Document 1: History of Residential Segregation in the US

The rise of industrialization was accompanied by a migration of African Americans from farms to cities to help meet the demand for labor.However, various "legal" measures were taken in response to the rising numbers of African Americans in cities. For example, a number of cities in the South adopted ordinances that established separate neighborhoods for White and African-American residents. After the Supreme Court held one city’s residential segregation law unconstitutional in 1917, "racial segregation in southern cities was accomplished by the same means as in the north: through violence, collective anti-Black action, racially restrictive covenants, and discriminatory real estate practices."

By the 1930s, most cities had well-defined boundaries within which African Americans and other people of color were allowed to live. This discrimination was racial, not economic, and even middle class and upper-income African Americans were confined to segregated areas. To accommodate the growing population of African Americans in these increasingly overcrowded areas, single family homes were subdivided into multifamily homes with high cost rentals.By 1940, spatial isolation had become a permanent fixture of the residential structure of African-American community life, and that isolation only increased during the next 30 years.

Beginning in the 1930s, a number of government agencies were formed that affected housing patterns in the United States. The U.S. Housing Authority ("USHA") established a public housing program to improve housing conditions for low-income Americans, but nearly all of this affordable housing was in segregated public housing projects. Public housing programs were segregated by law in the south and nearly always segregated in the rest of the country in deference to local prejudice, with housing projects for African Americans usually adjoining segregated neighborhoods or built on marginal land near waterfronts, highways, industrial sites, or railroad tracks.As one historian noted, "The most distinguishing feature of post-World War II ghetto expansion is that it was carried out with government sanction and support."

The Fair Housing Act was passed in 1968 to address this continued segregation and prohibit discrimination in housing. It prohibited discrimination based on race, color, religion, and national origin. Importantly, Congress declared that "it is the policy of the United States to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States." The Fair Housing Act is rooted in both the 13th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution. It prohibits not only intentional discrimination, but also policies and practices that have a discriminatory effect or perpetuate segregation. It also includes a provision that is unique in civil rights laws – a requirement that HUD and other federal agencies and their grantees "affirmatively further" fair housing to assess and address the racial impacts of official actions and to affirmatively promote residential integration in federal policy.In 1988, Congress amended the Fair Housing Act to add persons with disabilities and families with children to the list of protected classes.

Document 3: Where are the slums in China?

As of 2012, China’s rural to urban migration has reached a historic record: a total of 262 million migrants have moved to cities from the countryside. Many western [**observers and scholars**](http://www.chinadebate.com/2012/01/where-are-chinas-slums/) hail China’s urbanization, as China’s cities have absorbed the largest ever influx of rural to urban migrants without the emergence of massive slums. Compared with megacities like Mumbai and Rio de Janeiro, Chinese megacities appear remarkably slum-free. But how did China avoid this problem?

Among migrants streaming to megacities such as Beijing and Shanghai, the majority comes from the countryside. Given this fact, we can safely assume that at least a certain proportion of rural to urban migrants is pretty poor.  At this point, the puzzle is: if it is correct to say that then where is the space (e.g., slums) for them in the city? Or, simply put, where do the poor stay in the city?

Kam Wing Chan, professor of geography at the University of Washington, suggests that China’s rural migrants are “[**in the city but not of the city**](http://www.chinausfocus.com/political-social-development/in-the-city-but-not-of-the-city-the-myth-of-china%E2%80%99s-urbanization/)” because of China’s apartheid-like Hukou system, which creates “invisible walls” that prevent them from staying permanently in the city. Simply stated, under Hukou, rural migrants are allowed to work in the city. The city, however, is not responsible for providing social benefits for them. For example, migrant children typically were not allowed to attend local public schools until a few years ago. In addition, opportunities for migrants to change their rural Hukou status and permanently settle in the city are quite slim. For example, despite employing millions of rural migrants, Shanghai has only granted urban Hukou to 43 of them so far.

Constrained by the Hukou system, rural migrants have to keep circulating between their home villages and cities where informal housing is their only option. For many, this endless trip has lasted for decades and spanned generations. Even though there have been hundreds of millions of them, migrants in the cities are highly atomized and marginalized. This is the major reason why there are no expanding slums seen in the Chinese cities. For the government, however, the benefit of implementing Hukou is obvious. The system has enabled Chinese cities to obtained necessary laborers for economic growth and a busy, large and clean-looking city. At the same time, it lets cities avoid the costs of providing housing and other social services to rural migrants. It is the Hukou system that, for better or worse, has created China’s slum-free cities.

Document 4: Hukou System Explained

The Communist Party came to power in China in 1949. Under the leadership of [Mao Zedong](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mao_Zedong%22%20%5Co%20%22Chinese%20Communist%20Leader%20Mao%20Zedong%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), one of the government’s goals was to create economic stability between the country’s large rural farming population and the growing urban areas. The party had a few potential road blocks to steer clear of while creating this stability.

One potential problem was a large influx of rural workers to the cities looking for higher paying jobs. Latin America and India saw large slums develop outside of their major cities with similar conditions.

Another threat to the Communist’s effort was public protesting and civil unrest, especially in the cities. The plan they developed would have to address both concerns while creating stability for the entire country.

The plan was to implement a classification system to keep record of all Chinese as either a rural or urban citizen. The government then tied all social benefits (healthcare, education, social security, working rights, etc.) to a person’s local government.

The system is called “huji” but it’s commonly known by the name of the records “Hukou.” The Hukou System was implemented in 1958 and it still in place today.

While the urban citizens enjoyed a supply of labor opportunities and comfortable benefits for their families, their rural counterparts struggled. The agrarian culture in rural China is very difficult. The land isn’t nutrient rich for farming, the terrain is mountainous, there’s little economic infrastructure, they lack access to modern farm equipment, there’s often extreme draught and access to clean water is scarce.

Even with all of these challenges to daily life and extreme poverty the norm, the Hukou System was successful. At least for a while.

Often it is the parents moving to the cities, leaving their young children to be raised by grandparents. These children are the forgotten casualties of China’s economic boom.

The socioeconomic impacts of 50+ years of “rural” and “urban” classification are incalculable. Generations were conditioned to believe they were second-rate citizens and received second-rate treatment. Even with restrictions somewhat relaxed, it will take help for the damage to be repaired. This is an acceptable condition for China as they have successfully avoided slums around their major cities and have largely avoided public protests.

Today, there are still over 250 million rural Chinese living on less than $2/day. Part of the problem is the Hukou System.

Document 2: Effects of racial segregation

Spatial and racial inequalities are directly associated with access to virtually all products and services associated with the good life – e.g., health, education, employment. Sprawl, concentrated poverty and racial segregation tend to concentrate a host of problems and privileges in different neighborhoods and among different racial groups. These “concentration effects” shape opportunities and lifestyles throughout the life cycle and across generations. Research has demonstrated links between neighborhood characteristics (like poverty and inequality) and teenage pregnancy, high school dropout rates and delinquent behavior. Patterns of privilege also emerge early in life, persist throughout the life cycle and recreate themselves in subsequent generations. Infant mortality rates, quality of schools, employment opportunities, life expectancy and more are affected by where one is born, lives, works and plays.

Access to clean air and water, exposure to lead paint, high rates of stress and obesity, poor diet, social isolation and proximity to hospitals and other medical facilities all vary by neighborhood and contribute to long-established disparities in health and wellness. The affluent and predominantly white D.C. suburb of Bethesda, Maryland, has one pediatrician for every 400 children, while the poor and predominantly black neighborhoods in the District’s southeast side have one pediatrician for every 3,700 children.

If education is to be “the great equalizer of the conditions of men – the balance wheel of the social machinery” as the Massachusetts educator Horace Mann anticipated over 150 years ago, that day has yet to arrive. After two decades of progress in desegregating the nation’s schools, it appears that progress may have come to a halt or perhaps may have even been reversed. In 2000, 40 percent of black students attended schools that were 90 to 100 percent black compared with 32 percent of black students who attended such schools in 1988. The share of Hispanic students attending schools that were 90 to 100 percent minority grew from 23 percent during the late 1960s to 37 percent in 2000. Continuing disparities result in fewer educational resources, less qualified teachers and higher teacher turnover and, ultimately, lower educational achievement in low-income and minority communities.

If there is one single factor that is most critical for determining access to the good life, it might be employment. This is particularly true in the United States where individuals and households are far more dependent on their jobs to secure basic goods and services than is the case with virtually all other industrialized nations. The importance of place and race have long been recognized by spatial mismatch theorists who posit that lower-income residents of poorer communities generally reside in or near central cities while job growth has been greater in outlying suburban communities. Those most in need of employment, therefore, find it more expensive to get to those jobs when they find one. The metropolitan areas with higher levels of black-white housing segregation were those that exhibited higher levels of spatial mismatch between the residential location of blacks and the location of jobs.

A depressing feature of these developments is that many of these differences reflect policy decisions which, if not designed expressly to create disparate outcomes, have contributed to them nevertheless.