French-American Foundation

SciencesPo.

Housing and School Segregation and Intergenerational Inequality in the U.S.

by Gary Orfield & Patricia Gándara
UCLA
French-American Foundation Scholars-in-Residence at Sciences Po in 2009

Patricia Gándara is a Professor of Education at the University of California in Los Angeles. She is Co-Director of The Civil Rights Project at UCLA, the Associate Director for the University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute, and the Co-Director for Policy Analysis in California Education, which is a University of California/Stanford University policy research consortium. Her research focuses on education equity and access for low income and ethnic minority students. Professor Gándara earned her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from UCLA.

Gary Orfield is a professor of Education, Law, Political Science and Urban Planning at the University of California in Los Angeles. He is the Co-Founder and Director of the Civil Rights Project at UCLA, the nation's leading research institution of civil rights and racial inequality. His work focuses on the development and implementation of social policy, concentrating on the impact of equal opportunity policy in American society. School desegregation and the implementation of civil rights laws have been central to his work. Professor Orfield has served as an expert witness in many court cases, notably Grutter v. Bollinger, in which the Supreme Court upheld the affirmative action policy used by the University of Michigan. In 2007, he received the Social Justice in Education Award from the American Educational Research Association for "work that has had a profound impact on demonstrating the critical role of education research in supporting social justice."

***

Housing segregation is a fundamental mechanism of inequality in metropolitan societies and education is the central way that the inequality is transmitted to the next generation. Housing policy is often discussed in terms of physical features of housing, design, and healthy conditions, but stratification, inequality and denial of equal opportunity are primarily about location. Location is very heavily priced into housing costs everywhere because location involves prestige, convenience, social contacts and networks, peer groups for children, contacts that may lead to jobs, safety and comfort in daily life, and,

importantly, school opportunity. Where there is school assignment by housing location, the link is exceedingly clear.

If the housing market is extremely stratified or if marginal or excluded groups are housed in an isolated fashion as the result either of government policy (well intentioned though it might be) or of private discrimination, then the supposedly neutral process of sending children to the nearest school becomes a powerful mechanism for perpetuating or even deepening inequality, because of school differences in teacher quality and experience, student peer groups, community resources, and other key forms of inequality. Even when families are offered school choices, the results tend to reflect and often deepen inequality because the more privileged families in neighborhoods with stronger social capital and networks are able to make more informed choices and call on personal contacts to ensure they receive their first choice. Markets can only aid equity when information and access (such as free and convenient transportation) are equalized and barriers such as discrimination and hostility are ended.

Residential isolation of excluded groups tends to perpetuate itself, to feed negative adaptation among the excluded and a sense of superiority on the part of the privileged. Isolation plus bias produce a toxic momentum of deepening inequality. Segregated housing is not necessary to create inequality and isolation but it makes it much easier to maintain, it deeply reinforces inequality, it helps intensify real and apparent differences, and makes the inequalities relatively invisible to the majority. Once it is institutionalized it can easily sustain itself even in the absence of overt discrimination.

Discussion about inequality and discrimination tends to focus on acts of discrimination when the reality is usually more like a powerful default set of mechanisms and that perpetuate, deepen, and spread inequality with apparently race neutral procedures (institutional discrimination) and a combination of ideologies and political strategies that deepen stereotypes and increase the distance between the excluded and the mainstream.

Whites in the U.S. tend to deny the nature and seriousness of these mechanisms and reinterpret the results as the products of individual choice, differential hard work, and the inferior culture and behavior of those excluded. Since the effects of the segregation produce and reinforce actual differences whites can and do reinforce the stereotypes that justify blaming the victims and excusing the mainstream society.

The long history of racial and ethnic inequality in the U.S. has focused on two widely recognized systems of racial oppression, especially of African Americans. The two historic systems were slavery and segregation imposed by law, often known as "Jim Crow" in the U.S. The struggle over the first led to one of the world's most devastating civil wars in the mid-19th century. The struggle over the system of legal segregation in seventeen states and the national capital was the central challenge and accomplishment of the nation's greatest social movement, the civil rights movement of the mid-twentieth century. Slavery and Jim Crow have been defeated, yet racial inequality remains stubbornly intense. This is largely because there is a third system, housing and

neighborhood segregation, which was the target of Martin Luther King's last large campaign, the Chicago Freedom Movement, but which is still largely intact today.[1]

The basic mechanism of U.S. racial subordination today is neither violence and subjugation nor state imposed racial controls, it is a system of residential separation linked to highly segregated and unequal schooling that is seen by most Americans as a system of private choices about housing through market mechanisms but which looks very different to many families of color. It embodies systems of discrimination that function to connect whites to networks of social capital and economic and educational opportunities while seriously disconnecting blacks and, often, Latinos. This system is the product of both government policy and practice and of a variety of private forms of discrimination, differential knowledge and contacts, fears, and constrained choices growing out of the earlier history of discrimination. It can perpetuate residential isolation now even without active discrimination, though active, but hard for individuals to detect discrimination is still widespread. Segregation, once established, is a durable and expansive system that tends to last and to spread and to be built into a variety of practices and norms.

The opportunity to get a decent home in a decent neighborhood and to send your child to a school where he or she will be treated well and obtain the education necessary to succeed in the mainstream of the society are fundamental parts of the dreams of all families. Research in the U.S. shows deeply shared common aspirations. To those in the dominant group who succeed in fulfilling this dream the system often seems eminently fair, a just reward for their hard work. They think those who fail should have worked harder or may be from and inferior culture.[2]

In societies divided by race or ethnicity the problem is usually perceived very differently by members of the established majority group and those who are in the excluded minority. Particularly in societies which pride themselves on universalism, equality and opportunity, there is a desire to believe that it has been extended and that the inequalities are the results of defects of the others, not of the basic institutions. Governmental institutions tend to see their rules and processes as fair and not to examine their unintended consequences for social inequality. Politicians, especially in difficult times when the public is frustrated, face a temptation to blame the troubles on an unpopular and disrespected minority and to promise strong action to change things.[3]

---

[1] James R. Ralph, Jr , *Northern Protest*, *Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement*, Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

[2] Jennifer L. Hochschild, *Facing Up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1995.

[3] Matthew Pratt Guterl, *The Color of Race in America, 1900-1940*, Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2001; Lawrence W. Levine, *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1996; Michael Lewis, *The Culture of Inequality*, New York: New American Library, 1978; Philip Green, *The Pursuit of Inequality,* New York: Pantheon, 1981; Paul M. Sniderman, Philip E. Tetlock and Edward G. Carmines,eds., *Prejudice, Politics and the American Dilemma*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, l991; Stephen Steinberg, *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity and Class in America*, New York; Atheneum, 198l; Thomas F. Pettigrew, *Racially Separate or Together*? New York: McGraw-Hill,

Groups on opposite sides of lines of separation and inequality tend to see the society through different lenses. Even in a survey taken in 2009 after the huge breakthrough of the election of President Obama, there were large gaps in racial perceptions of the racial situation in America which are apparent in the following question from a *Washington Post* survey:

How big a problem is racism in our society today? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, a small problem or not a problem at all? (Responses, 1995, 1996, 2009).

		------ Problem -----			----- Not a problem ----			
		NET	Big	Somewhat	NET	Small	Not at all	No opinion
1/16/09	All	74	26	48	26	22	4	*
	Blacks	85	44	41	15	11	4	0
	Whites	72	22	49	28	23	5	*
7/7/96*	All	89	54	35	11	8	3	1
	Blacks	93	70	23	6	5	*	1
	Whites	89	52	37	10	8	3	1
7/2/96	All	88	53	35	11	8	3	2
	Blacks	95	72	23	4	4	1	1
	Whites	87	50	37	11	8	3	2
10/6/95	All	84	48	36	15	9	6	1
	Blacks	94	64	30	6	3	3	0
	Whites	83	46	37	15	8	7	1
9/28/95	All	83	41	42	24	12	12	1
	Blacks	95	68	27	6	5	1	*
	Whites	83	38	45	17	13	4	1

This Washington Post-ABC News poll was conducted by telephone January 13-16, 2009, among a random national sample of 1,079 adults (landline and cell-only respondents), including additional interviews with randomly-selected African Americans, for a total of 204 black respondents. ***7/7/96 and previous: Post-Kaiser--Harvard 1995.**

Governments and establishment institutions normally tend to view the regular processes by which people gain access to housing, neighborhoods and schools as neutral and reasonably fair. Members of excluded groups and researchers who carefully study the processes in operation often have a very different perspective.

Schools, Housing, and Civil Rights. Unequal schools serving unequal communities perpetuate social inequalities and help produce unequal lives. Bourdieu and Passeron (1970) argued that the schools had largely replaced traditional means of passing on status to the next generation. This has become increasingly apparent in the U.S. as income and

---

1971; Beverly Daniel Tatum, *Can We Talk about Race?* Boston: Beacon Press, 2007; G. Orfield, "Public Opinion and School Desegregation," *Teacher's College Record*, vol. 96, no. 4, Summer 1995, pp. 654-670. James R. Kluegel and Eliot R. Smith, *Beliefs about Inequality: Americans Views of What is and What Ought to Be*, Hawthorne, NY: Aldine, 1986, Howard Schuman, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, Maria Krysan, *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1997.

.

life chances have become much more strongly linked to educational attainment in the post-industrial economy. Income gaps have widened and social mobility has declined in part because of extremely large class and race-related gaps in college attainment. Unequal schooling in metropolitan areas often perpetuates the effect of segregated housing.[4]

In the U.S. extensive civil rights enforcement, including race conscious efforts to desegregate schools and housing have been essential in serious efforts to break these vicious cycles of inequality and have provoked major political conflict. Massive progress was achieved for decades against what had been totally segregated schooling in the South and the housing markets in many metropolitan areas have become less segregated for blacks since l970. Both residential and school segregation of Latinos, on the other hand, has been rising as their numbers soar.[5]

Problems of racial and ethnic inequality all have special local and national dimensions, yet there are surprising regularities that appear across very different contexts in the neighborhoods and schools of the U.S. In the U.S. it is typical for the leaders of any given community experiencing racial conflict to insist that their situation is unique, their intentions are positive, that their racial and ethnic outcomes cannot be compared to those in other communities and to resist calls for more racial data. Yet those of us who research patterns across a vast continental society with fifty very different state systems of education and hundreds of metropolitan areas with very different histories, economies and demographic compositions often find strikingly similar patterns and policy impacts.

We know, because of the ability to force release of data through class action litigation and enforcement of civil rights laws, that discrimination is very deeply rooted in many social institutions. We know from systematic tests of the housing and job markets by testors of different races reporting the same qualifications that discrimination is very much alive. Under what circumstances, this is true across nations is a much more difficult question. Sometimes comparisons simply miss the point. This paper is something much simpler, an exploration of the ways two central dimensions of ethnic and racial stratification in the U.S, housing segregation and related school segregation operate and the central role of data and research in understanding and addressing the problems of deepening inequality. This is followed by a set of propositions derived from U.S. experience with segregation for consideration in France. Its goal is to provoke a discussion and to encourage exchange of data and ideas among U.S. and French scholars not to reach conclusions about French realities.

---

[4] G. Orfield and Nancy McArdle, *The Vicious Cycle: Segregated Housing, Schools and Intergenerational Inequality,* ,W06-4. Joint Center of Housing Studies, Harvard University August 2006.

[5] G. Orfield, *Reviving the Goal of an Integrated Society: A 21st Century Challenge*, Los Angeles, Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, January 2009. [All reports of the Civil Rights Project cited in this report can be found on the web at civilrightsproject.ucla.edu.]

French and American publics both express desire for equal opportunity.[6] A 2008 survey comparing attitudes about discrimination in France, the U.S., and 14 other countries indicated that American and French values were quite similar, although the institutions and policies are very different. 96% of Americans and 94% of the French say they believe that "equal treatment of different races and ethnicities" is important, with 79% of Americans and 69% of French saying it is very important. 85% of Americans and 83 percent of French say that the government should act against discrimination. Less than a fifth of French (18%), however, believe that government is already doing enough, compared to 55 percent of Americans, probably reflecting the contrast between extensive data and color-conscious civil rights policies in the U.S. since the civil rights era of the l960s and the colorblind basis of French policy which is quite similar to U.S. policy in the l950s when governments and school authorities often claimed to treat all races the same and insisted that collecting detailed data on racial inequalities of particular groups would tend to stereotype minority groups.

The 2008 survey showed a strong French expression of opposition to job discrimination with 94% favoring equal treatment but a skepticism about whether substantial gains had been made. Almost two-thirds (62%) said things had gotten better during their lifetimes, but only one-eighth felt that big changes had occurred. One fifth thought nothing much had changed and one-sixth actually thought things were becoming even more unequal. Americans were much more optimistic that there had been major progress during their lifetime and most felt that government had done enough. One 2006 study suggests that Americans show a much greater tolerance of inequalities than the French[7] In France, of course, the minority populations are much smaller and the civil rights policies have not forced deep changes in basic institutions as some of the U.S. policies have done.

One thing that is clear in American studies of civil rights policies is that there is much more expressed support for equality in principle than for any kind of forceful action to make it real in practice. Vast majorities of Americans, for example, more than nine-tenths, will often affirm the principle of integrated schools but opinion is much more divided when it comes to any specific policy intended to actually integrate schools. When policies do put them in integrated schools, however, substantial majorities say it is a positive experience. (The limited enthusiasm for action is also true in many other civil rights policy domains.)[8] Both countries, however, do have strong traditions and

---

[6]World Public Opinion.org, *Publics Around the World Say Governments Should Act to Prevent Racial Discrimination Most Countries See Progress in Racial Equality; Some Do Not,* March 20, 2008. Findings from international polls of 14,896 people by research centers from around the world and managed by the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) at the University of Maryland. Interviews were conducted in 16 countries representing 58 percent of the world's population: Azerbaijan, China, Egypt, France, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Nigeria, the Palestinian territories, Russia, South Korea, Turkey, Ukraine, and the US. The French poll was by Effience, the U.S. poll by PIPA.

[7] Louis Chauvel' « Tolérance et résistance aux inégalités », in Lagrange H. (dir), L'épreuve des inégalités, Presses de Sciences Po, Paris, pp. 23-40.

[8] G. Orfield, "Public opinion and school desegregation," *Teachers College Record*, vol. *9* (1995). pp. 654-670.; Donald Kinder and Lynn Sanders, *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*, University of Chicago Press, 19

expressed commitment to equality and rights, values that were important resources for the civil rights movement in the U.S.

In the U.S. normal sequence in civil rights disputes is for officials to deny the claims, to try to block acquisition of data, to attack the expert or lawyer who raises a problem, and to insist that either everything feasible is already being done or that doing anything more would be "radical" and would make a bad situation worse. Often it is only possible to gain a substantial change by pressure from a court or external agency implementing a civil rights law. A standard part of the defensive argument in the U.S. is to say that the inequalities are not caused by government practices but by the defective culture and behavior of the group that is failing to take advantage of its. Another target is the teachers and social workers who work with the excluded groups. The logical conclusion of this line of argument is that policy has been too lax, that there should be higher expectations and more requirements and more sanctions if necessary. In the U.S. this line of thinking has focused very heavily on the public schools since the civil rights era and for decades the central effort has been to increase requirements, sanctions and accountability in the belief that that will produce a cure.[9]

Riots and Reactions. The shock to France from its massive riots in 2005 has similarities to the shock America experienced when the ghettos of Los Angeles erupted in 1965 in an orgy of burning and killing across hundreds of blocks in the Watts neighborhood, a stunning development in a city that thought of itself as progressive and in a nation that had just enacted the most sweeping civil rights laws in its history and was launching the "War on Poverty." Nearly thirty years later, in 1992, another vast riot exploded in Los Angeles, a city that had not solved many of the problems that were clearly identified in the l960s. The second massive riot included large numbers of Latinos as well as African Americans in a city transformed by a vast migration from Mexico and Central America. Looking at Los Angeles and the many other urban riots that roiled the U.S. from 1965 to the explosion of hundreds of communities after Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated in 1968, there may be some significant parallels between France's current challenges and what happened in the U.S. four decades ago—disconnected and isolated youth, anger and incompetence in police-community relationships, explosions in areas of isolated housing with few jobs, accusations about the schools and opportunity, political exploitation of stereotypes and fears about the rioters, some sober discussions of problems long excluded from politics, etc.

The distinguished Commission President Lyndon Johnson appointed to examine the American riots of the l960s crossed the country, gathered data from many sources and issued a somber warning that "our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white, separate and unequal."[10] Within months of the issuance of this report and the assassination of Dr. King, however, a divided Democratic party, torn by the war and civil upheaval, narrowly lost a fateful election to Richard Nixon and his Republican Party which formed a new Southern-suburban coalition committed to roll back some of the

---

[10] National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders,* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968,

major policies of the civil rights movement. It turned out to be a powerful coalition that would unite with religious conservatives and govern the U.S. for most of the next four decades, but whose policies were significantly limited by congressional Democrats and by the courts, until conservative appointments changed their direction by the l990s. The U.S. riots helped produce a political reaction that helped elect anti-civil rights leaders, undermined and helped divide the civil rights movement, and set the stage for increasing racial inequality. Richard Nixon was elected on an anti-civil rights platform in l968 and began to dismantle civil rights law and Ronald Reagan, an aging speaker at conservative events, became California Governor on an anti-civil rights, "law and order" platform the year after the great Los Angeles riot.[11]

In divided societies there is a temptation to exploit fears of the majority to mobilize political support. This increasingly focused on a massive non-white immigration to the U.S. following the immigration reform of the 1960s. This happened in California in the early 1990s as Republican political leaders pursued a "wedge issue" strategy of attacking blacks and immigrants and limiting their rights in a series of referenda as the state faced a severe economic slowdown. The national Republican party actually subsidized a referendum campaign to outlaw affirmative action in California, seeking to mobilize white voters, as part of their presidential campaign.[12] Strong anti-immigrant provisions were included in the U.S. welfare reform legislation enacted during the 1996 presidential campaign. Fortunately a strong surge of Latino registration and voting brought an end to major anti-immigrant strategies in California after the 1998 election which decisively defeated the Republican conservatives.

Some French interpretations of the 2005 events were similar to U.S. reactions to the 1960's riots. Azouz Begag, French Minister for Equal Opportunities from 2005-2007, described those participating in the 2005 uprising as "children or grandchildren of immigrants from former French colonies who have been stigmatized by members of the majority ethnic population, many of whom feel that people of non-European origin do not deserve to be treated as equal members of French society."[13]

After the massive Los Angeles riot in l965, the Governor of California appointed a special commission headed by a former director of the CIA to examine what had happened. In its report, the commission highlighted the job crisis, noting the "overwhelming hopelessness that comes when a man's efforts to find a job come to naught."

---

[11] G. Orfield, "Race and the Liberal Agenda: The Loss of the Integrationist Dream," in Margaret Weir, Ann Shola Orloff, Theda Skocpol, eds., ***The Politics of Social Policy in the United States***, Princeton**:** Princeton Univ. Press, l988, pp. 313-356.

[12] Bruce Cain and Karin Mac Donald**,** *Affirmative Action as a Wedge Issue: Prop 209 and The 1996 Presidential Election,* Harvard Civil Rights Project, 1996**.**

[13] Ibid., p. xxiv. Hugues Lagrange and Marco Oberti (dir.) Émeutes urbaines et protestations. Une singularité française, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 2006 ; Laurent Mucchielli et Véronique Le Goaziou, Quand les banlieues brûlent. Retour sur les émeutes de novembre 2005, Paris, Éditions La Découverte, 2e édition 2007

> Invariably, there is despair and a deep resentment…. Welfare does not change this. It …adds nothing to a man's stature, nor relieves the frustrations that grow. In short, the price for public assistance is the loss of human dignity.[14]

"In America," said U.S. Dept. of Labor expert Daniel Moynihan in 1966, "what you do is what you are: to do nothing is to be nothing. One of the young black men who helped stop a riot that went on for days in a housing project area in the black ghetto in San Francisco in l966, commented on the riot saying of people in the community: "All we can see is darkness ahead. And sometimes at a time like this all they can do is strike out into the night." He said the riot wasn't about a "major thing."

> It was just an idea to strike out at something and someone. Even if you don't do anything but break a window or a chair… you feel that you are hurting a white man or something like this because the white man is the one that is doing everything to you that causes you to have all these problems on you now."[15]

As was true of the U.S. race riots in the l960s and later, he concluded that the rioters "lacked the training, experience, and leadership with which to articulate a coordinated set of demands."[16] France, he said, had been living in denial about their problems: "For many years, mainstream politicians denied or minimized the existence of ethnic discrimination. As the Republic's constitution and laws banned discrimination, the matter was considered closed. Yet what good is the theoretical principle of equality…if in practice it is flouted every day in the lived experience of countless citizens."[17] The problems included "thirty disastrous years of high unemployment and economic insecurity in which the children and grandchildren of migrants, especially those originating in the Islamic world, were treated as suspect or illegitimate parts of French society."[18]

In the U.S. the black and Latino immigrants to the big cities were economic immigrants, seeking the good industrial jobs that were abundant from World War II until the 1970s, but who were excluded first from neighborhoods and good schools and then saw their jobs disappear amid globalization and recessions. In fact one masterly study of more than a half century of Census data shows that the severe decline or urban black communities was rooted in the chronic joblessness of black men in the Depression of the l930s as they were the first to lose their jobs and never recovered while white immigrant groups moved

---

[14] Ibid., p. 94.
[15] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Time to Listen .... A Time to Act*, Washington: Govt. Printing Office, 1967, p. 5/.
[16] Ibid., p. xxv. For similar findings on the 1965 Los Angeles riots, see: David O. Sears, John B. McConahay, *The Politics of Violence: The New Urban Blacks and the Watts Riot*, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1973. For other treatments of the 2005 riots, see: Hugues Lagrange and Marco Oberti (dir.) Émeutes urbaines et protestations. Une singularité française, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 2006 ; Laurent Mucchielli et Véronique Le Goaziou, Quand les banlieues brûlent. Retour sur les émeutes de novembre 2005, Paris, Éditions La Découverte, 2e édition 2007
[17] Begag., p. xxvii.
[18] Ibid., p. xxviii

ahead.[19] At that point the costs of the isolation and inadequate education became much greater.

At first, as with the Mexican migrant farm workers long important in harvesting U.S. crops, Begag says the immigration to France "was seen as a flow of temporary workers with no families camping in the margins of the host society, which was thought to have no need to worry about them because they were *not there for good*….. Then suddenly, in the mid-1970s, 'their' presence among 'us' became an issue with the first wave of the international economic slowdown….. Now their presence was seen as a problem in the schools of residential neighborhoods, in public spaces, and, in due course, in prisons."[20] As things worsened, they "ended up being blamed for unemployment and scapegoated for the economic downturn….Anti-Arab racism took on alarming proportions." The repeated efforts of conservative governments to limit the rights to immigrate and become citizens and to pay immigrants to return to North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa produced many years of political struggle in France.[21]

An anti-immigrant politics happened in California in the early 1990s as Republican political leaders pursued a "wedge issue" strategy of attacking blacks and immigrants and limiting their rights in a series of referenda as the state faced a severe economic slowdown.[22] Strong anti-immigrant provisions were included in the U.S. welfare reform legislation enacted during the 1996 presidential campaign. Fortunately a strong surge of Latino registration and voting brought an end to that effort in California after the 1998 election decisively defeated the Republican conservatives. When conservatives in the U.S. House of Representatives proposed dramatic anti-immigrant legislation in 2006, millions of people marched in protests that sprang up in immigrant destinations all over the U.S. and the legislation was stopped.

National Differences. There are, of course, important differences between the nations. The U.S. was born as a multiracial nation and cursed with slavery and bitter conflicts and wars with native communities. It expanded hugely not only from purchase of a vast part of a continent from France but also from wars with Mexico and Spain which brought in conquered populations whose culture and language were devalued and whose people were subordinated. These issues are not small or recent; they are foundational and existed back when what is now the nation was a collection of European colonies and Indian nations. They were the cause of a huge civil war and both that war and World War II, were centrally about race and racism. From the beginning there were struggles in American law about these issues and the aftermath of the Civil War, the "Reconstruction"

---

[19] Stanley Lieberson, *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*.Berkeley: University of California Press, l980.
[20] Begag, 11.
[21] Alec G. Hargreaves, Multi-Ethnic France: Immigration, Politics, Cullture and Society, 2nd ed., New York: Routledge, 2007; Patrick Weil, Philip L. Martin, Susan F. Martin, Managing Migration : The Promise of Cooperation, Lanham, MD, États-Unis, Lexington Books, 2006; Patrick Weil, La République et sa diversité, Paris, Seuil, 2005).
[22] Bruce E. Cain and Karin Mac Donald, "Affirmative Action as a Wedge Issue: Prop 209 and The 1996 Presidential Election," paper delivered at Civil Rights Project Conference, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, December 3, 1997.

period, wrote some of the answers into the Constitution. Even after the Civil War a caste system of social relationships, economic subordination and political exclusion in the South, where most blacks lived, showed the continuing power of race. Many of the civil rights protections were interpreted away by hostile courts and conservative administrations after both the Reconstruction of the 19th century and the civil rights revolution of the mid-twentieth century. Unlike France, however, the U.S. was not a major colonial power. It has not taken away citizenship from groups that were granted it. It has never had a centralized education system or a uniform curriculum and there has always been wide religious and cultural diversity. The U.S. has the most modest system of social supports to alleviate poverty, except for the elderly, of the advanced nations and France's has been much more ample, especially for children and families.[23]

The U.S. now has eight huge metropolitan areas with more than a million residents who are immigrants as have Paris and London. The American immigrant population is much more shaped by a single sending country, Mexico, but it is very diverse and differs greatly among the large centers. Very large concentrations of the U.S. immigrant residents live quite close to the Mexican borders and there are major ethnic portions of large metro areas which operate largely in Spanish and there is a massive Spanish language media as well as the right to begin education in the native language in many states. European cities do not confront the challenge of dealing with such a massive immigration superimposed on the great historic race relations challenges concerning rights of African Americans that are far from settled in American cities.

The U.S. had two great social movements—abolitionism and the civil rights movement—each of which produced generations of political and intellectual struggle over issues of racial justice. Following World War II, it had a series of major governmental initiatives and reports laying out agendas of racial change and developing theories and research to support them which eventually led to the historic action of the Supreme Court in banning Southern segregation, to a massive social movement, leading to a series of laws reshaping key aspects of American race relations in the 1960s. The U.S. civil rights movement and the laws enacted in the l960s essentially abolished the many overt forms of apartheid that had dominated the South throughout its history and broke some key features of the American caste system. This was a huge accomplishment but it left largely intact the system of urban residential segregation in all parts of the country and it did not seriously address the segregation and inequality spreading with the rapid rise of the Latino minority.

The idea of integration has a very different meaning in the two nations. What is often described as integration in France would be called, often pejoratively, "assimilation" in the U.S. The U.S. is a far more pluralistic society and has, for example, very few conflicts over an extraordinary diversity of religions in a society where religious beliefs and practice are much more widespread. Although there are strong divisions over the

---

[23] Barbara R.Bergmann, *Saving Our Children from Poverty: What the United States Can Learn from France,* New York: Russell Sage, 1996.

issue, there is a strong movement for multiculturalism in American education.[24] The idea of integration in the U.S. is one of inclusion and mutual respect in multiracial settings.

Perhaps the more useful comparison with France may not be the not the black-white situation but the challenges of the massive Latino immigration. There had been serious problems of discrimination and segregation of Latinos[25] ever since the Mexican War but they were a minor population group in most of the country until recently. After the l965 immigration reform which ended policies of European there was a vast surge of immigration from Latin America and Asia and many cities suddenly became highly diverse and polarized along new lines. These new populations have not been incorporated in thought, policy and large social movements at the national level though they have been a substantial presence in the Southwest throughout its history and the sudden protests of millions against conservative anti-immigrant policies in 2006 surprised the nation. Latinos, a pan-ethnic identity, not even recognized as a group in most national statistics until l980, became the nation's largest minority by 2000. One of every five students in the US is a Latino and they are experiencing growing residential segregation and intense educational segregation by ethnicity, class, and often language, "triple segregation," and have by far the lowest level of success in higher education—the critical barrier to economic security and middle class status in the contemporary U.S. There is disturbing evidence of intergenerational persistence of inequality compared to other immigrant groups.[26]

American cities, particularly those outside the South, have usually lived in denial that they have racial problems that need governmental action. Whites tend to interpret segregation as a natural product of choice and residential segregation as normal, even when research shows that minorities strongly prefer integration and often experience discrimination in housing choice. Before the civil rights movement, the basic ideas of the Northern and Western cities and their white leaders was that everything necessary had been done to treat minorities fairly. Outside the South, Blacks and Latinos were free to vote and to run for office, though they rarely were chosen. The school systems believed they were fairly serving all children who wanted to enroll in equal ways and ignored the fact that they were highly segregated,

Sometimes consciousness of these issues was raised for a time after spectacular riots in American cities (East St. Louis, 1917, Chicago, 1919, Tulsa 1921, Detroit 1943, scores of riots in the l960s in many cities, and huge riots since the civil rights era in Miami, Los Angeles, and Cincinnati), commissions were appointed, reports were written but very little was done to change the underlying conditions. Until the civil rights era the few

---

[24] James A. Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society,* 2nd ed., New York: Teachers College Press, 2007.

[25] The term Latino is used to denote the general class of individuals of Spanish speaking origin. Hispanic is another widely used term to encompass many different Spanish speaking subgroups. In the US, about 70% of Latinos are of Mexican origin. The next largest subgroup is Puerto Ricans, forming about 9% of the Latino population.

[26] Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras, *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policies,* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2009; Edward E. Telles and Vilma Ortiz*, Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*, New York: Russell Sage, 2008.

white U.S. intellectuals who were actively interested largely focused their critiques on problems in the Southern states which still had legal segregation not on the great cities. A number of the scholars who helped create urban sociology at the University of Chicago in the early twentieth century treated the spread of black segregation as a normal and predictable process.

Housing discrimination was endemic as soon as large black migrations from agricultural regions began. Until 1948 courts enforced legal agreements among residents of white neighborhoods that made it illegal to sell to minority buyers. Until l968 there was no legal barrier to racial discrimination in real estate, until l988 there was no significant enforcement power of the Fair Housing law, and in the Bush Adminstation only less than 20 of the estimated four million annual incidents of housing discrimination were prosecuted.[27] White public opinion reflects a widespread belief that there is very little discrimination in the housing markets. The racial patterns in segregated housing were considered regrettable but the only solution that has been offered, has been to allow individual families to file complaints about housing discrimination, which were very rarely prosecuted.

After World War II there was massive rebuilding of cities and transportation systems and the launch of vast projects constructing suburban homes for tens of millions of Americans after a long lapse in housing construction caused by the Great Depression and the War, but the creation of the world's first predominantly suburban society was done with profound inequalities by race. One basic goal was to remove the "blight" and "slums" near American downtowns which were usually occupied by blacks, and to build new high density subsidized housing in dense locations in the ghettos where they were to live if they could not afford private housing. More than nine-tenths of the housing destroyed by the urban renewal program of the 1950s and early 1960s was occupied by minorities, whose "slums" were cleared to make way for efforts to bring the middle class whites back into the central cities.[28] Almost all new single family housing was marketed only to whites until the late l960s. The largest construction of subsidized housing for poor families in American history was carried out in ways that fostered segregation. By ignoring race and heavily subsidizing suburban home ownership for young white families while building vast metropolitan communities, the problems were compounded.

When the decision was made, in the housing crisis after World War II, to build subsidized housing for large groups of the nonwhite families that had poured into the great cities for wartime jobs, key decisions about where it would be built and how it would be designed were left to local officials who almost always decided to built it in ghettos with large concentrations of poor families.

The result of decisions in many policy areas to simply accept segregation was a social disaster. Many of the large black and Latino housing projects have now been torn down after huge social problems developed, many of the segregated urban school systems have

---

[27] National Fair Housing Alliance, *The Crisis of Housing Segregation*, Washington HFHA, April 2007.
[28] U.S. National Commission on Urban Problems, *Building the American City*, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968,

been sued and found guilty of intentional segregation and ordered to implement remedies, many police departments were found guilty and ordered to recruit and hire diverse groups of officers, and vast investments have been made in arresting and imprisoning large sectors of young minority males as the fear of violence intensified. There are still huge educational challenges in educating massive concentrations poor minority families in ghettos and of immigrants, too often isolated by ethnicity, poverty and language, and hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent in largely failed efforts to equalize the isolated impoverished schools, first with incentives and then with tough sanctions. The exit of middle class white families from the big cities to the suburbs has now been followed by the exit of much of the nonwhite middle class and major employers, leaving huge areas of double segregation by race and poverty in the cities and spreading into parts of the suburbs.. Many of the reform efforts have been half-hearted, inconsistent and incoherent and found no enduring political support.

When the U.S. embarked on the war on poverty and the civil rights revolution in the mid-1960s, organizers and researchers found conditions in many urban communities, where life had deteriorated to the point most people had given up hope. Things were often most bleak in the housing projects that had been supposed to transform lives in the ghetto and the barrio. Among the many things that were learned from the hundreds of studies of poverty and of race triggered by the reforms of the l960s were that poverty was, of course, strongly related to race and had many impacts on children. Nonwhite children experiencing poverty were much more likely to live in communities of concentrated poverty, isolated from mainstream society, than were the white poor and that poverty for nonwhites lasted much longer on average and there were fewer exits, compared to poor whites for whom it was often a temporary issue.

The housing projects were often established in ways that intensified isolation and fostered deeper inequality. When the federal courts were, for example, supervising the desegregation of the San Francisco public schools research showed that there were predictable racial differences in achievement, controlling for class and that the learning deficit was twice as great for black students living in the high density isolated housing projects, which housed a substantial share of black children in this city of extremely costly private housing.[29] Schools which drew substantial shares of their students from housing projects had such serious problems attracting and holding teachers and were so demoralized as institutions that a number of them in the heart of the black ghetto were simply shut down, their entire staffs were removed, new leaders and teachers were selected from across the country under special policies with additional funding.[30] Even with all of those steps, several years were needed before significant gains were recorded and when the special conditions were not seriously maintained the schools tended to

[29] Private communication to the author, who was overseeing the desegregation plan for the Federal Court from San Francisco Unified School District Research Director, Robert Harrington, 1992.
[30] This policy was known as reconstitution and was initiated in the schools in the heart of the Bayview-Hunters Point African American Community under the Consent Decree negotiated between the school district, the civil rights plaintiffs, and the State of California in 1983.

revert to worse records over time.[31] By the l990s the city was blowing up its housing projects, conceding that they could not make them work.

When Begag describes the ZEPs for the schools and the ZUPs for the poor areas, it sounds very much like what was called Title I of the l965 Elementary and Secondary Education program, which has now been concentrating money in high poverty schools for 44 years and is, since 2001, known as *No Child Left Behind*, and programs like the Community Action Program of the 1964 War on Poverty, which tried to empower poor neighborhoods, and the Model Cities legislation of the late l960s which was intended to produce coordinated multidimensional plans to uplift troubled inner city communities. Both were largely abandoned by the Republicans when they came to power.[32]

Housing. In the U.S. more than 80 percent of the population lives in metropolitan areas, many of which contain hundreds of neighborhoods and many separate municipal governments and dozens of separate school districts hiring their own staff and operating their own schools, subject to some general policies and tests from the state government.. Although the country has a very high level of home ownership—more than two-thirds of families own their own homes—Americans move frequently and economic opportunity often requires moves in regional and national labor markets. The U.S. has a very small sector of public housing and highly complex sales and rental markets, with millions of small sellers and rental agents. It has had laws outlawing discrimination in housing markets for forty years. Yet very severe levels of racial and ethnic separation exist, far beyond what research shows can be explained either by economic differences or by the residential preferences of the minority groups. School opportunities tend to reflect or even intensify the level of residential segregation and to be deeply linked to many forms of unequal opportunity. Schools are more segregated than neighborhoods, unless there is a desegregation plan because families with school age children chose areas more segregated by race and class, because minority students have much less access to private schools, and because the changing age structure means that the youngest cohorts of Americans are much less white than the oldest. The severity of segregation in U.S. schools is apparent in the following tables which show that two-fifths of black and Latino students were in intensely segregated schools in the most recent federal data and that both groups were in schools where most of their classmates were poor.

School Segregation Levels, 2006-2007 School Year

[31] Consent Decree Advisory Committee, *Desegregation and Educational Change in San Francisco.* Report to the Federal District Court, 1992.

[32] G. Orfield, "Politique Généeale et équité: Un Tiers de Siecle de Réformes de L'Educatiaon aux etats-Unis d"Amérique, *Perspectives*. vol. XXIX, n 4°, decembre 1999, 657-676; G. Sunderman, J. Kim and G. Orifeld, *NCLB Meets School Realtiies: Lessons from the Field*, Thousand Oaks: Corwin, 2005; Agnès Henriot-van Zanten, « La sociologie de l'éducation en milieu urbain : discours politique, pratiques de terrain et production scientifique, 1960-1990 », Note de synthèse, *Revue française de pédagogie*, n°95, 1991, 115-142 ; Bénédicte Robert, «De l'apprentissage au changement. Les politiques scolaires de compensation en France et aux Etats-Unis (1965-2006)", Doctoral Disseration, Paris, Sciences Po, 2007.

National Percent of students in 90-100% Minority Schools

White	0.92
Black	38.5
Latino	40.0
Asian	16.2
Indian	20.2

Percent of white students in school of typical student, by race, 2006

White	76.6
Black	29.4
Latino	27.0
Asian	43.8

Average percent of poor students in a child's school 2006-2007, by race

White	31.5
Black	58.8
Latino	57.4
Asian	35.8
Indian	52.6

Source: Civil Rights Project computations from the Common Core of Data of the National Center for Education Statistics

The central mechanisms of residential segregation—discrimination in the sales, rental and mortgage lending markets, lack of knowledge of better housing opportunities by minority families, lack of networks and contacts in the most desirable neighborhoods, fear of rejection, harassment, and isolation in white areas, and largely segregated staffing of real estate and rental offices in differing parts of metro areas all combine to maintain a high level of separation, even as millions of black and Latino families move from historic areas of isolation into communities that had always been overwhelmingly white, often only to see the white families leave and segregation expand.

The situation in the public schools, where students largely attend schools nearest their homes, is even more segregated that housing patterns for a number of demographic, economic and networking reasons. Families with school age children live in more segregated patterns than households without school age children and minority families rely more strongly on public education than do white families. Catholic schools which are often also neighborhood based and relatively affordable are also highly segregated. In the U.S. minority families are also, on average, younger and larger than white families. All these conditions together tend to exacerbate school segregation even in those

neighborhoods with residential diversity, a process that makes it more difficult over time to maintain interracial neighborhoods and is one of the reasons for the importance of appropriate school integration plans. School desegregation plans made the schools in the South less segregated than the neighborhoods, with increasing racial integration for three decades before a conservative Supreme Court created policies that terminated many of the urban plans.[33]

By the time children are moving from childhood into adolescence, their surroundings become more and more important and " later adolescence, youth are in even greater contact with the neighborhood and broader community ecologies and institutions because the epoch-specific changes of preparation for work and independent family life propel late adolescents into new contexts deeply embedded in community ecologies and institutions (for example, networks of employment opportunities or networks of opportunities for persistent antisocial behavior.)"[34] Adolescents are spending far more of their time with their peers than with their parents. Black children live, on average in communities with far more poor people and far more uneducated people than whites independent of their own family's economic status. Both black and Latino children now, on average, attend schools in which a substantial majority of all their classmates are poor.[35]

To understand the nature of housing as a key structure of inequality and stratification, one must move beyond the way that acculturated and connected financially well off members of the dominant social groups experience housing decisions—as a market of individual choices with few or no non-financial constraints and with readily available information on websites showing which neighborhoods offer the highest performing schools for their children. We must understand how it operates for those without knowledge and connections and money and who are members of historically excluded groups, marginalized as visible minorities who have not only less income and wealth but are often also harmed by poor education, minority religious status, and poor command of high status use of the dominant language. For these people, especially in the great cities with high-cost private housing markets, housing is the opposite of a market choice. It is often a search for subsidized housing, often planned and operated by government or private housing, usually in poor condition in neighborhoods that are poorly connected with the assets that are so powerful for urban mobility—social capital, strong middle class peer groups for children, strong local labor markets, peer groups using the dominant national language fluently, and schools which offer strong competitive preparation for post-secondary education and connections with good colleges and jobs.

---

[33] J. Boger and G. Orfield, eds., *School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back*? Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2005.

[34] J. Lawrence Aber, Martha A. Gephart, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn and James P. Connell, "Development in Context: Implications for Studying Neighborhood Effects," Brooks-Gunn,ed., vol. I, pp. 44-61.

[35] G. Orfield, *Reviving the Goal of an Integrated Society: A 21st Century Challenge*, Los Angeles, Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, January 2009.

There are, of course, millions of middle class nonwhite families in the United States who do not rely on subsidized housing and have the means to purchase or rent housing in much better neighborhoods. Those families still face a substantial probability of discrimination compared to similar white families in the housing markets and in the mortgage finance markets. President Obama's administration has been challenged by a late 2008 report by a national commission headed by former Republican and Democratic Secretaries of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros and Jack Kemp. The report finds that there are still millions of violations of fair housing rights each year and only an extremely limited effort to prosecute a handful of cases against those violating the law.[36] New data shows that there are already some two million black and Latino suburban children attending intensely segregated schools with 0-10 percent white classmates even though the suburbs remain overwhelmingly white.[37] Housing discrimination and segregation are still spreading further into metropolitan space.

The current housing crisis especially threatens middle class minority families. The problem is very serious and a direct reflection of the discrimination in the housing market. Risky and expensive loans very vulnerable to foreclosure are heavily concentrated in areas with substantial nonwhite population who were denied standard mortgages and, controlling for income, there are huge gaps in such loans by race. The wealth of these families is very heavily concentrated in housing equities. The abundance of mortgage money in the l990s allowed many families to leave concentrated poverty ghettos and barrio --there was a huge surge of Latino homeownership--and get into areas with better schools. Those families who lose their homes are likely to end up in schools more segregated by race and poverty. Now too many of these families are losing all their wealth and their home and their neighborhood and, of course, many are going to be especially vulnerable to layoffs and cutbacks in working hours. In middle class minority areas, foreclosures will cut the value of the homes on which people are paying their mortgages and be real threats to neighborhoods until they are sold or bulldozed.

At worst, housing in bad neighborhoods or projects offers few or no good connections into middle class status for children and isolates them in a way that not only creates obstacles but fosters negative connections with gangs and illegal criminal economies and organizations and practices and ideologies that are seen very negatively and strongly sanctioned by the dominant society. When the housing is severely segregated, over one or two generations it can create a situation where a community of ambitious economic immigrants or refugees turns into a kind of ghetto of social pathology, deepening intergenerational inequality fostering not the original culture but an oppositional culture of the city streets. One prominent Yale urban sociologist, Elijah Anderson, has studied behavior in urban black neighborhoods for decades and reports that young men in these threatening settings are forced to present themselves in ways that mean they will either be seen as predators (and be relatively safe) or as victims, and be preyed upon. It they chose

---

[36] National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, *Report of the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity*, Washington, November 2008.

[37] G. Orfield, *Reviving the Goal of an Integrated Society: A 21st Century Challenge*, Los Angeles: Civil Rights Project, 2009.

to appear as predators they will be seen as threats even by ordinary black residents and will be viewed very negatively by potential employers. In other words, in this perverse situation survival on the street makes exit from a very bad situation even more difficult.[38] These conditions, particularly negative for young men, who come to be seen as threats and potentially violent by the dominant culture and for young women, who are offered very few opportunities to marry and raise children in two-parent families in the mainstream of the culture, can create a social chasm, in which the behavior of the most frightening groups in the segregated area become a justification for the majority group to blame the "inferior" culture of the minority group for the groups problems—and to make both personal housing choices and choices about public policy that reinforce intergenerational segregation. This situation produces what Martin Luther King described as the false consciousness of superiority on the part of the segregators and a false consciousness of inferiority on the part of the segregated. [39]

The conditions of middle class black and Latino families moving into middle class suburbs are far less depressing on their face but deeply threatening to the future of those families as they develop. There has been a vast outward movement of black and Latino families from the core ghettos and barrios of the central cities into growing sectors of suburbia and a predominantly suburban nation. These families, however, have not gained access to the same suburban communities and schools as similar white families. In a detailed study of those families purchasing homes in the suburbs of Boston, one of the most costly housing markets in the U.S. Harvard Kennedy School researcher Guy Stuart found that most of these families were moving into just seven of 126 suburban municipalities, most of which were in the process of spreading residential and school segregation and which encompassed none of the preeminent high schools of the suburbs.[40]

Residential segregation is the root of social inequality in the modern metro area not primarily because of anything about the housing unit itself but because it buys location, community and access. Real estate sales people in the U.S. commonly say that there are three things that really matter in determining the value of a home. They are "location, location, location." The reason that the identical structure has a hugely different price, prestige and demand in different neighborhoods and communities is that buyers and renters understand the very powerful relationships between location, future value, networks, safety, social standing, socializing one's children, preserving or enhancing the life changes of the next generation, and creating more family wealth (again, could you analyse this process in more detail using some key studies ?). Often in American urban

---

[38] Anderson, Elijah (ed.) (2008). *Against the Wall: Poor, Young, Black, and Male*. Penn Press: Anderson, Elijah (2003). *A Place on the Corner: A Study of Black Street Corner Men*, (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Anderson, Elijah . *Code Of The Street: Decency, Violence and The Moral Life Of The Inner City*. New York: W.W. Norton, l999.

[39] Martin Luther King, Jr., "Facing the Challenge of a New Age," address to NAACP Emancipation Rally, Atlanta, January 1957, in *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr*., vol. IV, Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2000, p. 76.

[40] Guy Stuart, *Segregation in the Boston Metropolitan Area at the End of the 20th Centur*y, Working Paper, The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University and Taubman Center for State and Local Government, Kennedy School of Government, February 2000.

housing markets, only a few blocks separates housing in communities of affluence and standing and those that virtually no one with real choices would want to live in. Where there is a border between separate municipalities in a metro region, or separate school districts, or even separate school assignment areas, the value and demand for a house and the social prestige of living there can be dramatically affected.

When we talk about the cost of housing segregation we are talking about a wide variety of location related advantages of disadvantages which can have major impacts on families and futures. Often, in the U.S. discussions of the housing crisis for nonwhites has only been about the physical dimensions of housing and the consequences of answering those problems while ignoring the locational issues that everyone thinks about in the private markets have been immense, often compounding inequality.

In societies with wide distributions of income, some of this segregation is simply the produce of income and markets, other is the product of land used controls that create artificial scarcity or absence of some forms of housing in areas which are kept exclusive by public policy which prohibits, for example, the development of high density affordable rental housing, by public policy deciding where and how to build subsidized housing which determines the location of poor people in expensive housing markets, and by prejudice and discrimination.

In extensive research in the U.S. it is clear that money matters for location but that it explains little of the extreme segregation that minority families often experience. The truth is that in spite of many highly restrictive land use policies and wide differences in average income by race, there great majority of communities in most metros would have been significantly integrated if money actually determined location. In fact there was a broad overlap of incomes in spite of average differences among racial and ethnic groups and there was a broad range of prices and rents in many neighborhoods. In fact poor white families, of whom there were many, were typically able to live in neighborhoods with lower concentrations of poor people that nonwhites with substantially higher incomes. One study found for example that blacks earning five times as much as low income white families were living in neighborhoods with more poor people and that very few poor whites were living in the kinds of neighborhoods poor blacks and Latinos typically lived in.[41] Race, it turns out, matters a good deal more than money in determining where people live.

Sometimes this is treated not as an issue of discrimination but as an unfortunate situation of incompatible preferences. In any situation where some or most of the decisions are made by the choice of participants, structures of preferences obviously matter. If the private choices of groups seeking housing are incompatible segregation can result even without anyone intending it or engaging in active discrimination as was demonstrated by economist Thomas Schelling [42]in his examination of the cumulative impact of a situation

---

[41] Harris, David J. and Nancy McArdle, *More than Money: The Spatial Mismatch Between Where Homebuyers of Color Can Afford to Live and Where They Actually Reside.* Harvard Civil Rights Project. 2004.

[42] Thomas C. Schelling, *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*, New York: Norton, l978.

where both blacks and whites expressed a preference for diverse vs. segregatated neighborhoods but blacks defined ideal diversity as having a far higher percentage of black neighborhoods than whites did and whites were included to see the ideal diverse neighborhood as viewed by blacks as a neighborhood with too many blacks, likely to become a ghetto. Even if such a neighborhood started out well integrated, as it became more attractive to blacks it would become relatively less attractive to whites which would tend to make it increasingly black, and thus increasing the divergence in preferences, until it finally reached the level where few whites would prefer it and would move in. Given the fact that the average American moves every six years, a steadily growing percent of blacks in the market and a steadily shrinking share of whites could over the space of a generation produce resegregation. While there are many complexities and missing elements in this theory, research does show that there are different preference structures and also that minority families perceive that they will not be welcomed in some white communities or will be very severely isolated. These are doubtless two of the reasons why segregation has such staying power and capacity to expand into larger and larger areas even after it has been declared illegal.
A 2009 report analyzing school statistics for the 2006-2007 school year shows that there are now approximately two million black and Latino children living in American suburbs and attending intensely segregated schools with only 0-10% white students.[43] This is about one fourth of the suburban black and Latino enrollment and there are many other schools undergoing transition.

Metropolitan Segregation and the Civil Rights Struggle. In his final book, *Where Do We Go from Here? Chaos or Community*, Martin Luther King discussed his belief that once the apartheid laws of the South were defeated it would be much easier to deal with the structures of urban inequality such as those in Chicago, one of the nation's most segregated cities, but he discovered that the resistance was more fierce and ugly than he had faced before. Residential segregation was more difficult to battle since there is no clearly illegitimate central social policy to fight against, since the mechanisms are multiple and complex, and since they are essentially invisible to the dominant society which sees housing choices as individual, economic, and largely unconstrained by social pressures. In Chicago the city government did not confront his marchers with police dogs and fire hoses as they did in Alabama but there were mobs on the street throwing bricks at King and burning the cars of the marchers.[44] There has been an widespread ongoing debate in the U.S. about place-based versus mobility-based policies although a number of observers think that both are needed and that neither has been done on a substantial basis. One of the central problems with the place-based strategy in an economy dominanted by private market decisions is that putting new housing into an area where there is no significant private investment and middle class families are not entering generally leaves the residents with weak schools and job opportunites and weak networks of opportunity. On the other hand mobility plans have been limited and their results controversial, with strong evidence of benefits in the largest race-based mobility plan, in metro Chicago and

---

[43] G. Orfield, *Reviving the Goal of an Integrated Society: A 21st Century Challenge*, Los Angeles,. CA: The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto *Derechos Civiles, January 2009*.

[44] James R. Ralph, Jr , *Northern Protest, Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement*, Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

weaker evidence from more modest class-based plans in several cities under the Moving to Opportunity Program. There have also been a number of experiments with requiring suburban housing developers to produce a share of housing that is affordable for low and moderate income families which has confronted the problem that because of the shortage of such housing in suburbs mionority families never get any significant access unless there is explicitly race-based marketing.[45] (French discussion of these experiences includes Jacques Donzelot's book (with Catherine Mével and Anne Wyvekens) *Faire société : la politique de la ville aux États-Unis et en France*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2003.

One of the reasons why the American struggle over race has focused so strongly on the schools rather than housing is that housing transactions are individual and complicated, overwhelmingly occur in private markets in the U.S., and it is easy to hide many forms of discrimination. We know from systemic audits of housing market practices by matched teams of home seekers of different races making the same requests at the same offices, that discrimination is still widespread.[46] A small number of remedies won for individuals in enforcement actions do nothing to change the overall system. In contrast, in the schools it is possible to radically change the social reality rapidly by reassigning students and teachers in the public schools where the vast majority of Americans are educated. School integration in metropolitan areas is to a considerable extent a treatment of a major symptom of a pervasive system of urban inequality in which residential segregation is a root cause. But because there is no effective treatment on any major scale for the housing problem so far and school integration can change outcomes substantially for segregated youth, it has been the basic target.[47] Housing segregation has improved modestly for blacks except in some of the biggest markets since the l970s but it is still very high. It is lower but intensifying for the rapidly growing Latino population.

If housing is the root of the problem of metropolitan social inequality, schools and socialization in very different kinds of seriously segregated schools are central mechanisms for replicating and perpetuating social inequality.
The more dominant formal schooling becomes in producing the economic and social status of the next generation, the more devastating segregated schooling can become, given the fact that schools are far more decisive in determining future status students from minority homes with little family or neighborhood social capital than for children with educated parents with educational resources, strong connections with the dominant culture and language, and good understanding of what is needed to prepare for post-secondary education.

Since the rapid deindustrialization of the U.S. in the l970s, educational attainment has become far more decisive in determining mobility and status with almost all of the net gains of the economy going for many years to those with post-secondary education as the

[45] Xavier Briggs de Sousa, ed,,*The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press,2005.
[46] National Commission on Fair Housing, 2008.
[47] G. Orfield, *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy*, Washington: Brookings Inst., 1978.

income differential by education level widened seriously.[48] In 2005 the median income of high school dropouts was $20,900, of graduates, $30,100, of college graduates $51,700.[49] Educational attainment varies widely by race and ethnicity and language status and by the racial and poverty compositions of the schools students attend. Higher education, without major system changes, "reinforces generational patterns of income inequality."[50]

Middle class white children's fate is far less connected to school quality since they have access to many more key resources at home and in their peer groups, relations and communities, but they typically connect with the best and most articulated educational pathways. Poor children whose outcomes are more powerfully affected by schooling because of the absence of home and community resources, typically get the worst settings and opportunities. These inequalities are particularly pernicious in a society which assumes that schooling offers equal opportunities independent of these conditions and which feels that it is therefore entirely legitimate to allocate future status on the basis of school attainment, measured by the standards and in the formal academic language of the dominant group.

Three Issues

Dealing with all major aspects of the syndrome of inequality rooted in segregated housing and schools would be a vast undertaking. In this paper we will introduce three issues and then suggest a series of propositions arising from U.S. research and experience for possible exploration by French researchers. First there will be a discussion of the extreme case of housing segregation—concentrated high rise subsidized housing for minority populations, something that has been extensively studied in the U.S. and has striking parallels to the 2005 Paris setting. The second is the question of school choice both among schools and for educational programs or tracts within schools, and third will be research on the mechanisms that make segregated schools unequal and the conditions underwhich desegregated schools can be most beneficial. Following those sections there will be a discussion of the kind of data that has been found to be absolutely essential for serious enforcement of civil rights in the U.S. Those discussions will provide a basis for the propositions that follow.

The extreme cases of housing disasters: high rise housing projects. When the 2005 upheaval occurred in France, it was of great interest to U.S. social scientists that residents of concentrated and isolated housing projects were at the center because such projects have become so notorious in the U.S. that creating more such complexes has been outlawed for four decades and the old ones are being removed. The most extreme conditions of social pathology in the U.S. have been fostered by giant housing complexes, often built with good intentions and good physical materials at great cost,

---

[48] Robert Haveman andTimothy Smeeding, "The Role of Higher Education in Social Mobility," *The Future of Children*, vol. 16, no. 2 (2006), pp.125-143

[49] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 2008*, table 689.

[50] Ibid., p. 143.

which concentrate poor people with low education levels from socially rejected minority populations in communities with virtually no real educational or social connections with the dominant society. In those conditions, even physical structures that could be settings for social success and wealth accumulation if situated in different parts of the city, provided with some amenities signifying status and populated by mainstream social groups with resources, can become high pressure distilleries of social pathology. This was recognized by researchers and policy makers concerned with what were described as America's "vertical ghettos" by the late l960s when such buildings were banned by the Congress, and by the l970s when a long process of blowing up these buildings and lowering this level of extreme segregation was under way, though it was often poorly implemented.

What seemed clear to an American who remembered the urban riots of the l960s, particularly in places such as Newark, New Jersey, a large industrial city very close to New York, where the massive violence centered directly around intensely concentrated public housing projects, was that the recent riots and violence in the French suburbs seemed to have similar roots and be linked to similar forms of vertical ghettos, but they were occurring on the edges rather than the center of the city and in a society with an even stronger myth of equal opportunity and formal education-based meritocracy than the U.S. possess, a society with very little of the kind of stark consciousness about racial and ethnic inequality of the sort produced by the civil rights movement and generations of research and social movements about the issues..

In the l950s major urban centers in the U.S. commissioned designs for housing and built what were considered massive improvements in housing for poor people and, through the use of urban renewal powers, bulldozed large areas of urban slum housing, housing that was often severely overcrowded, decayed, and even lacking basic features such as bathrooms for each apartment. The new housing was high density high rise housing built in what were supposed to be park-like settings, drawing on some contemporary European design ideals. This housing, which was built at great cost and opened with great optimism at a time of serious housing shortages was in such serious trouble by the late 1960s that Congress voted to prohibit any further construction of such projects. There were, of course, serious design errors with bad decisions about elevators, safety of stairways, etc. and general failure to follow up with quality maintenance, but the basic problems were reflections of concentration huge numbers of people without a future and with little or nothing constructive to occupy their energies and in constant need of money and status in cities where they had few connections with the mainstream society, which viewed them with disdain and, increasingly, with fear. By the early l970s the government actually blew up one of the largest complexes, which had fatally decayed in the city of St. Louis. Over the next quarter century that policy was extended to a number of other major American cities and new efforts, such as Hope 6, were initiated in the hopes of using low density housing in the private market to accomplish what the big isolated projects had obviously failed to deliver.

The largest project constructed in St. Louis was known as Pruitt-Igoe and the largest project in Chicago was called the Robert Taylor homes. Both were large complexes of

buildings designed to housing thousands of people. The Pruitt-Igoe complex had 33 buildings with almost 3000 housing units on a 23 hectare site in the city's economically devastated North St. Louis community. It was an isolated area in a jobless part of a city that was, as a whole, in a dramatic decline which would make it the most rapidly shrinking metro area in the U.S. by the l970s. If new housing whose design was widely praised by architects was enough to lift up a community, it should have happened in what was one of the nation's largest complexes.

The pathology of life in Pruitt-Igoe was brilliantly described by researcher Lee Rainwater in his book *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a* Federal Slum.[51] The images of drugs and crime and degradation of both the buildings and the social environment showed that a massive investment, praised by architects, had become a social catastrophe in a very short period of time, proving that it was possible to make a very bad situation far worse Within five years of the time it opened in 1954, this huge isolated complex had become a scandal with pervasive crime and violence and people badly needing housing refusing to live there because of fear, producing one of the highest vacancy rates in the nation.[52] Even people desperate for housing in a very poor section of a poor and declining city would not live there.

How "temporary" solutions become permanent and self-perpetuating. Subsidized housing, when it was first developed on a large scale in the U.S. after World War II was expected to be a temporary solution for families in trouble who would use it as a launching pad into later success by being spared what were considering the damaging impacts of low quality housing in poor areas. The focus was on reaching the physical standards the federal government spelled out for good construction and adequate living space. Initially it was not available to the poorest families because it required that the family be able to pay some reasonable part of the total real rent.

Over time it became long-term housing for the poorest of the poor, virtually excluding families who were making progress in life through priorities to help more and more disadvantaged people and over time the young veterans, the widows, and others experiencing short term needs were replaced by entire societies of people with no real chances for mobility. Over time, even the building that were initially occupied by whites tended to be defined as minority housing, and the buildings that were supposed to be a launching pad became a sign of searing and irreversible failure, often a breeding ground for social pathology.

When the large housing effort began, the politicians decided that it would be too hard to confront the racial issue. The situation was that business oriented conservatives were opposed to government operating in the housing arena and the Southern Democrats were from areas who desperately needed housing but were committed to segregation. Northern Democrats concentrated in big cities where the depression and World War II had prevented housing construction for decades urgently needed housing as well and

[51]Lee Rainwater , *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum*, Chicago : Aldine, 1971.
[52]Rain water, p. 1.

decided to agree with Southerners to create local control on this issue, subject to the "separate but equal" provision that housing must be provided for all groups somewhere.

The result of this decision was to create major housing developments in areas of segregated nonwhite population meant that the children growing up there would be highly isolated by both race and class and that they would grow up in areas which were typically in severe economic and social decline with few job opportunities, major presence of crime and violence, few middle class families and adults of any race, and, typically, weak schools with inexperienced teachers and poorly educated classmates.

Over time the isolation from opportunity and contact with the mainstream society, going on as deindustrialization and suburban sprawl made the situation worse and worse of young men stuck in weak schools in the central cities, produced severe social pathology. In two many communities crime and incarceration became the norm for young men and communities and poorly educated and poorly paid young women tried to raise children on their own with less and less public support from an increasingly conservative society. The big housing projects became sub-communities of failure where there were almost no stable two parent working families with normal jobs in the mainstream and very little social mobility. Projects which were hailed as great designs in the 1940s became spectacular failures that discredited the whole idea of social housing by the l960s and began to be destroyed systematically by the same governments which had built them in the 1970s and l980s. In the meantime they had reinforced racial stereotypes about the communities segregated and the individuals who lived in them.

The nation's large urban housing projects were a product of the postwar housing shortage and what were presented as excellent examples of urban design. If one were to see the newspapers of the early 1950s, there were pictures of proud mayors and architects announcing great plans to end urban blight in front of attractive models of urban skyscrapers set in parks, looking new and modern and clean in place of the decried (?) slums and badly deteriorated buildings there were replacing. If one were to look at these models and take them at face value, they were not that different from examples of upscale urban housing being built for market rate tenants at the same time. If one knew the federal standards, these were not cheap or inferior buildings. There were very substantial investments in the quality of the buildings and many of the sites were very expensive since they were typically places where there had been dense slums and acquiring them was difficult and costly because of the people who had to be moved and the divided property that commanded high prices because of the high rent rolls and divided ownership. One researcher reports on the opening of the largest of the Chicago Project, the vast Robert Taylor Homes which opened in 1962:

> …..the trees, gardens and decorative flower beds interspersed amid the startling high rises helped Chicago forget about this recent history. External galleries on the buildings gave thousands a remarkable view of the city's South Side, a clear day revealing the downtown skyline. …. Indeed, there were only signs of life and vitality: throngs of children climbed on new playground equipment, men and women colonized parking lots and alleyways with music and festivities, and soft

> ball and basketball games filled the park areas. …. The Housing Authority inundated tenants with mailings and communiqués that promised construction of parks, playgrounds., schools, free dental clinics and recreational centers. In one letter to the incoming tenants, CHA Executive Director Alvin E. Rose personally thanked them for making our communities the most beautiful in the whole city. I hope you are as proud as I am…."

The big projects were typically situated in segregated ghetto or barrio communities on land that had no value to anyone else and was severely distressed in its economic situation, the social structure and social capital of the surrounding community, and in terms of its schools, which had few students achieving at grade level and schools whose staffs were leaving as they saw what they defined as deterioration and racial transition. School staffs were overwhelming white but black or Latino teachers often left these jobs as well, given the many problems they faced and the growing social distance between the middle class teachers and what they saw as the "gangbangers" in the inner city. These were communities where almost no one chose to make private investments, either to purchase a home or a condo and where very few businesses operated even though there were very large numbers of residents and locations which were often only a short drive from downtown.

Housing advocates, often called "housers" in the U.S. made a "deal with the devil" accepting the fact that the new housing was going to be segregated and very high density in order to get a substantial new supply of housing that meet physical and health standards of the federal government. Accepting segregation and building projects that were obviously intended to be segregated was, of course, a violation of the "equal protection of the laws" provision of the Fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, probably the most important legal standard to be created as a result of the American civil war, one of the most vicious civil wars in world history, where one person died for even nine slaves who were freed. Building and identifying tenants in this way also violated the provision in Title VI of the l964 Civil Rights Act (the most important legal monument of the civil rights movement) which prohibited discrimination in any program or activity in the U.S. receiving funds from the U.S. government. What the federal government did was to pretend that the issue did not exist, to ask only that there be a fair share of the housing for minorities, and to give local politicians control over where the housing was built and how the tenants were selected, subject to federal requirements. Almost everywhere the local housing authorities and city councils decided to operate in a way that was virtually certain to be segregated. In Chicago, where the housing authority's executive director recommended that low density housing scattered around the city would be far better for the families, she was fired and the neighborhood politicians were given a veto which led to the exclusion of subsidized housing in white areas.[53] At the same time, because the federal government decided only to build subsidized housing in municipalities which wanted it and set up housing authorities to run it, almost nothing was built for families in the rapidly growing white suburbs, where the white middle class was rapidly moving. The vast majority of suburban communities didn't want any

[53] Elizabeth Warren, *The Legacy of Judicial Policy-Making: Gautreaux Chicago Housing Authority : The Decision and Its Implementation,* Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1988.

projects and did not set up housing authorities so they got none. The result of this was to force declining central cities to provide the social services for poor people who could not get housing elsewhere and to run what soon become deteriorating housing projects which were often poorly funded by the government. During the "Great Society" period of the 1960s, when the federal government was transferring substantial funds to the cities and unemployment levels reached the lowest point of the century, this was somewhat manageable, but as the economy declined, racial polarization grew, and there were savage cuts in social budgets and joblessness soared, it became impossible.

School impacts. Typically subsidized housing projects were built with very little consideration of the schooling that would be available to the children who lived there. When there was consideration, usually in large projects, the plan was about building a new school for the project children, with little or no consideration of the predictable problems of a school occupied entirely by children of very disadvantaged children, usually in a neighborhood when the post-elementary schools were very weak and often severely dysfunctional. These schools were usually instantly segregated by race and class and with deep educational problems. When the projects were small or when they displaced existing neighborhoods by removing the families living there before the land was cleared, the students often negatively affected adjoining schools that were often marginal and faced decline and overcrowding with the influx of new students.

Research conducted by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in the 1970s and early 1980s showed that a substantial share of the segregation in the metropolitan areas studied was caused by the concentration of subsidized housing in segregated minority communities and the differential access of white and nonwhite tenants to housing units in neighborhoods of different race and income levels. There was a brief effort to combine school and housing remedies in civil rights enforcement but it was abandoned after President Reagan was elected.[54]

One of the basic problems at each stage of the housing story is the question of how to find housing for displaced minority families who are displaced as part of a process of a plan which is justified as eventually improving housing or community conditions. The problem is that if there is no plan to give them a fair choice of housing in decent neighborhoods that are not threatened and not adjacent to the existing minority area, any displacement is likely to create or intensify a process of segregation somewhere else. Segregation is the default result of moving minority communities subject to discrimination in a discriminatory housing market. It has happened over and over again across the U.S. for six decades.

A series of well-meaning changes in national housing policy tried to address the situation of those most desperately in need and, in the process, made a bad situation worse by overstressing already troubled and marginalized communities with large numbers of the most disconnected and impoverished families, who brought with them many problems of family chaos, mental and emotional problems, consistent failure in the job markets,

---

[54] G. Orfield and S. Eaton, *Dismantling Desegregation*, New York: New Press, l996, chapter 11.

poor attitudes toward school, and, often, no resources to contribute to the larger community. The policies were well intentioned. Critics assailed housing agencies for only serving people with some income who could pay part or all of the rent when there were very large numbers of poorer people with virtually no resources. By the late l960s, under the leadership of the U.S. Senate's first black member in the twentieth century, Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, Congress adopted a policies providing preference for the very poor and this began to rapidly replace those with some or significant resources and social capital with those with none. The government was criticized for letting families stay at low rent when they began to get jobs and move out of severe poverty, given the scarcity of public housing. When this was changed by charging those families much more if they stayed, they usually left. Finally, as the great scandal of homelessness and people sleeping on the streets began to appear in American cities on a substantial scale in the l980s—something that had simply not been true on any substantial scale in the U.S. for a long time—Congress adopted absolute preference for the homeless, many of whom had serious psychological and sub stance abuse problems and very few of whom had any serious employment. Channeling the flow of newcomers into the housing projects with these preferences created communities with tremendous needs. As government began to cut taxes and reduce social services and operating support for housing authorities at a very fast rate with the conservative movement of the Reagan era, these resources and even the resources for physical upkeep of the projects deteriorated dramatically. By this point, projects that had been seen as big solutions to the depravity of the impoverished core ghettos concentrated disadvantage on a larger scale and with greater intensity than what had existed before.

As this process proceeded, there was an increasing exit of the families who could figure out any way to get out and replacement of them by more troubled families.
It was a kind of social Gresham's law, the economic rule that bad currency drives good currency out of a market as people quickly spend the bad currency and hoard the good. If one were to conceive of a large housing development as a kind of bank of social capital, this process of replacing families with some social and economic capital with those with none had enormous impact on creating ongoing decline in the social resources of the community and the spurring a vicious cycle of accelerating decline. In the end of a process like this, the only people who would live there were those who had absolutely no other choice or those who were living off the growing pathologies as gangs and drug dealers took over sections of buildings and the police simply stopped trying to restore order in a powerless and increasingly feared area to any serious degree, fearing for their own safety.

The failure of the big projects, like those in St. Louis and Chicago was so rapid and so dramatic that the Congress voted to ban building any more such projects when it reformed housing law in l968. By the l970s, the worst of the projects were becoming uninhabitable and too many were becoming centers of crime and degradation and their communities become the poorest and most dangerous in the cities. Although it is very rare for bureaucracies to admit spectacular failures, the federal government began to pay to blow up the projects it had paid to build only a generation earlier. By now, many of the largest projects in a number of cities have been destroyed. Typically they had many

vacancies near the end and the families still living there were given market-based rental subsidy certificates or vouchers to find their own housing in the private market. A small part of the subsidized family housing was sometimes rebuilt on the site in a much different scale and, where possible, in a mix with private housing serving much less disadvantaged families. Unfortunately the level of help for these families in finding housing outside the areas that are or are becoming segregated ghettos has not been adequate.[55]

Many of the worst schools in our large central cities, where most of the students fail to graduate and very few are either ready for postsecondary education or effectively trained with specific job skills, draw heavily on students from concentrated subsidized housing projects. We have too many schools where students have no contact with other students and families with real social capital and strong home and community educational environments.

Peer groups matter for children. Peer groups dominated by middle class children who are academically successful and embedded in schools and community networks committed to preparing students for college tend to produce substantial benefits in both academic achievement and life chances for children living in families in isolated poverty. This is the essential finding of the last half century of research on school integration, beginning with the massive Coleman Report study of l966, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, based on a massive national survey conducted by the federal government. The essential findings of that study were that schooling outcomes were not substantially related to the amount of money that schools spent and that the spending was not seriously unequal by race, but that they were strongly related to the background of the peer group and to the knowledge of the teachers, measured by standardized tests. Networks and distribution of teaching resources were key elements not only of social capital but of educational capital as well.

The schooling situation is at its worst in the most isolated schools serving the most isolated and disadvantaged communities, many of which have attempted to implement a succession of reform theories over the past four decades and have been under fierce pressure for accelerating academic achievement since the 1980s when almost all of the states adopted the basic recommendations of President Reagan's *A Nation at Risk*, report which claimed that American schools were seriously deteriorating and that the basic reason was not anything about social and racial inequality but was about the fact that the standards were too low and that accountability had been too lax.

A quarter century of pursuing this theory has produced failure since the agenda was set by a report issued by the Reagan Administratioon in 1983 titled, *A Nation at Risk*. Though there have been modest gains in math achievement in the early grades, there was

---

[55] For treatments of French housing policy, see: Sylvie Tissot, L'Etat et les quartiers, Paris, Seuil, 2006 also in English Patrick Le Galès, *Cities in contemporary Europe*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000 and *European Cities, social conflicts and governance*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002, and "Urban policies in Europe", in Y.Kazepov, *Changing Urban Europe : Poverty, Segregation, Governance*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2004),

been virtually no change in reading, and the evidence shows that other subjects and goals of education have been neglected. The achievement gaps have not closed and there is evidence that the graduation rates actually declined. Certainly the long increase in the level of high school and college completion stalled very badly. On some of these dimensions, racial gaps actually grew. The basic assumptions of NCLB were that a combination of a large increase in mandatory testing, mandates for annual progress of all subgroups of students toward the state-defined "proficiency" levels together with a variety of sanctions, escalating over a four year period could bring all U.S. students to the proficiency level within 12 years. Apart from a early reading program, which did not succeed it was entirely driven by goals on test gains in reading and mathematics. As researchers predicted, since the goals were beyond what had ever been achieved in a school district, there was a steady growth of schools branded as failures and the sanctions very disproportionately hit schools serving the poor and minorities. The law required that all schools had "highly qualified" teachers but there was no mechanism to hold such teachers in schools under sanctions and surveys showed teachers believed that it both narrowed the curriculum and led experienced teachers to leave such schools more rapidly. The state governments were required to intervene to reform the huge list of failing schools but research showed they lacked the capacity to do so. [56]

The Dropout Crisis. In the U.S. with the drastic decline in the manufacturing sector of the economy and the dramatic shrinkage of labor unions and the rise of global competition and transfer of even white collar work to other nations, there are few good jobs available without education qualifications and a much stronger link between educational attainment, income, and employment and a stronger probability that someone who has not completed secondary education will become a criminal and be incarcerated. There is also a very strong link between failure to obtain a high school degree and becoming and remaining an unmarried mother or father, families which experience extreme difficulty in the U.S. due to the very limited welfare system, the lack of good child care for low income families and the extremely low wages of low skill jobs, the vast majority of which are not unionized and offer few benefits to the workers.

The nation's dropout problem, which leads about a fourth of students to fail to complete high school and nearly half of males who are black, Latino or American Indian, is concentrated in a small fraction of the nation's secondary schools, about 2000, dubbed "dropout factories" by Johns Hopkins researcher Robert Balfanz. Most of these schools are high poverty urban black and Latino schools.[57] Controlling for other factors, students in such schools are less likely to graduate and there is a direct relationship between the

---

[56] Jaekyung Lee, *Tracking Achievement Gaps and Assessing the Impact of NCLB on the Gaps: An In-depth Look into National and State Reading and Math Outcome Trends*, Cambridge: Civil Rights Project, 2006; Gail Sunderman, James Kim, and Gary Orfield, eds. NCLB Meets School Realities, Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, 2005; G. Sunderman, ed., Holding NCLB Accountable, Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, 2008,; Sunderman and Orfield, " Domesticating a Revolution: No Child Left Behind Reforms and State Administrative Response," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 76 no. 4 (Winter 2006, pp. 526-556.

[57] Robert Balfanz, Chapter 3 in G. Orfield, *Dropouts in America*, Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2004, pp. 57-84.

percent nonwhite and the percent poor in a school and its dropout rate. Students in schools were many of their friends drop out are more likely to dropout and schools struggling with many disadvantaged students have less resources to devote to the many challenges such young people face. Students in more advantaged schools have a very different school community and much more connection with and information about possibilities for education after high school. The teachers and administrators in those schools have more resources to support a much smaller faction of students in trouble or threatening to dropout. Under the U.S. accountability student of NCLB, weak schools tend to have a higher average test score (which has great consequences for the school,) if low scoring students dropout or are transferred somewhere, a situation which creates a very negative incentive for the school.

U.S. statistics show that poor white children often live in and attend schools in communities with many middle class families but black or Latino children in racially or ethnically segregated schools are almost always attending schools of concentrated poverty. In our research we call this double segregation. Neighborhood based schooling superimposed on segregated housing means convenient middle class schools for white children and doubly segregated schools for students of color as well as a growing number of triply segregated schools, isolated as well by home language.

The U.S. has now had more than a half century of investigation of effects of interracial schooling. It is now clear that there are benefits, especially in terms of the life chances and the educational attainment of the students, but that the degree of benefits depends on how the interracial schooling setting is handled. Optimal conditions require changes that it appears have not been widely discussed in France where a radical assimilationist philosophy appears to be dominant.

Integration. In a classic book, published 55 years ago, Prof. Gordon Alport set out a theory of conditions for successful intergroup relations that has now been tested in many circumstances across the world. Alport's classic, *The Nature of Prejudice*[58], concluded that "equal status interaction" was the key to reducing prejudice and creating successful relationships among groups. In order to accomplish this it was essential to create conditions under which the groups would interact under conditions of equality and mutual respect and in an institution or community where the authority figures made and publicized and enforced rules of fair and equal treatment. This theory has been extensively explored by a number of researchers studying race relations and developing interventions to improve conditions in the U.S. over the years.[59] There is now a massive synthesis of research from more than 500 studies across the world by Thomas Pettigrew and Linda Tropp.[60] It seems clear from this extensive international and U.S. research

---

[58]Gordon Alport, *The Nature of Prejudice.* (1954). Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley Pub. Co

[59] Elizabeth Cohen, Walter Stefan, Robert Crain, Robert Slavin, *Student Team Learning: A Practical Guide to Cooperative Learning* (3rd Edition) Washington: National Education Association, 1991.

[60] Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent meta-analytic findings. IN: Stuart Oskamp (Ed*). Reducing Prejudice And Discrimination*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.,; Pettigrew Thomas F; Tropp Linda R. "A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory**."** *Journal of personality and social psychology* 2006;90(5):751-83;; Aronson, E., & Patnoe, S. , *The jigsaw classroom: Building cooperation in the classroom* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

that a good deal is understood both about the dynamics of polarization and segregation and techniques that improve both race relations and academic performance, which is obviously damaged in students perceiving that they are the objects of discrimination and negative stereotypes.

There is substantial research showing that discrimination and segregation are harmful to health and well-being, to academic performance, and to performance on tests, independent of the actual ability or knowledge of the test-taker. If those relationships are true, obviously institutions that segregate disadvantaged minority populations, do not actively challenge widely held stereotypes about them, and do not create conditions of desegregation and equal status interaction, are, in fact, harming them and suppressing their potential. Imposes on such a system, "neutral" measures of merit such as standardized tests, is very likely to lead to results which critically underestimate (and thus unfairly punish) the potential of the students from the minority group. Such results, when they are treated as truly neutral and scientifically valid then have the continuing effect of reinforcing stereotypes of superiority held implicitly or explicitly by the dominant group. The results of decisions based on such evaluations can deepen the separation and marginalization of the subordinate group and lead to counterproductive and even pathological behavior, which then only tends to reinforce the ideas of the dominant group about its own superiority (what Martin Luther King called the "false sense of superiority of the segregator") and lead members of that group to act in ways that increase the separation—for example moving their families out of diverse neighborhoods or their children out of potentially diverse schools.

Desegregated settings, particularly with the Alport conditions of equal status interaction are met, provide opportunities for friendship and confront the prejudiced with evidence and experiences that tend to undermine their beliefs and attitudes by revealing the individuality of the other group and the many values and goals that are common across lines of social polarization. If there is to be either assimilation, or full mutual acceptance of the excluded group becoming part of the mainstream of the dominant society or true integration in which the society and its institutions accept and honor the diversity and culture of the historically excluded group while extending full opportunity for participation in institutions changed by the positive acceptance of the previously excluded in which Martin Luther King called the "beloved community, " positive desegregation is an essential prerequisite.

Research shows, of course, that much of what young people bring to school or the labor market is not the product of school or other formal institutions, but of the peer group, which tends to increasingly challenge the family for influence as students pass from elementary education into adolescence and secondary education. In high poverty, ethnically isolated neighborhoods negative rather than positive peer groups draw youth off the path to the mainstream and onto the path to economic failure and, too often, to jail and a life destroyed. In neighborhoods without economic possibilities and decent jobs, the vacuum is often failed by gangs and crime, the only ways that young men who are

---

1997.

irrelevant and rejected by the broader society can find respect and money, both extremely important to adolescents trying to find a place in their society and to be attractive to young women. In finding a place in the economy, formal educational qualifications are very important but networks connected to job opportunities and employers are also invaluable. Such networks and the information and contacts they convey are virtually nonexistent in isolated concentrated poverty ethnic enclaves.

In a society where formal qualifications and personal presentation are very important qualifications, cultural and linguistic isolation can be major barriers. If someone does not speak and write the dominant language at a high academic level, it is very difficult to achieve great mobility in society and the economy. It is very difficult to acquire that kind of linguistic facility in a setting where life and relationships are conducted largely in another language and there are very few speakers who make sophisticated use of the dominant language. There are similar barriers, of course, to acquiring familiarity and fluency in understanding and using cultural norms that are shared in the upper levels of the dominant social group. Segregation breeds unequal preparation which breeds underestimation of the capabilities of the subordinate group that is excluded from this cultural capital.

In communities where life has very seriously deteriorated there may be both an exposure to violence and intimidation of the sort that can become common when social order breaks down and there is no longer a coherent set of dominant values that can control deviant behavior. People who wish a normal life in such settings are often exposed on the one side to threats from groups within their community and, on the other side, to the agents of public agencies and the police who have become hostile to the group and have negative stereotypes about them.

Very large numbers of prominent academics submitted a statement to the U.S. Supreme Court in 2006 outlining the major finding of desegregation benefits and the costs of segregation. The statement was signed by 553 researchers at 201 universities and research centers[61] and, in a subsequent publication, the National Academy of Education, an organization limited to 100 leading researchers, independently confirmed the basic findings of the document. Nonetheless, a closely divided court limited desegregation efforts.

Complexities of Integration Among Immigrant Communities. Whether implicitly or explicitly, schools socialize students into th social and economic structure of the society.This is especially true for immigrant students, for whom few other connections with the mainstream of society may exist. Immigrant students learn in school what is expected of them and what society offers them. They learn there is often that there is a different set of expectations for them than for other students, even as the formal policies of the schools proclaim an equality that does not exist.

---

[61] G. Orfield, E. Frankenberg, and L. Garces**, "**Statement of American Social Scientists of Research on School Desegregation to the U.S. Supreme Court in Parents v. Seattle School District and Meredith v. JeffersonCounty**,"***The Urban Review***,** Volume 40, Number 1 / March, 2008.

A great deal of research has been conducted in the United States on the topic of expectations. This research looks at the expectations that teachers have of their students, that students have of each other, and that students hold for themselves. It also investigates the expectations that parents of different racial and ethnic groups have for their children. One clear finding is that immigrant and minority parents tend to hold very high expectations for their children's education, and their children, too, are often very hopeful about their educational futures. However, many immigrant, minority, and low income children fail to realize these expectations because of their schooling experiences. Students who are clustered into schools with many other disadvantaged students like themselves are often taught by teachers who lack a good understanding of their personal and familial challenges, cannot communicate with them or their parents in their own language, and seeing that they are not as prepared or knowledgeable about the curriculum, consequently hold low expectations for them. A classic but controversial study conducted in the 1970's known by the title, *Pygmalion in the Classroom*, found that randomly selected students who were described by a psychologist to their teachers as "late bloomers" who would soon excel academically even though they had not yet demonstrated this promise, did indeed outperform other children in the classroom based on the teachers' expectation that they would do well. A number of studies since this time have shown that teachers' expectations for their students influence the curriculum groups to which students are assigned, the rigor of the curriculum they are given, and a myriad of ways in which teachers send verbal and non-verbal cues that not a lot is expected of them.[62] Qualitative vidence of how teachers adapt teaching content, methods and evaluation to segregated classes and schools is provided in van Zanten A. *L'Ecole de la périphérie. Scolarité et segregation en banlieue*, Paris, PUF, 2001).

Minority students, too, can trigger processes that undermine their academic success when they fear that others may think they are intellectually inferior because of negative stereotyping. Claude Steele of Stanford University has argued convincingly based on a series of cleverly designed studies that Black and Latino students who harbor feelings of inferiority based on negative stereotypes that are held about their groups' intellectual abilities, will perform below their actual ability level on "high stakes" tests. That is, when cued that other groups (for examples, whites) tend to outperform their group on the test, their performance aligns with these expectations. Steele argues that the fear of performing badly in a "high stakes" arena such as intellectual ability can cause performance-dampening anxiety and result in lowered test scores. To "save face" minority students may simply remove themselves from the competition, refusing to take challenging courses or not competing for honors, because they fear reinforcing the stereotype that they are less capable. Steele further argues that schools need to attend to these issues by helping to support a strong group identity for minority students.

Other research has shown that teachers, and others, tend to underestimate the abilities

[62]For example, two educational researchers, Jere Brophy and Thomas Good found that teachers did not call on or wait as long for a correct answer from students whom they assessed as not knowing the answer, and students were very sensitive these teacher behaviors in developing their own self-concepts as learners.

of students who speak with an accent, and this is particularly true if the student bears an accent from a socially disadvantaged group. Oftentimes well-meaning counselors and teachers suggest to students of color, and immigrants, that they should not take very rigorous courses or not attempt to enroll in colleges that are too demanding, fearing that these students will meet with failure. Robert Ream has referred to this as "negative social capital" when teachers inadvertently undermine minority students' ambitions. Group membership often carries with it lowered expectations even for many talented non-white students when their group is not seen as high achieving. Consequently, they are steered away from many educational opportunities "for their own good."

Social reproduction is effectively supported by differences in peer groups. There are a number of reasons for this, including importantly, the human and physical resources that more advantaged peers bring to a school, but just as important is the social capital that these students bring. A young non-white woman explained the process by which knowledgeable peers can share critical social capital –knowledge of the structures and values of the educational system that are unknown to "outsiders". In this young woman's case, it made all the difference between a life of humble aspirations and the medical doctor that she became:

> "I had to go to school to register and there was this huge line. . .
> if you wanted the general course which just prepared you for the basics. The girl in the other line was a girl I had gone to school with. . . .she said, "Don't get in that line,get in this line, this is for college prep." I told her that was not for me, and she said, "Yes, it is," and so I went with her because I didn't want to be alone. . . . When I got in the line, she talked me into it by saying,"Don't stand in that line because you will learn the same stuff you learning in seventh and eighth grade, just reviewing the same stuff."

Students who attend school systems that are more equitable and that have fewer divisions among students with respect to the curriculum they are offered, such as in France, may not run the same risk of being channeled into completely different curricula, but they do run the risk of not knowing about opportunities that exist in the larger world outside their own community enclaves and of holding lower aspirations for themselves than do the children of the middle and elite classes. There is also the possibility, of course, that they will be transferred into dead end short vocational training programs that do not lead to actual jobs. It is often through the exchange of information that occurs among peers that students come to see different futures for themselves. Where students are segregated and isolated from such knowledgeable and self-confident peers, either in separate schools or in separate classes and academic programs, they have little access to the mainstream cultural and social capital and their ambitions, and motivation, are limited.

Assimilation and Rejection of the Host Society. We have found that when students' culture and language are nowhere evident in the schools that they attend, they are sent a very clear message that they are is not valued by the school.[63] This can result in self-hate, in which the student may attempt to deny that she is from another culture and

[63] Angela Valenzuela, *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*.Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.

disappear into the new culture, often cutting ties of intimacy with the culture of the parents. For this reason retraining of teachers and implementation of special courses and instructional units was frequently part of the process of implementing desegregation.[64] The consequences of cultural insensitivity and disrespect are poignantly described in a classic work by a Mexican American author, Richard Rodriguez, who writes of the way he lost the language, then the culture of his parents, and finally lost his deep connections to them as he struggled to be accepted into the mainstream culture.[65] .

A number of U.S. researchers have studied the opposite phenomenon: when immigrant students hang onto their culture and language, while simultaneously acquiring knowledge of the new culture and language. Rubén Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes, among other American sociologists have studied thousands of children of immigration in a number of urban areas in the United States and concluded that excessive "Americanization is unhealthy for immigrants." One of their key findings is that students who maintain their home language (with the help of the schools) also tend to maintain closer ties to their family culture and are more that their immigrant parents hold for them. These students, bilingual and bicultural, tend to outperform academically their immigrant peers who quickly lose the familial language and culture.[66] It has also been suggested that those students who lose the close familial culture ties are more likely to evidence behavior and disciplinary problems as their families are much less able to exert authority over them.

Attempts to eradicate the native language of students through English-only instruction, eschewing any instruction in the student's home language, have been found to be less effective in teaching literacy in English than instruction beginning with the home language. This somewhat counter-intuitive finding is based on solid learning theory, that people learn most efficiently when new learning building on existing knowledge and the learner is not treated as a tabula rasa. Other research has demonstrated that successful multi-lingual learners outperform monolingual learners on a variety of cognitive tasks that can support more high level academic achievement.

At the same time there is clear evidence in U.S. research that failure to acquire academic English is very damaging for eventual academic success and that a good working knowledge of English is highly beneficial in the labor markets. Surveys of immigrants show a clear understanding the acquiring English is a very important goal. The question is how best to approach the problem. There is growing evidence, some of which will be published in a forthcoming Civil Rights Project book, *Forbidden Language*, presenting new evidence on the consequences of policy changes in California, Arizona that banned bilingual education, that ignoring and assuming children will simply acquire proficiency and learn successfully through immersion in the dominant language will diminish both learning and positive attitudes.

---

[64] E. Frankenberg and G. Orfield, eds., *Lessons in Integration*, Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 2007.
[65] Robert Rodriguez, *The Hunger of Memory*, New York:Godine, 1990.
[66] Alejandro Portes and Rubén Rumbaut, *Legacies: The Immigrant Second Generation*, New York: Russell Sage, 2001.

The integration of immigrant and minority students into the broader society must be a critical concern of modern societies, and in this regard there is considerable evidence that denying young people a strong sense of identity that is tied to their familial and community originscan result in significant social upheaval. In the United States, large numbers of Black, Mexican, and American Indian students simply refuse to go to school where they are made to feel as failures because of their perceived inferior status and lack of mainstream cultural capital. Isolating students and families, denying them good connections with the mainstream in their communities, and then disrespecting or ignoring what their families most value is a recipe for educational failure.

School choice: an opportunity to escape segregation or an instrument to fortify it and render it legitimate?

School choice is not a long tradition in American public schools. The U.S. has experimented with many forms of school choice and many debates over school policy have considered the impact of schools and school policies on residential choice and "white flight."

The practice for many years was to mandate that children attend the zoned school for their neighborhood, except in the seventeen states with segregation laws, in which black and white students both had separate neighborhood schools, sometimes quite close to each other. When desegregation began in the 1960s, thousands of Southern school systems adopted a choice plan, leaving the schools separated but allowing students to transfer and providing transport. The plan called "freedom of choice" was widely implemented but typically left the minority schools totally segregated while a very small group of nonwhite students transferred to schools where they were usually isolated and unwelcomed. It left the schools so segregated that both federal officials and the Supreme Court found that it failed to implement the legal requirement that the segregated system be ended. That was the reason for the ordering of immediate mandatory desegregation by the Supreme Court in l968[67] and the extension of that ruling to require transportation if needed to overcome neighborhood segregation in 1971.[68]

A 2007 article[69] reporting on attitudes of parents in a diverse neighborhood on the periphery of Paris (and a comparison group in London) showed that even liberal French parents committed to diversity worried about too much contact with disadvantaged children and adopted strategies to avoid it or ameliorate its impacts. French families were not significantly interested in cultural pluralism but were committed to the idea of a single unified approach to education for all children in a country where formal

---

[67] *Green v. New Kent County,*391 U.S. 430 (1968)
[68] *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, 420 U.S.1 (1971).
[69] Agnes van Zanten and Maroussia Raveaud, "Choosing the local school: middle class parents' values and social and ethnic mix in London and Paris, "*Journal of Education Policy*,Vol. 22, No. 1, January 2007, pp. 107–17

educational achievement was much more important in controlling access to good jobs as adults.

The authors argued that assuring middle class status for their children now relies on formal schooling, especially in France, so even if the parents were progressive and living in a gentrifying part of an area of diversity, they were primarily concerned about the academic achievement of their own children. French parents were especially focused on school success because the French labor market success was much more directly linked to school results than the English. The French parents, coming from a society that emphasized universalism and assimilation into French culture tended to see minority families as lower class families in poverty, not families from a different cultural and linguistic background and to favor more remediation to bring them up to level while also blaming the students and their parents. The temptation is thus strong to move from a discourse that denounces structural social inequality to one that pities teachers and blames pupils and parents They tended to justify enrolling children in diverse schools as a duty of citizenship rather than something that would be an advantage for their children and to strategize to get their children special placement in higher tracks or music programs that drew in higher status fellow students. Parents favor diluting the concentration of poor children either by dispersing poor children to more schools or strategies to attract more middle class children and families into their school. In contrast to the U.S. there is neither a policy imperative or an integrationist philosophy of the value of cultural diversity and pluralism to support such schools and the rigidity of the nationally centralized curriculum prevents any significant cultural adaptation or "equal status interaction" in the formal school program.

Those who understand and use choice most effectively, of course, tend to see it as an eminently fair system, focusing on an apparently open market mechanism and ignoring the way in which advantage builds advantage. Azouz Begag, however, speaks of the ways the "meritorious" pass on the baton to their descendants in the competition for jobs and of the "differential nature of social reproduction, in which the older generation of the national education system, the chances of success of children of well-off parents are vastly higher. They have "radically different levels of information about how the system works, what are its "paths, modes of access, and rules" which provide great opportunities to build in advantage for their children.[70] In a complex maze of choice those who enter and come out winners are likely to be those who have well informed guides.

Choice as an educational policy has had a curious history in the U.S. U.S. public schools were organized to serve every part of the country and the tradition was that almost all students were assigned on the basis of where they lived. In the states that had schools that were segregated by state there were separate systems of schools for blacks and white, but all were assigned on the basis of where they lived, which meant students of different races living in the same area would be assigned to different schools. There were a few famous high schools for gifted students like Boston Latin, Bronx Science, and San Francisco's Lowell High School, but these were rare exceptions. Choice was injected

[70]Begag.

into the system in a major way when, following the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, southern officials interpreted the constitutional mandate now as requiring actual desegregation but as permitting the maintenance of the separate schools but allowing students who desired to change to transfer to another school. The "freedom of choice" system was tightened up, once the 1964 Civil Rights Act became law. Policies required all students to receive choice forms, guaranteeing free transportation, and forbidding transfers that would increase segregation such as white transfers out of biracial communities. In the North where there were no segregation laws, the choice system was called "open enrollment", something like the kind of choice that takes place in parts of the French system now, where families of all races could transfer from one area to another without provision of transportation. It was found that often it undermined diverse areas by permitting the exit of white families and increasing the isolation of minority families since whites did not transfer into minority areas and nonwhites were often reluctant to be in a school where they were isolated and did not feel welcome, in a school without teachers or curriculum that related in any way to their culture and history The northern system eventually was found, in a number of major urban school lawsuits to be a constitutional violation as a public policy that actually increased segregation. The southern system, even with the increased protections, was rejected by federal officials and the courts by the late l960s because it had failed spectacularly to actually produce integrated schools on any scale.

Choice came back in more sophisticated forms in the 1970s. Major cities, found guilty of public action that deepened segregation, had to take action to integrate schools but wanted to avoid the mandatory transfers ("busing") that had produced so much conflict in the early l970s. "Busing" is the term given to urban integration plans by the segregationist governor of Alabama, George Wallace, who ran for President in l968. The policy was previously known as school integration. It was popularized during the administration of President Richard Nixon, whose "Southern strategy" created a political coalition of Southern white and suburbanites across the U.S. which dominated American politics for 40 years and whose sway was broken only by two moderate Southern governors, Jimmy Carter (1976-1980) and Bill Clinton (1992-2000) who themselves had worked to limit desegregation in their state capitals but generally enforced the law, but gave little priority to the issue, as presidents. Busing became an extremely contentious issue, especially when it was first implemented in scores of Southern cities in the early 1970s. There is no evidence that the means of going to school had any educational impact and a majority of American children are normally bussed to school for nonracial reasons because of low density settlement patterns in U.S. suburbs, rural and small town communities. The effects of the school integration produced by busing depend, of course, on what the composition of the receiving school is and how the plans are implemented. Overall, however, desegregation tends to improve test scores modestly and significantly improve chances of graduation and college and job success for minority children. It has no negative achievement effect on white children. It benefits from the fact that disadvantaged children are more strongly affected by schooling experience and home effects dominant the achievement of middle class children, so one group can gain without the other losing. Surveys of students in desegregated schools produces highly positive findings of all groups about the degree to which they feel comfortable and knowledgeable

about each other and well prepared to live and work in integrated communities.[71] The stability of the plans depends on the demographic of the community, housing market conditions, and the degree to which the plan encompasses the housing market. Most of the "busing" plans have been mandated by courts but make extensive use of choice mechanisms in their implementation. Research suggests that in order to obtain the most positive results it is important that the teachers and administrators be trained in techniques to create a climate of fairness, mutual respect and equal status interaction in the schools.

So they developed ways of creating new specialized schools that parents of any race from anywhere in the district could attend but with enrollment controlled through separate waiting lists to guarantee that the schools would be desegregated. This produced many highly popular urban schools and, of course, struggles by parents who did not get their first choice school. There are now more than two million students attending magnet schools across the U. S. The other form, "controlled choice" was invented in Cambridge, Massachusetts in the aftermath of the bitterly divisive desegregation experience in Boston (perhaps the worse in the country, in good part because the city was desegregating lower income students of both races in a climate of total polarization with the Boston school officials opening defying the court). In Cambridge the new plan required that all families in this very diverse city, directly across the Charles River from Boston, list their preferences among schools in order of preference. All schools were made schools of choice and a number developed specialized programs. Most students went to their first or second choice school and the system maintained high levels of desegregation in the city for three decades, even though there were always complaints by some parents. Research showed very positive views of the experience from the students. This system produced little overt political conflict and spread to a number of other school districts.

A faculty seminar at Harvard University in the l990s commissioned a number of studies of choice and produced a book, *Who Chooses? Who Loses*? which concluded that unrestricted choice almost always led to stratification of schools. The form of choice now most favored by American conservatives is charter schools, semi-private publicly funded schools that receive federal and state funds but are not under the local school authorities. They generally have no equity provisions and are, on average, significantly more segregated that public schools.

Since recent appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court by three conservative presidents there have been several decisions that are leading to the dismantling of desegregation plans and the mechanisms they have inserted in choice plans to assure desegregation. In both Boston and San Francisco the dropping of desegregation requirements on the strongest selective high schools has had the impact of substantially increasing segregation. The most important lesson of the U.S. experience with choice is that unrestricted choice not only will fail to end stratification but that it will probably intensify it. If choice is to produce diverse schools that goal must be a basic part of the plan and the plan must strongly address the inequality of information among groups of parents, assure that admission not be limited by class to those who can provide their own

[71] Statement of 553 American Social Scientists to U.S. Supreme Court, 2006

transportation, and make the outsider students feel welcome and respected in receiving schools.

Schools obviously affect decisions about where to live, even though only about a fourth of American households now have school age children. The residential choices of families with children have, of course, dramatic impacts on the social composition of schools where attendance is related to neighborhoods. American interracial neighborhoods, in any case, are often not stable and the statistics at any point in time reflect a point in a process of transition. In the l970s a strong academic and legal debate erupted over the issue of "white flight" which conservatives argued was caused by school integration efforts. This spurred a number of studies and legal battles and that research continues. It is clear that without supportive school and housing integration policies and strong enforcement of laws against "racial steering" in the real estate markets, there is a tendency toward resegregation whether or not there are any school desegregation policies. White families tend to choose whiter schools and nonwhite families, who strongly prefer interracial neighborhoods, tend to move (or be steered into) neighborhoods that appear to be interracial but are actually in transition. Desegregation plans that are very limited and that leave many segregated white options for white families tend to accelerate demographic change, at least in the beginning but resegregtion had taken place in thousands of neighborhoods before desegregation and in communities that never desegregated their schools and it is continuing in communities that have ended their school desegregation efforts. The most successful desegregation plans have actually been those that are most radical, involving as much as possible of the metropolitan real estate market. A number of metropolitan-wide plans that have existed for as much as three decades have actually been related to significant increases in residential integration. Residential integration of African Americans has increased substantially since civil rights laws and school desegregation occurred but the changes have been least in the older metropolitan areas. There is now serious expansion of school resegregation in suburban areas, particularly in the large metros, which typically have no school desegregation policies and simply let the neighborhood-by-neighborhood transition in the real estate market proceed. Communities which have remained stably integrated for substantial periods of time, such as President Obama's Chicago neighborhood of Hyde Park, tend to be very successful economically and the product of concerted local efforts, often supported by powerful local institutions (in this case the University of Chicago).[72] What this line of research suggests is that there is a tendency for segregation to spread, whether or not schools are desegregated, that avoiding this destructive process takes concentrated and concerted efforts but leads to real benefits and that broader rather than narrower school desegregation efforts, supported by strong enforcement of fair housing laws (since minority families often do not have real residential choice even when they have money) can be positive components.

Serious Civil Rights Enforcement is Impossible without Data

Data is essential. When we have a serious problem we want to solve in metropolitan

[72] G. Orfield, "Ghettoization and its Alternatives," in Paul Peterson, ed, The New Urban Reality, Washington: Brookings Inst. 1985, pp. 161-196

society, we measure. We don't try to estimate economic growth or joblessness or environmental conditions or traffic flow or educational success by guesses and impressions. No one has enough personal experience to comprehend through immediate experience complex relationships working out in many ways in a changing community of millions of people. We decide what we need to know and we measure it. Ethnic inequality is a very serious problem.

The only way most citizens can know about general conditions of urban racial equity is through data. Data documenting its growth and conditions it confronts is one of the only ways an important emerging group with little financial or political power can make claims in the society and credibly bring its issues into public debate. Would environmentalists be able to capture public attention or target policy changes if measurement of the relationship of specific chemicals to pollution and climate change were forbidden? Credible statistics allow the groups to be aware of their own situation and to raise policy issues and attack stereotypes, ignorance, and misunderstanding about their situation. [73]

Since serious social movements were founded a century ago to fight for racial justice in the U.S. a continuing theme has been the demand for information and their effort to uncover the facts of inequality in any possible way. understand racial change and solve racial discrimination and inequality It is no accident that the half century of struggle by black leaders to create major civil rights reform often turned to collection and publication of data as central tools both for initiating reforms in the courts and in politics and for mobilizing their own community and focusing on the most important goals. There was an endless stream of studies and reports starting with the work of the great black sociologist, W.E.B. DuBois in the late l9th century.[74] Black researchers and their supporters counted school spending by race, lynchings, voting statistics, income and many other measures showing the depth of the inequality and the utter failure of the government's "separate but equal" policy. Scholars worked with organizers and lawyers to produce data that could launch new issues and win new interpretations of the law and enforcement actions. And they always demanded more data, often against the active resistance of public officials, who said it was unnecessary and knew it would not look good.

When the Supreme Court finally, in l954, overturned the system of state-imposed segregation operating in seventeen states, it relied heavily on empirical studies that showed its powerful relationship with harm to nonwhite students, virtually all of it

---

[73] For a more extensive discussion of these issues and the impact of U.S. civil rights policy see: G. Orfield, "Why Data Collection Matters: The role of Race and Poverty Indicators in American Education," in W. Hutmacher, D. Cochrane, and N. Bottani, eds., *In Pursuit of Equity in Education: Using International Indicators to Compare Equity Policies*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pp. 165-194.

[74] DuBois' work began with the first major student of urban racial patterns, *The Philadelphia Negro*, and led to the production of a long succession of studies and monographs and articles in *The Crisis*, the NAACP Magazine.

produced by researchers outside government.[75] Even after *Brown*, however, all data on school segregation and desegregation for more than a decade, however, came not from government but from a voluntary organization of journalists in the South funded by the Ford Foundation, the Southern Education Reporting Service. That data was very important for the mass social movement being created by Martin Luther King and others as well as for the continuing battles in the courts and Congress. When Congress passed the first major civil rights law fundamentally changing American society in 90 years, the l964 Civil Rights Act, the enforcement process was impossible without a vast expansion of data on issues of racial equity. When there were decisions to actually change racial conditions fundamentally in civil rights reform, data was essential. Voting rights laws were targeted on states with consistently low percentages of nonwhites voting. School desegregation was triggered by proof that local decisions were directly related to levels of segregation and monitored to show actual change in school composition. Affirmative action employment plans require data on the labor force by race to judge underrepresentation. To actually produce rapid change there had to be statistical definitions and statistical measures if the law was to be applied uniformly and promptly.

The Census and state and local offices had always collected statistics offices for births, deaths, etc. and states with segregation laws published data on the black schools and colleges. Data was collected on immigrants and their origins in the national Census, held ever ten years. . Data on key institutions such as the enrollment of schools, hiring by public agencies and private firms, treatment by the police, levels of voting, availability of mortgages, and many other issues central to civil rights claims were rarely collected and demands to produce them were often central to civil rights struggles. In Chicago, for example, years of battles and protests were necessary before the school board authorized the first collection of data on school enrollments by race and school. Publication of key outcomes of education by race and school only came, in many school districts, following the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 strongly supported by President George W. Bush, the most conservative president in recent history, who argued that such statistics were essential to assure educational accountability. Though they differed with him on many issues, civil rights organizations in the U.S. were virtually unanimous in supporting this proposition. Civil rights opponents have fought to eliminate racial data, including the unsuccessful referendum campaign for the "Racial Privacy Act" to eliminate racial data in California which went down to a 64-36 defeat by the voters after scores of organizations and political leaders successfully argued that racial and ethnic data was essential to provision of services and protection of rights. [76]

. Systematic collection of data on Latinos is very recent. The Census had traditionally collected immigration data, place of birth and data on moves from one place to another and it tried in l970 to make ethnic estimates based on Spanish surnames. Only after the Civil Rights Act of l964, however, did the federal government begin systematic

---

[75] *Brown v. Board of Education,* 1954.

[76] Ritu Kelotra, *"Civil Rights Groups: Proposition 54 Defeat is Victory for All,"* Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, civilrights.org, October 8, 2003

collection of Latino data from schools and colleges and other institutions in the late l960s. Would Americans know that Latinos have become the largest minority group in the society, that they are highly segregated and that their educational attainment levels are the lowest if we could not collect and public ethnic data? We now know, for example, that many problems thought to be caused by immigrant status do not end with the first or second generation the passage of time and market forces are now solving inequalities partially because Latinos are locked into weaker neighborhoods and schools. [77]

Once direct data was available there was vastly more information available on Latinos as a group, the press coverage became deeper and more intense, and the groups themselves gained much better opportunities to frame issues with official statistics that were widely accepted as starting points for policy debates. It is not difficult, for example, to know how many Latinos are concentrated in schools with high concentrations of poverty, with low test scores and graduation rates for Latinos, with few or no teachers of their enthnicity where there is a vast difference in course taking that excludes them from or leads to failure in higher education. We can tell whether things are getting better in the third of fourth generation or whether inequality is consolidating, and under what circumstances one or the other outcome is likely to occur.

Researchers in France , like American researchers when limited data was available, have tried to infer findings about race and ethnicity using available data about birth place, parents' birthplace and a classification of names, as well as home language. All these elements were available for U.S. Latinos before direct data was collected and the Census in 1970 tried to use the "Spanish surname" method of identification. The problem is that these were indirect inferences and they could not, in their nature, capture much of the reality. Many people with certain names do not, of course, fall within the category and vice versa. Ethnicity lasts much longer than two generations, especially for segregated populations with notably different cultures, there are serious problems counting people who are not legally present in a society, and there is no way in such a system to tap into and study evolving pan-ethnic identities which may be very important and are developing rapidly among U.S. Latinos and Asians. The category of "white" is obviously a composite identify of great social importance and the tracking of new pan-national identities is of great significance for a society and it cannot be assessed by collecting data about country of origin. Indirect data is usually available only for a limited number of variables—residence, labor market status, etc., and is not provided for vitally important issues such as location and success within schools and classrooms, success in obtaining mortgages, housing, and other vital aspects of life. Another problem related to indirect data is that it has limited credibility and is much more difficult for non-specialist to use, such as community groups and movements who would want to make their own calculations. It is also not a credible basis for legal proceedings or enforcement actions.

Examining the following tables from the current French data system illustrates some of the problems. The first tells us that the term "immigrant" in France can, in no way, be an adequate representation of a particular social or nationality group since there are large groups of immigrants from very different backgrounds in many parts of the world. Any

[77] Gándara, *The Latino Educational Crisis*, 2009.

summary statistics on immigrants would have a very uncertain connection to any particular one. The second table tells us that, for example, immigrants are much more likely to fail to complete school or to receive short term training of very limited value in a labor market which has had high unemployment for many years and in which immigrants have special difficulties. The available data and the important survey work of Michele Tribalat do, of course, provide some important information, particularly in the institutions where it is available. We can see, for example, that immigrants from Muslim nations have much higher unemployment levels and compare those by the nation from which they come and they are much less likely to be offered job interviews. Those are important findings but we can have no idea how much of the official data which combines all immigrants and does not follow ethnicity into subsequent generations. relates to particular groups either on the educational attainment side or on the consequences for their later lives as would be shown in good longitudinal data with clear ethnic categories. If one were to try to make inferences they would be likely to seriously underestimate the problems for some subgroups and overestimate them for others and the conclusions would not be reliable bases for policy or measures of practice.

..

.

Flux d'immigration permanente par motif

2003

* Conjoints, enfants et ascendants de Français, parents d'enfants français.

** Titulaires d'une rente accident du travail, bénéficiaires de l'asile territorial, étrangers malades, actifs non salariés, familles de réfugiés et apatrides.

Champ : hors entrants de l'Espace économique européen (EEE).

Sources : OMI, OFPRA, Ministère de l'Intérieur.

Nationalité	Travailleurs permanents	Regroupement familial	Familles de Français*	Vie privée et familiale	Réfugiés	Visiteurs	Autres**	Ensemble
Europe (hors EEE) et ex-URSS	**1 144**	**1 032**	**624**	**4 499**	**3 097**	**906**	**485**	**11 787**
Afrique	**2 097**	**19 014**	**13 122**	**43 938**	**4 314**	**3 259**	**4 318**	**90 062**
Algérie	397	5 367	4 105	15 884	226	1 441	1 134	**28 554**
Maroc	707	7 775	2 366	10 789	0	448	254	**22 339**

Flux d'immigration permanente par motif

2003

Tunisie	194	3 068	3 610	2 265	16	163	109	**9 425**
Afrique hors Maghreb	799	2 804	3 041	15 000	4 072	1 207	2 507	**26 923**
Asie	**2 013**	**4 772**	**1 517**	**8 779**	**1 960**	**1 949**	**1 202**	**22 192**
Turquie	339	2 768	372	3 882	857	112	283	**8 613**
Vietnam	84	58	80	582	16	46	43	**909**
Chine	222	339	149	1 132	39	381	149	**2 411**
Japon	386	450	81	192	0	250	46	**1 405**
Liban	364	157	64	246	5	156	12	**1 004**
Amérique, Océanie	**1 244**	**1 948**	**961**	**4 927**	**366**	**1 496**	**316**	**11 258**
Autres: divers, apatrides	**2**	**2**	**4**	**28**	**53**	**6**	**1**	**96**
Ensemble	**6 500**	**26 768**	**16 228**	**62 171**	**9 790**	**7 616**	**6 322**	**135 395**
Rappel 2002	7 469	27 267	21 020	43 681	8 495	9 985	5 560	**123 477**
Rappel 2001	8 811	23 081	18 765	34 682	7 323	8 968	5 026	**106 656**
Rappel 2000	5 990	21 404	15 992	31 140	5 185	8 424	3 596	**97 083**

. .

.

Répartition des immigrés et des non-immigrés selon le diploma

En 2007, en %

Note : résultats en moyenne annuelle.

Répartition des immigrés et des non-immigrés selon le diploma

En 2007, en %

Champ : France métropolitaine, personnes âgées de 15 à 64 ans.

Source : Insee, enquêtes Emploi du 1er au 4ème trimestre 2007.

Diplôme	**Ensemble des immigrés**	**Ensemble des non immigrés**	**Ensemble de la population**
Diplôme supérieur à Bac+2	14,3	12,6	12,8
Baccalauréat + 2 ans	6,4	11,8	11,3
Baccalauréat ou brevet professionnel	14,5	18,7	18,4
CAP, BEP	12,7	24,3	23,3
BEPC seul	7,5	12,2	11,8
Aucun diplôme ou CEP	44,7	20,3	22,5
Diplôme non déclaré	0,0	0,0	0,0
Ensemble	**100,0**	**100,0**	**100,0**
Effectif (en milliers)	3 520	36 097	39 617

% Distribution of the immigrants and the non-immigrants by diploma In 2007, Note: results on average annual. Field: Metropolitan France, Ages from 15 to 64 years. Source: INSEE

.

Beyond Data Collection. Simply collecting information is not enough. Data creates possibilities but more must be done to realize those possibilities. It makes better policy possible but it does not drive the political or bureaucratic processes. Wonderful data controlled by public agencies pursuing their own policies may not be released or may be presented only in ways that support that agenda. This is a particular problem for relatively powerless communities with few specialists and little money for their own data collection and research. In the U.S. during the Reagan Administration the government never released the data on the racial composition of individual schools so it would have been impossible to know the impact of various policy changes unless the data existed and there was a mechanism, known as the federal Freedom of Information law, that made it possible for our research project, then at the University of Chicago, to demand access to the data set, do the computations and publish the results. On other occasions the power

of Congress to demand that agencies release data had the same effect. The basic point is that once the data exists there are important possibilities that otherwise do not exist for creating issues, for evaluating the impact of different solutions, and for empowering relatively powerless groups to challenge the policy and legal systems.

In France, where administrative agencies often exercise great power[78] it may be particularly important to make data very widely available on the web for independent analysis and for foundations and other institutions to support scholars from outside government to produce and publish such studies and to train members of minority groups to carry out such analyses. Journalists can also play a vital role in obtaining, analyzing, and explaining data, broadening the public understanding of these important social issues.

Without data there is simply no way to know how serious problems of ethnic inequality are, to investigate patterns of causation, or to evaluate possible solutions. Much becomes subjective and impressionistic in a situation where there are deeply inconsistent understandings on opposite sides of the lines of social division. Few agencies or institutions voluntarily disclose the specifics of ethnic inequality within their operations. 3. American statistics have shown that many widely believed things are wrong and many trends that would have gone unnoticed have turned out to be very important... Needless to say, it is dangerous to attribute to ethnicity, conditions and actions that are actually the products of poverty. Because race and class are independent factors, yet very substantially related to poverty, both must be measured and great care must be taken not to attribute to race problems that arise out of poverty or to poverty the kinds of limits on educational opportunity that affect much of the minority middle class. For example, U.S. data shows that black and Latino middle class families are now increasing rapidly in suburban rings but they are experiencing severe segregation in spite of the large white majorities in suburbia Studies of minority access to college have shown that poverty works very poorly as a substitute for race if the goal is to achieve a racially diverse class. The poverty statistics can be related in many ways to the rich body of data on race and ethnicity available since the l960's. The wrong diagnosis may well trigger policies that make things worse.

Data is not a sufficient condition for social advances of excluded groups. Often the lack of information on issues of obvious significance is a sign that a society or its government does not want to confront the issue. The officials could simply assert that there were no problems of unequal treatment or attainment and there would be no data to prove them wrong. Denial of problems and refusal to collect or to publish data on sensitive issues are typical responses of those wishing to preserve the status quo. Stereotypes thrive in the absence of data.

In more than forty years of collecting very extensive racial data, the argument that it would harm nonwhites has not been adopted by any major civil rights organization and there have been many demands for increased data. The availability of racial and ethnic

---

[78] A. van Zanten, A. Régulation et rôle de la connaissance dans le champ éducatif en France: Du monopole à l'externalisation de l'expertise ? *Sociologie et sociétés*, vol. n° 40, n° 1, 2008).

data has often been of critical importance in winning legislative and judicial battles for civil rights and for assessing the enforcement of civil rights laws.

Commenting on the data problems in his 2007 book, *Multi-Ethnic France*, Alec Hargreaves notes: "The statistical lacunae generated by the state reflect a long-standing unwillingness at the highest level officially to recognize immigrants and their descendants as structurally identifiable groups within French society." [79] Azouz Begag, former French Minister for Equal Opportunities, summarized the need for French data, noting that "The idea of drawing statistical distinctions on the basis of origins always makes people feel ill at ease in France. There have, indeed, been major controversies…. Yet the fact remains that, if we are serious about equal opportunities, poking around in a broken motor without the proper tools is a pretty risky proposition, if not an outright con game."[80] The nation, he said, must have "statistical data on ethnic origins" to develop and monitor " public action designed to correct inequalities." The American experience strongly confirms this argument.

.

Propositions on Segregation and Equal Rights.

Obviously one cannot visit France briefly and read reports of what is happening and offer any specific advice. Having been deeply involved in studies of racial and ethnic inequality as well as a variety of programs and civil rights interventions we are very well aware of the importance of context. Developing and implementing policy requires a deep understanding of the relationships in the communities and institutions as well as the public and private institutions that need to change and adapt. What we can do, based on extensive research and analysis of similar issues in the U.S. is to offer a series of propositions for discussion and for serious analysis in the French context, where there is the available data is still very limited, many opinions expressed which are very similar to those which were made at earlier stages in U.S. civil rights problem, opinions which were then widely held and which proved to be wrong. We don't know whether that may be true in France but we know that the errors of underestimating the seriousness of segregation and inequality have been extremely costly in the U.S. and believe that good policy for France may require facing some of these issues.

Proposition 1: If there is a severe social cleavage in an urban community, which individuals cannot solve on their own, and policy does nothing about it, it will deepen. For generations in the cities moderates in the U.S. counseled waiting for change to naturally evolve. It did not. Putting resources into a segregated system perpetuated and sometimes intensified inequality. Because schools are the primary public institution that deals with youth on a regular basis, they are an important vehicle for socializing populations to live together harmoniously. No other institution exists with such a broad reach to break the chain of stereotyping and social cleavage among youth. And it is

[79] Alec G. Hargreaves *Multi-Ethnic France*: *Immigration, Politics, Culture and Society*, New York: Routledge, 2007, p. 11.
[80] Begag, p. 120.

critical to attack this social problem among young children because developmentally they are more able and likely to change in attitudes than older individuals and build connections across lines of social cleavage. Much is known about the conditions for doing this successfully.

Proposition 2: If discrimination is ignored, inequality will spread and a rationale will develop to rationalize it. A characteristic of urban settlement patterns is that neighborhoods and communities are continuously in competition and households have choices about location. Those choices tend to continuously enrich the successful communities of the dominant group and to continuously impoverish those where the group victimized by broadly held stereotypes is located. School and housing choice policy without specific goals and techniques to overcome segregation will intensify it—markets may be efficient in economic terms but they do not produce equality and they give tremendous advantages to people with better information and contacts. They can, for example, capitalize the value of fear of other groups into housing prices.

Proposition 3: Dominant social groups normally have stereotypes about subordinated groups and the politics of scapegoating, which plays on those stereotypes and fears is often much easier and more successful than the politics of facing difficult racial and ethnic issues particularly in times of economic stress. This means that leadership trying to address inequality must be willing to sacrifice short-term advantage, particularly in initiating new policies. Positive social movements, effectively using the expressed values of the dominant society, as the U.S. civil rights movement did, can be a major resource for such leaders. Violence reinforces stereotypes and makes order the dominant issue.

Proposition 4: In communities with racial or ethnic polarization there is a tendency for the residents to treat differences as evidence of cultural inferiority and to try to force assimilation within segregated institutions, sometimes with punitive measures, while creating avoiding contact.

Proposition 5: The most positive conditions for changing prejudice and distrust among population groups require equal status contact with cannot occur in segregated housing and schools. Acquiring the social and cultural capital of the dominant society happens best through social interaction under positive conditions within major institutions and settings. All humans need a healthy identity to function successfully as citizens. They must be able to feel good about who they are. If people are forced to abandon the identity conferred in their homes and communities in favor of an alternative identity that is neither supported in their own community nor reinforced in the dominant community, they will be more likely to reject some or all of the precepts of the dominant community particularly if they are not treated fairly when they act within the dominant norms. Rejection reinforces societal cleavages on both sides of the lines of division. Schools that reflect and respect features of the immigrant communities are more likely to build the kind of trust that facilitates positive ideas among students and parents which aid both educational success and social adaptation.

Proposition 6: Poverty and isolation breed crime and fear of crime breeds increased separation and deepened fear, speeding disinvestment and destruction of the social structure of the minority community, which is then blamed on faults of their families and beliefs and treated with increased criminal sanctions and incarceration.

Proposition 7: Segregated high density housing with impoverished populations blocks creation of networks that link to the mainstream society and, over generations, fosters social pathology even among descendents of ambitious groups of families who arrive with mainstream values and ambitions. Schooling arrangements built on top of severely segregated housing it will be instantly unequal and will become more so as people with more options leave or transfer out.

Proposition 8: Compensatory programs within a setting of isolation and poverty fail and often foster paternalism. Closing gaps within segregation would require a sustained commitment to give better key resources to the disadvantaged and powerless than to the privileged and powerful communities over long periods of time but the logic of political survival leads elected officials to allocate resources to those who are most organized and have the most politically relevant resources.
Evem when there is formal equity of funds, the social capital and in-kind community contributions are extremely unequal.
.
Proposition 9: Effective policies ending unequal opportunity and including minorites in the mainstream require clear goals, an explanation that people can understand and eventually accept, clear data to know what is happening and identify problems needing solution, enforcement of the legal requirements, and technical support in communication and developing positive
policies of integration.

Proposition 10: When such policies are adopted and effectively administered they can create communities that are very attractive to families of all backgrounds, which show large increases in wealth, employment and social capital, and schools which children of all backgrounds find positive and intellectually and socially stimulating.

Proposition 11: It is impossible to know the extent and seriousness of problems of racial and ethnic equality without accurate statistics. Metropolitan society cannot be accurately understood without statistics and this is especially true of issues where groups on opposite sides of social cleavages selectively perceive realities.
insert language about utilization
Denial of data is normally defended as an advantage to the less successful groups but data is essential for those groups to make their case for needed changes and to convince the establishment institutions to face problems they wish to ignore. Denial of data works to preserve the status quo and forestall mobilization and reform.

Exploration of these propositions must include not only government and its dependencies but independent research from universities and other institutions by researchers who have contact with and credibility with the groups experiencing discrimination as well as those

running the major institutions. It is urgently important to develop researchers and intellectuals from among the subordinated groups. Government rarely fundamentally critiques its own operation, especially on issues of basic social polarization. External participants in the process, including researchers from minority groups make invaluable contributions.

Bibliography

Aber,J. Lawrence. Martha A. Gephart, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn and James P. Connell, "Development in Context: Implications for Studying Neighborhood Effects," Brooks-Gunn,J. Greg Duncan and J. Lawrence Aber, eds., *Neighborhood Poverty: Context and Consequences for Children*, New York: Russell Sage, l997, vol. I, pp. 44-61.[1]

Alport, Gordon, *The Nature of Prejudice,* Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley Pub. Co, 1954.

Aronson, E., & Patnoe, S. , *The jigsaw classroom: Building cooperation in the classroom* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman. 1997.

Balfanz, Robert, and Nettie E. Legters, "Locating the Dropout Crisis: Which High Schools Produce the Nation's Dropouts," in G. Orfield, *Dropouts in America*, Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2004, chapter 3.

Beyala, Lalixthe, Oxford: Heinemann Publishers, 1995, published in l992 in Paris as *Le Petit Prince de Belleville.*

Boger, J. and G. Orfield, eds*., School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back*? Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Bourdieu and Passeron, *La reproduction: éléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement* (Paris, Éditions de Minuit, 1970.)

Cain, Bruce E. and Karin Mac Donald, "Affirmative Action as a Wedge Issue: Prop 209 and The 1996 Presidential Election," paper delivered at Civil Rights Project Conference, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, December 3, 1997.

Clark, Kenneth B., *Dark Ghetto*, New York: Harper and Row, 1965, p. 32

Cohen, Elizabeth, Walter Stefan, Robert Crain, Robert Slavin, *Student Team Learning: A Practical Guide to Cooperative Learning* (3rd Edition) Washington: National Education Association, 1991.

Consent Decree Advisory Committee, *Desegregation and Educational Change in San Francisco.* Report to the Federal District Court, 1992.

DuBois, W.E.B., *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, l899.

Gándara,Patricia and Frances Contreras, *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policies,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Guène, Faïze, *Dreams of the Endz*, London: Chatto & Windus, 2008: pp. 22-23, originally published in Paris in 2006 as *Du rêve pour les ou*fs.

Guèn, Faïze, *Kiffe Kiffe Tomorrow,* Orlando: Harcourt, 2006, first published as *Kiffe kiffe demain,* in Paris by Hachette in 2004.

Haveman, Robert, and Timothy Smeeding, "The Role of Higher Education in Social Mobility," *The Future of Children*, vol. 16, no. 2 (2006), pp.125-143

Harris, David J. and Nancy McArdle, *More than Money: The Spatial Mismatch Between Where Homebuyers of Color Can Afford to Live and Where They Actually Reside*. Harvard Civil Rights Project. 2004

King, Martin Luther Jr., "Facing the Challenge of a New Age," address to NAACP Emancipation Rally, Atlanta, January 1957, in *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr*., vol. IV, Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2000, p. 76.

Lee, Jaekyung, *Tracking Achievement Gaps and Assessing the Impact of NCLB on the Gaps: An In-depth Look into National and State Reading and Math Outcome Trends*, Cambridge: Civil Rights Project, 2006.

Myrdahl, Gunnar, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*, New York; Harper and Brothers, 1944.

National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, *Report of the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity*, Washington, November 2008.

Orfield,Gary *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy*, Washington: Brookings Inst., 1978.

___,"Public opinion and school desegregation," *Teachers College Record*, vol. *9* (1995). pp. 654-670. [1]

____. *Reviving the Goal of an Integrated Society: A 21st Century Challenge*, Los Angeles:Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, January 2009.

-----, Why Data Collection Matters: The role of Race and Poverty Indicators in American Education," in W. Hutmacher, D. Cochrane, and N. Bottani, eds., *In Pursuit of Equity in Education: Using International Indicators to Compare Equity Policies*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pp. 165-194.

Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2000). "Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent meta-analytic findings." in: Stuart Oskamp. *ed., Reducing Prejudice And Discrimination*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.,;

Pettigrew Thomas F and Tropp, Linda R. "A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 2006;90(5):751-83.

James R. Ralph, Jr , *Northern Protest, Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement*, Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

Lee Rainwater , *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum*, Chicago : Aldine, 1971.

Rodriguez, Robert, *The Hunger of Memory*, New York: Godine, 1981..

Stuart, Guy, *Segregation in the Boston Metropolitan Area at the End of the 20th Centur*y, Working Paper, The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University and Taubman Center for State and Local Government, Kennedy School of Government, February 2000.

Sunderman and Orfield, " Domesticating a Revolution: No Child Left Behind Reforms and State Administrative Response," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 76 no. 4 (Winter 2006, pp526-556
U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 2008*.Washington: Government Printing Office, 2008.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Time to Listen …. A Time to Act*, Washington: Govt. Printing Office, 1967.

van Zantan, Agnes, and Maroussia Raveaud, "Choosing the local school: middle class parents' values and social and ethnic mix in London and Paris, "*Journal of Education Policy*,Vol. 22, No. 1, January 2007, pp. 107–17

Valenzuela,Angela , *Subtractive Schooling: U.S. Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*, Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.

Elizabeth Warren, *The Legacy of Judicial Policy-Making: Gautreaux Chicago Housing Authority : The Decision and Its Implementation,* Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1988.

Wilson, William Julius, "The Economic Plight of Inner-City Black Males," in Elijah Anderson, ed., *Against the Wall: Poor, Young, Black and Male,*" Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2008, p. 61

World Public Opinion.org, *Publics Around the World Say Governments Should Act to Prevent Racial Discrimination Most Countries See Progress in Racial Equality; Some Do Not,* March 20, 2008.

Supreme Court Decisions

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka,347 U.S. 483 1954.
Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
*Green v. New Kent County,*391 U.S. 430 (1968)
Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 420 U.S.1 (1971).
Parents Involved in Community Schools (*PICS*), 127 S.Ct. 2783 (2007)

Répartition de la population selon le lieu de naissance et la nationalité

en milliers

Source : Insee, Recensement de la population, 1999.

Nationalité	**Lieu de naissance**		**Ensemble**
	En France	**À l'étranger**	
Ensemble	52 650	5 870	58 520
soit : Français de naissance	*51 340*	*1 560*	*52 900*
Français par acquisition	*800*	***1 560***	*2 360*
Étrangers	*510*	***2 750***	*3 260*
	Immigrés	**4 310**	

www.ined.fr