

NOMOS XLIII

Yearbook of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy

MORAL AND POLITICAL EDUCATION

Edited by

Stephen Macedo, *Princeton University*

and

Yael Tamir, *Tel Aviv University*



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS

• *New York and London*

THE PROMISE OF RACIAL INTEGRATION IN A MULTICULTURAL AGE

LAWRENCE BLUM

A social commitment to school integration beat a hasty retreat in the 1990s. In a series of legal decisions at the federal and federal district levels, states and school districts have been permitted to dismantle programs (such as busing and magnet schools) aimed at increasing racial diversity in their schools. The districts have been declared, in the key legal terminology, "unitary"—that is, whatever segregation currently exists is declared not to be a result or vestige of state-sponsored or state-created segregation. Not all school districts legally permitted to avoid or jettison desegregation actually go this route. Many sponsor initiatives to bring white students and racial minority students into the same schools.¹ All told, however, racial segregation in schools itself continues to increase, with Latinos increasingly segregated.²

Deliberate efforts to racially diversify school populations are losing public support as well, most strikingly among blacks, the group most strongly behind the decades-long push for integration. Justice Clarence Thomas, in his Supreme Court opinion in the *Missouri v. Jenkins* case of 1995, articulated an increasingly heard plaint. It is insulting and even racist, Thomas said, to assume that a black child has to sit next to a white child in class in

order to learn. Thomas elaborates, "To presume that blacks must have a sufficient quota of whites in the classroom to learn is to presume that there is something inherently wrong with blacks."³ Blacks are increasingly, or at least publicly, viewing efforts at integration as an *alternative* to energy put into enhancing the quality of schooling for black children.⁴

Defenses of desegregation—particularly of blacks or Latinos with whites—in the face of this opposition tends to focus on occupational benefits. Gary Orfield, a prominent researcher and advocate for school integration, replies directly to Thomas's argument by saying that integration works by providing "economically disadvantaged minority" students with greater life opportunities through "access to middle-class schools, and to the world beyond them."⁵

Many blacks still find the ideal of integration attractive but feel that given the current demographics of schools, the conditions for realizing important integrationist values are unlikely to materialize. Gloria Ladson-Billings articulates this sentiment well: "In a better world I would want to see schools integrated across racial, cultural, linguistic, and all other lines. But I am too much of a pragmatist to ignore the sentiment and motivation underlying the African American immersion school movement. African Americans already have separate schools. The African American immersion school movement is about *taking control* of those separate schools."⁶

The *mere* physical co-presence of children from distinct ethnoracial groups in the same school is not by itself a good.⁷ Those who favor racial plurality in schools, and its intentional promotion, believe there to be vital goods to be secured in such schools not attainable, or much more difficult to attain, in schools composed entirely, or almost entirely, of one racial group. I argue in this paper that popular and to a large extent scholarly discussion of ethnoracial plurality in schools has lost sight of these goods, which are social, moral, and personal (to the individual student), as well as civic, the type of good to which I will devote most attention.

The neglect of these goods by both opponents and proponents of desegregation is connected with a public discourse that has tended to operate with an excessively narrow—consumerist,

instrumentalist, and nondemocratic—conception of the appropriate goals and values of education itself. Recovering a richer conception of education will provide the foundation for a renewed concept of “racial integration” and its values.

I draw my conception of the value of racially mixed schools from the more general ideals of racial integration articulated by Martin Luther King, Jr. He said, “Integration is creative, and is therefore more profound and far-reaching than desegregation. Integration is the positive acceptance of desegregation and the welcomed participation of Negroes into the total range of human activities . . . [A] desegregated society that is not integrated . . . leads to ‘physical proximity without spiritual affinity.’ It gives us a society where men are physically desegregated and spiritually segregated, where elbows are together and hearts are apart.”⁸

Randall Kennedy adds a more explicitly civic and democratic dimension to King’s moral and spiritual vision. “Integrationists seek . . . to create a society in which the intimate and equal association for people of different races in all spheres of life . . . is *welcomed* as a normal part of a multiracial democracy.”⁹ We ignore King’s and Kennedy’s idealism at our peril in education policy decisions. Unless we are aware of these ideals, and their associated range of social benefits, we cannot know what we are losing when we retreat from them, and whether the abandonment is worth the price.

The “ideal” nature of my argument—the recognition that it is only under certain conditions that various components of the integrationist ideal are realized—means that I am by no means advocating racial desegregation as an overriding policy objective. Under less than ideal conditions—including those currently obtaining in many classes, schools and districts—it may be reasonable to favor policies that do not press toward racially mixed schools, or even that facilitate certain kinds of single-race (or single-race-dominated) schools. At the same time, I will also argue that, despite the retreat from both the social ideal of integration, and the more minimal goal of racially plural schools, we actually know a good deal more than we did when King wrote those words about how to *realize* integrationist ideals in racially diverse schools.

INTEGRATION AND ASSIMILATION

When King spoke of "desegregation," he meant a process by which schools that were monoracial (and generally created as such by the state) become deliberately racially mixed. ("Desegregation" can also be used to refer to the end-state created by that process.) In King's time, virtually the only schools that were racially mixed were ones that had been desegregated in this sense. Currently, however, racially mixed schools are frequently *not* a product of desegregation. While often called "desegregated," these schools draw a racially diverse group of students because of their location (schools in mixed neighborhoods, or located on the border of more than one monoracial neighborhood) or non-race-related features of the school (magnet schools), rather than by dint of race-based assignment or admissions policies.¹⁰

As King said, desegregation, or, more generally, the existence of a plurality of ethnoracial groups in a school, is a necessary step toward his conception of "integration," an embracing of that plurality and an attempt to establish humane, moral, and civic relationships among students of the different groups. Although schools have been in the process of becoming *less* racially mixed in the 1990's, reversing a trend prior to that point, a majority of students do attend schools that are racially plural in a meaningful sense. According to Orfield and Yun's findings, in 1996-97, the average urban black student attended a school with 35 percent blacks, 36.5 percent Latinos, and 15 percent whites. (To put this in some perspective, 35 percent of blacks as a whole attended schools that were 90-100 percent non-white.) In the suburbs the numbers for the average black student were 20 percent black, 30 percent Latino, and 40 percent white. In small cities, whites attended schools that were 14 percent black and 8.5 percent Latino; in the suburbs of large cities the percentages for the average white student were 6.8 percent black and 7.4 percent Latino.¹¹ If a racially plural school is defined as more than 10 percent of two groups (or more), the majority of Latino, black, Asian, and Native American children attend racially plural schools.¹² A not insubstantial minority of whites does so as well. (On average, whites attend schools with 81 percent white classmates.)¹³

The racial demography of a given school is quite relevant to its potential for attaining the personal, social, and civic goals I will address below. A minimal, critical mass of students of two or more groups is necessary for some of these goals, but the goals will be greatly facilitated if more than that number is present. Similarly a high percentage of one majority group poses greater challenges than a school with a lower percentage. And the ideal situation (present in very few schools) is one with no ethnoracial group in the majority. Beyond this, the ease of achieving some of the various aims is affected by the percentages of *whites* specifically. I am not able to comment further on the bearing of distinct ethnoracial demographic patterns on the forms of and possibilities for implementation of the goals I discuss below but want only to flag these demographics as important desiderata in achieving the goals of racial integration.

I will follow Dr. King and retain the language of "integration," at least some of the time. But I do want to enter a cautionary note regarding some of its associations. First, because of its history, "integration" has carried an implication that the groups involved are limited to blacks and whites. Latinos have fought their own battles for integrated schools and equal education,¹⁴ but public recognition has been slow to incorporate that history. Given how irredeemably culturally plural the nation has become—with Latinos soon becoming as numerous as blacks, Asian-Americans the fastest-growing panethnic group, and other groups not readily classified under the familiar categories—the association of the term "integration" with only white and black is unfortunate, and should be jettisoned.

A related, but more subtle, implication is that integration concerns only the mixing of students of color with whites. While many central issues concerning integration do indeed concern whites, the potential benefits of racial diversity of schools are not confined to interactions between whites and other groups. Seldom a matter for legal action, integration of distinct non-white groups is nevertheless starting to be a significant social and policy issue; the city of Pasadena for example has crafted a school integration policy that mixes Latinos and blacks.¹⁵

Finally, for many, the term "integration" carries assimilationist overtones—as if its meaning were that the minority group were

fact on their motivation to learn. (Argument (2) did not depend on the actual psychological impact of the message of inferiority but only on the constitutional wrongness of its declaration by the state.)

- (4) Segregation is *inherently* unequal, hence wrong.
- (5) Equality of opportunity cannot be provided in separate schools.

The first argument still carries some force with desegregation advocates. By and large black-dominated school systems do receive fewer resources than white, and, perhaps more importantly, fewer than needed to secure equal educational opportunities for both groups. The large number of legal suits based on inequities in district funding within states (in some of which the courts have found in favor of the plaintiffs) testify to continuing inequity. (Many of these involve a racial dimension.) A pure resource equity argument is, however, less compelling now than it has been in the past. The gap in expenditures has certainly been greatly reduced since the 1950's. Apart from inequities in physical facilities and teacher salary, however, on the average, teachers in majority black and Latino schools are less well trained and have performed less well on tests designed to assess teacher knowledge and competence. Many blacks not otherwise attracted to the idea of sending their children to white-dominated schools feel that doing so is the only way to ensure that their children will receive adequate educational attention from the state.

The second argument is not applicable to current forms of segregation, since ("de facto") segregation in schools is no longer a matter of official state policy ("de jure"). The argument used in some cases subsequent to *Brown* that resulted in busing to achieve integration—that a certain district's segregated or insufficiently desegregated schools are a *legacy* from prior state-created segregation—objects to extant inequities and their genesis in earlier state-sanctioned segregation rather than to the official declaration of inferiority.²³

The third argument, based on empirical connections between the declaration of inferiority, the children's sense of self-worth, and their resultant motivation to learn, is mooted by the same absence of state-declared inferiority just noted.²⁴ In any case, the

empirical connections between segregation, self-worth, and academic motivation have never been well established and later desegregation cases seldom relied on them.²⁵

The fourth argument, "inherent inequality," may come to no more than (2)—declaration of inferiority—in which case it is not a separate argument. However, Roy Brooks also points out that the *Brown* decision can be read as glossing "inherently unequal" as (3)—causing reduced self-esteem, motivation, and academic achievement (though he correctly notes the misleading character of that usage, since the language of "inherent" is generally understood to *contrast* with causal effects).²⁶ But the Court's statement "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" has often been understood more broadly, to condemn as unequal and wrong separate single-race or predominantly single-race schools in their own right, independent of how they are created or of specific effects those schools have on the children who attend them. The Court's language here lends itself to such a reading, though much of the rest of the decision does not dovetail with this "inherent inequality" idea. Much writing on racial integration draws at least partially on the idea that once a school has been shown to be segregated (by some measure), this renders it unequal and thus morally problematic, independent of other deficiencies in the school. This view has the virtue of retaining a strong morally critical edge to the idea of racial separation, but the conflation of separation and inequality makes it more difficult to pinpoint the basis of the moral ills involved. (I argue below that non-integrated schools *are* morally and civically problematic, but not necessarily because, or only because, they are *unequal*.)

The fifth and final notion is equality of opportunity. Argument (1), regarding equal educational resources, is one concretized form of that more general idea. The Court declared that "the opportunity of an education . . . where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be available to all on equal terms" and goes on to say that segregated schools "deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities."²⁷

Yet the absence of a clear constitutional standing for the principle of equality of opportunity has made for some confusion. "Equal protection," the salient constitutional principle used in

the *Brown* case to mandate equality, does not irrefutably supply a rationale for the more substantive principle of equality of opportunity, and the Court itself notes that the Fourteenth Amendment cannot be read as having intended to forbid segregated schools.²⁸ Yet the Court goes on to rely on the confused "inherent inequality" idea to bring school desegregation under the jurisdiction of "equal protection of the laws" in that Amendment.²⁹

Nevertheless, whatever the weaknesses of its constitutional foundation, equality of opportunity has come to be the major argument, or family of arguments, used to support desegregation, and also constitutes a powerful idea in American political culture as a grounding for arguments in the domain of education. Let us look, then, at the relation between equality of opportunity and racial integration.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

By linking desegregation and equality so closely, the *Brown* Court initiated a confusion between the two ideas that continues in current thinking. In Jonathan Kozol's passionate and influential attack on racial inequalities in education, segregation and inequality routinely serve as proxies for one another.³⁰ Gary Orfield's series of extremely valuable empirical studies of desegregation are marred, from a normative point of view, by a tendency to assume both that racial separation can virtually never be anything other than inequality-producing, and also that inequality (of opportunity) is the *only* thing wrong with racially separated schools.³¹ Both racial segregation and inequality of opportunity are indeed bad things, and empirical connections do exist between them. But they are bad for somewhat distinct reasons, and cannot serve as automatic proxies for one another.

Broadly speaking, there are two types of equality of opportunity relevant to schools—equality of educational opportunity, and equality of life chances or occupational opportunity. Equality of educational opportunity is quite a complex notion once one pushes on it a bit,³² but our purposes will be served by the intuitive idea of equivalent educations, taking individual differences into account. (For example, a dyslexic child may require special

tutoring to gain an education equivalent to that of a non-dyslexic child who does not receive tutoring.)

Educational opportunity was a major focus in many of the early desegregation legal and policy battles. Historically the African-American community has placed great value on education, both in its own right and as a means to occupational mobility. Robert Carter, a lawyer in the early desegregation cases, eloquently states the view prevailing at the time, of the link between desegregation and equality of educational opportunity:

I believe I accurately speak for the lawyers [involved in the *Brown* cases] in saying that we believed that the surest way for minority children to obtain their constitutional right to equal educational opportunity was to require the removal of all racial barriers in the public school system, with black and white children attending the same schools, intermingled in the same classrooms, and together exposed to the same educational offerings. Integration was viewed as the means to our ultimate objective, not the objective itself.³³

Carter mentions these beliefs in part to say that subsequent developments prevented the hoped-for desegregation, and its conversion into equality of opportunity, from taking place. Districts resisted integration by various means; extensive desegregation did not really begin in the South until after 1964. After (and before) that many whites left school districts in which their children would have gone to school with a substantial number of blacks (so-called "white flight"). Continuing housing segregation in the context of neighborhood districting helped prevent schools from becoming racially mixed. Blacks and other integration advocates underestimated white parents' resistance to their children attending schools with blacks. While originally desegregation was seen as a southern issue, when it moved north, blacks were disappointed to witness white reluctance and outright racism as well. Undoubtedly *part* of the recent black retreat from the "dream" of integration is black bitterness over white rejection, and a defensive retreat into the security and warmth of a community where they will not have to worry about acceptance.³⁴

In addition, Robert Carter's assumptions about how desegregation would lead to equality of opportunity were faulty, or at

least limited. Equal education requires not only the co-presence of different groups of students in schools and classes, and equal exposure to educational content. It also requires teachers and schools to treat children of different racial groups equally, an assumption both Carter and the Court may have made but did not articulate.

Unfortunately the overwhelmingly white teaching force frequently failed, and still fails, to treat children of color and particularly black and Latino children, equally.³⁵ In their rich and comprehensive study of an ambitious desegregation program in St. Louis that buses urban black students to white-dominated suburban schools, Amy Stuart Wells and Robert Crain note that many of the white teachers do not believe in the black students' academic abilities, and hold various stereotypes and prejudices regarding them (for example, as unmotivated and disruptive).³⁶ Even independent of their distinct prejudices, the teachers often fail to understand the life situations and cultural backgrounds of their students, thus constraining their ability to deliver an equal education—to treat their students truly equally. (Earlier, I argued that schools had to recognize culturally distinct identities in service of a non-assimilationist, culture-respecting, integrationist ideal. Here, I am arguing that a related recognition is required for equality of educational opportunity.)

Wells and Crain contrast these teachers with a smaller number of what they call "visionary educators" whom the desegregation program has spurred to reevaluate their own pedagogies. "The visionary educators argue that showing students, especially African-American students, that white educators believe in them and support them is half the battle in trying to improve their academic achievement."³⁷ Thus there are racial, cultural, and class dimensions of what it would take for the largely white teaching force truly to provide equal education to students of color.³⁸ Doing so would be a significant achievement.

Apart from the behavior of teachers, a school can fail to provide equality of educational opportunity through a policy of tracking, defined here as assessing some measure of attainment (often thought of as "ability") in a cohort of students in the same grade, and then forming distinct classes according to results of that assessment. In desegregated schools, when (as is typical) the

black and Latino children dominate the bottom track, with few in the top track, those children are almost inevitably deprived of equal educations.³⁹

These complex forms of unequal treatment undermine equal educations. At the same time, a recognition of their character should be regarded as an important advance in our understanding of the range of factors involved in bringing about the ideal of equality of educational opportunity.

The unequal treatment of black students in urban or suburban, white-majority schools has persuaded some black parents to shun such schools. It is true that unless the equal treatment condition is met the equality of opportunity argument does not come fully into play as support for integrated schools. However, depending on the school's distance from this ideal, a black or Latino child might, all told, still be better off in a suburban school in which she was not treated fully equally than in an urban-majority black or Latino school with inferior educational resources. Many black parents send their children to such schools for precisely this reason.⁴⁰

More recently, the focus on education as the domain of opportunity has been supplemented, and in some cases supplanted, by occupational or life chances opportunity, as the earlier quote from Gary Orfield suggests (above, p. 384). In the early years of desegregation, it might have been easier to believe that *educational* opportunity, and success, translated directly into *occupational* equality, and success. However, later research has indicated that occupational success functions partly independent of school success. Some researchers have shifted their focus to the longer-term issue of equal occupational opportunity as a distinct goal by which to assess desegregation, and have found that black students who attend racially integrated secondary schools do better in the world of work than their counterparts from monoracial schools.⁴¹ If valid, this research provides not insubstantial support for racially mixed schools, especially a mixing of blacks and whites, though the argument is confined to middle-class whites.

I emphasize the distinguishing of equality of opportunity and racial integration primarily to *contrast* equality of opportunity arguments with other types of benefit of integrated education. While equality of opportunity (of either the educational or life

chances variety) is indeed a vital goal by which to assess educational policy, racial integration included, it is nevertheless only one possible good and purpose of education, and of integrated education in particular.

In fact the notion of "equality of education" or "equality of educational opportunity" contains an ambiguity that has muddied the waters in this area. Equality of education is a good independent of the *quality* of education in question, as a matter of justice. And *race-based* inequalities in education (as elsewhere) are particularly odious, even where the superior education received by whites is still relatively poor in quality.

Yet we must obviously be concerned about the quality of education received by all groups, and not only about its equal or unequal distribution among the groups. Perhaps ironically, the focus on equality of educational opportunity among both proponents and detractors of racial integration has had two confounding effects on the debate. First, it has tended to deflect a clear focus on the character and quality of the education received by the different groups. It has kept us from inquiring into the range of appropriate educational goals for a democratic and liberal society, goals that could then serve as standards by which to assess various forms of racial integration and separation. When the Thernstroms say (echoing Clarence Thomas's remark cited above, p. 383-84), "[I]t is fortunate that there is no compelling evidence to support the belief that black students cannot learn, or cannot learn as well, when they attend schools with few white classmates," they seem to assume that we all agree what it is that these children are, or should be, learning.⁴² The focus on the racial inequality issue encourages our failing to examine this assumption.

While the meaning of "education" in "equality of educational opportunity" can be neutral among conceptions of education, I believe that its general understanding in popular discourse, especially currently, tilts toward some conceptions of education and away from others. It tends to involve a consumerist, purely instrumental, and individualistic conception of education. The benefits of schooling are seen as accruing *only* to the individual student, rather than, for example, to the society or polity; it is individual students whose opportunities are at stake in "equality of opportunity."⁴³ What one student receives in the way of schooling

is not seen as part of a larger picture in which other students are affected. Parents' search for good schools for their children has often become uncoupled from a sense that their child shares an educational fate with her cohort, that the education of one must be seen in the context of the education of others.

The educational benefits in the equality of opportunity framework also tend (again, not always, or necessarily) to be viewed in terms of cultural capital needed for the student to "get ahead" in the world, rather than in terms of their intrinsic educational, personal value. Schooling's social dimension—social development that accompanies participating with fellow students in a learning community—also drops out of this picture. So the reigning understanding of equality of opportunity tacitly omits the moral, social, and civic dimensions of schooling, both as benefits to the society, and as non-individualistic or non-instrumental benefits to the student.

I will argue that these essential moral, social, civic, and personal dimensions of education can either be provided *only* in ethnoracially plural settings or that such settings are *much more likely* than monoracial ones to provide them. In virtually no case can the good be attained through mere ethnoracial co-presence alone; in that sense I agree with the criticisms of busing and other measures designed to increase ethnoracial plurality for its own sake that such measures lose sight of their relationship to the genuine goods of that plurality and to the several distinct factors needed to attain them. Those factors are manifold, but I will focus on three—curriculum, pedagogy, and (a general catchall category) other school-based factors. (Thus I omit the vital factors related to the structural relations between ethnoracial groups in the larger society, which have a strong impact on relations among ethnoracial groups in schools.)

MORAL GOODS IN INTEGRATED EDUCATION

While the civic, social, moral, and personal goods of integrated education are not entirely separable from one another, I will begin with moral goods, in part because Martin Luther King's paean to integration is cast in moral (and spiritual) terms, and also because this area has drawn extensive research. Moral

growth among students regarding race involves at least the following goals: (1) reduction or elimination of racial prejudice, a goal that applies to all ethnoracial groups (because (ethno)racial prejudice has no racial boundaries),⁴⁴ and whose moral force derives in part from the more general moral principle of equal respect for all human beings;⁴⁵ (2) treating members of groups other than one's own as individuals (for example, by not stereotyping); (3) accepting members of groups other than one's own as co-equals in shared enterprises, and recognizing common interests with them in attaining superordinate goals; and (4) experiencing a sense of shared humanity with members of other groups, an exemplification of what Martin Luther King calls "a recognition of the solidarity of the human family."⁴⁶

These goals have hardly been met in many ethnoracially plural schools. But at this point there is no excuse for accepting this unfortunate circumstance as an inevitable, or purely random, result of racial plurality. Largely spurred by court-mandated and voluntary efforts to desegregate schools, social scientists since the 1960's have engaged in extensive research on attaining these goals in ethnoracially plural settings. The language in which this research is couched is not always explicitly moral. For example, "improving intergroup relations" is a common formulation of a subject of research inquiry within social psychology, one that foregrounds a social, in contrast to a moral, aim. However, the moral aims are in fact presupposed. As a result of this research, we now know much about how racially mixed schools can reduce prejudice, increase mutual comfort and acceptance, weaken stereotyping, promote an appreciation of members of "racial outgroups" as individuals, promote a sense of shared attachment across ethnoracial boundaries to common goals and a consequent recognition of common interests, and, by implication at least, a recognition of common humanity. While many programs have not been fully tested, it is now clear that if teachers were appropriately trained and if school administrators would commit themselves to these goals, moral relationships between students of different races could be greatly improved, and the moral characters of students positively affected.⁴⁷ The education and education policy communities could make great strides toward King's vision of racial integration had they the will to do so.

All these moral/educational aims are extremely difficult to achieve in monoracial schools, of any race. Portions of some of them—aspects of multicultural curricula, or certain ways of teaching about stereotypes—could be accomplished in monoracial schools. But by and large the pedagogical programs and initiatives researched depend on the co-presence of students from different ethnoracial groups. They all concern ways to turn that presence into educationally and morally beneficial results.

CIVIC GOODS IN INTEGRATED EDUCATION

Racially integrated schooling plays, or can play, a vital *civic* role in a racially and ethnically plural democracy, a function not entirely distinct from the moral role just discussed. Civic education is increasingly recognized as an important component of schooling, as it was more explicitly in earlier historical eras, and a plethora of civic education programs have made their way into various schools, or have at least been crafted for this purpose. The *National Standards for Civics and Government* (created by the Center for Civic Education), and the esteemed *California History-Social Science Curriculum Framework* (which promotes a strong civic dimension in the study of history) are two prominent examples.⁴⁸

Relations among ethnoracial groups are central to the requirements of civic education in the United States. Race has always been a central fault line in American life. Citizenship was formally limited to whites (“free white persons”) in the 1790 Naturalization law, and racial restrictions on naturalization were not fully abandoned until 1952. Immigration policy was driven by racial considerations (not always acknowledged as such) until 1965, and initiatives to limit immigration in the mid-1990’s (such as California’s Proposition 187) are generally regarded as having a partly racist motivation as well.⁴⁹ While blacks were formally granted equal citizenship in the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments after the Civil War, their ongoing struggle for full status as equals in the American polity has suffered setbacks and reversals since that time, and has certainly not yet been completed.⁵⁰ The Supreme Court recognizes the deleterious yet historically central divisiveness of race by according laws containing racial distinctions the highest level of scrutiny among categories

of social differentiation. While a staggering outpouring of major and/or popular general works on race in the United States in the 1990's disagreed on the extent and significance of improvement in the quality of lives of (primarily) blacks, there was much greater agreement on the large gulf of communication, perception, and social comity between the races.⁵¹ This gulf is recognized by most to take its toll on the quality of civic cooperation and public interaction.

Yet, surprisingly, extant civic education programs give race very little attention. It is certainly not seen as a central civic concern. In general, the race-related civic goals such programs and guidelines propose consist in teaching that it is un-American to discriminate against people on the basis of race (as well as religion, creed, national origin, and the like).⁵² These programs often also invoke a more general and vaguer idea of "equality" but without further elaboration of its implications for civic education regarding race.

Any attempt to spell out civic virtues is bound to be controversial. The burgeoning literature in this area within philosophy, political theory, and educational theory yields a wide range of qualities claimed as essential for citizens to sustain and reproduce the polity.⁵³ Differences stem from several sources—whether a minimalist or a more robust conception of civic education is sought; whether the liberal, democratic, market, republican, or other feature(s) of the society are particularly emphasized; how "moralized" the conception of citizenship; and others. Recognizing these controversies, I will offer a conception of citizenship specifically related to the domain of race that emphasizes the liberal, democratic, egalitarian, and participatory dimensions of our national traditions, and presupposes the recognition (1) of our history and continuing legacy of racial inequality and racialized understandings of (full) citizenship, (2) that ethnoracial differences constitute a particularly difficult and charged form of difference among our citizens, and (3) that, partly in consequence, ethnoracial differences mark significant lines of mutual ignorance and misunderstanding. Thus the model of civic education with which I operate goes beyond the minimal goal of cultivating those dispositions necessary to reproduce the current political order to encompass dispositions implied by ideals suppos-

edly but not always actually embodied in current institutions and practices.

In this light I see at least four civic commitments, concerns, and abilities related specifically to the area of race that should be part of a civic education program. These incorporate but go beyond a commitment to non-discrimination just mentioned, and give substance to the idea of equality. One is a commitment to racial equity in the larger society, correcting the historical legacy of injustice. This involves, at least, a concern that the life chances of blacks and Latinos as groups be brought more in line with the life chances of whites, and, on the curricular level, presupposes students learning about the historical and current deficiencies of the American social order in the area of race.

This civic goal involves nurturing a general sense of social justice, directed specifically at racial inequities. That sense of racial justice is best promoted in a racially plural educational context, partly because students of color are more likely than white students to have had an experience of injustice and, especially in the case of blacks, Latinos, and Native Americans, to have been introduced by their families and communities to the idea of social justice as it bears on racial groups. Most (especially middle-class) white students, in the absence of direct educational exposure in this area, have little awareness or understanding of the experience of being racially discriminated against, being thought inferior, being an object of demeaning stereotyping, and the like. They have little understanding of how the world looks and feels to blacks, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, or immigrants of color. They do not recognize the historical factors that have shaped the differing lives of distinct ethnoracial groups.⁵⁴

White students' education in racial justice will thus be enhanced by exposure to the personal and familial experiences of students of color. Discussion of race and ethnicity-based experiences of injustice or insult personalizes the civic issues at hand, making them more compelling and accessible to white students than they would be through bare curricular study. (Explicit curricular study, however, must be a central part of this civic education, whether in racially plural or monoracial schools.) Even independent of the character of education and interaction in integrated schools, Orlando Patterson claims, "The sociological evidence is

now overwhelming that Euro-Americans who went to school with Afro-Americans tend to be more tolerant and more in favor of greater educational and economic opportunities for Afro-Americans.⁵⁵

A second, related but more general, aim is a broader sense of equal civic attachment and regard for members of all groups. As mentioned above, Smith has convincingly traced the historical sources of the deeply rooted failure of American society to regard its non-white members as full citizens. In addition, Thomas and Mary Edsall and others have convincingly argued that whites' failure to experience a sense of full civic attachment to blacks permeates many issues of public policy. Part of the opposition to government programs that has become a stable reference point in contemporary American politics stems, often on an entirely unacknowledged level, from a sense that people of color, and especially blacks, are the primary beneficiaries of such programs, whether this is true in any particular case or not.⁵⁶ For much of the white electorate, blacks and poorer Latinos are not experienced as fully part of the "we" whom they reflexively embrace in their view of the appropriate subjects of social policy. Equal civic attachment involves a sense of being bound up with those of other ethnoracial groups in a national, as well as local, community of shared fate, accompanied by a conception of social good that embraces these other groups as well as one's own. That sense of shared fate frequently eludes members of many ethnoracial groups (not only whites) with regard to other groups, although its consequences are much more deleterious for the groups most in need of public attention and concern than they are for whites.

This sense of civic attachment can be promoted by ethnoracially plural education in a manner similar to the way the sense of racial justice can be promoted. Respectful classroom interchange that draws on differing experiences and perspectives of students of different groups tends to promote that sense of connection that can be expanded into a sense of civic attachment, while it still recognizes and validates the distinct ethnoracial identities that students bring to the classroom interchange.

Beyond this, schools can more directly promote civic attachment by explicitly constructing the school itself, its subunits, and to some extent its classes, as civic spaces. Being sensitive to promoting a sense of ownership of the school on the part of mem-

bers of all groups by promoting participation in policy making and rule setting, in extra-curricular activities, in community-affirming rituals, and the like, serves to encourage a sense of shared attachment among students, and shared responsibility for the school as a civic community.⁵⁷

A third civic aim is to decrease social segregation and the social discomfort, strain, and absence of relation that so often currently exists among persons of different racial groups. This absence of social connection is, as a civic concern and a social phenomenon, distinct from social injustice and inequity (though they are sometimes conflated), and also distinct from equal civic attachment. This aim is civic in a broader sense. It concerns the quality of public life, not only engagement with processes related to the making of official policy.

The related educational task is for students to learn ways of being with members of other racial groups without perpetuating this sense of ethnoracial strain and disconnection. For this they need to learn to be interpersonally comfortable, including sharing public spaces in the school, with ethnoracial others. Students must learn to engage one another across these divides, and not be paralyzed by fear that what they say will offend someone of another group, yet be open to learning about what does offend, and able to discuss these matters further. None of this can be learned in monoracial schools. Stephan's work, mentioned earlier in connection with moral aims, is pertinent here.⁵⁸ Classes themselves must be mixed, and forms of cooperative education (including group projects with ethnoracially mixed groups) utilized that promote mutual respect.⁵⁹ Other venues for providing superordinate goals are drama, sports, and other extra-curricular activities, service and civic projects, and the like.

A fourth civic aim is the ability to communicate and engage with those of other distinct ethnoracial groups in the process of public deliberation, compromise, and shared institutional commitment necessary to the functioning of democratic institutions in a racially plural society. This cross-racial civic deliberation requires the more general civic skill of communicating honestly and fruitfully across the socially salient gulf of race difference about issues related to race. While common interests across ethnoracial lines can sometimes be identified without engaging

ethnoracial differences, by and large the process of public deliberation across ethnoracial lines regarding most issues of general concern will require some such engagement.⁶⁰ Yet many, perhaps most, Americans lack this ability, and have precious few occasions to learn and practice it. A potentially extremely valuable dimension of integrated education is acquiring this ability with regard to fellow students. Schools present a particularly favorable venue for overcoming barriers to interracial communication. Students are thrown together for a good portion of their lives during formative years. Because schools are explicitly dedicated to learning and growing, and especially to civic purposes, a rationale exists for schools' promotion of the skills and personal sensibilities necessary to communicating about race. (Workplaces also generate imperatives requiring cross-racial cooperation and communication, but not generally about racial matters nor with broader civic purposes.)

How is this communication to be fostered in schools? Undoubtedly, its current presence in classrooms is scant. Yet in my experience students generally welcome acknowledgment and validation of their race-based experience (as they see it) and their ethnoracial identity.⁶¹ They often feel that other groups fail to appreciate these experiences and viewpoints. (This may include wanting others to realize that they do *not* regard their racial identity as being as important to themselves as others may think.) In addition, all groups resent being stereotyped in what they recognize to be an especially charged area and are grateful for settings in which this resentment can be acknowledged and the stereotypes begun to be dissipated. When confident of this acknowledgment by their peers and teachers, students are willing and eager to learn from others and to engage in conversation about these charged matters.⁶² Knowledgeable educators are coming to recognize the importance of fostering these cross-racial conversations as part of building a sense of civic community in the classrooms and in schools.⁶³

PARTICULARISTIC GROUP RECOGNITION AND SHARED CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

I argued earlier that a culturally sensitive form of racial integration should validate students' desire for racial and cultural recog-

nition. Here I am suggesting that such recognition can play an important role in facilitating cross-racial conversations about charged racial matters in classes. The capacity to engage in such conversations becomes an important skill that is a component of the more directly civic ability to deliberate with those of different groups concerning matters of public concern. Yet some critics of multicultural education fear that validating distinct cultural and racial identities in school contributes to a debilitating separatism rather than a healthy shared civic engagement. They would wish to focus only on commonalities among the students, ignoring these ethnoracial differences, and would press universalistic norms of equality and respect for individuality as values that can bind students together.

I very much agree that the direct teaching of such universalistic values is vital, and they have been part of my moral and civic panoply of values. At the same time, leaving unrecognized the distinct ethnoracial identities that are socially and personally significant to students in general (not in every single case perhaps) prevents the students from truly understanding one another, appreciating one another as individuals, and developing the empathy necessary for a genuine personal appropriation of the universalistic values of respect and equality.⁶⁴ The form of civic education I advocate is likely to prevent such particularistic ethnoracial recognition from either encouraging or legitimating an ethnoracial group separatism that involves distrust or hostility toward outgroup members. While acknowledging that in-group socializing and ethnicity-based organizations can be healthy and supportive to students in ways unappreciated in the assimilationist model of integration,⁶⁵ the encouragement of discussion and engagement across ethnoracial lines is likely to have the effect of blurring those lines themselves to some degree. The more students of differing groups feel comfortable socializing with and partaking of cultural and other group-based activities of groups other than their own, the more difficult it will be for any group to erect strong barriers that shield in-group from out-group members.

Indeed, it will be difficult even to maintain a sharp in-group self-definition within the school itself, if some members of group A start being accepted as school friends by members of group B.

There will be white kids who become part of a black social group, blacks who do the same with an Asian-American group. This does not mean the white kids stop being white, or the black kids black, though in some cases, especially if there is some racial ambiguity in the student's family background or upbringing, something like this can happen as well. But it does mean that within that school, the boundaries of who counts as "in the black group" will become flexible and blurred. In addition, the increasing number of interracial children (all groups are experiencing an increase in out-marrying), who can be expected to be present in the kinds of mixed schools discussed here, have the effect of pressing those ethnoracial boundaries to become even more permeable, subject to change, and incapable of sharp definition.

The result of this permeability is not assimilation as traditionally understood—a shedding of cultural distinctness in favor of a dominant cultural norm defined by dominant groups. Nor is it even a cultural uniformity with a more truly multicultural character, itself an advance over the older model of "Anglo-conformity." In any school, as in the society as a whole, ethnoracial groups with a critical mass of members will retain their distinctness. The distinctness remains historically, socially, and educationally important to recognize and respect, as it expresses itself in students' individual identities. At the same time, in the context of schools infused with the civic education I have been describing, students of all groups will be encouraged, directly and indirectly, to cross those boundaries in numerous ways. The resultant muting of boundaries is to be welcomed both for its expanding of the individual horizons of the students, as well as for its facilitating the sense of social and civic connection essential to a multiracial democracy.⁶⁶

TRANSFER OF CIVIC ATTITUDES FROM SCHOOL TO THE PUBLIC ARENA

Is the form of civic education I have been sketching likely to be significant in forming citizens committed to equality and democracy in a multiracial context? Would students take their experience of the face-to-face "society" of their class, racially pluralistic as it may be, and generalize it to the much more impersonal

world of civic relationships in a city or nation-state? It is a standard objection to one type of communitarian or fraternalistic view of the polity that it misleadingly, and even dangerously, wishes to model civic relations on the intimate ties of friendship or close communities.⁶⁷

On one level, this is an objection, or at least an expression of caution, regarding *any* civic or moral education taught and practiced in schools. A child might well not practice the civic or moral virtues learnt in school in the world outside it. Civic education even at its best would do well to face up to the disjunct between the sort of trusting and nurturing school and classroom setting conducive to internalizing civic values, and the outside world, where a range of other norms and expectations may pull for different qualities, and discourage the civic or moral ones in question.⁶⁸

Nevertheless, although the civic-minded school is a face-to-face community, it is not necessarily or generally a community of intimates, with strong personal ties. Students who learn to work and learn together in cooperative activity, and who engage one another in honest conversation about race, need not be friends with one another. Their connection often does not extend beyond the bounds of the school. A school, especially at the junior high level or above, where students share classrooms with several distinct groupings of fellow students each day, is much more like an intermediate association between intimacy and the impersonality of a large polity. In this regard it is like a church or synagogue, a neighborhood organization, or a bowling league. It is as reasonable to think that a class or school has the potential to be at least as important a context for forging a civic-minded character as are these other associations. Moreover, if connections to the outer world are explicitly emphasized in the civic and moral education itself (as they should be), and especially if that education sometimes takes the form of civic projects engaged with the world outside the school (for example, in service learning with a strong civic component), the carryover from school to polity is that much more likely.

In addition, there is some reason to think that racial attitudes formed in the kind of school setting I have been describing are *more* likely to have an impact on students' racial attitudes in general (outside school) than are other civic attitudes likely so to

generalize. This may seem paradoxical, for we are all familiar with individuals who divide racial "others" into a smaller number of "acceptable" persons (often friends of theirs), leaving the majority the target of the same objectionable stereotypes the moral and civic education is attempting to undermine.

However, set in the context of curricular material that teaches the complex history and circumstances of group Y, honest conversations about race that will inevitably lead to a questioning of stereotypes of the group, and a pedagogy that avails itself of proven or near-proven insights about reducing prejudice and stereotypes,⁶⁹ a member of racial group Z is more likely to appreciate the internal diversity of racial group Y. She will thus become more likely to treat members of group Y (in general, not only in her circle of school acquaintances) both as individuals and as fellow human beings.

Moreover, racism and its legacies (residential racial segregation, general social segregation), and a pervasive ignorance about one another's lives, situations, and cultures set up distinctive barriers between racial groups. The very idea of "race" does so as well, implying a kind of unbridgeable gulf and dissimilarity.⁷⁰ Even though the school setting involves direct connections only between *particular* members of distinct racial groups, forging these connections in the way I have described involves an assault on the *general* barriers between the racial groups in question.

For these reasons, other things being equal, successful civic education concerning race is more likely than civic education in some other areas to transfer from the school context to civically valuable attitudes and commitments in public arenas.

PERSONAL BENEFITS OF INTEGRATED EDUCATION

I have dwelt on the moral and especially the civic benefits of ethnoracially plural schooling because these are particularly striking lacunae in much dispute about integration and desegregation. But the individual student benefits in other ways, also not captured on the equality of opportunity model. The moral and civic virtues enable one to "live well," as Aristotle said. They provide richer and more meaningful forms of engagement with one's fellow citizens and human beings, and with the larger society.

Beyond this, learning about the experiences, outlook, and histories of ethnoracial groups other than her own is a vital part of a student's learning about the character of her own society and world. Any education with a plausible claim to being called "quality" must involve a deep understanding of the social reality of one's society. I mentioned earlier that, in an instrumental sense, children of color suffer more in the loss of social capital from an ignorance of their society. Whites can much *better* afford to be ignorant of the lives of non-whites than the reverse. Still, my point here is not this socially related cost but the intrinsic educational loss to the student of a lack of knowledge of other groups.

Of course some of this knowledge can be provided through a rich multiculturally sensitive curriculum, even in monoracial or near-monoracial schools. But, first, while some teachers in such schools may provide such a curriculum, the pressure and perceived need for it is likely to be much greater in ethnoracially plural schools.⁷¹ Second, and more important, my argument has been that a school that draws on the experiences of students and their families in multiracial classroom settings will be the most felicitous setting for students of all groups to see the point, retain knowledge, and achieve a deeper understanding of the social realities of groups other than their own.

The second personal educational benefit is that knowledge of one's society involves a form of *self*knowledge. In understanding the race-based experience of groups other than one's own, one comes to understand not only "the other" but also oneself. This is so on several levels. One is as an American. The plurality of ethnoracial groups is a deep part of the fiber of American life, so in understanding them one gains a deeper appreciation of one's Americanness as a social and cultural identity. In particular, all major ethnoracial groups have had an impact on the shape of popular and political culture that form the fabric of social existence for all Americans. Many whites recognize that certain styles of dress, modes of personal interaction, language, music, films, dance, and the like, originated with distinct non-white groups. Blacks are unquestionably the most prominent group in this regard; their cultural influence far outstrips their proportion of the population. But, especially in certain parts of the country, and increasingly everywhere, Latinos have had an impact on

food, language, music, and the like. Fewer whites may recognize that cultural forms they think of as "white" or—more vaguely but still with an implication of whiteness—as "mainstream" have been decisively influenced by Latinos, blacks, Native Americans, and others.⁷² Political culture and institutions too have been decisively shaped by the European encounters early in our history with Native Americans and Africans, and, later, especially with Mexicans. More recently, the Civil Rights movement has had a profound effect on public and legal understandings of equality and justice, American-style.

EXPANDING THE HORIZONS OF WHITE STUDENTS

Echoing the equality of opportunity argument, Orlando Patterson says, "Integration is about the acquisition of social and cultural capital [by Afro-Americans]."⁷³ Yet all the benefits discussed in the previous sections accrue to whites as well as to students of color, or to the society as a whole. Segregated schooling and a segregated life are very constricting to white students.⁷⁴ These sheltered white students do not learn how to "read" the behavior of individuals in other ethnoracial groups. They do not get to know members of these groups as individuals. They cut off a large source of friendships and friendly acquaintanceships.

Sheltered white students fail to develop what some have called "multicultural and multiracial competence"—a recognition of and knowledge about cultural and racial differences that allows individuals to negotiate a culturally pluralistic world.⁷⁵ Lack of such competence will affect white students who will have to function in an increasingly culturally plural work environment. Janet Schofield cites a report commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor, which concluded that "the ability to work effectively in a context of cultural diversity is one of the basic competencies which is required to perform effectively in the U.S. labor force."⁷⁶ An absence of integrated education could thus have a materially deleterious effect on whites. (As mentioned above, racial minorities are *more* harmed by lack of multicultural competence, a point integral to the occupational form of the equality of opportunity argument.)

In closing this discussion of the potential benefits of ethnoracial diversity in schools, let us note how it provides the answer to Clarence Thomas's oft-echoed show-stopper, "It is insulting to say that blacks need to sit next to whites in order to learn." The response given by proponents of the equality of opportunity argument, such as Orfield, and Wells and Crain, is "But for access to higher status knowledge and personal/occupational networks, blacks do need to sit next to whites." That answer is compelling as far as it goes, but its still-lingering sense of insult stems from a failure to recognize that white students have much to learn from black students also. Such mutual interchange among students of different ethnoracial background is of great value to blacks too, and to Latinos, Asian-Americans, whites, and so on. That benefit is to the individual student but also to the larger society.

CONCLUSION

The retreat from a commitment to integrated education betokens a loss of faith in the democratic promise of schooling in a culturally pluralistic society. I have not explored whether that pessimism about schools is empirically justified. My argument has been more minimal. A range of vital personal and civic goods—communication, cooperation, understanding, civic attachment, commitment to racial justice, multiracial competence and personal comfort, social and self-understanding—is virtually unattainable without, or is greatly facilitated by, racial and cultural plurality in the student bodies of our schools. These goods have dropped out of sight in public discourse concerning both desegregation and school reform more generally.

Regarding desegregation, equality of opportunity—either of education or of life chances—has taken center stage as the prime argument in its favor. I hope that the empirical case for a link between desegregation and equality of opportunity stands up to scrutiny, and further hope that this link will have an impact on public policy in this area. Nevertheless, my own task has been to indicate the limits of equality of opportunity as an argument for integrated education. Equality of opportunity does not by itself supply the civic skills and commitments needed to reproduce

and strive to perfect a multicultural democracy, and tends to operate with an instrumentalist, individualistic, and non-civic conception of education.

The moral, civic, and personal sensitivities, concerns, and abilities must be deliberately taught; students do not acquire them through mere contact, in school, with members of other ethnoraacial groups. Disappointingly, these goals are not given a central place even in most programs of civic and moral education, much less in teacher education more generally. Their full realization requires teachers and schools sensitive to cultural and life situation differences among students; who themselves believe that all students have contributions to make to the education of other students; who are committed to facilitating interracial understanding, conversation, and cooperation as an integral part of their educational goals; who have learned, or are in the process of learning, the pedagogical skills necessary to facilitate this goal. It also requires that teachers so described have the support of their institutions and its key administrators. The institution must not set the cultural identity of students against the school's own cultural norms but must manifest a culture of inclusion, respect, and faith in all children's ability to learn.

Is it asking too much that teachers learn to provide safe and trusting settings in which they can facilitate cross-racial connections, the frank expression and discussion of racial issues and experiences—in which they can teach racially oriented civic virtues? One hesitates to add new demands to teachers already grappling with new mandates of standardized tests and enhanced accountability. Nevertheless, racial and ethnic pluralism and the legacy of historical injustice will be with us for the foreseeable future, and will continue to play a large role in the real world of schools and classrooms. Teachers often conceive of their roles in narrow ways that prevent them from acknowledging the impact of these responsibilities—that it is not their place to deal with social development of students, that merely mixing students is sufficient to teach respect and acceptance, that they must totally ignore race and color in interaction with students.⁷⁷ But educators cannot really afford not to pay attention to racial matters, any more than they can afford not to deal with moral and civic issues generally.

While Martin Luther King, Jr.'s vision of deep moral and civic relationships across racial lines has lost its luster among all ethnoracial groups, a re-visioned conception—shorn of its assimilationist associations, and aware of the complexities or racial prejudice and division—remains as valid today as it was in King's time. The *Brown* Court was right to brand both educational inequality and racial separation as moral wrongs, even if its reasoning was not entirely adequate, and some of its specific arguments no longer applicable. Moreover, in the world of education, we now know better how to create the integrationist vision than we ever have known before. The future of the highest ideals of our democracy requires that we not abandon it.

NOTES

Earlier versions of this chapter were presented to the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy (in December 1998) and to the Committee on Philosophy, Politics, and Public Policy. I am grateful to both audiences, and especially to my commentators at the ASPLP, Anita Allen and William Galston.

1. Examples in large metropolitan areas are Wilmington (Delaware), Louisville (Kentucky), and St. Louis. See Gary Orfield and John T. Yun, "Resegregation in American Schools," report of the Harvard University Civil Rights Project, 1999, 18. J. S. Fuerst and Roy Petty in their 1992 study of school integration add, "[M]anaged integration—achieved largely through intelligent use of busing—is working in hundreds of small and medium-sized communities all across the country." "Quiet Success: Where Managed School Integration Works," *The American Prospect*, Summer 1992, 65.

2. Orfield and Yun. Gary Orfield and Susan Eaton, *Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education* (New York: New Press, 1996), ch. 3, "The Growth of Segregation."

3. *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 115 S. Ct. 2038 (1995).

4. See, for example, Glenn Loury, "Integration has had its day," *New York Times*, April 23, 1997. The lead article in the August 5, 1998, edition of *Education Week* begins, "African-American parents, by an overwhelming margin, want the public schools to focus on achievement rather than on racial diversity and integration, a survey released last week says." It goes on to say that white parents express anxiety about integration.

5. Orfield and Eaton, xv. David Shipler captures a related attitude among blacks, stated by Laura Washington, an editor and publisher: "My mother's not a real big fan of white people. But she said to me: 'You've got to live with them. If you're going to be professional and go out into the world you're going to have to work with them every day . . . You need to learn how to understand how they think and how they live and the cultural differences, and you better learn it as early as you can. So go to an integrated high school.'" David Shipler, *A Country of Strangers: Blacks and Whites in America* (New York: Vintage, 1997), 102.

6. Gloria Ladson-Billings, *Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994), 3.

7. I adopt David Hollinger's useful phrase "ethnoracial" group to emphasize the partly racial, partly panethnic/pancultural character of the five major such groups—African-Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, and Euro-Americans. Pluralism as an ideal must also be cognizant of distinct cultural groups within each of these ethnoracial groups (e.g. Haitian-Americans, Chicanos, Korean-Americans). David Hollinger, *PostEthnic America* (New York: Basic Books, 1995).

8. Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Ethical Demands for Integration," in James M. Washington (ed.), *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1986), 118.

9. Randall Kennedy, "In Praise of Racial 'Integration,'" In *Intellectual-Capital.com*, July 24, 1997.

10. An argument could also be made that the term "desegregation" or "desegregated schools" should be completely abandoned except where it involves the process of altering racial demographics in a school previously intentionally created as racially segregated. Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom point out that the notion of "desegregation" (understood as a process rather than an end state) regnant in the 1970's—breaking up clusters of black students and placing them in majority white schools—is obsolete, if we confine ourselves to extant school district boundaries, for the cities to which desegregation orders of that era were applied no longer have white majority schools. Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White: One Nation Indivisible* (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 337–338.

11. Orfield and Yun, 25, 14. Since the authors' figures do not supply the percentage of actual schools with different racial demographics, one is unable to determine the percentage of students sharing schools with students of particular percentages of ethnoracial groups other than their own.

12. As Fuerst and Petty note, "With little fanfare, integration has become a fact of life for the majority of African-American school children in the United States." ("Quiet Success," 65.)

13. Orfield and Yun, 15.

14. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Henry Gutierrez (eds.), *Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

15. Peter Schmidt, "California district strives to mix blacks and Hispanics," *Education Week*, April 12, 1995, 3. See also Lynn Beck and Rebecca Newman, "Caring in One Urban High School: Thoughts on the Interplay among Race, Class, and Gender," in Deborah Eaker-Rich and Jane Van Galen (eds.), *Caring in an Unjust World: Negotiating Borders and Barriers in Schools* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1996), concerning both tensions and positive relations among blacks and Latinos (mostly Central American immigrants) in a high school.

16. A black parent cited in an article about black disenchantment with integration makes this point about the reality, and whites' understanding, of integration: "Some blacks are rethinking integration for the simple reasoning that it never happened . . . We have extended the olive branch only to find that whites don't want integration, they want assimilation. People aren't willing to give up that much of their own identity for integration." Wil Haygood, "Race in American life: Ideals giving way to reality," *Boston Globe*, Sept. 14, 1997, A1.

17. Cited in John Brenkman, "Race Publics," *Transition*, issue 66 (undated), 27.

18. David Shipler, *A Country of Strangers*, 34 and elsewhere, cites blacks making this point.

19. Many blacks were of course aware of the distinctness of black culture, which had been articulated in this period by Ralph Ellison, Langston Hughes, and others. Perhaps the black legal activists at the NAACP were equally aware that cultural differences might play a role in the success of integration. But such issues had no legal standing, and there was no reason to bring them into the desegregation arguments.

20. Horace Kallen, Randolph Bourne, Alain Locke, and W. E. B. DuBois were influential proponents of cultural pluralism in the first decades of the 20th century.

21. There exists a burgeoning literature on the importance of respect for and sensitivity to cultural and racial factors in providing effective, quality education to racial-minority children, and on methods for incorporating that respect into pedagogy. Some of the most important works are Sonia Nieto, *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*, 2nd edition (White Plains, NY: Longman, 1996); Gloria Ladson-Billings, *The Dreamkeepers*; Theresa Perry and Lisa Delpit,

The Real Ebonics Debate (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997); Ann Locke Davidson, *Making and Molding Identity in Schools: Student Narratives on Race, Gender, and Academic Engagement* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1996); Lisa Delpit, *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom* (New York: New Press, 1995); Rosina Lippi-Green, *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Sonia Nieto, *The Light in Their Eyes: Creating Multicultural Learning Communities* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999).

22. For criticisms of the *Brown* Court's reasoning, see Andrew Kull, *The Color-Blind Constitution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992); Thernstrom and Thernstrom; David Armor, *Forced Justice: School Desegregation and the Law* (New York: Oxford, 1995).

23. The important cases making explicit the legal standing of the legacy argument are *Green v. New Kent County* 430 U.S. 391 (1968) and *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

24. A variation on this argument claims that in American society racial separation itself damages the self-worth of blacks. I argue elsewhere that *de facto* school segregation that results primarily from residential segregation partakes of something like the inferiority-declaring force of what was objectionable about *de jure* segregation. "Racial Integration' Revisited," in Joram Graf Haber and Mark Halfon (eds.), *Norms and Values: Essays on the Work of Virginia Held* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998), p. 211.

25. For an extended critique of the alleged empirical connections between segregation, self-worth, and academic motivation stated or implied in the *Brown* decision, see Roy Brooks, *Integration or Separation: A Strategy for Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 13–21. As Brooks points out (citing Walter Stephan) there are reasons for thinking that white-dominated schools in which blacks are a minority may well involve factors tending toward the *lowering* of black self-esteem—whites' racism against blacks, blacks' comparison of themselves to better-prepared white students, loss of power and status (compared to majority black schools) merely from being a minority. Brooks, 23.

26. Brooks, 12.

27. From text of Court's opinion, cited in Richard Kluger, *Simple Justice*, (New York: Vintage, 1975), 781.

28. *Brown* in Kluger, 780.

29. *Brown* in Kluger, 782.

30. For example, the statement "In no school that I saw anywhere in the United States were nonwhite children in large numbers truly intermingled with white children" is proffered early in the book in the con-

text of a discussion of unequal education, as if it were barely conceivable that a group of black children could become educated in any significant sense in the absence of whites. Jonathan Kozol, *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), 3.

31. Two of Orfield's studies are cited above, footnotes 1 and 2, and there have been many others over the past decades, with the Harvard University Civil Rights Project sponsoring them approximately every two years since the early 1990's.

32. See, for example, the issue of *Social Philosophy and Policy* devoted to "Equal Opportunity", vol. 5, issue 1, Autumn 1987; Kenneth Howe, *Understanding Equal Educational Opportunity* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997); and Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (with new preface and epilogue) (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 128-139.

33. Robert Carter, "The Unending Struggle for Equal Educational Opportunity," *Teachers College Record*, vol. 96, #4, Summer 1995: 621.

34. Shipler, *A Country of Strangers*, 34 and elsewhere.

35. Nor are black teachers entirely immune from prejudice against especially poor black and Latino children.

36. Robert Crain and Amy Stuart Wells, *Stepping Across the Color Line: African-American Students in White Suburban Schools* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). Personalizing this general insight about unequal treatment, a black male student, interviewed by Sara Lightfoot in her study of "good high schools," speaks of white teachers in one school who seem repelled or afraid of darker-skinned black students, contrasting them with the school's principal, "who does not draw back from him." Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, *The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

37. Wells and Crain, 290.

38. Delpit, *Other People's Children*.

39. Wells and Crain describe a modification of a common three-tiered tracking system, namely a two-tiered one, used in some of the St. Louis schools they studied. The two tracks are "honors" and "everyone else." While the honors classes were often all-white, Wells and Crain plausibly claim that the presence of a strong racial mixture in the other track, and the absence of an almost-all-black bottom track, makes this form of tracking substantially superior for the black children to the three-track model. There are other lesser forms of tracking—for example, having permanent ability groups within a single desegregated classroom, but not creating the classes themselves by ability group sorting.

There is a good deal of literature on tracking debating its pros and cons, but a substantial body of research suggests that non-tracked schools are better for the "lower ability" students while not being

detrimental to the "higher ability" ones. See Jeannie Oakes, *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

40. The METCO program in Boston, in which racial minority children can choose to attend suburban (generally overwhelmingly white) schools, at great inconvenience (long bus rides, culturally alien environments, difficulty of parental contact with school, and the like), has been a going concern for several decades.

41. Amy Stuart Wells and Robert Crain, "Perpetuation Theory and the Long-Term Effects of School Desegregation," *Review of Educational Research*, Winter 1994, vol. 64, #4: 531-555. The relevant literature cites three factors that convert black attendance at white majority schools into enhanced occupational success, independent of student school achievement. The first comprises skills of interaction in a white world, which enhance the student's self-presentation in applying for jobs, and his or her subsequent ability to negotiate the cultural terrain of white-dominated workplaces, thus enhancing job performance. The second is access to information about colleges and jobs that would not be attained at schools serving a less-middle-class clientele, a climate of support for pursuing higher education, school counselors pushing and helping students to make application to colleges, and the like. The third is the school's reputation; in general, an employer, or college, is more likely to select a black graduate from the integrated than the segregated school. (Note that the first two aspects concern class factors as well as, or intertwined with, racial ones.) It is worth noting here that one of the important pre-Brown integration cases, *Sweatt v. Painter* 339 U.S. 629 (1950)—ruling against a segregated law school in Texas with facilities and expenditures comparable to the then-white-only University of Texas Law School—makes use of very similar arguments.

42. Thernstrom and Thernstrom, 342.

43. "Equality of opportunity" can also take a more group-based focus, where the groups in question are defined by race, class, or gender. While this conception is less individualistic, it still does not engage with the larger social good of education; moreover, some conceptions of this group-based good see the group as simply standing in for the interests of individuals within the group, rather than involving a good to the group in its own right. Such a conception is made explicit in Brooks, *Integration or Separation*.

44. The consequences of racial prejudice and their moral seriousness are not symmetrical across racial groups, however. For a discussion of this issue, see L. Blum, "Moral Asymmetries in Racism," in S. Babbitt and S. Campbell (eds.), *Racism and Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

45. Not all forms of departure from the principle of equal respect are equally objectionable. Among such forms, race-based discrimination is particularly invidious, because of the historic evils that have attended it.

46. King, "Ethical Demand for Integration," 121. Randall Kennedy speaks of seeing oneself and racial others as "neighbors united by ties that run deeper than those of racial kinship" and "not as members of separate racial tribes." ("In Praise of Racial 'Integration.'") This absolute prioritizing of common humanity over ethnoracial solidarity is not, I think, required by a true integrationist vision, including King's, and is not consistent with the pluralist version of integration that I advocate here. While in *some* sense our common humanity is deeper than our ethnoracial particularity, in other ways the solidarity of discriminated-against racial groups is no less meaningful or valid than the common humanity.

47. Walter Stephan, *Reducing Prejudice and Stereotyping in Schools* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999). A substantial body of literature in social psychology (summarized by Stephan, a major figure in the development of this literature) explores the conditions (in schools and classes) under which individual racial prejudice is reduced and interracial acceptance and liking promoted. Much of the literature operates within a paradigm deriving from Gordon Allport's 1954 work, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979 [1954]), known as the "contact hypothesis." That hypothesis asserts that contact between groups is more likely to lead to reduction in prejudice and greater acceptance when the contact is characterized by equal status; when it involves cooperative activity in the service of shared, superordinate goals; when it is supported by the authority of the surrounding institution(s); and when it involves the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups.

48. Center for Civic Education, *National Standards for Civics and Government*, 1994. *History-Social Science Framework* (for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve), (adopted by California State Board of Education, 1987).

49. See Juan Perea, *Immigrants Out: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 1997) and Rogers Smith, below, footnote 50.

50. In a recent exhaustively researched work on the history of American citizenship, Rogers M. Smith argues convincingly that the conception of American citizenship as inclusive of all who swear allegiance to (what are taken as) American values and institutions, independent of race, religion, and ethnicity, is seriously deficient, and that American laws and public understandings of citizenship have historically been

bound up with racial (and other ascriptive) hierarchies. Only if we face up to the contamination of our understandings of citizenship by these racist views can we fully achieve the liberal, democratic conception of citizenship that many wrongly regard as already triumphant. Rogers Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). Matthew Frye Jacobson's *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998) argues that notions of "whiteness" have been and are deeply intertwined with ideas about "Americanness."

51. A small sample of major popular or scholarly works on race in this period: Cornel West, *Race Matters* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997); Jennifer Hochschild, *Facing Up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); Andrew Hacker, *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, and Unequal*; Patricia Williams, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991). Other works mentioned herein: Thernstrom and Thernstrom, Sniderman and Piazza, Shipler, Tatum, Patterson.

52. It is the burden of books like Smith and Jacobson to argue that racial discrimination is only partly, and ambiguously, "un-American."

53. A good summary of some of the most influential trends in recent citizenship theory is Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman, "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory," *Ethics*, 104 (January 1994): 352-381.

54. Conversely, school may well be the one setting in which blacks, Latinos and other people of color can learn how the world looks to white people. It is sometimes said (in contrast to the converse) that racial minorities do understand whites, since they must learn something about the white world in order to make their way in it. The truth in this insight can be greatly overstated. Racially isolated blacks and Latinos often carry around extremely oversimplified and overgeneralized views of whites; and the knowledge necessary to navigate a white-dominated society may remain at a surface level. In addition, the different groups of color themselves may well be isolated from one another socially, and school may provide the best, or the only, venue in which they can learn about one another as well.

55. Orlando Patterson, *The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's "Racial" Crisis* (Washington, DC: Civitas, 1997), 191.

56. Thomas and Mary Edsall, *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics* (New York: Norton, 1992). See also Donald Kinder and Lynn Sanders, *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). Paul M. Sni-

derman and Thomas Piazza, *The Scar of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 1993). While Sniderman and Piazza are concerned to demonstrate that far from all opposition to government programs benefitting blacks stems from racial prejudice, their findings nevertheless support the idea that *some* of the opposition lies in this source and that there is still a good deal of racial prejudice among whites, even if (as I agree) many social analysts misleadingly overstate both the degree of white racism and its impact on stances on policy issues.

57. Lawrence Kohlberg, better known for his paradigm-creating work in moral development theory, also did pioneering work in creating democratic communities in schools. See F. Clark Power, Ann Higgins, and Lawrence Kohlberg's misleadingly titled *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989).

58. See note 47.

59. "Cooperative learning," which brings groups of racially heterogeneous students together in working groups, with a common task, and scope for all to make distinctive and recognizable contributions to the group effort, is generally regarded as facilitating more positive intergroup relations. See the summary by two of the leading researchers in this area, David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, "Social Interdependence: Cooperative Learning in Education," in Barbara Benedict Bunker and Jeffrey Z. Rubin (eds.), *Conflict, Cooperation, and Justice: Essays Inspired by the Work of Morton Deutsch* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995).

60. Roger Sanjek's *The Future of Us All: Race and Neighborhood Politics in New York City* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998) provides a rich and hopeful description of how an extremely ethnoracially mixed neighborhood succeeded in bridging its ethnoracial differences to find common ground, in part through acknowledgment of those differences themselves and working through and with them to produce mutual understanding, compromise, and constructive public deliberation.

61. On the importance of recognition of one's cultural identity in public venues, see Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in Amy Gutman (ed.), *Multiculturalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). Some typical experiences that students from different ethnoracial groups have had and that relevant literature suggests they wish acknowledged are the following. Many black students want non-blacks to acknowledge a barrage of slights and put-downs they feel they suffer outside the awareness of many whites. Many white students want to talk about ways they have tried to avoid prejudicial attitudes or behavior, or that they have grievances too that may be unrelated to race but are important to them. Many Asian-Americans want to say how they feel the

"model minority" image of their group is constricting to their aspirations and often conveys a tone of derision and lack of full acceptance, whether conscious or not. Some Latino students want to talk about being caught in the middle between white and black, or being pushed to adopt a race-like identity when they see their ethnocultural identity, one which embraces both light and dark-skinned Latinos, as more salient in their self-understanding. Both Latinos and Asians often resent the insistent focus on black and white that dominates discussion of racial and ethnic matters in the public domain and in schools and colleges.

62. For further discussion of interracial dialogue in classrooms (higher education in this case, but largely applicable, with modifications, to secondary education) see Lawrence Blum, "Can We Talk? Interracial Dialogue in the College Classroom," in *Change: The Magazine of Higher Education*, November/December 1998: 26-37.

63. Sonia Nieto's *The Light in Their Eyes: Creating Multicultural Learning Communities* is particularly insightful in this regard. See also Mary Dilg, *Race and Culture in the Classroom: Teaching and Learning Through Multicultural Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), and Beverly Daniel Tatum, *"Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?" and Other Conversations about Race: A Psychologist Explains the Development of Racial Identity* (New York: Basic Books, 1997) (discussed below, note 65).

64. Sanjek's study (note 60) makes a good case that in local communities, productive alliances toward shared civic goals actually require engagement with ethnoracial differences.

65. Beverly Daniel Tatum's *"Why Are All the Black Kids . . ."* provides the best account of which I am aware of the developmental pressures and personal value of in-group socializing among racial minorities in schools and colleges, set within a general normative framework that assumes that a complementary connectedness to groups *other* than one's own ultimately represents a more personally and morally mature form of racial identity.

66. In *Integration or Separation*, Roy Brooks makes a case for a stronger validation of separatism than I do, though this form is itself a good deal weaker than a full-scale ethnic nationalist who wishes to have as little to do with society beyond the borders of the group as is economically and socially possible. Brooks argues that blacks (the group on whom he focuses his argument) may need (what he calls "limited") separation in order to develop the self-confidence and self-affirmation necessary to function in a white society that will almost inevitably be insensitive to their needs. "Limited separation provides an option to scores of African Americans who do not have the superhuman strength or extraordinary

good fortune to make it in racially hostile, predominantly white mainstream institutions" (190).

Blacks, and other racial minorities, can, certainly, experience this hostility, and black groups can be a vital source of support. But Brooks's argument appears to lock that white hostility in place as a permanent feature of our society and of the institutions in question; at least it involves no frontal attack on that hostility. By contrast, in the schools I am describing, institutional pride and the teachers' professional identity would be bound up in making the school a welcoming rather than hostile environment. Teachers would be committed to taking a stand against racial prejudice, and the form of education too is likely to mean that, at least, there is not a united front of hostility toward black students on the part of the majority white student group. White teachers, and some students, would be part of the "affirming" group for black, and other minority, students.

67. Cf. William Galston, "A Public Philosophy for the 21st Century," in *The Responsive Community*, vol. 8, issue 3, Summer 1998, 36.

68. Nancy Rosenblum rightly cautions that the effects of an association cannot be automatically inferred from its purposes. Not everything structured to be a "school of virtue" will end up being one. "The Moral Effects of Associational Life," *Report from the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy*, vol. 18, #3, Summer 1998, 12.

69. See above, note 47: Walter Stephan, *Reducing Prejudice and Stereotyping in Schools*.

70. Audrey Smedley very convincingly makes this point about the concept of "race" in *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a World-view*, 2nd edition (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999).

71. This is a purely pragmatic argument. On my view, the need for a rich multicultural curriculum is not dependent on the ethnoracial demographic of a school (though the details of it may be—for example, a district with a large Laotian immigrant population has reason to give more attention to Laotian culture, history, and experience than a district that does not).

72. Almost all forms of what most whites think of as distinctively "American" music for example (even including country and western music) have been shaped, often decisively, by the black presence in America.

73. Patterson, *Ordeal of Integration*, 191. Patterson does not entirely believe that this is the *only* value of integration since, as noted earlier, he cites the increase in tolerance and concern for justice for Afro-Americans on the part of whites as an important effect of integration. (See above, p. 401–402.)

74. To note one pointed example, a middle-class white girl who attended a mixed school reported how acquaintances of hers who attended all-white schools rolled up the windows of their cars when a car of black kids pulled up alongside them. H. Andrew Sagar and Janet Ward Schofield, "Integrating the Desegregated School," in *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, volume I (JAI Press), 230.

75. This argument does not distinguish between racial groups and ethnocultural groups. These are by no means the same. First generation Haitian-Americans have cultural norms distinct from African-Americans, though both are "black" and may be subject to similar racism. There are important cultural differences among different "white" groups. Every so-called "racial" group in the United States—that is, groups thought of racially even when a geographical term like "Asian" or "Latino" is used to designate them—contains myriad cultural groups within it. Nevertheless, the way that cultural and racial group identity are so intertwined in the United States makes the above argument applicable to both.

76. Janet Ward Schofield, "Review of Research on School Desegregation's Impact on Elementary and Secondary School Students," in Kofi Lomotey and Charles Teddlie (eds.), *Readings in Equal Education*, vol. 13 (New York: AMS Press, 1996), p. 92.

77. Janet Ward Schofield, *Black and White in School: Trust, Tension, or Tolerance* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1989), a superb study of the effects of desegregation in a middle school, masterfully articulates attitudes held by teachers (both white and black, though somewhat less by the latter group) that stand in the way of their being proactive in civic education in the area of race. See especially chapter 2: "The Teachers' Ideology."