white females were more likely to cohabitate than white males. Blacks broke from this general pattern of greater female cohabitation, however. Of the three blacks that cohabitated, all were male. Not a single black female lived in a cohabitation arrangement.

**COHABITATION ACROSS RACE AND GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number enrolled</th>
<th>Number cohabitating</th>
<th>Percentage cohabitating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td>559*</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* on campus students not counted

Asians in the Law School sample were remarkably integrated in terms of cohabitation arrangements. There was only one cohabitation set made up exclusively of Asians living together. All other Asians living in cohabitation sets were living with whites. This pattern of high Asian dispersion and integration among whites also tracks closely with studies on residential segregation. Asians in the middle- to upper-income brackets are the least segregated relative to whites of any other minority group of comparable wealth.\(^{39}\) Indeed, even when one does not control for wealth, Asians are more integrated than blacks—that is, even poorer Asians are less segregated than wealthy

---

38 Interviews with black students indicate that none of them cohabitated with white non-law students.
blacks.\textsuperscript{40} By comparison, the degree to which blacks do not cohabitate is striking. Indeed, I would argue that it is comparable in some ways to segregation. This comparison becomes more apparent when one compares the Law School sample to the wider literature on racial segregation; the Law School sample mirrors the results of other studies regarding segregation.

Many other studies indicate blacks and whites are segregated to an extent than whites and other minorities, and the Law School cohabitation data would seem to bear this out. In their influential book \textit{American Apartheid}, Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton marshal considerable empirical support for their contention that blacks more likely to be segregated than any other minority group.\textsuperscript{41} Indeed, they find that even the wealthiest blacks, more segregated than poorest Latinos or Asians,\textsuperscript{42} and that unlike Asians or Latinos, black segregation is not significantly affected by the wealth or class of either blacks or whites.\textsuperscript{43} Black racial segregation, unlike segregation among Asians or Hispanics, is also not significantly affected by educational level or occupation.\textsuperscript{44} They conclude that "[o]nly blacks experience a pattern of constant, high segregation that is impervious to socioeconomic influences. The persistence of racial segregation in America’s cities, therefore, is a matter of race and not class."\textsuperscript{45}

Little research has been done regarding the racial aspects cohabitation. Because there is a dearth of secondary literature on the subject, I attempt to analyze the cohabitation patterns of Yale law students through the lens of two somewhat similar phenomena: interracial marriage, and job-hunting.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Id.} at 87.
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Id.} at 85.
The cohabitation results from the Yale Law School sample can be compared in some ways to similar results found in studies of interracial marriage. Obviously, interracial cohabitation and interracial intermarriage are not entirely comparable for the simple reason that living together and getting married are not entirely comparable. Both, however, reflect some social tie greater than a casual relationship. Such shared living arrangements speaks to a certain trust and social network. Both show a willingness on the part of the parties to share physical space and living arrangements, and a willingness to yield no small degree of privacy to the others. Both relationships indicate at least some pooling of financial resources.

Most of the studies done in the area of intermarriage mirrors this paper’s findings regarding the cohabitation patterns of Yale Law School students. These studies have concluded that Asians are by far the most likely to intermarry with whites, with Hispanics a distant second and blacks least likely to intermarry.\(^{46}\) For black women, the group with the lowest out-marriage rate, the percentage of in-marriage is 98.7\%, meaning that only 1.3\% of black women marry a person of a different race.\(^{47}\) By comparison, almost 70\% of Asians marry non-Asians, with the number climbing even higher for some Asian subgroups.\(^{48}\) In short, “[b]lacks stand out uniquely among the array of American ethnic and racial groups in the degree to which marriage remains within the group.”\(^{49}\)

This data on intermarriage tracks closely with Yale Law School cohabitation patterns. Asians had the highest rate of intermarriage with whites, and according to the Law School sample are the most likely to live with whites. Blacks had the lowest rate of

\(^{44}\) Id. at 87-88.
\(^{45}\) Id. at 88.
\(^{46}\) See Nathan Glazer, *Black and White After Thirty Years*, PUBLIC INTEREST, Fall 1995, at 61, 61-79.
\(^{47}\) See id. at 79.
interracial marriage with whites, and in the Law School sample no black student lived with a white student.⁴⁰

This disparity in cohabitation rates among different races may reflect racial disparities in other forms of relationships. Interviews with several indicate that people find housemates through pre-existing social networks. Of the six cohabitants interviewed, not one person found their housemates through advertisements in the local paper, postings in the Law School, or other "public" means. Rather, cohabitation arrangements were formed on the basis of pre-existing relationships. Of the six cohabitants interviewed, all six knew their housemates before they moved in together. All six found their housemates informally through a social network—they were already friends, or met through acquaintances.⁵¹ Although I have been unable to find any studies regarding the finding of housemates, a parallel might be drawn to the literature regarding the finding of jobs. Sociologist Mark Granovetter, in his famed article The Strength of Weak Ties, concluded that "people find out about jobs more through personal connections than by any other method."⁵² The interview evidence from Yale law students would seem to indicate that like job-hunting, housemate hunting is most successful when social ties are utilized.

A black student whom I interviewed suggested that students cohabit primarily for social reasons, and that black students socialize differently than their white peers.

⁴⁸ Id.
⁴⁹ ld.
⁵⁰ In addition to the social parallels between interracial marriage and cohabitation, the national intermarriage data and cohabitation data for Yale law students are also directly related in some cases: some portion of the cohabitants in the Yale Law School sample are likely romantic couplings with the partners living together.⁵¹ Interview with Asian member class of 1999 (Dec. 2, 1998); interview with Asian member of class of 1999 (Dec. 2, 1998); interview with white male member 1 of the class of 2000 (Dec. 2, 1999); interview with white male member 2 of the class of 1999 (Dec. 2, 1998); interview with white female member 1 of the class of 1999 (Dec. 8, 1998); interview with white female member 2 of the class of 1999 (Dec. 8, 1998).
Being a black student at the Yale Law School one “becomes part of a ready-made community.” Because there are so few black students at the Yale Law School, the black students already form an “extended community of black students” who socialize together. The student suggested that “black students don’t need to replicate family relations in their living arrangements because already part of an extended family in the Law School.” This testimony about the strength of ties among black students fits into the Granovetter analysis in an interesting manner. Granovetter found that in job-hunting, persons with numerous “weak” ties rather than a few “strong” ties were more successful at finding a job, hence his title. The width and breadth of one’s social network, not its depth, determined one’s likelihood of finding a job. Applying this analysis to the cohabitation context, black students may have a fewer number of strong ties in the Yale Law School community rather than numerous weak ties, leading to a lower likelihood of finding a housemate.

Marriage and New Haven

Another interesting pattern which we see in 1997-98 pool are the students who chose to live outside of New Haven. I define “outside of New Haven” as an address outside of the City of New Haven, but including the other communities within New Haven County.

Of the 646 students enrolled in 1997-98, forty-eight students (7.4% of the pool) lived outside of New Haven, often far outside of the city. The students farthest from the

52 Mark Granovetter, The Strength of Weak Ties, 78 AM. SOC. REV., 1360, 1371 (1973).
53 Interview with black member of class of 1999 (Dec. 14, 1998).
Law School who regularly commuted classes lived seventy miles away, in New York City. Of the forty-eight students who had campus addresses outside of New Haven, exactly half—twenty-four lived outside of New Haven County entirely. Indeed, of the forty-eight students, one-fourth—twelve—lived outside out Connecticut.

Married students made up a disproportionate segment of the students who resided outside of New Haven. Of the forty-eight students who lived outside of New Haven, fourteen were married (29%). This is much higher proportion than the percentage of married students in the overall law school population. In the class of 1999, for example, there were twenty-three married students out of a class of 207 (11%). Indeed, although the Law School does not keep an exact count of married students, it is estimated at about sixty. This would mean almost a quarter of married students lived outside of the City of New Haven, compared to 7.4% of the overall student population.

I do not believe that the high correlation between marriage and living outside of New Haven is coincidental. One possible explanation is a married person’s desire for housing that provides greater space at a lower rent. It is a common phenomenon that persons with families, desiring more physical space, choose to live in suburbs rather than in urban areas. This explanation fails to take into account the availability of larger housing units in New Haven. Turning back to our cohabitation data, 23.5% of law students not in assigned housing cohabitate, and the average cohabitation set is 2.5. Of the fourteen married students who lived outside of New Haven, none had children living with them, so their cohabitation set would presumably be two. Assuming the cohabitation data is an accurate indicator of the availability of housing units which can accommodate

---

54 One student who was on an intensive semester program listed Berkeley, California as her address.
two or more people, New Haven would appear to have adequate housing to accommodate married couples.

The possibility that larger unit availability explaining why married students live outside New Haven is further undermined by where married students outside of New Haven are living. The character of the communities in which married Yale law students live do not necessarily seem to lend themselves to cheaper rents for greater space. While half live in communities that could be characterized as suburbs of New Haven, many live in areas at least as urban as New Haven, with a correspondingly high cost for housing units with greater space. For example, of the forty-eight students living outside New Haven, nine lived in New York City.

A more likely explanation for the high correlation between being married and choosing to live outside of New Haven is the availability of employment for spouses in New Haven. Of the fourteen married students who lived outside of New Haven, personal interviews with these students show that twelve were married to spouses who held jobs outside of New Haven or who were seeking employment outside of New Haven. All twelve cited their spouses’ employment or employment prospects as a major reason for their decision to not live in New Haven. With this small sample of married students, we may be seeing a segment of the Yale student population, traditionally thought immune to the employment situation in New Haven, being affected by the relatively poor state of the New Haven economy.

Thus in the 1997-98 sample we see a distinct ghetto-ization of Yale law students. Law student population is clustered predominantly in one region, to the north of the Law School, and further in one neighborhood, the East Rock neighborhood. Those not in that
neighborhood but to the south of the Law School are further concentrated in a handful of distinct apartment complexes.

**BEFORE THE GHETTO**

The population distribution of Yale Law students was not always so. Looking historically, the law student ghetto as we know it did not always exist. My historical survey begins shortly after World War II in 1947-48, the first year for which I have reliable records.

Not unlike the rest of the world, the Second World War marked a watershed at the Yale Law School. One alumnus recounts a near riot among Yale Law School students when they learned of the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941:

> [T]here was an underlying air of tension on campus. At about 7:00 pm, a couple of freshmen on old Campus began to beat the top of trash barrels with sticks. The excitement spread, Undergraduates from all over congregated. Dan Kelley and Art Davis were sent down High Street to rouse the law students, who abandoned their carrels, and with green eyeshades still in place, joined the crowd. Finally some ringleader shouted, “To the President’s House!”

One group of students went to the President’s House, another went to the corner of Chapel and College Streets and began pulling trolley wires off the overtracks. They entered the Taft Hotel and were expelled only when the manager turned a firehose on them. The group that went to the President’s House was spared the indignity of the firehose, and were instead treated to a rousing speech:
President Seymour called out, "Men of Yale!" (No women then!) More cheers. He said something to the effect that Yale men would as ever respond to the country's call. More cheers. We had no idea what he meant.

In the morning, small groups gathered on the first floor corridor to attempt to piece it all together. Would the government really call on law students to fight, rather than argue?

The government would indeed call upon law students to serve, and Seymour would prove correct—the Yale students would answer the call, and the war transformed the Law School.

Yale Law students would leave New Haven, abandoning the housing stock. According to one account, within months a sizeable portion of the student body had enlisted or had been drafted. "Most of us finished the first term, and then the departures began." Another sizeable segment of both the students and faculty had left the Law School to enter war-related government service. A cursory glance at the alumni directories of the war year classes indicates that a large portion of these men and women worked in war-related government service during the war.

Other personal anecdotes from alumni of that era underscore the sense that the Law School went on hiatus during the Second World War. As one alumnus recalls: "I visited the law school during the war. There was a corporal's guard of professors, many teaching out of their proper fields. A handful of students were carrying on. The rest were scattered all over the globe."

---

55 YALE LAW REPORT, Spring 1995, at 32 (quoting Morgan P. Ames, member of the class of 1947)
56 For example, of the 24 faculty curriculum vitae/biographies in the Yale Law Reporter of 1946, 12 faculty members are explicitly described as being veterans or serving in some war-related government position during World War II. See YALE LAW REPORTER, 1946 SUPPLEMENT 10-17 (1946).
57 By "war year classes" I refer to the classes of 1939-47—classes where the students would have been enrolled in law school at some point during World War II.
58 YALE LAW REPORT, supra note 55 at 32 (quoting Morgan P. Ames, member of the class of 1947)
The class enrollments confirm these anecdotes of a tremendous drop in the Yale Law School population. The class of 1945, the smallest Law School class of this century, numbered only forty graduates. By comparison, the class of 1939 began with 162 students, and the class of 1948 began with 160 students. Many student organizations went on hiatus during World War II. The Barristers' Union, Moot Court, and the Student Association all were inactive for some time during the war, only to be revived in 1946.59

The Yale Law School was not alone. At law schools all around the country, "the decrease in the numbers of both law students and faculty members was dramatic during World War II."60 "In 1938, there was a total of 28,000 students in 109 ABA-approved schools. By 1943, there were 4,800 students in these same schools."61

Meanwhile, although Yale Law School students were leaving New Haven, New Haven itself was thriving with war industries. Since the nineteenth century, New Haven had been a "town heavily involved in guns."62 The Second World War and the resulting boom in munitions were kind to New Haven.

With the explosion of war-related industries, the population of New Haven grew dramatically. People migrated to New Haven in large numbers in search of jobs. There is little doubt that the War was a major cause of growth in New Haven. The New Haven of earlier generations was a major industrial center, and during the War New Haven was home to several major defense-related industries. A sampling of the list of factories approved by the federal government as war industries gives us some taste of New Haven's industrial base: The Moralin Firearms Company, the Sargent Company, the

59 Yale Law Reporter, supra note 56 at 81-83.
60 Robert Stevens, Law School: Legal Education in American from the 1850s to the 1980s at 217 n.7 (1983).
61 Id.
Winchester Company, the Bolton Manufacturing Company, the M.B. Manufacturing Company, the American Tube Bending Company, the Malleable Iron Fittings Company, the Safety Car Heating Company, the Wire Rope Corporation of America, Snow and Nabstedt, the Armstrong Aircraft Corporation, the Amstrong Rubber Company, the Seamless Rubber Company, the A.C. Gilbert Company, the C. Cowles Company, the Geometric Tool Company, and the Rockbestos Company.63

All of these factories required employees, and unsurprisingly there was a population boom in New Haven. By mid-1943, the New Haven Housing Authority estimated an influx of 2,700 families into New Haven.64 Military authorities estimated that in 1944, ten officers and five families were arriving in New Haven each week, and this did not account for workers who were not in the military.65

Post-War New Haven

The Yale Law School in 1947-48 was deeply affected by the Second World War. Many of the Law School students that left because of the war returned to the Law School following the war and reappear in the 1947-48 sample. This would do two things: change the character of the Yale Law School and exacerbate an already tight housing market in New Haven.

62 BROWN, supra note 10 at 3.
63 This list is taken from the NEW HAVEN REGISTER, October 29, 1942.
65 See id.
"Students with a little more maturity"

Many law students left the law school in 1941, and "returned to the campus with a little more appreciation and, perhaps, maturity." The experience of Byron White, the retired Supreme Court Justice, is representative. White entered the Law School in 1939, but left New Haven to serve in the armed forces during World War II. He did not return to the Yale Law School until February 1946, and graduated in September 1946. Because the Law School was on a six-term (semester) system rather than a three-year system, the majority of students who were to return did so in the term beginning February 1946.

The anecdote of students with "a little more maturity" than in the prewar classes is born out by statistical evidence which indicates that the students in the 1947-48 sample were considerably older than in other samples. While exact age data, such as date of birth, is not available, the 1948 issue of the Yale Law Reporter notes what year sixth-term students graduated from college. Of the 110 sixth-term students—the equivalent of second semester third-years by modern reckoning—in the 1947-48 sample, only six graduated from college in 1944 or 1945. The majority, sixty-five out of 110, graduated in 1942 or earlier. Assuming that the average age of graduation from college was twenty-
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66 YALE LAW REPORT, Spring 1996, at 33.
67 See Byron White, A Tribute to Myres McDougal, 66 MISS. L.J. 1, 3 (1996).
68 YALE LAW REPORT, Spring 1996, 33. In the six-term system, a student was required to attend the Yale Law School for six terms to earn a degree. There were three terms per year: spring, summer, and fall, with the summer term being optional. Interview with Abraham Goldstein, member of the class of 1949 (Dec. 15, 1998).
69 YALE LAW REPORT, supra note 68 at 33.
one, the average age among the sixth-term students in the 1947-48 sample was 29.9. By way of comparison, the average age among third-years in 1997-98 was twenty-seven.\textsuperscript{70}

Another interesting fact that is probably related to average age is the portion of the Yale Law School student body that was married in the 1947-48 sample. In response to the large numbers of a "new breed of student"—that is, married students—a student organization known as the "Yale Law Wives" was formed in 1948 at the suggestion of the dean of the Law School.\textsuperscript{71} This group, known alternately as the Yale Law Wives or as the Yale Law Dames, grew "into a full-fledged organization with the usual complement of officers and an ever increasing roster."\textsuperscript{72} The group organized social events, offered refreshments for students during the finals period, and provided "an opportunity for wives to meet others who have similar tastes through its various interest groups, which include bridge, gourmet cooking, sewing and literature."\textsuperscript{73} Although I could not obtain exact membership data of the Yale Law Wives, several photographs of the group in the Yale Law Reporter depict scenes with more than twenty women.

Finally, evidence suggests that Yale law students had more access to money in the post-World War II years. Abraham Goldstein recalls that the "vast majority" of Yale law students were veterans and were cash benefits from the government. He himself received a cash payment, and used it sublet summer housing.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{70} See Law School Diversity? Look at the Numbers, YALE DAILY NEWS, September 27, 1996 at 1.
\textsuperscript{71} YALE LAW REPORTER, 1950 SUPPLEMENT 64 (1950).
\textsuperscript{72} Id.
\textsuperscript{73} YALE LAW REPORTER 77 (1969).
\textsuperscript{74} Interview with Abraham Goldstein, supra note 68.
City planners had anticipated that the migrant workers and military officers who had come to New Haven would leave after the War ended. Although the military withdrew from New Haven, a sizeable number of the workers in war-related industries did not return to their native communities but instead settled in New Haven—indeed, growth continued unabated. There was a sharp increase in demand for housing, particularly for smaller units and boarding houses, the type of housing one would imagine students would traditionally inhabit. I believe that Yale Law School students were competing with industry workers for housing in New Haven. An overview of the literature supports the idea that housing market was very tight both during the Second World War and shortly thereafter. Without the expected exodus, and with the return of veterans, the housing shortage in New Haven was even more severe in the years shortly after than World War II than during it. A November 1945 survey estimated that 3000 individuals and families were searching for housing. 75 Another survey in 1949 showed that the housing shortage had not eased—there were still 6,592 individuals or families in search of housing. 76

Yale Law School students in the 1947-48 sample faced this housing shortage. In the 1947-48 sample, we see a relatively high number of students (fifty-two students) living outside of New Haven, making it one of only two samples where more than ten percent of the class lived outside of New Haven. I attribute the high number of Yale Law

75 See Solomon, supra note 64 at 296.
76 See id.
School students living outside of New Haven to the housing shortage in New Haven during and immediately following World War II.\textsuperscript{77}

It was young single workers and young married couples that uprooted and moved to New Haven to find work during World War II, and I believe these younger workers were competing for exactly the same housing stock that Law School students would typically desire. Abraham Goldstein, a member of the class of 1949, notes that off-campus housing was in “very limited supply” during his time at the Yale Law School. Although there was demand for off-campus housing among the students, they found the sorts of housing they could afford to be “fully occupied” by non-Yale students.\textsuperscript{78} Given that there was such limited housing, most students “lived where the University put you.”\textsuperscript{79}

Interestingly, the students who lived in off campus housing in New Haven in the 1947-48 sample were fairly evenly distributed along a north-south axis from the law school. This is in contrast to housing patterns from the 1960s on, where a significant majority of the off-campus population lived north of the law school along the Whitney Avenue-Orange Street corridor. The single largest concentration of law students outside of the dormitories lived at 70 Central Avenue (thirty-two students), to the south and west of the Law School, near the Yale Bowl. This apartment complex was built as a joint

\textsuperscript{77} Although I unfortunately have no data on exactly who is married among the 1947-48 sample, the high number of students who live outside New Haven may be related to the high number of students who are married. There may be some relationship between these two statistics. In the sample from 1997-98 there was a correlation between being married and living outside of New Haven; a similar correlation may be present in the 1947-48 sample. For the 1997-98 sample, I posited that employment opportunities for spouses and a desire for greater space may have led them to search for housing outside of New Haven. I believe that it is possible that for different reasons married students in 1947-48 also chose to live outside of New Haven. Although I have no information regarding of the employment of the spouses (overwhelmingly, if not entirely, wives) of students, I suspect that the housing shortage in New Haven was a greater factor in 1947 than employment opportunities for spouses in New Haven.

\textsuperscript{78} Interview with Abraham Goldstein, supra note 68.

\textsuperscript{79} Id.
project between Yale University and the city of New Haven. Using surplus war material, it was a complex of Quonset huts designed to house veterans, but due to the high number of students who were veterans, Yale took an increasingly larger role in administering the apartment complex. A similar, though smaller, Quonset hut complex was built in what is now the Science Hill area to the north of the Law School.

The East Rock neighborhood was not home to a significant population cluster of law students in 1947. The law student ghetto is nowhere to be seen. Not counting female law students in University-owned housing along Hillhouse Avenue and the University-owned Quonset hut complex, only thirty-one law students lived to the northeast of the law school in 1947-48. Few law students lived there, according to personal accounts. East Rock was where “society,” not students, lived. At the time East Rock was a “very posh residential” neighborhood where students did not live but instead “walked along [the streets] with eyes agog at the splendid homes.” Students wanted to live north of the law school. Of the two Quonset hut complexes, the one to the north of the Law School was consistently more popular than the one near the Yale Bowl. Living north was “socially favored,” but difficult due to a lack of housing accessible to students.

In general, the law students in the 1947-48 sample are evenly scattered around the Law School. Of the students not living in the law school dorms or undergraduate residential colleges, eighty-one students lived to the north of the law school, seventy-nine to the south. Of these students, seventy-four lived to the west of the Law School and eighty-six lived to the east.

---

80 Id.
81 Id.
82 Id.
One population cluster north of the Law School worthy of note were female law students. In both the 1947-48 and 1957-58 sample, most female law students were housed along Hillhouse Avenue. The Law School and University set aside these buildings for this purpose, as female students were not allowed to live in undergraduate dormitories or in the Law School dormitories.

The majority of students in the 1947-48 sample, however, lived in the Law School dormitories. Slightly less than half of the student body—237 students out of a total enrollment of 488—lived in the dorms. This high percentage of students in the dorms would continue into the sixties. For example, in 1957-58, 266 out of 538 students lived in the Law School dormitories.

Thus in the 1947-48 we see a population distribution without any trace of a law student ghetto in the East Rock neighborhood. Instead we see a large number of students relying on University provided housing of various kinds, despite factors which one might think would cause law students to move into off-campus housing—law students who are older than in other years, more married students, and more access to money. Personal accounts confirm that there was ample demand for housing off-campus housing, especially north of the Law School. In 1947-48, however, the supply was simply not there.

THE TRANSFORMATION

The law student ghetto as it exists today is a product of the 1960s and 1970s. The 1967-68 sample represents the beginnings of a dramatic social change at the Yale Law
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83 In 1947-48, 16 out of 24 female law students lived along Hillhouse Avenue. In the 1957-58 sample, 15 out of 23 female law students did so.
School and in New Haven. The Yale Law School of later years, the concentration of law students to the northeast, and the development of the law student ghetto have their roots in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The changes at the Yale Law School began with a change in the cast of characters. The radical political realignment of the American population was mirrored within the Yale Law School student body. Robert Bork, then a professor at the Yale Law School, described the change in the student body as follows: "The change at the law school began abruptly with the class that entered in 1967. Unlike the traditional liberal students of the second- and third-year classes, whom they frightened as much as they dismayed the faculty, these students were angry, intolerant, highly-vocal, and case-hardened against logical argument." 84 Bork continues: "The entry of another politicized class in 1968 gave the radicals effective control of the student body. I was on sabbatical leave that academic year, but upon returning in 1969 I saw the entry of a third such class and a law school becoming an intellectual and pedagogical shambles." 85

Others agree that the Yale Law School student body changed radically in the late 1960s and early 1970s, although they do not put the negative and apocalyptic spin on the transformation that Bork does. Harlon Dalton, a graduate of the class of 1973, notes with some pride that his class was more "politically aware" than previous classes. 86 Robert Stevens, also a former Yale professor, writes: "Students at least in the elite law schools at the end of the 1960s claimed a dramatically greater interest in serving the underprivileged and restructuring society than had students at the beginning of the decade. When

---

85 Id. at 37.
questioned about their political philosophies, they showed a decided shift to the left."\textsuperscript{87}

Another student that was a member of those "angry, intolerant, highly-vocal" classes proudly stated that "in the late 1960s Yale law students had a closer relationship to flower children than to the Fortune Five Hundred."\textsuperscript{88}

The change in the composition of the Yale Law School student body resulted in a dramatically different atmosphere at the Yale University and New Haven. "New Haven at that period was a city in substantial turmoil."\textsuperscript{89} There was unrest and protest on university campuses across the nation, and Yale was no exception. "Turmoil was the order of the day—student strikes, arson in university buildings (three episodes in the law school alone), angry demonstrations, classroom disruptions, rejection of rationality as reactionary, obscenities shouted at faculty members, the usual assortment of barbarities."\textsuperscript{90} One episode was so striking Robert Bork opened his recent book, \textit{Slouching Towards Gomorrah}, with it:

One morning on my way to teach a class at the Yale law school [in 1969], I found on the sidewalk outside the building heaps of smoldering books that had been burned in the law library. They were a small symbol of what was happening on campuses across the nation: violence, destruction of property, mindless hatred of law, authority, and tradition. I stood there, uncomprehending, as a photograph in the next day's \textit{New York Times} clearly showed. What did they want, these students? What conceivable goals led them to this and to the general havoc they were wreaking on the university? Living in the Sixties, my faculty colleagues and I had no understanding of what it was about, where it came from, or how long the misery would last.\textsuperscript{91}

The unrest was caused not by the non-Yale inhabitants of New Haven, but

\textsuperscript{87} Stevens, supra note 60 at 234.
\textsuperscript{88} Yale Law Report, Spring 1996 at 47 (quoting Robert A. Webb, member of the class of 1969).
\textsuperscript{89} Mark V. Tushnet, Critical Legal Studies, 100 Yale L.J. 1515, 1531 (1991).
\textsuperscript{90} Bork, supra note 84 at 37.
by Yale Law School and University students—the "brightest, best educated, most affluent members of the baby boom generation." Accounts of Yale University in the late 1960s indicate that law students, more so than undergraduates, were disproportionately involved in radical politics—"the elite law school had become part of the student revolution." As Bork sardonically writes, "These white, upper-middle-class Yale law students saw themselves as the people’s vanguard. Judging from the reaction of the non-Yale population of New Haven, ‘the people’ would have liked nothing better than to cane their vanguard’s bottoms." 

All of this unrest had a profound effect on the culture of the Yale Law School. The culture at the Yale Law School in the late 1960s was a culture of fear and uncertainty. One recalls that “[w]e often had to get to our classes through pickets marching in the halls. Faculty, afraid for their safety, no longer returned to their offices in the evening. Most took their research and writing home to avoid the possibility of destruction." Personal safety became a real concern for faculty and students. Alexander Bickel was the subject of several verbal assaults in the Law School hallway and his likeness was burned in effigy at a protest staged on alumni weekend in 1969.

The atmosphere of the 1960s had a profound effect on the housing patterns of Yale Law School students. The spirit of the age led some students to experiment with

91 Id. at 1.  
92 Id. at 21.  
93 STEVENS, supra note 60 at 235.  
94 BORK, supra note 84 at 38.  
95 Id.  
unorthodox living arrangements. Some law students living in the dorms chose to organize themselves as a commune in the Law School courtyard.97

But another reaction, probably more common, by the members of the Yale Law School community was fear. Some faculty refused to walk through the courtyard while the commune was there for fear of being harangued or worse. While some students moved into communes in the law school courtyard, I believe that the fear of unrest led other students to leave downtown New Haven in favor of other housing options. The most striking aspect of the 1967-68 sample is the tremendous number of law students who chose to live in undergraduate residential colleges and outside of New Haven.

One hundred and four students lived in either undergraduate residential colleges or in University housing attached to residential colleges and typically reserved for undergraduates. This is a sharp rise from the twenty law students who lived in such undergraduate University housing in the 1957-58 sample or the twenty-nine who did so in 1947-48. Also, by comparison, thirteen law students lived in undergraduate University housing in 1977-78, three in 1987-88, and only one did so in 1997-98.

Seventy-nine law students lived outside of New Haven in 1967-68, again the highest number out of the six samples. Meanwhile, 194 law students lived in the law school dormitories. A combined total of 379 law students (64%) lived outside of New Haven, in the law school dormitories, and in University housing—the highest absolute number, and the second-highest percentage of total enrollment after 1947-48.

97 See Tushnet, supra note 89 at 1531 n.63 ("A ‘commune’ was established in the courtyard of the Law School, though by national standards it was a relatively tame affair.") Known as “People’s Park at Yale,” as a reference to the famed park in Berkeley, California, the commune lasted for a semester. Interview with Abraham Goldstein, supra note 68.
The high number of law students choosing to live outside of New Haven, in the law school dormitories, and in University housing may reflect a growing fear of chaos and disorder in the city of New Haven as reflected in housing decisions. Throughout the city, "violence and threats of violence" were not uncommon.98 I believe the move to University-provided housing and away from private housing stock in New Haven proper is linked to the rising crime and unrest of this period. I believe students chose to seek refuge from the problems in New Haven in the "safe havens" of University-provided housing, or they chose to avoid New Haven altogether.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside of New Haven</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Housing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School Dorms</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total not in New Haven</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage not in New</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98 Bork, supra note 84 at 40.
Personal accounts of faculty members confirm that fear of unrest played a role in their decisions regarding housing. Those who lived “close enough to the campus and to the town Green, where demonstrations [were] to take place, [were] mildly worried. Should a rampage occur, as many thought possible, the faculty homes were not out of reach.” 99

Just as faculty members, at least according to some accounts, had grave concerns about living close to downtown New Haven and the Green, students also chose to avoid living toward downtown New Haven. Harlon Dalton, in an interview, notes that he felt that students, particularly white students, did not feel comfortable in the predominantly black downtown areas. 100

99 Id. at 41-42.
100 Interview with Harlon Dalton, supra note 86.
Finally, moving to the west was not a viable option because by 1967, much of the real estate to the immediate west of the law school was occupied by public housing. Elm Haven, the large public housing project to the west of the law school, was converted into housing for the poor in 1955.

The urban chaos in New Haven did not end with the previous 1967-68 sample, but by 1971, the worst was had passed. Abraham Goldstein, in his Annual Report of the Dean in 1972, wrote: "In my second year as Dean, the storms we had anticipated when I took office in the spring of 1970 did not materialize. . . . Could it really be that those who raged so recently are now satisfied?"101

Although urban unrest in New Haven peaked in 1970-71 and the fear of riots and violence abated, the effects of would last well into the 1970s. Goldstein writes that after the "cathartic . . . psychodrama" of the previous years, students turned inward out of "emotional exhaustion," and, he feared, had "given up on society."102

The population distribution data would sadly seem to indicate that, at least in terms of housing decisions, they had. In 1977-78 we see a continuation of the flight to the Whitney-Orange corridor, this time with male students leaving their earlier haven of University housing and following female students northward. the flight from New Haven had begun in earnest.

By most accounts, the culmination of urban unrest in New Haven was in the summer of 1970, with the trial of several Black Panther accused of murdering a former Black Panther turned police informant. Many considered the trial unjust, and protests erupted. Over May Day weekend in 1970, New Haven was transformed into an armed

102 Id.
camp. Over 13,000 protestors came to New Haven in addition to the student protestors already present. In response the government deployed 4,000 law enforcement officers. The weekend was marked by several major incidents of violence. Fifteen hundred demonstrators attempted to storm the federal courthouse, only to be routed on the Green by tear gas-wielding riot police. The Yale hockey rink was bombed, allegedly by right-wing protestors.

Yale was deeply affected by the Black Panther Trial of 1970 and the accompanying protests. The Student Senate voted for a campus-wide strike to support the indicted Black Panthers. Many of the elected bodies in Yale’s residential colleges voted to give housing to the out-of-town protestors over May Day weekend. John Hersey, then a master of a residential college, questioned the fairness of the trial. He was echoed by numerous other University officials, including Kingman Brewster, then President of the University. The Black Panther trial led to town hall meeting at the Law School, with the possibility of the Law School or Yale Law School students offering legal support being considered.103

But in addition to Yale’s involvement in the protests, another major reaction on the part of the Yale community was a sense of despair and fear. Just before the May Day protests, Ralph Winter was quoted as saying: “If ten percent of the rumors spreading around here are true, then there will be no New Haven on Monday.”104 “Stores sold out of their stocks of fire extinguishers. A surprising number of faculty families found it just the time for out-of-town vacations. So did many students.”105

103 See Tushnet, supra note 89 at 1534.
104 BORK, supra note 84 at 42.
105 Id.
The population distributions in the 1977-78 sample bear out Bork's gloomy outlook in 1970. Students were simply not living near downtown New Haven.

*Female Law Students in 1967-68: The Move Northward*

The history of women at the Yale Law School begins in 1886, when Alice Coburn received an LLB from the Yale Law School. She came unannounced to registration, noting that nothing in the University catalog explicitly barred women, and refused to be turned away.\(^{106}\) Another woman would not be admitted until 1918,\(^{107}\) but their numbers remained in the single digits until the Second World War. The Second World War marked a watershed for the entry of women to education institutions, including law schools. The Yale Law School was no exception. Female enrollment increased significantly, rising from four women out of an enrollment of 162 in the class of 1939 (2%) to eight out of forty in the class of 1945 (20%).\(^{108}\) The prominence of women was underscored by the fall in overall enrollment in the Law School as a result of the war. For example, the class of 1943 numbered only seventy-three, of whom eight were women. The class of 1945, the smallest Law School class of this century, also had eight women—and only forty total students.

Following the rise in female enrollment after World War II, the number of women students—both as a percentage of the student body and in absolute numbers—fell during

\(^{106}\) After this incident, Yale added the following sentence to the University catalog: "It is to be understood that the courses of instruction are open to persons of the male sex only, except where both sexes are specifically included." F. HICKS, THE HISTORY OF THE YALE LAW SCHOOL (1937).


\(^{108}\) YALE LAW REPORTER, *supra* note 56 at 81-83.
the 1950s and remained low throughout the 1960s. Until the early 1970s, the number of women students remained miniscule. It was not until 1971 that female students exceeded ten percent of the student body. A cursory glance at the 1948, 1958, and 1968 pools indicates that the number of female students actually dropped from the 1940s to 1950s, and remained constant at about five percent of the student body until the late 1960s to early 1970s. The high of twenty-four women in the law school reached in 1947-48 would not be surpassed until the late 1960s.

M A L E / F E M A L E R A T I O N A T T H E Y A L E L A W S C H O O L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>464/24</td>
<td>515/23</td>
<td>573/22</td>
<td>464/162</td>
<td>361/248</td>
<td>381/265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%/5%</td>
<td>96%/4%</td>
<td>96%/4%</td>
<td>74%/26%</td>
<td>59%/41%</td>
<td>59%/41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female Enrollment at the Yale Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of female law students begins to rise dramatically in the late 1960s. This increase in female law students is one in the housing trends that transforms the Yale Law School and begins the creation of the law student ghetto in the late 1960s. Until the late 1960s, because female law students were not allowed to live in the Law School dormitories, they were offered housing north of the Law School, primarily along Hillhouse Avenue. Two addresses, 17 Hillhouse and 56 Hillhouse, housed female law students from the early 1930s until 1960s. However, 17 Hillhouse was converted into offices in 1959, and 57 Hillhouse was converted into an annex to the Peabody Museum by the University in 1960.¹⁰⁹ Neither the Law School dormitories nor the undergraduate dormitories were open to women law students at that time. In particular, Yale College would not admit women until 1969, and thus women were not allowed to live in the undergraduate residential colleges. Thus in the sixties, we see the after effects of the dislocation of a sizeable portion of female law students.¹¹⁰

Female law students responded to this dislocation by moving north of the law school and up the Whitney-Orange corridor. Of the twenty-two women in the 1967-68 sample, two lived outside of New Haven, one lived south of the Law School, and the remaining nineteen all lived north of the law school.

I believe that female students had concerns about personal safety given the urban violence and unrest in downtown New Haven, just as male students, perhaps even more so. Studies consistently show that women are more sensitive to issues of personal safety

¹¹⁰ For example, in the 1957-58 sample, 15 out of 23 female law students lived at 17 Hillhouse Avenue.
than men. Given the degree of unrest in New Haven, law students’ housing preferences as a whole appear to have been geared toward safety concerns, as witnessed by the movement into University-owned housing or out of New Haven. Female law students could not move into University-owned housing, so they were forced to look for other safe housing alternatives.

I believe the modern “law student ghetto” of the Whitney-Orange corridor was formed in the late 1960s and 1970s by female law students moving away from urban New Haven. Women were not allowed to live in the Law School dorms until the late 1960s, and women were not admitted to Yale College until 1969. Thus in the 1967-68 sample, it was simply not possible for female law students to live in the undergraduate residential colleges. Even in the years shortly after 1969, although I have no statistical data to support this contention, I suspect the majority of those Yale Law students who lived in undergraduate dormitories attended Yale College as undergraduates. I suspect that female law students, who could not have attended Yale College, did not have the social networks to acquire housing in the undergraduate dormitories. Given their inability to live in the Law School dormitories or undergraduate dormitories, which can be characterized as traditional safe havens from the unrest in New Haven, I believe women law students chose to move northward away from downtown New Haven in search of personal safety.


112 According to one alumnus who lived in an undergraduate residential college while he was in law school, he and most others who did so were Yale College alumni who lived in their old residential college. Interview with David Martz, member of the class of 1985, October 21, 1998.
Why East Rock?

Assuming that my hypothesis that law students (beginning with women) chose to move northward for reasons of personal safety is correct, the question remains: why north?

Law students did not move south, I believe, because downtown New Haven, to the south, was scene of most of the unrest. Several major riots broke out o the New Haven Green. Assuming that law students chose to move for reasons of personal safety, it would be reasonable to assume that they moved away, rather than toward, the center of urban unrest. Further, in 1966, Interstate 91 was completed and connected to Interstate 95, effectively cutting New Haven off from the water to the south and from the west.\textsuperscript{113} The new highway system formed a formidable barrier separating the law school from potential housing stock to the west and south.

Also, at some point in the mid-1970s, University began discouraging graduate students from living in dormitories.\textsuperscript{114} Also, between 1967-68 and 1977-78, we see a steady decline in the number of Yale College alumni attending the Law School.

Assuming that most of those Law School students who chose to live in the residential colleges were Yale College alumni, the decrease in College alumni would likely cause a drop in the number of Law School students. The fear that drove students into undergraduate residential colleges in 1967 kept them from reentering urban New Haven housing and instead they moved north along Whitney-Orange corridor.

\textsuperscript{113} BROWN, supra note 10 at 20.
\textsuperscript{114} Interview with David Martz, supra note 112.
This move north was underscored by the steadily decreasing population of the Law School dormitories. The population of law students in the Law School dormitories dropped in every year surveyed since 1947-48. The dorms, if not full, were generally at close to full capacity for most the post-World War II period.\textsuperscript{115}

As the capacity of the dorms decreased, students were forced to look for housing alternatives. Because this decrease in dorm capacity occurred as there was unrest in New Haven and thereafter, I believe students who found themselves searching for housing outside the Law School chose to search north.

Meanwhile, the housing stock in the East Rock neighborhood became increasingly affordable to law students. The process by which housing stock is becomes more affordable to those of lower incomes is usually referred to as “filtering” or “price filtering.” Although “the literature contains almost as many distinct definitions of filtering as analysts who use the term,”\textsuperscript{116} I use the term as follows:

When new housing is built, some families move into it and leave their old housing vacant. The demand for the type of housing they formerly occupied decreases, reducing its price and permitting families with somewhat lower incomes to buy or rent it. In turn, these families move out of housing that is somewhat lower in quality, reducing the demand for that type of housing and enabling families of still lower income to move in.\textsuperscript{117}

Although sound in economic theory, little empirical data exists to prove that filtering actually occurs.\textsuperscript{118} In particular, the causal connection between private housing production for the upper- and middle-class and better housing conditions for the poor is hotly debated. For the purposes of this paper, however, it is not important to inquire into

\textsuperscript{115} Interview with Loretta Tremblay, \textit{supra} note 37; interview with Abraham Goldstein \textit{supra} note 68.
\textsuperscript{116} \textsc{Jerome Rothberg et al.}, \textsc{The Maze of Urban Housing Markets} 239 (1991).
\textsuperscript{117} John C. Weicher, \textit{Private Production: Has the Rising Tide Lifted All Boats? in Housing America’s Poor} 53 (Peter D. Sahlin, ed.) (1987).
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{See id.} at 56.
the causation of why the East Rock neighborhood became more accessible to students, but merely to note that it did. In earlier times, the East Rock neighborhood had been the “patrician showplace of the city.”\textsuperscript{119} Lower Whitney Avenue, today the hub of the law student ghetto, had been home to “great brick houses and baronial castles.”\textsuperscript{120} By the 1960s and 1970s, however, the East Rock neighborhood and the area to the north of the Law School had become more plebian and affordable, allowing law students the opportunity to take up residence.\textsuperscript{121}

THE LAW STUDENT GHETTO IN THE FUTURE

Having traced the historical creation of the law student ghetto, we should now ask what perpetuates this unusual population clustering. I believe the continued existence of the law student ghetto can be traced to several factors: path dependence, the inertial social effects of a large cluster of law students, the fact that the same concerns which drove students to these clusters in the 1960s and 1970s still holds true today, and the continued institutional influence of Yale Law School.

When an arrangement made in the past survives despite the fact that more efficient alternatives may now available because a satisfactory equilibrium has been reached is called “path dependence.”\textsuperscript{122} Path dependence is the claim that some “historical accident” can have important and irreversible consequences influences on the ultimate market allocation of resources, even in a world characterized by voluntary

\textsuperscript{119} BROWN, supra note 10 at 44.
\textsuperscript{120} Id.
\textsuperscript{121} See id. (noting that “drab apartments” had replaced the castles along Lower Whitney).

49
decisions and individually maximizing behavior."\textsuperscript{123} I will focus on one specific good the University provides that I believe illustrates the notion of path dependence.

One reason the population clusters of law students survive is that the University has encouraged it by running a shuttle between the University and the East Rock neighborhood. The shuttle, which is free to those with Yale ID, runs twelve-hours a day, five days a week. The shuttle goes from several locations on the University campus up to the East Rock neighborhood via Whitney Avenue, then returns downtown and stops at the New Haven Towers apartment complex and the Ninth Square apartment complex before returning to the campus. This shuttle operated by Yale University touches upon path dependence in several ways.

First, the shuttle can be seen as an adaptation to compensate for path dependence. A variety of factors, detailed above, led students to form a law student ghetto. The costs of eliminating this population cluster are high and such a move is unlikely—some adaptation was therefore required. Given that a significant student population has moved to the East Rock neighborhood, the shuttle was needed to transport them. This situation is what some have called "weak-form path dependence."\textsuperscript{124} A previous path taken is not entirely efficient, and thus requires an adaptation to reach equilibrium. This equilibrium is, however, local. The situation with the students in East Rock and a shuttle to transport them is satisfactory and stable, but we cannot say that it is superior to a situation without a shuttle but with all students near enough to easily walk to the University.

\textsuperscript{123} S.J. Liebowitz & Stephen E. Margolis, Path Dependence, Lock-in, and History, 11 J.L. Econ. & Org. 205, 205 (1995)
\textsuperscript{124} See Roe, supra note 122 at 647.
Second, the shuttle can itself be seen as a form of path dependence. The very adaptation improves the existing arrangement and creates new incentives to preserve it. Put in economic terms, it stabilizes the local equilibrium. Without a shuttle, students would have less of an incentive to live in the law student ghetto.

Finally, the shuttle is also illustrative of how path dependence might be broken by external actions. In 1996 Yale University re-routed the shuttle so that it stopped at Ninth Square, an urban redevelopment project in downtown New Haven that Yale wished to support. It is probably too early to gauge whether or not attempt to influence students’ housing decisions will be successful, although in the 1997-98 sample, only eight students lived in Ninth Square.

We should also not underestimate the social effects of a large cluster of law students. Law students are a social network. They learn of housing opportunities from each other and often live together. Therefore, if a decisive majority lives in one neighborhood, as they do, other law students may gravitate toward that neighborhood for no other reason than because so may other students are already there. The presence of law students in a neighborhood performs an important signaling function to other law students. The presence of other law students is a cue—it indicates one’s peers have judged that area to be an acceptable place to live.

Although we have discussed path dependence and inertia, we should not assume that the underlying rationale for living in the law student ghetto has faded. Some of the same factors which led Yale Law School students to choose to move north decades ago still holds true today.
Although New Haven and the United States today is not marked by the urban unrest and strife of the 1960s, urban crime—and the fear of it—remain live issues. New Haven has been ranked as the third most dangerous small city in America and the thirteenth most dangerous among all cities. 125 Yale University ranks in the top five percent of colleges and universities for all categories of crime. 126 Assuming that one of the reasons that students in the 1960s and 1970s chose to move north was for fear of urban unrest, it would not be unreasonable for such fears to exist today.

Finally, we should not overlook how the institutional influence of the Yale Law School accentuates and supports the existing population clusters. For example, every year the Yale Law School Admissions Office distributes informational material regarding housing to incoming students. In its 1997 packet, in addition to information regarding on-campus housing the Admissions Office included two flyers regarding off-campus housing. 127 One flyer was from the New Haven Towers. The other from Hadley Inc., advertising vacancies in the East Rock neighborhood. By sending out information regarding some housing opportunities but not others, the Law School exercises tremendous influence, steering entering students toward certain neighborhoods and buildings. The Towers apartment complex had the single largest concentration of law students at a single address. Of the eighteen advertised rentals in the Hadley flyer sent out in the summer of 1997, in the 1997-98 sample sixteen of the addresses were occupied by law students. 128

127 YALE LAW SCHOOL ADMISSIONS OFFICE, HOUSING INFORMATION AND LOTTERY APPLICATION (unpaginated) (1997).
128 Note that each of these addresses may consist of multiple units, so the students in the 1997-98 sample may not have been living in the exact units advertised. Regardless, the congruence between the rentals
The congruence between the residences suggested by the Law School and students’ housing patterns does not answer the question of whether the Law School is shaping the preferences of incoming students or merely reflecting them. The answer, I suspect, is both. The Law School’s institutional inertia reinforces existing student preferences, and also inculcates new students to these preferences.

CONCLUSION

This paper has found a noticeable isolation of the law student community from the remainder of New Haven. Law students are withdrawn physically and geographically and clustered into their discrete geographical spaces. This isolation is a sort of class segregation—class not in the sense of socioeconomic status but of occupation and social role.

This ghetto-ization of the law students is not new. It could be argued that living in the dormitories or in University-provided housing—as was the case in the 1947-48 sample—is even more isolating. In a sense the historical narrative is not so much about the creation of a law student ghetto but a movement of one.

But in important ways the observation that the law student ghetto just moved from the dormitories to East Rock fails to capture critical parts of the story. The story is more than just the movement of a law student ghetto, but the movement indicates something about the character of this population cluster. The law student ghetto today speaks to the voluntary nature of this ghetto formation. Unlike the dormitories which involve less advertised through the Admissions Office and student housing choices indicates the degree to which the Law School influences students’ housing decisions.
personal choice and agency, the formation of a population cluster outside of the institutional context require s more effort on the students. Thus the modern law student ghetto speaks to the strength and resilience of the clustering effect.

This cluster has, however, its own cracks. The noticeable disparities along the north-south axis between whites and minorities as well as the segregation in cohabitation shows even within the Yale law student cluster there are divisions. The increasing diversity of the Yale Law School has not been fully reflected in housing patterns. Black Yale law students in particular seem to experience isolation within isolation.

The story then is not just about change but continuity. There can be no doubt that there has been dramatic change in the population distribution of Yale Law School students over the past half century. But this study of the Yale Law School is also testament to the enduring nature of housing preferences and the power of private preferences to trump institutional actions. Even with little institutional initiative, law students continue to live together and in close proximity to each other.

- One student at address
- Two to eight students at address
- Nine to twenty students at address
- Twenty-one or more students at address

Size of circles corresponds to number of students within the range.