







































































































































































































perpetuities rules. Perhaps similar fears also lay behind the contemporary enlargement of authority granted to members of the present generation to control the disposition of property by their successors.

The intellectual paradox Alexander discussed in his work was, therefore, mirrored in the social history of the late nineteenth century. Indeed, as the twentieth century opened, legal thinkers were beginning to openly note such contradictions, complain about classical reliance on freedom of contract and property alienation as central tenets of American political life, and construct new theories for justifying the existence and operation of regulatory regimes. The gradual unwinding of the political side of classical or formal modes of legal analysis is one of the subjects taken up in the next chapter on the rise of zoning, urban planning and land use regulation. And, of course, since history sometimes repeats itself, the paradox in nineteenth-century thought Alexander wrote about reappeared in recent decades as debates flowered over the wisdom of reforming the common law Rule Against Perpetuities. For part of that debate, see Jesse Dukeminier, *The Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities: Ninety Years in Limbo*, 34 U.C.L.A. L. REV. 1023 (1987).