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Contradictions of segregation

- Liberal polities are committed to ending segregation or isolation—but do not do so.
  - Weakness of will
  - Alternative understandings of liberal ideals—individual or group?

- Liberal polities oppose racial or ethnic segregation
  - But protect class segregation

- Whether, and why, should liberal polity reject group separation?
Racial and class isolation are entwined, but diverging

• In 284 US cities with > 100,000 people, correlation between White/Black segregation and family income segregation:
  • 0.31 in 1980
  • 0.24 in 2015

• In 1,542 US cities, 46% had increasing economic segregation and decreasing White-Black segregation from 1980 to 2015
Class separation is increasing, and racial/ethnic separation is declining, in US cities.

Variation by region (higher in south), city size, groups being compared.
Regions vary in group, but not in class, segregation
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U.S. cities are facing new situation, where class separation may become increasingly important, or even dominant.
Costs of segregation and isolation

• Well documented in education, health, crime etc.

• Also in politics
  • Lower trust of elites, institutions, and neighbors
  • Many disfranchised residents, and extensive police oversight
  • Political parties and candidates don’t engage with and mobilize residents
  • Less collective goods provision; little political or civic participation
Benefits of voluntary separation?

• Immigrant or ethnic enclaves
  • jobs, housing, legal services, civic ties, religion, culture, language, norms

• Self-chosen isolation among Blacks
  • “Some blacks avoid residing in white neighborhoods to limit unpleasant experiences with whites. . . . [or] to avoid interracial conflict. . . . There is also. . . the positive preference for a black neighborhood. . . . Black self-segregation is still a choice. . . . [T]he problem is not closing ranks per se”
    • Tommie Shelby, 2016

• Moving to mixed-income neighborhoods can
  • weaken social networks
  • increase vulnerability
  • decrease political participation
Laws reject racial separation, and permit class and religious separation

- *Buchanan v Warley; Shelley v Kraemer; Fair Housing Act; TDHCA v ICP* (2015)

- Zoning laws: “community wealth is strongly positively correlated with the degree of local land use regulation. . . . Researchers and policy-makers should seriously consider exclusionary desires as a motivation in many instances.”
  - Gyourko et al. 2008

- *Wisconsin v Yoder* (1972)
Liberal norms mandate contradictory responses to group separation

- Promote inclusion in the name of “equal and extensive liberty for all, from freedom of expression and association to the right to an unconditional social minimum and to participate as equals in collective self-governance” (Shelby, 2016)
  - Douglas dissent in *Yoder*: a decent polity owes children the resources, skills, and opportunities to choose their futures

- *Or*, communities have the right of self-determination, so long as no legal exclusion
  - Including the wealthy? Whites? Xenophobes?
More complexities

• What would people choose if they had experienced both voluntary group separation and integration?
  • Amish reject the premises of that question

• If inclusion places most burdens on disadvantaged, what is the public interest, and interests of those groups?

• Do race/ethnicity and class present the same grounds for principled liberal intervention?
  • Public opinion and laws say no
  • If racial/ethnic segregation is declining and class segregation is increasing, how much should liberals promote a shared future?