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The argument

- America has no “integration policy”
- Existing policy is (mostly) antidiscrimination policy
- Focus on policy for economic and educational integration
- The irony: Though designed for African Americans, African Americans are the least integrated minority group
The antidiscrimination law framework

- Reconstruction’s 14th Amendment of the Constitution
- Civil Rights Act of 1964: Title VI and Title VII
- Executive Orders, set-asides and Small Business Administration programs
Title VII’s mechanics for economic integration

• No discrimination on basis of race or national origin

• Individuals and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission can initiate lawsuits; race reporting requirements

• Two theories of discrimination: disparate treatment and disparate impact
Status of economic integration

- February 2010 white unemployment rate: 9.7%; African American 16.2; Latino 13.4; Asian 8.4
- Studies show widespread preferences for immigrants over native-born, especially African Americans (Wilson, Waldinger, Moss and Tilly)
- EEOC litigation failures
What about diversity policy?

• No government policies for diversity in employment

• Executive Order for affirmative action benefits Blacks, Asians, Latinos, Native Americans

• Voluntary affirmative action and diversity policies (more than 1/3 of large companies have a diversity policy; more than 1/2 have training)
Integration into capitalism?

• Small Business Administration and set-aside programs in spending bills

• Controlling for education, age, time of immigration and language ability, still wide variation in business formation rates

• Korean (23.7); Chinese (10.6); Spanish Central American (5.9); Black Caribbean (5.7); African American (4.5); Laotian (2.6)
Title VI and education

- No discrimination on the basis of race or national origin
- Threat of fund cut-off (rare but powerful)
- Title VI key to end segregation of African Americans in schools
Unintended integration effects of Title VI

- May 25 memorandum: failure to accommodate LEP children is discrimination (5% limit)
- Mandatory ESL or bilingual education
- *Plyler v. Doe* and undocumented children
Integration, diversity and multiculturalism

- No federal “diversity” policy in schools
- Diversity constitutionally permissible for higher education (not required)
- Decentralized education; multiculturalism voluntary and highly variable; tendency toward culture with language instruction
Race and integration: mixed picture

• High school drop out rates show Latinos disadvantaged: 27.5% of Latinos in 2007; blacks 215; whites 12.2

• But Latinos and Asians outperform African Americans on SAT: Asians 1623; whites 1581; Mexican Americans 1362; African Americans 1262

• Test gap persists when controlling for socio-demographic variables
What is to be done?

• Nothing? America’s laissez faire policy largely works

• Persistent issue of African American exclusion from American mainstream
The ultimate measure of integration?

- % of married in racially exogamous marriage
- Source: Lee and Bean (forthcoming)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>