

Integration versus voluntary ethnocultural clustering

A POLITICAL THEORY THESIS

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Political Science (MSc)

Silke Zwart s1051672

Dr. B. R. van Leeuwen

24.123 (24.702) words

15th of August 2022

Nijmegen School of Management

Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Political Theory

Abstract

In an increasingly multicultural society, where racism is still prevalent, it is important for policy makers to determine the best way to deal with this situation. On the one hand, there are theorists like Iris Marion Young and Michael Merry. Their non-ideal theory entails that people should deal with the situation as it currently is by allowing voluntary clustering amongst people with similar ethnocultural backgrounds. Racist structures are so prevalent that it's unlikely to change sufficiently. On the other hand, there are theorists like Elizabeth Anderson and Margo Trappenburg. They theorize about a society as it should be: a society where individuals are more equal, where people treat each other with respect regardless of ethnocultural background. They believe integration is not only an end, but also the means to achieve this: how can people empathize when they don't really interact? I will argue why I indeed believe integration is the most effective way to cultivate as much social equality as possible.

Content

Chapter 1: Introduction..... 4

Chapter 2: Voluntary ethnocultural clustering..... 13

Chapter 3: Integration..... 29

Chapter 4: The importance of integration..... 44

Chapter 5: Conclusion 59

References 64

Chapter 1: Introduction

On January 1st 2022, over 4.4 million people living in the Netherlands had a migration-background (CBS, Hoeveel mensen met een migratieachtergrond wonen in Nederland?, 2022). This indicates an increasingly diversifying population. Cities in particular are often already known for their diverse inhabitants. To anticipate this, the Dutch government has mainly focused on integration in the sense that newcomers are obligated to take an integration course and learn the Dutch language. The goal is to create shared understanding and involvement, so that all citizens can participate in society. However, because city populations are so large, cities are also known for a certain kind of civic apathy (Van Leeuwen, 2010). This means for instance that the city population is adopting a certain ‘live and let live’ state of mind. Unfortunately, it also means that those inhabitants don’t necessarily always communicate with each other or are willing to offer help to others, as the person in need is unfamiliar to them. Moreover, because streets in cities are often crowded, bystanders often expect others to help out when someone needs help – so those bystanders don’t have to take action. So a diverse society can also create certain tensions. Especially in heterogeneous neighborhoods, people in cities trust their neighbors less than people in villages (Putnam, 2007).

This could potentially lead to people from the same background clustering together in suburbs. Sometimes this occurs by choice. It can be comfortable to surround oneself with familiar cuisine, music, people, habits and buildings. Proponents of voluntary ethnocultural clustering theorize that ethnic clustering therefore doesn’t have to lead to negative consequences, if it leads to groups thriving in their own space. However, the choice to group together on the basis of culture or ethnicity should be a voluntary one. Proponents of integration emphasize that ethnocultural clustering is hardly ever voluntary, but is most likely to occur when people are pushed towards certain areas as a consequence of unaffordable housing, discrimination and/or other effects of social inequality. This limits the integration, enhances the distrust and intensifies the feeling of literally being excluded from other parts of the city.

Integration

Two theorists that have provided the pro-integration side with many arguments to underline the importance of integration, are Elizabeth Anderson and Margo Trappenburg.

Elizabeth Anderson (2007, 2010) argues that disadvantaged groups need self-segregated spaces, to enable disadvantaged groups to cope with the stresses of integration. But integration can also lead to sustaining a community of equals. Therefore, it is an important tool in a multicultural society with social equality.

Anderson believes that, in order to combat the social disadvantages caused by segregation, it is not only crucial to have a diverse range of individuals in places of decision making, but also in education. Integrated schools offer more fairly distributed opportunities that will lead to a larger pool of candidates who can more effectively compete with others, because they now share a similar educational background. People that interact with people from several ethnocultural backgrounds are better capable of understanding each other's circumstances, concerns and needs. Moreover, interracial interaction can lead to more social and cultural capital (Anderson, 2010).

Anderson therefore pleads in favor of striking a balance between giving ethnic groups their own space and integration (Anderson, 2007). Yet she does consider integration a crucial component in achieving equality. This is in line with Margo Trappenburg (2003), who poses the question whether it is desirable for minority groups and majority groups to strive for ethnically diverse neighborhoods. She states that integration is good for democracy, because people will come across more diverse insights. It also contributes to equal opportunities as for example financial means are shared. Furthermore, she states that integration is better for the economy, because people might have more incentive to learn the native language (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 301).

Voluntary ethnocultural clustering

Iris Marion Young (1999, 2000) and Michael Merry (2013) explain why voluntary ethnocultural clustering can also be justifiable. According to Iris Marion Young (1999), people should be allowed to cluster voluntarily based on a shared ethnocultural background. Forcing people to integrate would be too much of an infringement on people's rights to cluster with others that are part of the same social group based on shared characteristics. Perhaps individual citizens identify with people from the same group. It is crucial to acknowledge the importance of clustering for these groups: it is easier for them to express themselves amongst people from the same culture, as they are likely to share at least some habits, norms and values (Young, 1999, p. 244).

Another advantage of voluntary ethnocultural clustering is that ethnocultural clustering grants underprivileged groups access to benefits (Young, 1999). Policies can effectively be implemented in certain demographic areas.

Moreover, when different ethnicities are mixed together, the local councils are likely to be dominated by white people. White people are likely to have been the ones in power for quite some time. Due to better access to education, they often have better access to places in power. This is problematic, because it makes political action that is crucial in tackling injustice quite challenging (Young, 1999, p. 244). She therefore believes it would be better for social equality to give colored neighborhoods their own councils. Young believes that potential downsides from voluntary ethnocultural clustering should be compensated by providing better public services, such as housing, education and public transport (Young, 2000).

This is in line with Michael Merry (2013), who argues in favor of voluntary clustering in schools. Educational programs have been affected by institutional racism. They have therefore created incredibly unequal relations that are hard to solve (Merry, 2013, p. 136). Research by Agirdag and Korkmazer (2015) has shown that this leads to children of color performing below average, whether they speak the language or not. Even if they are highly intelligent. Society is unable to help develop their talents, because the capabilities of people of color are often underestimated (Korkmazer & Agirdag, 2015, p. 248).

As a solution to problems created by integration, Merry (2013) proposes to allow voluntary separation. This is the phenomenon that people from specific ethnicities would like to cluster and therefore ‘separate’ from other ethnicities – specifically in schooling. Separation entails the involvement of choice. It does not mean that there are no involuntary structural (discriminatory) forces involved in the choice to separate. It merely “describes efforts to resist, reclaim, and rearrange the terms of one’s segregation when those terms are counterproductive to equality and citizenship” (Merry, 2013, p. 4). In other words, the purpose of voluntary separation or voluntary ethnocultural clustering is to make society more just by improving the conditions necessary for equality and citizenship. The practical forms voluntary separation/clustering might take, will depend on the groups in question, the circumstances they face, the experiences or ideals that guide their separation and the resources at their disposal. Sometimes the most desirable and effective response to involuntary segregation is not to integrate neighborhoods or schools, but to change the conditions that cause segregated experiences (Merry, 2013, p. 4).

Voluntary separation might therefore be more likely to provide the resources necessary for self-respect than integration. Self-respect is very crucial in establishing equality. Merry defines this as a sense of being in charge of one's destiny. This means having a reasonable sense of self-determination to make choices and having the ability to act upon those choices (Merry, 2013, p. 26). All people should get equal opportunities to do so. Equality of opportunity means that one's prospects should not be influenced (especially negatively) by morally irrelevant traits such as ethnicity, race, gender, sexuality, religion and so on. But what is the best way to achieve this?

Considering these two schools of thought, the question remains what the most optimal course of action is when marginalized people (typically people of color) are coerced to live in urban areas with people from a more privileged background. In particular when this results in marginalized people feeling like they are being looked down upon and socially excluded. Would allowing voluntary ethnocultural clustering improve social equality, or would it be unbeneficial? Both sides of the debate – those who approve of voluntary ethnocultural clustering and those who argue in favor of integration - acknowledge that there's social inequality, but they differ on the best response to that problem. To understand the core of this dilemma, it is important to differentiate between ideal theories and non-ideal theories. According to Valentini (2012), idealist theories and non-ideal theories can be distinguished on three accounts. First, 'ideal theory' may be taken to mean 'full-compliance theory', and 'non-ideal theory' may be understood as 'partial compliance' theory. This focuses on the question of what duties and obligations apply to people in situations of partial compliance as opposed to situations of full compliance. Second, 'ideal theory' is considered to be 'utopian or idealistic theory', and 'non-ideal theory' often as 'realistic'. This emphasizes the question of whether considerations of whether something is likely to occur should constrain normative political theorizing and, if so, when this should matter. Lastly, 'ideal theory' may indicate 'end-state' theory, and 'non-ideal theory' may be understood as 'transitional' theory. This indicates a focus on the question of whether a normative political theory should aim at identifying an ideal of societal perfection, or whether it should focus on transitional improvements without necessarily determining what the 'optimum' for a solution is (Valentini, 2012, p. 654).

Arguments in favor of integration often tend to belong to the tradition of ideal theories, but this doesn't necessarily have to be the case. One can imagine arguing in favor of integration in the world as it is today, despite its flaws (for example by arguing that racism exists in either

society, but that clustering would make this worse). The other way around, one can imagine arguing for allowing voluntary ethnocultural clustering in a different world than the world as it is today. In order for voluntary ethnocultural clustering to have the desired effect, perhaps some conditions should be met that aren't a reality today (for example compensation from the state for potential downsides from clustering). Nevertheless, because arguments in favor of clustering often in general lean more towards non-idealism and arguments in favor of integration tend to lean more towards idealism, this is a slightly arbitrary distinction I will make use of in this thesis.

Whereas the proponents of clustering are in general more pragmatic/non-idealist and try to develop the best way to cope with the presence of inequality, proponents of integration are more idealist and believe (very roughly speaking) that social inequality will lessen when different groups of people get to know each other. They believe that it is principally wrong if people move away because other people are not at ease with their presence.

Those who propose voluntary ethnocultural clustering, believe that forcing people to live amongst others that don't treat them with the respect that everyone deserves, is quite difficult or essentially impossible to defend morally speaking. Racism, discrimination and (unconscious) bias still results in unequal treatment of people with a migration background. It is more difficult for people from a different cultural background to find a place to work and therefore a stable income, which is also a huge limitation for them in finding a residence. So should they not be allowed to group together amongst people that will certainly not dehumanize them, because they share a similar ethnocultural background?

The debate on integration versus voluntary ethnocultural clustering is an important debate to have in an increasingly diversifying society, as the tensions as of today have not been resolved. Social equality is still only a noble aim and unfortunately not a reality. The main question my thesis focuses on will therefore be: To what extent should people from the same affinity group that want to live close to each other and form an urban community be allowed to do so?

In order to answer this, some definitions should be established first. Young (1999) defines affinity groups as people who positively identify with each other based on a shared ethnicity, religion, language, or lifestyle (Young, 1999, p. 204).

It is also important to determine what is meant by voluntary ethnocultural clustering for this thesis and how integration is defined. Voluntary ethnocultural clustering is defined as

clustering in any form where the actors make a conscious choice to group together based on affinities and could have decided to act otherwise (Young, 1990, p. 149). Even though Young uses together-in-difference to describe voluntary ethnocultural clustering and Merry refers to voluntary ethnocultural clustering as voluntary separation, the definitions of both these concepts fit into the definition given in the previous sentence.

Integration on the other hand is described by Anderson as “the free interaction of citizens from all walks of life in terms of equality and mutual regard in all institutions of civil society, and on voluntary terms in the intimate associations of private life” (Anderson, 2010, p. 95). This is a fitting description for how Trappenburg views integration as well; I will therefore use this definition for this thesis.

I would also like to explain what I personally mean by integration. Advani and Reich (2015) explain that the melting pot and salad bowl are well-known metaphors for what happens when different cultures meet. One form of the accommodation is if one new culture arises based on the mixing of elements of various previous cultures. This is called a ‘melting pot’. A second direction in which the merging of cultures can go, is when cultural groups are able to keep their unique cultural identities (at least to a certain extent). The metaphor of ‘the salad bowl’ is used to describe the situation of immigrants being part of a society whilst maintaining a measure of cultural distinction (Advani & Reich, 2015). To me, the most fitting definition of integration is the salad bowl. This way, no group has to give up (many) aspects of their culture and people from several different ethnocultural backgrounds will still be able to live together in relative harmony with others. This would be the ideal situation most proponents of integration agree should be aimed for. I think this also fits nicely with the definition of integration as free interactions based on mutual regard and equality, as given by Anderson.

If some communities “retained distinctive economic, political and cultural patterns” long after arriving in the country of destination, that is a sign that segregation or (un)voluntary ethnic clustering has occurred (Advani & Reich, 2015, p. 3). Many people will probably agree that segregation is indeed an expression of literal exclusion. I’m interested in analyzing how this exactly differs from voluntary ethnocultural clustering theoretically and in practice, if this also results in groups living separately, albeit voluntarily. A final important concept regarding multicultural societies is assimilation. This is when all cultures merge into and adjust to the dominant culture without keeping their uniqueness.

The specific focus of this thesis will be on the best way to establish social equality. This is defined by Schuppert (2015) as a situation where no group or individual is dominated (including instances of structural non-intentional interference) or alienated, in order to protect people against socially caused losses of self-respect (Schuppert, 2015, p. 441). Specifically the tension between integration versus voluntary ethnocultural clustering is very relevant in this regard, for it is in essence a debate on what viable inclusivity entails. I chose to focus the debate on social inequality, because other related issues – social disadvantages, representation, domination– are all symptoms of the two aspects of inequality, alienation and dominance. This results in the exclusion of groups from society. Because of inequality, there are for example social disadvantages. Social disadvantages are not necessarily causing inequality from the beginning, but they are a result of it and can potentially worsen inequality. Yet in a democratic society, some archaic mindset has to be present already before policies causing social disadvantages will be implemented in the first place.

Legitimation of theorists

My thesis will make use of arguments made by four theorists: Young, Merry, Anderson and Trappenburg. Young and Merry have both been very prominent in this debate, in particular as proponents of voluntary clustering. Young has been the first author to plead in favor of *residential* clustering of ethnocultural groups. She analyzes how oppression (which is a result from social inequality) works and why she strongly believes voluntary ethnocultural clustering is the best solution for this. Merry has specified this to arguments in favor of voluntary clustering in the sphere of education (in the sense of concentration schools, which he argues makes sure people from minority groups will not be disadvantaged by structural inequality). He also responds directly to the social equality argument on the side of integration. I will examine the arguments of the pro-integration side based on the theories of Anderson and Trappenburg. Anderson has been very prominent in this debate as well, focusing on how ethnic inequality doesn't originate from something people of color do, but from how it is perceived by people from other ethnocultural backgrounds. She believes intergroup relations have to be restructured for the purpose of social equality (Anderson, 2010).

Moreover, Trappenburg argues about the role of integration regarding equality in education. This directly contradicts how Merry argues that voluntary clustering is necessary in order to create equality in education. It is also noteworthy that Trappenburg focuses specifically on integration in Europe/the Netherlands, whereas Anderson argues in favor of integration in the United States. Furthermore, both Anderson and Young discuss the impact of integration on group dynamics, but they arrive at different conclusions. Lastly, Merry replies directly to Anderson and Trappenburg replies directly to Young. This is why I will make use of the arguments those four theorists have laid out.

Relevance

Scientific relevance

The main argument of proponents of voluntary ethnocultural clustering is that marginalized groups essentially need spaces for self-expression and places where they aren't constantly treated as the minority. Yet proponents of integration argue that integration lessens the necessity of such places, as they argue integration is crucial in combating social disadvantage. Communication can at least contribute to resolving prejudice, which is at the basis of social inequality. Even though theorists like Anderson and Trappenburg hint at this, the contact hypothesis by George Allport (1954) hasn't been explicitly related to the debate so far. This theory means that contact can improve intergroup relations, but only under certain pretexts (Allport, 1954). Yet by arguing in favor of integration, it is crucial to have a strong response to the most prevalent point theorists like Young and Merry make. Those arguing in favor of voluntary separation usually emphasize the importance of safe havens for people from minority groups. But if integration (under certain pretexts) would make society safer in general (in other words, less unequal), those safe havens might become less necessary. For in a more equal society, people don't have to fear verbal, mental and physical violence towards them because of the color of their skin or ethnicity. Therefore, the contact hypothesis should play a bigger role in the debate.

Societal relevance

Over the past years, inclusivity and diversity have become an important purpose of many policies, as they can potentially improve social equality. After all, how can a society be equal when certain groups are unable to take part in it or feel unrepresented because of a morally

irrelevant trait like sexuality, gender or ethnicity? Inclusivity is not easily definable, but often associated with general well-being and a holistic approach, which requires council members to address all aspects of the identity of the citizens (Berlach & Chambers, 2011). Because insights on what inclusivity looks like have changed over time, it is important to update this regularly.

I don't just mean what inclusivity looks like in practice, but also in theory. Because a debate impacts more than just theory: it could potentially have a lot of impact on concrete policies. The societal relevance of this topic relates to the increasingly diverse populations. This offers a lot of opportunities to learn from each other. However, it also poses the challenge of (in)equality. For example, since the covid-19 crisis, people with an Asiatic phenotype reported receiving an increasing amount of hatred and discrimination (NOS, #STOPASIANHATE demo in Amsterdam, 10 – 04 – 2021). Another example of multi-ethnic tensions are the Black Lives Matter protests. Police brutality ended the life of George Floyd and caused a lot of protests across the world (NOS, Dit is het verhaal achter de Black Lives Matter beweging, 06-06-2020). This made some people fear that equality means that they have to give up their privilege. These tensions need to be resolved, as minority groups otherwise run the risk of being unjustly stigmatized and dehumanized for the color of their skin.

Structure of the thesis

In the introduction, I have given an overview of the debate on voluntary ethnocultural clustering. In chapter two, I will go deeper into relevant theoretical perspectives and contributors who argue in favor of voluntary ethnocultural clustering, specifically Young (1999, 2000, 2008) and Merry (2012, 2013). The third chapter will focus on the arguments of the pro-integration side. I will illustrate those based on the theories of Anderson and Trappenburg.

After that, I will explain which arguments I consider the strongest in chapter four. Lastly, I will conclude with a short overview of the thesis and explain once more my answer to the main question, which is: To what extent should people from the same affinity group that want to live close to each other and form an urban community be allowed to do so? Moreover, I will formulate some policy recommendations.

Chapter 2: Voluntary ethnocultural clustering

In the previous chapter, I have already briefly described why Merry and Young argue in favor of ethnocultural clustering. This chapter will provide a deeper outline of their theories. However, I will begin with some practical examples of ethnocultural clustering. It is important to illustrate both the upsides and downsides of a theory regarding its contribution to social equality, by showing what it means in practice. I strongly believe that theory should be backed up by practical examples, because theory should be used to improve reality in order to be meaningful. Then I will continue analyzing the arguments of Young in favor of voluntary ethnocultural clustering. After that, I will examine the arguments of Merry, who argues in favor of voluntary ethnocultural clustering specifically in the realm of education. Lastly, I will explain how Merry relates social equality to civic virtues.

Practical examples

A practical example of voluntary clustering in schools can be found in a group of Islamic primary schools that are already in Zeist, Zwolle, Ede and Hoorn, as described in De Gelderlander (Colette Bekkers en Jaap Rademaker, *Islamitische basisschool komt er nu niet in Veenendaal, maar “het is een kwestie van tijd”*, 14 – 10 – 2021). Another Islamic secondary school might potentially be founded in Utrecht in the near future, reports RTV Utrecht (Redactie, *Eerste Islamitische middelbare school in Utrecht stap dichterbij*, 30 – 10 - 2021). This could lead to those children sharing and implementing similar cultural habits within their educational environment. Habits they might not be able to express in mixed schools. Being able to express one’s culture by honoring particular cultural habits, could potentially lead to an increase of one’s self-respect (Merry, 2012, 2013). After all, culture becomes a part of one’s identity. It is easier for individuals to respect themselves if their culture is respected – or at the very least not disrespected – by others.

Globally, another example of clustering can be seen in a neighborhood in the North of Milwaukee, writes NOS (Wouter Zwart, *53206 De treurigste postcode van Amerika*, 24 – 09 - 2016). However, this is a less successful example of clustering – albeit presumably involuntary clustering - than the previously mentioned Islamic schools. The people that live in

this neighborhood of Milwaukee, are often black and poor - without realistic chances of improvement. Police brutality frequently takes place and a really large part of the male residents are imprisoned at some point in their life, due to the rough circumstances they grew up in.

The neighborhood in Milwaukee also provides a concrete example of another potential downside of ethnocultural clustering. Because the majority of the state of Wisconsin is white, the other local governments in the state of Milwaukee (that don't belong to the black neighborhood I referred to earlier) are mainly driven by white interests. More than once, policies that were supposed to help the black neighborhoods in Milwaukee, therefore did not receive a majority at the state level and couldn't be implemented. For example, plans to build a railway towards the capitol Madison, which would have increased job access for people in the neighborhood, were never executed.

This is interesting, because decreasing opportunities for marginalized groups is precisely what Young (2000) claims would happen in an integrated society and not in the clustered area in Milwaukee. Even though this might be an example of involuntary clustering, clustering in any form always comes with the risk of a lack of solidarity outside of the community. At least in this particular neighborhood, the position of marginalized groups didn't improve when they had their own local government. On the contrary: it worsened their circumstances. Even if black neighborhoods would be represented sufficiently in their own local government, they probably still have to answer to higher forms of government where white people might be in power. Because the painful reality is that governmental positions are still mainly filled by people from majority groups, who aren't always concerned with the interests of minority groups. Proponents of voluntary ethnocultural clustering would have to defend why the feeling of belonging, shared identity and community is more important than the fact that clustered neighborhoods often have a huge shortage of public and private investments. Those investments are crucial when aiming for social equality, as financial equality is a part of this. Without financial equality, there's no equal access to the housing market, labor market and education market. Even if this is presumably involuntary clustering, issues of being able to push through legislation on higher levels of government, are not unlikely to remain under voluntary clustering.

Young

Young (1999) makes a distinction between segregation and clustering. Clustering to her means allowing groups to voluntarily group together based on a shared identity and giving them the means to compensate for potential unbeneficial consequences. Segregation is when the freedom of certain groups is limited (for example the freedom to choose where to live), whereas other groups do have this freedom based on a fixed characteristic – their ethnocultural background (Young, 1999, p. 240). They are forced to live amongst people with a similar ethnocultural background under worse circumstances than the majority group lives under. The aspect of force implies that segregation is per definition involuntary. Though she argues in favor of clustering, she considers the coercion that goes with segregation problematic for three reasons. First, segregation reinforces unjust disadvantages and privileges. Second, segregation violates a principle of equal opportunity and therefore restricts housing choice, which is morally wrong. Third, the very processes that produce segregation make it difficult to repair these wrongdoings, for at least two reasons. The first reason is that processes of segregation conceals the privilege from those who have it. The second reason is that social and spatial differentiation produced by this privilege hinders political communication among the segregated groups (Young, 1999, p. 240).

Even though she argues against segregation, she doesn't argue in favor of all desegregation policies. She describes and distinguishes two forms of desegregation: integration and together-in-difference or differentiated solidarity (Young, 1999, p. 243). According to Young, "integration envisions an ideal situation in which there is no noticeable group differentiation, spatially, educationally, occupationally, and so on (Young, 1999, p. 243)". She defines together-in-difference or clustering as residential clustering as clustering that "comes about through processes where people seek to live among those with whom they feel affinity rather than by exclusion (Young, 1999, p. 245)" or as "clustering in any form where the actors make a conscious choice to group together based on affinities and could have decided to act otherwise (Young, 1990, p. 149)".

She argues against the first policy (integration), first of all because she believes it would enhance inequality. Structures in society that are disadvantageous to marginalized groups are deeply embedded. This means that it is not realistic to expect social equality to occur anytime soon, according to Young.

Secondly, another issue of integration Young mentions, is that the marginalized groups would have to move out of their neighborhood. She believes that people of marginalized ethnocultural backgrounds often want to live amongst each other. Integration limits their freedom to do so, because then they would be required to live amongst people of the majority group. Moreover, if marginalized groups would have to adjust in the sense of them being forced to move amongst privileged people, the consequence is that way less adjustment would have to take place amongst people from privileged groups.

The third problem with the ideal of integration usually implicit in discussions of ethnicity and residence, therefore, is that it is likely to fail. When it does indeed fail, the segregated group seems to be at fault and gets blamed (Young, 1999, p. 244).

She does advocate for the second type of desegregation policy (Together-in-difference or clustering), for three reasons: it increases self-esteem, it leads to an openness to others and it reduces structural inequality. I will explain these arguments further in the following paragraphs.

Self-esteem

First of all, Young argues in favor of voluntary ethnocultural clustering because she believes self-organization increases self-esteem. When people live together in affinity groups and one member feels miserable, this likely affects the rest – because the members are closely connected. Affinity groups – again, defined by Young as people who positively identify with each other based on a shared national and/or cultural characteristic – feel more self-assured amongst likeminded people with a similar ethnocultural background (Young, 1990, p. 204). The other affected members will be more motivated to improve societal conditions when people from their group feel miserable, because of mutual affinities (Young, 1999, p. 246).

Openness to others

Second of all, together-in-difference or voluntary clustering could lead to an openness to assimilated others. The behavior, habits and language of minority groups will not only be ‘tolerated’, but actually recognized. Tolerance is an attitude of mutual non-interference. Its respect for liberty and pursuit of happiness is consistent with indifference. But the recognition of other groups is based on connecting with them while keeping a respectful distance. This

political relationship acknowledges the importance of group based organization, yet also expresses openness to listening to the others and learning about their perspectives (Young, 1999, p. 246).

Limiting structural inequality

Thirdly, another reason why Young (1990) argues that voluntary ethnocultural clustering is beneficial for minority groups, is that it emphasizes the recognition of social groups through clustering. This is a crucial step to achieve equality for those groups and tackle structural inequality. Only acknowledging inequality that exists between individuals, is not sufficient to combat structural inequality, as structural inequality affects groups and not only individuals. Various civil rights movements have mentioned that oppression is no longer a matter of a government oppressing a specific people, as has previously been the case. In a democratic society, as in the United States and Europe, injustices happen even when society is mostly well-intentioned. These injustices are able to continue when assumptions about individuals and/or groups are left unquestioned. Structural injustices are therefore harms that everyone in society takes part in to varying degrees. Even in an “enlightened” society, everybody contributes to the system that maintains structural inequality (Young, 1990).

Real justice is more than people having (or appearing to have) equal access to goods and services. True justice ensures that societal institutions help people with developing their full potential, by empowering the collective and community action. It is crucial to change the dynamics between different social groups as well. Many political philosophers have looked at social groups as simple associations or associates. Young argues that this doesn’t capture the true nature of social groups, in the sense that individuals will have similar histories, because of how they are commonly treated due to a shared trait. This in turn might lead to similar reactions to stimuli from the world. Social groups can become the core of one’s identity and lead to a desire to cluster together with those one shares an identity with (Young, 1990).

Moreover, Young (2000) explains that because the social rules, laws, and institutional routines constrain certain people as a group, evaluations of inequality and injustice must recognize the importance of social groups as elemental of a complete theory of justice. Another reason for this is that awareness of injustice almost universally compares classes of people rather than individuals directly. She argues in favor of a politics of difference, in which

equal treatment of individuals is not more important than the reparation of group-based oppression (Young, 2000).

To portray how oppression manifests itself, Young introduces what she calls “the five faces of oppression”. She describes a set of categories and distinctions to characterize oppression. Larger or more dominant social groups can control minority groups through one of five major ways: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural domination, or violence. Nearly every group that has been identified as oppressed can relate to these five aspects of oppression (Young, 1990, p. 42).

In relation to this, Young (2008) theorizes that certain groups are oppressed due to structural inequality. Those (institutionalized) racist structures are incredibly harmful, because they affect many everyday interactions in civil society and workplaces (Young, 2008, p. 91). This entails that the social position of certain groups means that the cooperation of diverse institutions and practices limit the possibilities of those groups to achieve wellbeing. Young puts this as follows: “Persons suffer specifically culture-based injustice when they are not free to express themselves as they wish, associate with others with whom they share forms of expression and practices, or to socialize their children in the cultural ways they value, or when their group situation is such that they bear significant economic or political cost in trying to pursue a distinctive way of life” (Young, 2008, p. 82). This means that for marginalized groups, integration might eventually not be beneficial, according to Young.

Those promoting a politics of difference, like Young, doubt that a society without group differences is possible or desirable. They believe that blindness to differences disadvantages groups whose experience, socialized capacities and culture differ from privileged groups (Young, 1990, p. 162). In a society of universal humanity, the experience of privileged groups will then appear neutral and universal. As a consequence, the experiences of the underprivileged would be labeled as incorrect - or worse. Therefore, Young (1990) not only believes diverse interactions to be unhelpful, but she argues they can even be harmful for marginalized groups in particular. She argues that a positive sense of group difference is implicit in emancipatory movements. She refers to this as democratic cultural pluralism.

She explains how this works in the following words:

“When there is an ideal of general human standards according to which everyone should be evaluated equally, then Puerto Ricans or Chinese Americans are ashamed of their accents of their parents, children of color despise the female dominated kith and kin networks of their

neighborhoods and feminists seek to root out their tendency to cry or to feel compassion for a frustrated stranger. The aspiration to assimilate helps produce the self-loathing and double consciousness characteristic of oppression. The goal of assimilation holds up to people a demand that they “fit”, be like the mainstream, in behavior, values, and goals” (Young, 1990, p. 165).

In the example of feminists and emotions, the point Young wants to get across is that there’s a movement within feminism that encourages women to adjust to the patriarchy. The patriarchy determines the dominant masculine (rational) norm, as opposed to the feminine (emotional) norm. Therefore women who behave in a masculine way are more accepted in higher positions by society. Similarly, people from a marginalized ethnocultural group likely don’t set the norms. This means that they will be socially forced to adjust to the norms of the majority. Young believes that all groups should be allowed to have their own norms – within limits of not violating human rights of course (Young, 1990).

Against assimilation

Because assimilationists strive for universal and neutral experiences as well, Young also argues against assimilation. Those who argue in favor of assimilation, desire to form one single new culture. The assimilationist ideal also assumes that there is a humanity in general, an unsituated groupneutral human capacity for self-making that could make individuals bloom, thus ensuring the uniqueness of every individual. However, because an unsituated groupneutral point of view doesn’t exist in reality, the situation and experience of dominant groups tend to define the norms of such a humanity in general. Against such an allegedly neutral humanist ideal, only the oppressed groups come to be identified as ‘those who are not meeting the norm’. The underprivileged are framed and viewed as the Others (Young, 1990, p. 165).

In conclusion, the ideal of together-in-difference attempts to balance two political interests and obligations that are often contradicting one another. On the one hand, interdependent citizens live in more closely organized and concentrated communities of interest and affiliation. On the other hand, a precondition for together-in-difference is coordinated cooperation over a broad context of interdependence via overarching institutions. This is a form of citizenship (Young, 1999, p. 245). Together-in-difference aims to provide cooperation over a broader range, yet also stimulates people to cooperate on smaller levels. This in turn could lead to more social equality, according to Young.

Merry

Clustering/separation can take place in many aspects of daily life. One of these aspects – the aspect that Merry focuses on - is education. I will briefly recapitulate the theory of Merry (2013), before going into his responses on arguments from the side of the pro-integration camp. Merry believes that even if segregation is often associated with injustice, it does not per definition mean that integration is the appropriate solution. He is not opposed to integration, but he does view voluntary clustering as a better alternative in a reality where marginalized groups are always disadvantaged. Therefore, he pleads in favor of voluntary separation (Merry, 2013).

Separation, according to Merry (2013), entails the involvement of choice. Merry acknowledges that structural (discriminatory) forces might be involved in the choice to separate. It merely “describes efforts to resist, reclaim, and rearrange the terms of one’s segregation when those terms are counterproductive to equality and citizenship” (Merry, 2013, p. 4). In other words, the purpose of voluntary separation or voluntary ethnocultural clustering is to make society more just by enhancing the conditions necessary for equality and citizenship. The practical forms voluntary separation/clustering might take, will depend on the groups, their circumstances, the experiences or ideals that guide their separation and the resources they receive. Merry argues that the most effective response to involuntary segregation is not to integrate, but to change the conditions that cause segregated experiences (Merry, 2013, p.4). Voluntary separation should be a way of pursuing equality and common citizenship, for example through deliberation. Merry argues first of all that voluntary separation is defensible when equality— which he believes consists of equal recognition, status and treatment— can’t be accomplished by integration or involuntary segregation.

Self- respect constitutes a fundamental value and an important basis for equality. Under conditions of inequality-producing separation, Merry argues, voluntary separation may be more likely to provide the resources necessary for self- respect for members of marginalized groups. Voluntary separation may more successfully supply the bases for equality by cultivating self- respect, but that separation must be accompanied by other relevant conditions that must be satisfied if equality is to be achieved (Merry, 2013, p. 67).

This determining of conditions are in line with Merry’s conception of citizenship. He argues that civic virtue entails promoting the good of the community. He defines civic virtues as virtues that “... are rooted in the character of an individual and have a positive impact on

society; they do not merely indicate social cooperation for self-interest” (Merry, 2013, p. 73). Yet civic virtue does not depend on integration and it is more than merely a political value. While separation and disadvantage often coexist, many forms of separation actually facilitate the existence of civic virtue. In other words, civic virtue can probably be more effectively developed because of spatial concentrations. So as long as the conditions of separation facilitate the development of civic virtue, integration is not the solution. Therefore voluntary forms of separation should be consistent with civic virtue. Even though civic virtue typically begins with the local, this doesn’t mean it becomes impossible to look further than the local surroundings. Especially regarding a sense of belonging or moral concerns (Merry, 2013, p. 68).

Civic virtues

Merry (2013) even believes that under conditions of voluntary clustering, people often are freer to discuss, deliberate, imagine, and pursue what civic virtue means when there are possibilities for cooperation and participation (Merry, 2013, p. 82). This participation is reflected in deliberation and discussion. This seems particularly crucial in a heterogeneous environment, because in an increasingly pluralist society, many beliefs and practices are not shared. Merry argues that this is problematic for developing civic virtue, because there is no shared basis of citizenship without a consensus within the community.

Merry’s (2013) account of citizenship allows for differences between ideologies and opinions of citizens, as long as they meet their basic civic responsibilities and obligations. It doesn’t believe that some form of shared communal practices are necessary to live together harmoniously (Merry, 2013, p. 73). It focuses not only on which conditions should be met in order for differences between ethnocultural groups to co-exist relatively harmoniously, but also on the process of how to determine which conditions should be met in the first place. For voluntary separation, this condition is that all different ethnocultural groups reserve the right to their own space.

A crucial precondition for individuals to develop civic virtue, according to Merry (2013), is forming attachments to others with whom they interact on a daily basis. This attachment can be formed in realms like history, language, and a broader cultural context. However, these strong attachments to one’s community of choice or inheritance should not limit people in fulfilling the obligations of a shared political membership. In other words: if attachments to

the community of choice are not in line with the identity of the shared political membership, an issue could possibly arise. It is therefore a matter of sorting priorities. But certain attachments can be more dominant than others in certain areas. Moreover, people have often been discriminated against and are excluded for some of their attachments (for example: linguistic attachments don't help people in the Netherlands when the language one is attached to is Arabic). So voluntary clustering certainly will appeal to those who don't receive equal treatment in mixed environments, because of common prejudice and discrimination. When basic access to equal opportunities is denied, or when people only gain access after being forced to assimilate, minority groups have the right to back out of integration on terms set by others, so that they can focus on strengthening their own networks and institutions. This is the concept of voluntary separation that is central in the theory of Merry (Merry, 2013, p. 74).

But context is a crucial factor as well. Voluntary clustering is a response to very particular social and political conditions—ones in which members of stigmatized minority groups are “positioned by social structures that constrain and enable individual lives beyond their individual control” (Merry, 2013, p. 87). Merry (2013) also explains that civic virtues are not only about the way in which people interact; they also describe certain characteristics of an individual. The purpose of the virtues is to have a positive impact on society through social cooperation. The maintenance of parks, schools, community centers and libraries are examples of this. Literacy campaigns, job services, and drug rehabilitation centers produce similarly positive outcomes regarding the development of civic virtues.

It then becomes important to note that initiatives for one community can also be beneficial to other communities. The benefits of a neighborhood watch program that shares the responsibility for safety within a community, might be applicable to adjoining neighborhoods as well. The relevant virtues can then also be implemented by others that can benefit from this. In a similar way, the local and communal may significantly overlap with the national or global. How “civic” the relevant virtues are will partially depend on their efficacy and reach (Merry, 2013).

Even though Merry (2013) argues in favor of voluntary clustering because of the increase in educational opportunities and the development of civic virtues, these are not the only benefits of voluntary clustering he mentions. He also believes it will also enhance both the self-respect of marginalized groups (this has been mentioned earlier in the introduction as well) and the opportunities to develop civic virtue. Civic virtue is at least partly tied to self-respect. First of all, because poverty, hunger and poor health contribute to feelings of failure (and thus less

self-respect), as this works against academic achievement. When people associate academic achievement with success (which is quite often the case), this can be problematic. A primary purpose of social equality is to prevent domination and (feelings of) alienation in order to maintain self-respect (Schuppert, 2015). Correspondingly, this limits the possibility of equality and the cultivation of civic virtue. Second of all, even though material advantages received by those born into privileged circumstances may give more access to power, more power does not automatically lead to more self-respect or more civic virtue. Because people that are privileged often feel a certain sense of entitlement, which is certainly not beneficial for the development of civic virtue. Conversely, being raised in non-optimal circumstances, may be more favorable to the cultivation of virtue. Other important conditions, such as acceptable levels of safety and nourishment, would have to be met. Moreover, other vital resources, such as emotional support and employment opportunities, should also be present (Merry, 2013, p. 89 – 90).

Responses to proponents of integration

In order to participate in a debate, it is important to be able to respond to arguments of the other side. Merry (2012) analyses the two most prevalent arguments in favor of integration. The first argument is that integration can increase social harmony. The second argument is about integration leading to social equality.

Social harmony

The first argument is based on the concept of social harmony. This argument entails that persons cannot come to understand and respect others whose beliefs, cultural differences or other personal traits are manifesting itself differently if there is an absence of interaction in the first place. Integration is seen as a resource because it offers persons of different backgrounds possibilities to interact with others and learn from each other. The purpose is to decrease the stigma on certain groups that lead to inequality through discrimination.

Merry (2012) responds by saying that this noble ideal is unlikely to become a reality. The right to choose a school parents feel is appropriate for their own child, makes segregation seemingly inevitable. Because if given the choice, parents will often send their children to schools amongst those with a similar ethnocultural background (Merry, 2012, p. 86).

Social equality

The second argument in favor of integration is that integration is supposed to contribute to combating social disadvantage in the labor market, education market and housing market. On the education market, it could offer less advantaged children access to the social capital middle-class families bring to school. This includes better course offerings, more experienced teachers and social networks that can offer more educational equality. This in turn can lead to more equality on the labor market (Merry, 2012, p. 84 - 85). In other words, integration can create similar circumstances and therefore level the playing field for underprivileged and privileged groups. Integration could therefore be the solution for people from marginalized groups who unfortunately currently don't have the same access to the education market and the labor market as people from majority groups. Proponents of integration argue that integration combats social disadvantage by distributing social capital more equally to the groups that are socially excluded (Merry, 2013, p. 25). Merry (2013) explains that this argument is on the one hand about political stability and social harmony. On the other hand, it is also about the terms of equal recognition needed for deliberation. Integration then promises shared values and social cooperation within communities. These supply the basis for a healthier democratic society (Merry, 2013, p. 25).

However, according to Merry (2012), the hypothesis that interactions in school between children of different backgrounds increase tolerance across diverse ethnicities – and therefore lead to more social equality and democratic stability, because different groups feel more represented and show more solidarity towards each other -- cannot be backed up by evidence, at least not yet (Merry, 2012, p. 86). Therefore it is uncertain/unproven whether this argument is correct. Merry doubts indeed whether this is the case. First of all, the conditions as well as the quality of interactions generally determine the significance of that contact. Shaping and facilitating interactions in a way that they would contribute to equality, is quite challenging. Therefore Merry considers it unrealistic.

Secondly, even if those interactions could take place, this doesn't mean that integrated schools would be the only type of educational institutions that are capable of contributing to equality. Clustered schools could contribute to equality as well. Merry argues that equality entails much more than supplying forms of social and cultural capital necessary to have enlightening interactions in a multicultural society (Merry, 2012). Because when self-respect is compromised or even absent, merely providing resources or opportunities is not sufficient. This self-respect is more likely to be developed in clustered schools, because people will quite

likely not disrespect others for their ethnocultural background if they have the same ethnocultural background. When individuals are respected by others, it also becomes easier to respect themselves. Because when someone feels like they have to adjust to fit the norm and belong to the community, this might make it more difficult to have respect for oneself if this person differs from the mainstream (Merry, 2013).

Responses to criticisms on voluntary ethnocultural clustering

Merry (2012) has refuted arguments of the theorists in favor of integration. However, people in favor of integration have also criticized those in favor of ethnocultural clustering. The first argument is that voluntary ethnocultural clustering is based on a sense of superiority. The second argument is about equality of opportunity. The last argument is that proponents of ethnocultural clustering downplay the importance of intercultural/interethnic interactions. Merry responds to those criticisms.

Self-respect

Merry (2012) explains that voluntary separation for stigmatized minorities is not driven by a sense of superiority. The primary motivation of voluntary separation is to protect the identities and improve opportunities of children from a disadvantaged background. Marginalized groups are far more likely to be dehumanized under involuntary separation, because of discrimination or exclusion. Neither of these contributes positively to their self-respect, because disrespected people might at some point feel like they don't deserve respect at all (Merry, 2012, p. 83). Self-respect can be seen as having a positive regard for oneself. The idea of self-respect is connected to the concept of human dignity. Self-respect thus entails the acknowledgement that persons have intrinsic value. One of the best ways to promote this value, is to ensure that individuals are not only entitled to their own conception of the good, but also to be able to successfully pursue what they believe in. Merry then explains the connection to social equality and self-respect:

“Here we see the connection between the intrinsic and instrumental benefits of self-respect, for self-respect is the psychological antecedent to self-reliance, and the more equally distributed the notion of self-respect is, the more possible it is to speak of justice. So self-respect describes a sense of being in charge of one's destiny, i.e., having a reasonable sense of

self-determination with respect to choices and the ability to act meaningfully upon those choices. (Merry, 2012, p. 82 - 83).

Equal opportunities

If voluntary separation occurs on the educational level, proponents of integration will argue that this harms equal opportunities. Merry mentions three objections they often have and responds to them. The first objection concerns inequality of resources. Voluntarily separated schools might be poor in resources like high quality and broad curricula, peer motivation and excellent teachers. Merry acknowledges that quality education comes with intrinsic and instrumental benefits. Yet he believes this is quite a narrow view of resources. For example, better teachers on average prefer to work in schools which have more privileged children, so equality may be denied to children who don't have access to the resources better teachers provide. But working conditions are more important than higher salaries or incentives in attracting better teachers (Merry, 2012, p. 93).

A second objection is that the underprivileged will not always choose optimally among options available to them because of more practical levels of education or crude habits of preference satisfaction. Yet this is not a reason to reject voluntary separation, according to Merry. While voluntary separation is necessary for developing self-respect, it does not mean that separation can allow special group rights that go against the interests of individual children. For voluntary separation does not necessarily mean the abandonment of that state supervision (Merry, 2012, p. 94 - 95).

A final objection is that separate schools might become successful due to other factors than their separation. They might become successful because of for example the presence of a charismatic leader or unusually active parents. This could be true for all kinds of schools, Merry argues. He acknowledges that currently, too little involuntarily segregated schools supply the social bases for self-respect and equality members of minority groups deserve. This results in involuntarily segregated schools often being undesirable places. Yet Merry argues there will always be some gap between principles and how they are implemented in practice. It also is important to remember that it takes time to establish an educational climate in which self-respect can be developed. It is unjustified to hold schools prematurely accountable when they must begin from a position of relative disadvantage. But institutions can still be upheld to certain standards through regulations (Merry, 2012, p. 95).

Downplaying of diverse interactions

Merry (2013) also addresses the concern of proponents of integration that by focusing on equality as self-respect, the importance of interacting with and learning to respect others unlike ourselves is downplayed.

The shared-fate argument – which is in essence similar to his argument regarding the use of voluntary clustering to combat social disadvantage - emphasizes interdependence between people who have not chosen to be involved with each other. It emphasizes the importance of shared practices and institutions among people that live close to each other. Citizenship entails that persons from different backgrounds will act in line with their rights and responsibilities. This also entails working together for a more equitable and better functioning society. Moreover, early and consistent exchanges are crucial to social cohesion in a diverse society. This is the only way in which understanding can be increased. Voluntary separation does not limit this, according to Merry (2013). Voluntary separation even appears to encourage focusing on the needs of one's own group and thereby to develop a form of citizenship necessary for mutual engagement and cooperation. Citizenship as shared fate entails a capacity for a more open mind towards others. It also entails the flexibility to not hold on too tight to whatever's familiar, but to be open to reshaping the practices and institutions of one's environment (Merry, 2013, p. 86).

Therefore, concepts like integration or citizenship can be experienced as a coercive pressure to conform. A rhetoric of liberty, equality and citizenship have in the past sometimes gone hand-in-hand with violence and exclusion. This is ironic, as this is different from what those values aim to achieve. According to Merry, voluntary separation often facilitates meaningful attachments that promote the wellbeing of the community. It can open up possibilities to other forms of social cooperation, even when other harms may be present. In other words, democratic and pluralist societies need individuals who are strongly rooted in local communities. Nevertheless, it remains important for individuals to be able to engage productively with those who are different from them. They should do so in more aspects than just the realm of politics (Merry, 2013, p. 89).

So in the end, the debate about integration and voluntary ethnocultural clustering is also very much related to the way citizenship is viewed. Voluntary ethnocultural clustering or integration might influence the extent to which people can or have to participate. It could also influence the ways in which civic participation occurs. This poses the question: what is the

difference regarding what's expected of citizens between an integrated and a clustered environment?

Conclusion

First, I have discussed the theory of Young. I explained that she makes a distinction between segregation and clustering (or together-in-difference). Though she argues in favor of clustering, she rejects segregation because it violates a principle of equal opportunity and therefore restricts choice. But even though she argues against segregation, she doesn't support all desegregation policies. She describes and distinguishes two forms of desegregation: integration and together-in-difference (Young, 1999, p. 243). She argues against integration, because she believes it requires marginalized people to adjust to the norms of the dominant groups, which means that those dominant groups will not have to make any (fundamental) transformations themselves. She believes this reinforces inequality, as this doesn't require social change.

Then, I explained that Merry also argues against integration and segregation. He proposes an alternative: voluntary separation. The goal of voluntary separation is to increase social equality by reconsidering and reinforcing the conditions necessary for equality and citizenship. Merry argues that the most effective response to involuntary segregation is not to integrate, but to change the conditions that cause segregated experiences by essentially creating safe spaces. Those spaces would be created if people would be allowed to separate voluntarily. This would result in more self-respect amongst marginalized groups.

Chapter 3: Integration

The previous chapter has outlined arguments in favor of voluntary ethnocultural clustering. This chapter will outline the arguments for integration. I will begin with illustrating what integration entails in practice, for the same reasons I started off the previous chapter with illustrating what voluntary ethnocultural clustering means in reality. The chapter will continue with an explanation of the theory of Elizabeth Anderson, whose theory outlines arguments in favor of integration in general. She argues that integration requires frequent and genuine interactions with people from different ethno-cultural backgrounds, in order to establish genuine relationships based on mutual respect. This can improve social equality. Then, I will dive deeper into the arguments of Margo Trappenburg regarding integration, as she focuses on Europe and the Netherlands in particular. She analyses six arguments in favor of integration and determines to what extent they contribute to more social equality.

Practical examples

An example of mixing occurs at the primary school De Fontein in Breda, as described by Omroep Brabant (Tonnie Vossen, 70 Oekraïense kinderen op Bredase basisschool, 18 maart 2022). At this educational institution, children of 43 different ethnicities receive their education together and simultaneously. All of those children have immigrated to a country (in this case, the Netherlands) where they weren't born. Although the countries those children were born in differs (some were born in Syria, others in Afghanistan or Ukraine), the result of them having to flee was similar: all those children had to get familiar with all new customs, learn a new language and form new relationships. Their similar experiences make it easy to empathize with each other, even if their ethnocultural background differs. Therefore the children help and support each other, according to one of the teachers.

But integration of course doesn't have to happen only in classrooms: it can also occur in neighborhoods. For example, in the L-flat in Zeist, many people from different cultures live together and all of them will contribute to a culturally diverse cookbook, writes RTV Utrecht (Redactie, Culturen van bewoners L-flat Zeist komen samen in speciaal kookboek, 16 januari 2022). This could be the kind of initiative that brings cultures together, though it is unlikely to be sufficient to let all cultures participate equally in civic life. Further actions are required to accomplish that.

Of course integration has its inherent challenges. Living amongst individuals with different ethnicities is the everyday reality for many Dutch citizens, as the Dutch cities in particular contain a lot of cultural diversity. However, this unfortunately doesn't mean that interactions always take place effortlessly. This might also be the case because living together closely and passing each other in the street, in public transport, supermarkets or on the stairwell doesn't necessarily mean that actual, meaningful interactions take place. So when they do interact, cultural tensions are likely to appear. It is necessary to start interacting on a deeper level in order to make future interactions go more easily.

Newspaper Trouw illustrates that there are different views on the question to which extent bicultural people should take over aspects of the Dutch culture and to which extent they can keep their own cultural habits (Petra Vissers, *Integreren komt van twee kanten, vinden Nederlanders met een migratieachtergrond*, 30 – 12 – 2019). Should immigrants adjust completely, or should they be allowed to keep at least some of the traditions from the other culture as well? Certain people seem to believe the former, but most immigrants would prefer the latter. Moreover, people with a migration background expect autochthonous people to also play a part in their integration, whereas certain autochthonous people believe the responsibility for integration should be on people with a migration background. This shows that for at least some people, living together in difference is not sufficient. Integration therefore unfortunately doesn't always seem to work in practice, especially when it results in minorities being discriminated against.

Anderson

Anderson (2010) acknowledges that the situation of marginalized groups as a result of integration currently isn't always optimal for them unfortunately. However, she believes that it should be possible to craft principles that are necessary to cope with injustice in society. One of the principles that is often discussed when talking about ethnic equality, is color blindness. This could be conceived of as a policy or an ideal. As an ideal, it is based on the belief of the abolition of ethnic identities. If all individuals would cease to think in ethnic terms and end all race-responsive behaviors, including stigmatizing people of color and ethnocentric opportunity hoarding, it would lead to the integration of individuals that used to be marginalized. This would as a consequence end inequality based on skin color and ethnicity. The color-blind ideal can thus be seen as an example of how an integrated society

might be realized. As a policy, color blindness should result in the legal prohibition of all policies involving explicit classification of skin color, whether they aim at segregation or integration, ethnic equality or ethnic hierarchy.

This is where color blindness differs from integration. The ideal of integration only aims at the abolition of ethnic segregation and its attendant inequalities. It does not plead for the entire abolishment of ethnic identities. Integration allows the use of race-conscious policies to achieve ethnic integration and equality. Moreover, acceptance that some degree of ethnic solidarity and affiliation on the part of the ethnically stigmatized, is necessary. First of all, to encourage integrative policies and secondly, in order to be able to cope with the stresses of integration. Thus, integration should also be distinguished from the decomposition of black institutions or the absence of ethnocultural clustering in neighborhoods (Anderson, 2010, p. 113).

Integration in relation to segregation and assimilation

Integration is the refusal of segregation. It consists of a comprehensive intergroup association based on equality. This requires the full inclusion and participation as equals of members of all skin colors in all social domains, especially in the main institutions of society that define its opportunities for recognition, educational and economic advancement, access to public goods, and political influence (Anderson, 2010, p. 112 – p. 113).

The ideal of integration has often been incorrectly related to assimilation. Assimilation takes a dominant social group as fixed. Moreover, it demands that other groups join it by abandoning their distinct group identities and conforming to what the majority group wants to be its defining norms, practices, and virtues. Consequently, this often amounts to cultural imposition in relation to national minorities. This is not in line with the equality aspect that integration is based on.

Anderson believes that assimilation is not what societies should strive for. Ethnic inequality arises not from specific black cultural practices like celebrating *keti koti*, but from interracial relations. In other words, ethnic inequality doesn't originate from something people of color do, but from how it is perceived by people from other ethnicities. Though assimilation means in essence giving up 'weird practices' and 'doing things the normal way'. This means that minority groups couldn't express their cultural habits, whereas the majority groups can. They

therefore wouldn't have equal rights under assimilation. So assimilation doesn't solve inequality (Anderson, 2010, p. 114).

Unlike the ideal of assimilation, integration does not view disadvantaged communities as the only ones that need to change. Integration aims to transform the habits of dominant groups. It is a tool for breaking down stigmatization, stereotypes, and discrimination. But even more importantly, it aims at constructing a superordinate group identity that captures all different social groups through which its members regard one another as equals, pool the local knowledge they have acquired in more parochial settings to solve shared problems, and hold one another to account. Anderson (2010) defines integration as "the free interaction of citizens from all walks of life in terms of equality and mutual regard in all institutions of civil society, and on voluntary terms in the intimate associations of private life" (Anderson, 2010, p. 95).

Integration, Anderson (2010) furthermore argues, is a process. "Integration takes place in four stages: (1) formal desegregation, (2) spatial integration, (3) formal social integration, and (4) informal social integration" (Anderson, 2010, p. 115). Formal desegregation consists in the abolition of laws and policies that enforce racial separation. Spatial integration consists firstly of equality of facilities and secondly of public spaces by substantial numbers of all ethnicities. A spatially integrated neighborhood may yet be socially segregated, if neighbors of different ethnicities do not interact in neighborly ways. Interactions should consist of for example welcoming others to the neighborhood, the engagement of small talk and doing small favors for one another like doing the groceries for someone who's feeling ill or chronically diseased. Similarly, a school may be spatially - but not socially - integrated if students of different races don't attend classes together, participate in different school clubs, rarely befriend one another, and cluster in halls or dormitories. This could also be referred to as micro-segregation. Social integration requires equal intergroup cooperation. Formal social integration occurs when members of different races cooperate in accordance with institutionally defined social roles. All ethnicities should occupy all roles frequent enough to be able to determine that roles are not ethnically identified. This happens for example when people of different ethnicities cooperate as equal lab partners, or as members of a sports team. Informal social integration involves cooperation, ease, welcome, trust, affiliation and intimacy that go beyond the requirements of organizationally defined roles. It occurs when members of different races form friendly or romantic relationships. At school and work, it happens when members of

different races share conversations at the lunch table or during coffee break, or when children play together during recess. (Anderson, 2010, p. 115 – p. 116).

The ideal of integration requires a restructuring of intergroup relations that are now often based on alienation, anxiety, awkwardness, and hostility. These relations should become more based on functional connections between citizens. Preferably, the relations should even contain some intimacy; people should at least cooperate as equals. Integration has first of all positive effects on the material well-being of people of color, because it can for example give spatial access to goods like employment and services (Anderson, 2010, p. 27 – 28). Secondly, it positively influences people's attitudes and behavior towards people of color. Lastly, it increases the ability of democratic institutions to respond justly to the claims of citizens from all social groups (Anderson, 2010, p. 117).

A relational theory

Furthermore, Anderson (2010) notes that her theory is relational, as contrary to non-relational views. The latter takes “de facto inequalities in goods as objects of direct normative assessment independent of the relations through which they are produced or their effects on social relations” (Anderson, 2010, p. 16). A relation, according to Anderson, is “a mode of conduct... by which one party interacts with (or avoids) the other party... or affect(s) the other party's interests or autonomy” (Anderson, 2010, p. 17). A group relation is a mode of conduct that governs relations between groups. Anderson advocates two ways for how group relations can be evaluated. The first way is contractualist. Contractualist means establishing whether all opinions are equal to the extent that certain inequalities between groups may be reasonably rejected by members of one group, or if this is not the case. The second way is democratic, when individuals in a democratic society are entitled to equal standing. The idea is that democracy relates to equality, which entails that each citizen is taken seriously as a morally accountable subject. Consequently, relations that depart from this, are unjust. The claim to equal standing is more challenging to accomplish than the claim to non-oppression, as equal standing requires active action and non-oppression only requires passively not doing something.

Liberties

However, there are challenges that arise when developing a just society. A just society must not only ensure the equality of its members, but also their liberties like freedom of speech and freedom of association. This requirement is not in line with the demands of equal standing, because then spreading stigmatizing ideas about other groups may fall under exercising one's freedom of speech. A similar problem arises regarding freedom of association: this might lead to and legitimize practicing social closure, for example if a soccer club would only accept people from a similar ethnocultural background. She illustrates guidelines on how to deal with the freedom of association by distinguishing "(a) prejudice and stigma from ethnocentrism, (b) the responsibilities of agents in different social domains, and (c) legal from moral claims of justice" (Anderson, 2010, p. 19).

Individuals might make use of their freedom of speech and association because of ethnocentrism or in-group favoritism. However, even though behavior rooted in ethnocentrism and in-group favoritism does not always inflict an expressive harm or violate principles of distributive justice, it is problematic that ethnocentrism and in-group favoritism do have the potential to create categorical inequality. In-group favoritism occurs when a group that has acquired control over an important good, favors its members in granting access to it. Favoring in-group members is not necessarily based on prejudice toward or stigmatizing representations of marginalized groups. A group might be merely indifferent or even slightly positive toward other groups, but simply favor their own group more. Although this doesn't marginalize the importance of the fact that stigma and prejudice arise from ethnocentric opportunity hoarding and exploitation through at least two pathways.

First, advantaged groups may create stigma and prejudice by stimulating in-group members to segregate from out-groups and to reinforce group boundaries. Second, when ethnocentric conduct generates systematic inequalities, dominant groups will create stigmatizing stories about marginalized and subordinated groups. They do so in order to explain and rationalize why marginalized groups are disadvantaged. This is primarily done by attributing those disadvantages to deficiencies of talent, virtue, or culture intrinsic to the group. Even though the disadvantages are actually a result of structural inequality. Stigma, in turn, often leads to prejudice, since it represents disadvantaged groups as deserving their inferior position and thus as despicable or odd. Behavior grounded in group prejudice or stigma toward gender, ethnic, and similar groups is always unjust, because it assaults the dignity of groups that do not deserve to be humiliated. Moreover, it usually also impairs their access to important goods

like healthcare and education for no morally defensible reason. Those disadvantaged by such conduct have a moral claim that the actors driven by prejudice or stigma should stop limiting their opportunities.

Democratic regimes have a duty to serve all citizens impartially. Ethnocentric conduct by officials can therefore be considered unjust, since it distributes such services in violation of their obligation to be impartial. It may also be demeaning, if it is sufficiently systematic to amount to a public designation of some groups as more entitled to public service than others. The same considerations apply to executors of public accommodations, who have a duty to serve all members of the public. The primary point is that they have to do so impartially. It also applies to employers and people who are selling real estate. They are obligated to do their part to ensure fair economic opportunities to all individuals. But individuals acting out of sympathy for in-group members in the context of personal relations, do not degrade out-groups or act unjustly otherwise. In-group members aren't morally obligated to befriend people from marginalized groups. Yet in-group favoritism can still be morally arguable. In-group favoritism does have the potential to enhance injustice since it may spread its effects beyond the sphere of intimate relations. Therefore it may lead to categorical inequality, prejudice, and stigma (Anderson, 2010, p. 20).

However, these moral claims of justice are different from legal claims. Even though stigmatizing speech and prejudicial rejection of others in the private sphere are unjust, there are convincing considerations of freedom of expression and association that argue against legally prohibiting such conduct. Yet the state should not allow such injustice to spread unrestricted. Public schools have an important function in promoting norms of respectful discourse and undermining prejudice. Because private ethnocentric affiliation contains the potential of injustice, the state should take action to prevent ethnocentric patterns of affiliation from reproducing themselves in institutions of civil society, for example public schools. The state should also implement an active protocol to bring students from different groups together. Ethnocentrism also impedes the development of a common identity as citizens. This common identity is necessary to sustain a vivid democratic culture and generate support for democratic governance. These developments give states further reasons to encourage people to develop more inclusive and therefore less insular identities in the realms they control (Anderson, 2010, p. 21).

Concrete policies

There are three policies that Anderson (2010) encourages alongside integration in order to combat social inequality. First of all, she pleads in favor of racially integrated juries.

Experiments with mock juries show that the quality of their deliberation improves compared to all-white juries. Racially integrated juries consider more facts, make fewer inaccurate statements and are more likely to correct inaccuracies that do still occur. Moreover, they more frequently raise questions about missing evidence that would be needed to make the case convincing on the prosecution side. These are reasons to adopt a general policy to select racially integrated juries (Anderson, 2010, p. 130).

Secondly, effective black political representation is also crucial. This requires the creation of “majority-minority districts,” in which a majority of voters identify with a single minority racial group. This group should receive the power to elect representatives of their choice. This policy has led to an increase in the number of people of color being elected. As a result, black political participation and trust in governmental support both increased. It has also provided the foundation for a black political leadership, which has established an inclusive, cooperative and representative style of politics in the United States. This can contribute to deflecting the negative stereotype of the militant politician of color who practices racially polarizing politics (Anderson, 2010, p. 133).

Third of all, Anderson proposes affirmative action. She defines this as “any policy that aims to increase the participation of a disadvantaged social group in mainstream institutions, either through “outreach” (targeting the group for publicity and invitations to participate) or “preference” (using group membership as criteria for selecting participants).” (Anderson, 2010, p. 135). Affirmative action – if implemented - is often implemented in three domains: employment, education, and government contracting (Anderson, 2010, p. 135). She compares four models in which affirmative action could be implemented: compensatory, diversity, discrimination-blocking, and integrative. Except for the diversity model, all models have the purpose of correcting race-based injustice, according to Anderson. The diversity model is more focused on the color blindness ideal, which Anderson rejects because it doesn’t acknowledge the systemic problems people of color face. Anderson proposes the integrative model. This model offers a complete picture of the reach and weight of affirmative action preferences and of ethnocultural injustice. It doesn’t wait for injustice to happen and compensates afterwards (as the compensatory model does), or merely blocking discriminatory mechanisms that could still have an effect (as the discrimination-blocking model does), but it

aims to remove the core of race-based injustice by practicing integration. Therefore integration is an essential part of undoing segregation and stigmatization (Anderson, 2010, p. 154 – 155).

Trappenburg

Now that arguments in favor of integration in general have been illustrated, I will also focus on arguments promoting integration more specifically in Europe/the Netherlands.

Trappenburg primarily focuses on Europe and the Netherlands in particular, because the United States have a very specific history of slavery that should be taken into account in the debate on integration. She argues why she believes that segregation disadvantages marginalized immigrant groups and why integration offers a solution to this issue.

Segregation leads to less social equality

Bovens and Trappenburg (2006) explain that the anti-discrimination policy of the Netherlands is based on segregation. They explain how this has unfortunately harmed minorities in two ways. First of all, an outstanding aspect of this policy is that it is a somewhat odd combination of conservative and liberal. For example: schools have been allowed to preserve their religious identity. This means that for example religious schools are allowed to reject children from the LGBTIQ+-community and Christian schools are allowed to not accept Muslims as students. Educational institutions therefore legally have the right to exclude certain vulnerable children.

Secondly, segregation harms minorities because corporations have been free to demolish subsidized housing for luxury villas and football clubs have been allowed to charge high admission fees. These measures have led to the exclusion of minorities, because minorities are often in low-paying jobs due to structural injustices. Therefore housing and memberships of football clubs (or other sport clubs or cultural clubs for that matter) can become unaffordable to them.

So Trappenburg argues against segregation, but also argues specifically in favor of integration and not of voluntary clustering as an alternative. She responds to some frequently made arguments by proponents of integration, regarding its effectiveness in combating social equality. She agrees with some of them and rejects others. First I will explain why she

disagrees with the arguments that integration is a burden to be shared and that the national culture should be protected. Then I will explain why she does believe integration is beneficial for enhancing economic growth, cultivating democracy and creating equal opportunities for children.

Sharing the burden of immigration

When the guest workers arrived in the Netherlands in 1960, original residents felt like they had to share all their possessions and their surroundings with strangers. They and/or their children had to compete with the newcomers for (low paying) jobs. If newcomers were to be spread out more demographically, they would be less of a burden, some argued. Needless to say that referring to people as a burden is incredibly offensive and dehumanizing. This will not stimulate newcomers to contribute to society (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 300). Therefore, this argument is by far not sufficient to argue in favor of integration.

Protecting national culture

When newcomers enter society, native citizens sometimes fear that they will be forced to give up certain aspects of their culture. The minority is influenced by the majority, but this process flows both ways. Some people then believe that their culture will lose its identity (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 302). Trappenburg argues that this is a weak argument, for three reasons. First of all, it is not realistic that the majority culture will disappear completely. Secondly, adding aspects to a culture is often seen as an enrichment. Thirdly, many of those aspects are cultural decoration. It is remarkable to use something that is factually speaking not crucial to exist as a human being as a reason to displace immigrants. Cultural aspects that are concerning fundamental human rights should be made obligatory, regardless of ethnic concentration. Because all people should respect human rights (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 303).

Enhancing economic growth

Mixing means newcomers have more incentive to learn the language. If immigrants are surrounded by other people who speak the same native language, this might not incentivize them to learn the language of the country they currently live in. This is important, because

speaking the native language improves their position on the job market and makes it more likely they will pay taxes. Moreover, speaking the language makes them more productive, as they will understand instructions more quickly and need less time translating (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 301). This argument is quite specific for The Netherlands, because African-Americans do speak English, but experience social inequality for different reasons.

For the sake of democracy

Trappenburg argues that people in a democracy should share public space, should be aware of a shared faith and identify with each other. This might lead to people from the majority group becoming aware of how others live and – as a result – aware of their privilege. Moreover, seeing one’s neighbor suffer might be more effective in increasing empathy than the suffering of people on the news. Separation or clustering limits the possibilities for interactions (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 307).

Creating equal opportunities for children

Trappenburg also believes that integration can create more equal opportunities in the realm of education. It is often difficult for marginalized groups to get to jobs that require a theoretical form of education.¹ Black schools often get worse educational results than white schools. This creates unequal opportunities that are morally unjust. The state therefore has an obligation to transfer children of color to white schools in order for them to make use of the opportunities white children receive. As a side effect, people with a multicultural background might be more stimulated to speak the native language (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 309).

In summation, Trappenburg argues that desegregation is good for democracy, a way to enhance economic means and opens a broader range of opportunities for children from marginalized groups. But there are also practical consequences of desegregation, for example that the state is required to transfer children from marginalized ethnocultural backgrounds to white schools. Because integration will not occur naturally, as white people are likely to send their children to white schools and people of color tend to send their children to colored

¹ Personally, I prefer to speak about practical education and theoretical education because of the inherent hierarchy in ‘higher’ and ‘lower’, so this is also the terminology I will use when explaining the argument that Trappenburg makes.

schools. Some might argue that implementing quota limits individual freedom, as this would in certain instances mean that parents wouldn't have a choice in which educational institution their children go to. In particular in the Netherlands, the country of special education, this is noteworthy. Another argument that is sometimes made by people proposing voluntary ethnocultural clustering, is that norms and values of various cultures might not always match. This might create societal tensions instead of the social harmony integration aims at accomplishing. How does Trappenburg respond to those two arguments?

Response to argument on limitation of individual freedom

It is first of all important to explain what the proposed quota would look like. By using quotas, an hierarchical way of organizing is enabled in the sense that ethnic minorities receive priority for a certain amount of workplaces and educational institutions, but are also to a certain extent encouraged to participate in public space. Because the quota's should be used to benefit people from marginalized groups, schools should implement a quota that requires at least the same percentage of people of color to enter than would be expected based on where people live (i.e. if ten percent of a neighborhood consists of people of color, the quota for people of color for schools in that area should be at least ten percent as well). This way, the argument that classrooms are full cannot be used to reject children of color.

Bovens & Trappenburg (2006) summarize that the argument of quota limiting individual freedom for example entails that individuals should have the freedom to choose which schools they send their children to. This shouldn't be the decision of the state, but of individuals, according to those who argue against the quota. The Netherlands in particular is quite liberal, which means it is concerned about the legal and moral right to self-determination. This isn't only in regard to education, but also to for example housing and sport clubs. Proponents of individual freedom in principle also support the right of individuals to form a school or sports club that would want to exclude other individuals from becoming members. This creates a tension: does any individual have the right to join any club, or does any individual have the right to exclude others from clubs, especially for no apparent reason besides personal preferences? Currently, in The Netherlands at least, the second way of thinking has been dominant regarding these sorts of issues (Bovens & Trappenburg, 2006). This way, the current policies, that have led to higher levels of segregation and exclusion, can be traced back to a surplus of individual freedom. Because this means that certain groups that are

disadvantaged, continue to be disadvantaged in the sense of for example experiencing more difficulty getting into certain places or getting a job.

According to Trappenburg (2003), a solution for people of color not getting hired because of their skin color, might be to not allow people to work somewhere if the quota for their group has been met (i.e. if half of the population of a country is Dutch, half of the employees of companies should also be Dutch). Denying people the right to choose where to work and receive education is quite problematic, so it might be more effective to attempt to draw people into mixed environments. This should always be the first course of action (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 317). However, quotas should be used if this doesn't appear to work. So Bovens & Trappenburg (2006) therefore argue that state interference is allowed to limit individual freedom. Even though Trappenburg agrees with not implementing residential quota's (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 317), she and Bovens do argue in favor of implementing quotas for schools and clubs.

Bovens and Trappenburg (2006) do note that quotas in schools and clubs should only be allowed after less drastic measures have failed. Otherwise, they fear that egalitarian concerns regarding lack of solidarity from the majority group and the dangers of social stigmas surrounding quota's, might indeed become valid. After all, people want to feel like they earned a promotion and don't get important positions in companies because a quota has to be met for example. Of course it could very well be the case that people of color wouldn't be promoted because of the quota, but because of their inherent quality. Yet the mere suggestion that people of color would be "favored" (even though they have been disadvantaged in all other instances) because of the color of their skin could unfortunately potentially already lead to intercultural tensions (Bovens & Trappenburg, 2006, p. 22). This is why quota should only be implemented very carefully as a last resort.

Yet even though they should be implemented with caution, there are severe benefits when using quota. First of all, it would enhance the individual freedom of people from marginalized groups. The use of explicit quotas in order to promote mixed schools and mixed clubs has remained taboo (Bovens & Trappenburg, 2003). This has led many schools to believe that they can stimulate more students to attend their schools if they chose to be completely segregated. Even though this goes against the anti-discrimination principle in many constitutions, schools can use different excuses on paper ('we don't have any room left in our classes') to not grant children from minority schools access to their programs, because they fear they would lower the average grades (Seyst.Nu, NDZ & D66 Zeist. 23 maart 2021. Motie

vreemd aan de orde van de dag, Eerlijke Kans Basisonderwijs. Gemeente Zeist). But if marginalized groups are unable to choose which school they would like to send their children to, this severely limits their freedom of choice as well. Moreover, not allowing people to attend a school based on their ethnicity, would be discriminatory (Bovens & Trappenburg, 2006, p. 17).

Secondly, the other option to prevent segregation (which is in essence what the limitation of freedom for marginalized groups comes down to), would be voluntary ethnocultural clustering. But Trappenburg challenges the notion that this clustering would occur voluntarily. Trappenburg (2003) mentions that mixing often occurs because white people move from neighborhoods to live with people from a similar cultural background. There might be some prejudice involved in this decision on the side of those white people.

Trappenburg argues that clustering isn't voluntary when it occurs from prejudice and discriminatory practices, as some coercion is executed to make certain groups leave. In fact, she considers it to be even misleading (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 307). Therefore the current state also limits the opportunity of minority groups to choose where to live. In other words, there is a loss of liberty on both sides of the debate, according to Trappenburg (2003). So the argument that not allowing ethnocultural clustering would take away people's liberty, is not that strong.

In conclusion, Trappenburg (2003) considers quotas in educational institutions to be necessary. Without quota's, schools have an incentive to remain segregated. There's a prevalent idea that people from marginalized groups will get lower grades and they are therefore less likely to be accepted to certain (good) schools. Educational institutions want students who get high grades, because this will increase their status. This limits their opportunities in the labor market later on as well (Bovens & Trappenburg, 2006, p. 17).

Response to potential societal tensions

Another argument that proponents of voluntary clustering sometimes mention, according to Trappenburg (2003), are fundamental differences between cultures in norms and values that make interactions difficult and create societal tensions. Western countries often view themselves as (relatively) liberal, meaning that they believe people should live their lives as freely as they can without hurting others. In many countries in Western Europe, social

equality is relatively well-established through laws. This is not in line with certain countries that have implemented laws enforcing inequality, such as not allowing women to enroll in educational programs or sentencing non-heterosexuals to death penalties. So what happens if people from those countries immigrate to, for example, the Netherlands? The concern of some people is whether the more patriarchal cultures are as concerned with social equality as progressives often are. Yet Trappenburg (2003) still believes it is possible to let people integrate who don't immediately share those values. Legal enforcement and legal control are more effective in ensuring individual freedom than expecting newcomers to share the individualistic values immediately (even though some of course do already share those values initially). Neighbors could provide each other with leaving examples of what liberty entails (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 303 – 304).

Conclusion

I have started this chapter with Anderson (2010), who argues that the ideal of integration only aims at the abolition of ethnic segregation and the inequalities it results in. It does not plead for the entire abolishment of ethnic identities. Integration allows the use of race-conscious policies to achieve ethnic integration and social equality. Moreover, it needs acceptance that some degree of ethnic solidarity and affiliation on the part of the ethnically stigmatized, is necessary. Primarily to encourage integrative policies and secondly, in order to be able to cope with the stresses of integration (Anderson, 2010, p. 113).

Then I explained that Trappenburg (2006) analyses five arguments that are often used to plead in favor of integration. She disagrees with the arguments that integration is a burden to be shared and that the national culture should be protected. She does believe integration is beneficial for enhancing economic growth, cultivating democracy and creating equal opportunities for children (Trappenburg, 2006). All these factors indicate an improvement of social equality. She also emphasizes that in order to establish integration, quotas have to be enforced to move children of color to white schools.

Chapter 4: The importance of integration

As the debate has been mapped out, it is important to make a comparison of the most convincing arguments on both sides of the debate. Therefore, I will dedicate this chapter to elaborate on whether the arguments in favor of integration are better for social equality than the arguments against integration. It is important to take the perspective of marginalized groups into account. Their position is the most crucial aspect of this debate, as they are the most vulnerable group.

Social equality means the absence of domination and alienation (Schuppert, 2015), but also equal opportunities in the labor market, housing market and financial equality. These are all crucial aspects of social equality. First, I will begin with analyzing arguments in favor of integration. I will discuss whether integration does indeed lead to more social harmony and social equality. Then, I will analyze arguments in favor of voluntary clustering. I will reflect on whether voluntary ethnocultural clustering is indeed voluntary, on self-preservation and on social structures. Furthermore, I will elaborate on whether not allowing voluntary ethnocultural clustering would be too much of an infringement on residential freedom and educational freedom.

Arguments in favor of integration

I will argue why social equality improves (or rather, why marginalized groups will be less dominated and alienated) when marginalized people are stimulated to integrate instead of clustering. I will use the arguments that Merry mentions as often made by the pro-integration side: social equality and social harmony. Even though Merry argues against those arguments, I don't think he's correct in doing so. To support this, I will make use of arguments previously made by Trappenburg regarding mixing in education and of the contact hypothesis by Allport (1954).

Social equality

The main argument in favor of integration is that integration leads to more social equality. Contact and honest interactions will create less stereotypes and less polarization, which leads to less alienation – society will become more of a unity and less pitting groups against each

other. It also leads to more equal opportunities, leading to less domination. It will become easier for marginalized groups to come to power if they are not being discriminated against or at least to a lesser extent. Specifically in the educational and the residential sphere, integration can greatly contribute to social equality.

First of all, integration in education can lead to more social equality. Trappenburg (2003) explains that integration is so particularly crucial in schools in order to establish more social equality, that integration should preferably be stimulated and enforced through quota if necessary. Currently, there are unequal opportunities, because black schools often get worse educational results than white schools. The state therefore has an obligation to transfer children of color to white schools to right this moral wrong (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 309). The desire to cluster might disappear if there would be more social equality. I will also elaborate on that when I discuss whether voluntary clustering is actually voluntary.

I believe implementing educational quota is justifiable and perhaps even necessary to work towards social equality. The character of children is still very fluid and it is therefore valuable for them to receive a broad social development through diverse social interactions. This counts for both people of color as well as for white people. Education is an ideal way to accomplish this, as there is a compulsory attendance in schools. It therefore has a great span of influence (Trappenburg, 2003).

Education also has a huge impact on creating more openness towards others and thus less alienation. The notion of developing open mindedness and intercultural citizenship through education is also supported by the reference to the previously mentioned primary school *De Fontein*. At this school, children from 43 different migration backgrounds help each other settle in a foreign country because they know firsthand what the challenges are of having to flee and having to start a new life. If children are taught to be open-minded, kind and empathetic by their teachers, parents and/or anyone else around them, this could really benefit society. Kymlicka (2002) calls this phenomenon the hidden curricula. This broadly refers to the implicit message carried throughout the educational system, for example in formal curricula, textbooks and in pedagogical action. Teachers' can also have different interpretations of the curriculum, based on their own values. Schools could function as a seedbed of a functioning multicultural society if they teach children the meaning of civic virtue throughout the curricula. This could improve civility if the school is diverse enough (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 307 – 308).

Eventually, intercultural education could lead to more openness to others and thus more social equality. It will teach children from a young age that when they come across people from a different ethnocultural background, they (the children) should treat them (the people from a different ethnocultural background) with respect - regardless of their background. Lucas et al. (2014) found that children were more likely than adults to generalize the unusual conjunctive relationship, suggesting that they are less biased by prior assumptions and pay more attention to current evidence. This is because children are aware of the fact that they still have a lot to learn, whereas some adults sometimes tend to overestimate their knowledge (Lucas et al., 2014, p. 297). This makes it likely that children will realize people simply differ, without attaching judgement to the differences, and be able to apply this insight later on in life as well. Even if there are children who – after stimulating integration – would initially still stigmatize/discriminate against others, they can change their perspective more easily than adults, for they are still at the beginning of their personal development.

Second of all, residential integration could also lead to more social equality. More people living together is also likely to lead to a certain necessary form of indifference. This is similar to the state of mind that seems to be characteristic for cities. In an article by Van Leeuwen (2010), he explains that Sennett argues that crowded and disorganized cities provide individuals with the experience that is necessary in order to fully develop personally. Inhabitants of cities learn to cultivate freedom by accepting “painful surprises and disorder (p. 633)”. In practice, this is best reflected by what Van Leeuwen refers to as side-by-side citizenship.

This form of citizenship requires “micro-publics”. This is a concept that could be described as a space of association, with a limited entry for the general public. Dialogue, debate and prosaic negotiations are crucial. Examples of such spaces include the workplace and educational institutions. But also places many young people attend, like clubs, youth centers and neighborhood houses. Such micro-publics within city space could be where side-by-side citizenship can take place, particularly in diverse environments (Van Leeuwen, 2010, p. 637). According to this form of citizenship, the acknowledgement of difference should be present in daily encounters. Especially in order to engage in passionate but civil debate concerning values, stereotypes and habits.

Intercultural citizenship seems to benefit from certain inherent aspects of city life such as indifference, even though this carries a negative connotation. Therefore indifference is another aspect that side-by-side citizenship requires to establish a certain openness to others.

If people differ, expecting homogeneity within a society is more likely to lead to conflicts, especially between the dominant group and ‘strangers’/forms of life that derive from the norm. A certain level of indifference thus seems to allow the possibility of personal freedom and a tolerant multicultural society (Van Leeuwen, 2010, p. 639). Though Van Leeuwen does argue that the contradiction Sennett creates between a sense of community at the local level and a meaningful, wider public sphere, is incorrect. According to Van Leeuwen, the public–private distinction should be understood in terms of a continuum. They don’t exclude each other.

The idea that contact could potentially increase an openness to others, is also supported by findings of rural inhabitants in general being less progressive than city inhabitants. Michalska & Zweglinska (2016) found that inhabitants of what they call Rural Central Europe were crucial for conservative parties to come to power: PiS in Poland and Fidesz in Hungary (Michalska & Zweglinska, 2016, p. 253). Both PiS and Fidesz are described by RTL Nieuws as openly anti-LGBTQ and anti-abortion, policies that are definitely not supported by progressive people who believe diversity is important (RTL Nieuws, EU dreigt met sancties tegen Hongarije na verbod op ‘homopromotie’, 16 – 06 – 2021). The population of Eastern Europe is much more homogenous than in cities and voters for PiS and Fidesz voted against the interests of marginalized groups. People in cities come in contact with a broader diversity of people (populations in cities are often way more heterogeneous than in rural areas) and are more likely to at least not be bothered by what’s different than what they are used to – the civic apathy that has been referred to earlier. This underlines that interactions, or at least being present in each other’s surroundings, are beneficial for social equality.

Though Trappenburg argues against residential quota because she considers it to be too much of an infringement on personal liberty, I would argue in favor of implementing residential quota the same way Trappenburg proposes to implement quota for educational institutions as a last resort. If a population consists of seventy percent white people, white people shouldn’t be allowed to move to a neighborhood if this neighborhood already consists of seventy percent white people. In order to stimulate integration, it is important that people live close to each other in order to be able to work together (most people prefer not to travel for hours to work) and perhaps even spend some of their leisure time together. If residential quotas are necessary to accomplish mixing or integration, more contact and therefore more social equality, this is definitely something that should be supported – albeit with caution.

Social harmony

Secondly, contrary to what Merry argues, integration does lead to more social harmony. More social harmony means less domination and less alienation – thus more social equality.

Societal tensions based on biases and stereotypes will decrease when integration is stimulated. Those stereotypes and biases exist because of misinformation. This misinformation will not be tackled if empirical evidence doesn't point to the contrary. People who only read terrible stories about a certain ethnocultural group in the media, will not have the possibility to have a positive encounter with someone from that group if all groups cluster within societies.

Moreover, stigmatization occurs when certain aspects/ideals/objects/groups are unfamiliar to those not directly related to them. The majority groups will be less understanding towards the minority groups and their customs when those customs are only expressed behind closed doors. The decrease of stigmatization, discrimination, racism, misinformation will give people from a different ethnocultural background a fairer chance on the housing market, labor market and will decrease the number of times they get blackguarded. If safe havens would protect marginalized people from being discriminated against, this problem would also be solved. But the problem is that in practice people will always run into each other, for example in their professional life, their neighborhoods, at events or via social media. The solution is to offer people the opportunity to interact in a sincere and deep way, not only in passing by. For example by organizing intercultural activities based on different cuisines, working with quota to stimulate diversity in the workplace through integrative affirmative actions (as Anderson proposes) and making sure people don't cluster in neighborhoods. An example includes the cookbook in the city of Zeist that has been mentioned in the introduction as well. This will reduce intercultural tensions and thus lead to more social harmony. Social harmony is a result of more social equality – through less polarization and less discriminatory practices for example.

The concept of increasing empathy through understanding, is in line with the contact hypothesis as described by Allport (1954). He argues that intergroup contact facilitates learning about the outgroup. This new knowledge about the outgroup leads to the reduction of prejudice. Moreover, intergroup contact is believed to reduce the fear and hesitation that sometimes occur when interacting with the outgroup, which results in less negative evaluations of the outgroup. Related to that, intergroup contact is expected to improve the ability of the privileged group to take the perspective of the marginalized, making it easier to empathize with the concerns of the marginalized group. Allport also theorizes that prejudice is

a direct result of generalizations and oversimplifications made about an entire ethnocultural group based on incomplete and/or incorrect information. The basic conception is that prejudice may be reduced as one learns more about a group of individuals (Allport, 1954).

Allport (1954) does note that there are four conditions interactions have to meet in order to improve interethnic relations.

First of all, it is important that the status of all groups involved is equal and that both engage equally in the relationship. To establish this, it is beneficial if members of the group should have similar backgrounds, qualities, and characteristics. Differences in academic backgrounds, wealth, skill, or experiences might influence perceptions of prestige and rank in the group. Therefore those differences should be minimized.

Secondly, the groups should have common goals. Both groups must work on a problem/task and share this as a common or superordinate goal. This is a goal that can only be accomplished if the members of a couple/several groups work together by combining their efforts and resources.

Thirdly, intergroup cooperation is crucial. Both groups must work together for their common goals without allowing competition to exist between them. The purpose of the collaboration should be the pursuit of common goals.

The fourth condition is that authorities, law and customs should be supported. Both groups must acknowledge some authority that supports the contact and interactions between the groups. The contact should encourage friendly, helpful, egalitarian attitudes and condemn ingroup-outgroup comparisons (Allport, 1954).

I want to argue that in the light of these conditions regarding fruitful interactions, harmonious integration can't be achieved without adjusting specific policies. First, I would like to mention policies that could be implemented to minimize differences that might affect status. The first option is offering houses in diverse price classes, so that people also meet people from different socio-economic classes. It is however crucial to not attach value or status to socio-economic positions, in other words to not view wealthy people as "better", more successful, harder working and/or more intelligent than less-wealthy people. But even if status would still be attached to socio-economic classes, perhaps to a lesser extent, it is still crucial to have mixed neighborhoods regarding housing prices to minimize the other differences. All neighborhoods should in principle become affordable for everyone, otherwise people will

cluster – something I would like to prevent, because I believe integration is crucial to improve intergroup relations. Meeting people from different socioeconomic classes might lessen some prejudices.

A second measure that is necessary to make integration harmonious, would be enforcing strict anti-discrimination laws, for example taking permits away from clubs who refuse entrance to people of color and making anonymous applications mandatory. My final suggestion would be to make ethnic equality a big part of all educational programs and organizing multicultural events. The same policies could also be used to increase intra group cooperation, as this will improve when there are less differences in status.

Common goals could be created and accomplished by stimulating initiatives in neighborhoods. For example, people could work together in organizing a food-truck festival with different cuisines, organize trips to different religious institutions, organize an intercultural festival and several afternoons where people can teach others a basic understanding of their native language.

Respecting authorities, law and customs could be a side-effect from minimizing differences of status. After all, people aren't really encouraged to respect a law when the law doesn't protect their interests. Moreover, minimizing differences of status might lead to more socioeconomic equality and better educational opportunities. This limits chances of coming in contact with the law.

Arguments against integration

However, one can't possibly plead in favor of integration without responding to the strongest arguments of the proponents of clustering. First of all, I will analyze the argument that voluntary ethnocultural clustering is crucial for self-preservation. Therefore, it is difficult to realize a society in which all people are treated equally and self-preservation is necessary. Secondly, I will analyze the argument that racist structures are often omnipresent in society and permanently prevent social equality from occurring. I will analyze whether integration could be more successful in dealing with the systemic inequality that is unfortunately still present than clustering and discuss the role of the privileged group in this regard. Lastly, I will go into whether marginalized groups are more likely to have to give up certain cultural habits under integration than other groups.

Need for self-preservation

In a society without social equality, people from minority groups sometimes need to self-preserve (especially according to proponents of voluntary ethnocultural clustering). The reason for that, is that many white people don't experience racism and therefore don't validate the experiences of people of color. This validation can be crucial for people of color to share experiences and keep their sanity and not feel alienated (Villalpando, 2003). Merry and Young believe clustering is a crucial form of self-preservation from social inequality for many marginalized groups. One of the purposes of clustering would then be sharing experiences with people who have similar experiences. This might indeed be really valuable, but voluntary clustering is not a solution for this for two reasons.

First of all, sharing can also be done in the private sphere. It is still possible to share stories, opinions, thoughts and feelings without clustering within educational institutions or implementing residential clustering. In an integrated society, there can still be spaces (even in the public sphere as well) to practice specific cultural habits or possibilities to interact with people with a similar cultural background. I will discuss this topic further when I go into if integration means that the minority culture will have to adjust to the majority culture. So eventually, it is justifiable to coerce people to integrate by implementing quota in neighborhoods, workplaces and educational institutions because of the benefits most people from minority groups will yield.

Second of all, something that is necessary, is not a voluntary act anymore. Voluntary contains per definition an aspect of choice. It is necessary for me to keep breathing in order to stay alive, yet nobody would claim that I 'chose' to keep breathing – it is not an option to quit breathing if one wants to stay alive. If people from minority groups are also in danger in our society, they don't have a choice but to self-preserve either. This makes it difficult to qualify such a decision as autonomous. Because of the structural discrimination that is often at the root of voluntary ethnocultural clustering, Trappenburg believes that 'voluntary' is not quite a fitting term. In fact, she considers it to be even misleading (Trappenburg, 2003, p. 307).

Another example: if someone were to hold another person at gunpoint and ask this person whether they want to give up their money or their life, this person has a choice in theory. But many will agree that in practice it is quite obvious what this individual will choose in order to stay alive. Especially (but definitely not exclusively!) in the United States, police brutality is incredibly prevalent towards black people (Chaney & Robertson, 2013). This is also illustrated by the killing of George Floyd that sparked the *Black Lives Matter* movement

(BBC, Minneapolis police 'engaged in pattern of racism', 28-04-2022). This is the quite literal equivalent of being held at gunpoint. If the way groups are treated makes them want to cluster, the way they are treated should change dramatically.

In other words, all individuals should principally be able to live in a society where they would feel so welcome that they wouldn't rather live in poor neighborhoods where the quality of their lives decreases. This could cause people that are already vulnerable to fall into a downwards spiral. Liberty to cluster should only exist when it doesn't harm others (or those people themselves).

Yet denying people who would still voluntarily desire to live in clusters the freedom to do so, does indeed limit their individual freedom to some extent. Policy makers should be able to justify this before implementing. A reason for a desire to cluster could be the previously mentioned safe spaces, but also because individuals want to surround themselves with people with similar backgrounds. This would make it easier to share customs and places. White parents often choose to send their children to a white school and people of color often send their children to a black school. A study by Massey and Denton (1993) indicates that the vast majority of people of color would not want to live in an entirely white neighborhood, but that they do prefer neighborhoods to consist of at least fifty percent people of color (Massey and Denton, 1993, pp. 88-96). This does indicate at least to some extent a desire to be able to cluster amongst affinity groups. Even though it is unclear to what extent this desire would still be present if society would be less racist, it is a signal that should be taken seriously.

Clustering to them would mean that facilities of specific ethnocultural groups (like places of worship or stores that sell products from a specific cuisine) would concentrate. It is likely that people who want to live in an integrated society, are limited in their options to do so. A practical argument: many facilities they need are only in a specific neighborhood in a society that allows voluntary clustering to occur. But it's also an issue that prejudices are more likely to exist if people aren't in contact with each other (Allport, 1995). When integration is supported, racist structures can slowly but surely be broken down and a more equal society should be built in the long term.

Dealing with oppressive structures

Young's theory is based on the idea that voluntary clustering would enhance equality, because social structures make it possible to dominate marginalized groups. Moreover, minority groups will always feel like they are different from the norm around majority groups (in other

words, alienated). Discrimination also originates from prejudice that are still present. Of course it is true that majority groups have more power and also have more means to obtain or keep it. They dominate the media and are indeed seen as the norm.

The presence of racist structures and its consequences – such as white people being seen as the norm and people of color as deviating from that norm - has to be acknowledged before an equal society can occur in order for those structures to change. Obviously, these structures are problematic and not easy to solve. Yet clustering is not the solution, but contact/integration (Allport, 1954). As long as safe havens are necessary or as long as people simply like to spend time amongst people with a similar background, local governments could still facilitate occasional meetings between different cultures, even in clustered neighborhoods. But to gain cultural knowledge, it is crucial to integrate and this should be the primary focus. Cultural knowledge might help deflect biases. Only when they have cultural knowledge, white people will be encouraged to speak out about issues that marginalized groups face. The support of the dominant group is crucial in establishing social equality, because they are more likely to be heard, they are in places of decision making and they are required to give up some of their privilege for the benefit of marginalized groups in order for them to have equal rights in the long term.

This is why representation is crucial. As Anderson (2010) argues, groups should receive the power to elect representatives of their choice. This will result in an increase in the number of people of color being elected. As a result, black political participation and trust in governmental support both increased in the United States. It has also helped fund the opportunity for a black political leadership, which has improved inclusivity, cooperation and representation in the United States. This can contribute to deflecting the negative stereotype of politicians of color practicing racially polarizing politics (Anderson, 2010, p. 133). This is reoccurring in practice: in the Netherlands, the amount of women in many local councils has increased, reports nu.nl (Redactie, Mede dankzij voorkeursstemmen meer vrouwen in nieuwe gemeenteraden, 28 – 03 – 2022) and The New York Times reports that The White House has announced their first openly lesbian press secretary of color (Zolan Kanno-Youngs & Michael D. Shear, Karine Jean-Pierre is named white house press secretary, 5 – 5 - 2022). Moreover, for the first time in history, the vice-president of the United States is a woman of color (Lisa Lerer & Sydney Ember, Kamala Harris makes history as first woman and first woman of color as Vice President, 26 – 8 – 2021).

Educational institutions and labor places also play a crucial part in this regard, as Trappenburg explains. I have discussed this when I argue that integration leads to more social equality as well. Yet the importance of low-key, unplanned, every-day interactions between people from different ethnocultural backgrounds can also be quite effective in getting to know others and deflecting stereotypes. As racism is based on biases and prejudice, this will only be resolved if people are shown that those biases are incorrect through interactions. This is once again supported by the previously mentioned contact hypothesis as described by Allport (1954).

So even though the experiences of marginalized groups indicate that there is still no actual equality (in fact, there is still a lot of racism present), some recent developments can definitely be classified as positive. If complete equality can never be accomplished, the increasing awareness regarding the existence of social inequality could be a first step to reduce tensions between groups significantly enough to marginalize one of the most important arguments in favor of clustering. This awareness has only been created because people from minority groups started to speak out more often and people from privileged groups started to listen better, reflecting in for example the societal discussion around Black Pete, reports EenVandaag (Petra Klapwijk, krappe meerderheid wil liever zwarte piet, maar acceptatie voor de roetveegpiet groeit, 11 – 11 – 2021). These positive developments indicate that some optimism regarding potential social equality in the future is justifiable². Yet it is crucial that the majority group cooperates. This means that privileged people should be aware of their privilege and should use at least some of it to benefit people from marginalized positions.

First of all, Young (1999) herself acknowledges that it is important that privileged people become aware of their privilege by seeing people who are less privileged when arguing against segregation (Young, 1999, p. 240). She doesn't explain why that wouldn't be the case for voluntary clustering, other than that she argues overarching institutions should work together. But this wouldn't affect structural change on the individual level, which might be just as important as the national level – or at least carries some importance as well. Because the individual level also affects the national level. Societal norms could change when individuals from majority groups would speak out against racist jokes or comments, discriminatory practices. They should also speak out in favor of equal opportunities and diversity. When a person of color gets discriminated against, the government should raise

² Of course social equality isn't improving everywhere, but in countries where representation is improving, the position of minorities is often improving as well. Yet representation doesn't just mean one individual from a minority group, but a way broader reflection of society in several governmental layers.

awareness by starting campaigns for example. Moreover, governments should do everything in their power to stop discrimination, by enforcing legal consequences on people that discriminate to make clear that such behavior is intolerable. This could change societal norms. People are likely to conform to norms and are often sensitive to social pressure, for most people like to be validated and accepted by others to at least a certain extent. So if racist comments lead to less validation and acceptance, less people will make them. Asch (1955) even found such a strong tendency to conformity in society that reasonably intelligent and well-meaning young people are willing to call a card black even though it's white, if this is the societal norm and would lead to more acceptance (Asch, 1955, p. 34).

Secondly, it is important for the dominant group to be supportive, because at least a part of the individuals from a marginalized background are understandably tired of having to fight for the right to equal treatment. They have been trying to achieve this for a long time and will not acquire results if people from privileged positions are not willing to give up some of their privileges. Despite the fact that exclusion and tensions amongst different ethnic groups currently exist, mixing is still beneficial in the long term. Clustering will in the short term mean that people from ethnic minorities will encounter less racist people, but in the long term the groups can't avoid each other forever. This will result in more miscommunication and misunderstanding, because people will not know how to interact interculturally. Even if the situation would not improve because of integration, it will become worse when groups are clustering. Emmanuel Levinas (1986) theorizes that the presence of the Other automatically calls out individuals to not kill them literally and figuratively by ignoring, despising and hurting them. An individual can choose to ignore this call, but will at least be coerced to consider the way they treat others: they feel this physically, Levinas argues (Levinas, 1986). Not interacting with individuals from a different ethnocultural background, means this call for humanity that their presence affects, is absent. Though the contact hypothesis and the arguments made by Levinas both have not been sufficiently proven, this could indicate that there's at least some truth in the importance of contact.

Thirdly, actions from the majority group will likely be more effective than actions from the minority group. The painful reality is that people from marginalized groups are often taken less seriously than people from majority groups. Noene Kazarjan describes a recent example of this phenomenon in the Netherlands, which occurred when Joris Luyendijk published the book *De 7 vinkjes*. Luyendijk mentioned 7 aspects in which people can be privileged. Those aspects include gender, education (of oneself and of one's parents), sexuality, physical ability

and ethnicity. The more aspects a person can relate to (the more boxes they tick), the more privileged this person is. This concept has been quite prominent in the media, but the idea is not as groundbreaking as the media considers it to be. Kimberle Crenshaw has written about the concept of intersectionality quite some time ago. Both these theories explain basically the same phenomena. Kimberle Crenshaw (1990) describes intersectionality as the interaction of multiple identities including gender, ethnicity and sexuality. However, not only the identities interact, but the power relations that stem from this and (dis)advantage certain people interact as well. Intersectionality might be more broadly useful as a manner of dealing with the tension between the necessity of group politics and the existence of multiple identities all at once (Crenshaw, 1990). Despite being published way earlier, intersectionality is way less mainstream, because people unfortunately sometimes find arguments made by white men more convincing than those made by women of color, according to an opinion article on BNNVARA (Noene Kazarjan, Hoe meer je lijkt op Joris Luyendijk, hoe groter de kans op een plek in de macht?!, 16 – 02 – 2022). Though it can definitely be considered positive that Luyendijk has made people more aware of this concept that is crucial for understanding social inequality, as his book got a lot of attention and support – even if he doesn't call it intersectionality. So putting the burden of integration primarily on marginalized groups – as Trappenburg proposes – is way less effective than at least including majority groups in the process as well.

Lastly, it is morally also incredibly problematic to force marginalized groups to adjust because certain people from majority groups are discriminating against them. Marginalized people should be able to exist where they want and don't have to feel different or as 'the other'. Even though Young (1990) uses this as an argument to plead for clustering, they will likely also be seen as the other if they are consciously or unconsciously coerced to live in areas with people from the same ethnocultural background by making them feel unwelcome in the rest of society. In many cities with multicultural neighborhoods, those neighborhoods are seen as the area where people with a migration background live. The fact that people often put emphasis on if a neighborhood is multicultural, strengthens my point: it is seen as deviating from the norm. This leads to these areas often receiving the lowest amount of attention and thus means from government officials, because marginalized groups are barely (if at all) represented.

A part of the support from majority groups should also consist of the acknowledgement of several group-identities in society. In a multicultural society, peoples identities can consist of multiple aspects. Young and Anderson both argue that this is crucial for social equality. If there would be more contact, the majority group would be more likely to grant rights to other groups. The majority group will be more aware of the issues minorities face. The majority group will also have a better view of what minorities need to achieve social equality and to express their cultural habits. This is crucial, because – once again – people from majority groups are still often in power.

Of course this doesn't mean that minority groups are not allowed to fight for their rights or are unable to stand up for themselves. On the contrary, they have historically achieved quite some results regarding equal rights through voting and protesting. I have simply tried to illustrate why the participation of white people is also crucial in establishing a truly equal society.

Integration doesn't mean minorities will have to give up their cultural habits

Young argues that under integration, people from marginalized groups will be forced to adjust to the norms of the majority and therefore feel alienated. This would not be beneficial for social equality, as all groups should share in the positive outcomes of integration equally in a society with social equality. To some extent, she definitely has a point here: norms of the majority are indeed quite dominant.

But whether this could be changed, really depends on how integration is implemented in practice. Integration does not have to mean that people are not allowed to cluster at all, i.e. there can still be buildings of worship or restaurants with particular cuisines. Integration also doesn't mean that cultural particularities can't exist anymore, it simply means that they should exist next to each other throughout the entirety of society and not clustered in parts of it. The metaphor of the salad bowl is quite fitting in this context. As an example: a Syrian restaurant shouldn't exist in a Syrian suburb, but next to a German restaurant in a neighborhood where Syrian people talk to their German neighbors. So there will still be places free from the dominant norms. Anderson (2010) even argues that the purpose of integration is to transform the habits of dominant groups in order to ensure a harmonious environment (Anderson, 2010,

p. 95). Requiring minorities to give up their culture would be assimilation, which Anderson as well as Young rightfully and explicitly argue against.

Integration should occur in most areas of people's lives (primarily in their living situation, education and professional sphere), but not necessarily in their leisure time. This way, I hope to limit individual freedom as little as possible. In other words, I plead for what Anderson (2010) would call formal integration. Of course the purpose of integration should still be to stimulate people spending their leisure time with a mixed group of individuals as well, but it would be too much infringement on the free choice of people to force them to do so. Moreover, affinity groups might indeed want to spend some of their time together to share cultural practices. This is completely harmless and should therefore be allowed – perhaps even facilitated.

Conclusion

I have argued why I believe that the benefits of integration (a more harmonious society and more social equality as a result) are contributing more to social equality than the benefits of voluntary ethnocultural clustering. These benefits of voluntary ethnocultural clustering include more familiarity, which might lead to more feelings of safety in the sense of not being judged or even treated with violence in any form. The primary argument on the side of voluntary clustering is that marginalized groups need safe spaces, where they aren't harmed by the racist structures in society. Yet the contact hypothesis theorizes how integration can lead to more contact and how more contact can lead to better relations. This also leads to more feelings of safety, but in a bigger part of society. Though it will take longer to accomplish, it is more sustainable. Moreover, I argue why contact is necessary to deal with the prevalent structures causing inequality. I also highlight the role of the dominant group in this aspect. Lastly, I discuss that integration doesn't necessarily mean that marginalized groups have to adjust to the norms of the minority.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the conclusion and final chapter of this thesis, I'll briefly summarize my response to the main question I have aimed to answer. Which is: to what extent should people from the same affinity group that want to live close to each other and form an urban community be allowed to do so? Then I will explain why I'm convinced integration combats social equality more (at least in the long term) than voluntary ethnocultural clustering does. Therefore I will argue why I believe people shouldn't be allowed to cluster. This should be prevented by implementing quota in workplaces, residential areas and educational institutions if necessary, but preferably through stimulation. I will offer some suggestions for follow-up research and policy-suggestions for local governments. Lastly, I will explain what the limitations of this thesis are.

Reflection

For this thesis, I have made some assumptions that maybe not everybody immediately believes to be as true as I believe them to be. First of all, the basic starting point is that basic equality in life for all persons is a crucial moral value. Secondly, I believe that there are deep injustices in our society that can be rectified only by basic institutional changes. As a result of this, certain groups are indeed oppressed. Lastly, I argue that structures of domination wrongfully influence society. Yet many people will at least be able to accept these assumptions enough to be willing to participate in a dialogue about their implications for conceiving social justice.

I have argued – based on arguments previously made by Anderson and Trappenburg - that the integration of affinity groups should preferably be stimulated or affected by quota if necessary. Residential quotas will be implemented to prevent clustering from occurring in workplaces and educational institutions. This benefits marginalized groups. In the following three paragraphs, I will elaborate on that. First I will argue that integration can contribute to combatting biases and therefore accomplish more social equality. Secondly, I will argue why integration can contribute to more economic equality (and therefore eventually also more social equality again) as well. Then I will go into the counter arguments of integration. First, I will explain why voluntary clustering is in the long term not beneficial for tackling

discriminatory structures. Secondly, I will argue why it is not an infringement on people's right to choose where to live or a limitation of the freedom of education.

First of all, integration benefits marginalized groups, because it is more effective in tackling biases that lead to discrimination. Contact leads to more understanding and thus to more social equality and social harmony. Ethnically diverse neighborhoods are often placed in cities and surrounded by negative stereotypes. But people who actually live nearby those neighborhoods, often know that the negative image of multicultural neighborhoods is incorrect. This makes white people who actually live close to those neighborhoods are often more accepting of people of color than white people living in villages. It is unlikely that those people are inherently less likely to believe in stereotypes, but they seem quicker to reject them, perhaps because their experiences don't confirm their biases. This indicates the tolerance of most inhabitants of cities is likely to originate from encounters between people from different ethnocultural backgrounds. People in cities have more encounters with different ethnicities than inhabitants of villages, yet are more accepting towards people from different ethnocultural backgrounds. This is supported by how inhabitants from rural Eastern Europe – where almost no people of color live - were crucial for conservative and anti-migration parties PiS and Fidesz to come to power. This indicates that people often find it way more complicated to dehumanize individuals that are standing in front of them.

Moreover, because of the racist structures that are unfortunately still present, white people in general often have more financial means than people of color. Therefore, there are usually better facilities in white neighborhoods. Not only in the sense of public transport, but also in the sense of educational opportunities. If people of color can use these as well, this would improve their opportunities and their circumstances – leading not only to more economic equality, but to more social equality as well. Having higher chances of better education means having better opportunities on the labor market. In the long term, voluntary ethnocultural clustering will not undo unequal structures and benefit marginalized groups. Perhaps there should be compensation for any downsides from clustering, but if clustering wouldn't occur, compensation wouldn't be necessary.

However, there are of course also potential downsides to integration in practice. Proponents of voluntary ethnocultural clustering will argue that there are some people from marginalized groups that want to live in clusters. Many people will only want to do so, because they understandably find the racist way they are treated insufferable. This is why it is crucial to create a society in which people from all ethnocultural backgrounds can feel safe. Even

though this is easier said than done, there are measures that governments can take. One of the solutions to this would be to implement a strict zero-tolerance policy towards discrimination. Stimulating diversity through integrative affirmative actions could also be a great course of action. The state can coerce educational institutions to a certain extent to accept students from various ethnocultural backgrounds by implementing quota.

Another counterargument against integration could be that it limits individual freedom. Quotas will have to be implemented in for example schools to ensure integration takes place. Those quotas, some argue, are too much of an infringement on people's liberties like freedom of education. People might be forced to send their children to mixed schools if they will not do this voluntarily. This would indeed limit the freedom of education, but I argue this is justifiable in this. Clustering can have severe consequences and a very defensible point of view is that certain rights end when they limit the rights of others. It is justifiable because it serves a greater good: equality. As has been theorized before, nobody chooses their ethnicity, gender, sexuality et cetera. Yet these are all aspects that can disadvantage people. This is why social equality is so crucial. Social equality or the absence of domination and alienation can only be achieved if people meet other people from a different background – as supported by the contact hypothesis.

Lastly, Young and Merry have argued that integration leads to minority groups not having a safe space to escape from oppressive structures in society. The contact hypothesis indicates that integration – under certain conditions – would make such safe spaces less necessary, because it will lead to more empathy, understanding and equality. Of course it is difficult to prove to what extent the contact hypothesis is actually true and how long it will take for stereotypes to fall away. It will definitely take a couple years, but what if it will take a couple decades or maybe even a century? Would it then still be justifiable to expect people from minority groups to integrate?

Suggestions for follow-up research

As a follow-up topic based on this thesis, I would therefore like to suggest researching the contact hypothesis further. First, its effectiveness needs to be empirically established and then the time it will take should be at least estimated. After that, a new moral contemplation on the tension between integration and voluntary ethnocultural clustering is necessary.

In relation to this, it would be interesting to investigate whether the progressive movement is indeed gaining support (as I have tried to show empirically) or if a stronger conservative movement is on the rise. It is difficult to determine to what extent the safe havens that people arguing in favor of clustering desire are indeed still necessary. Are people slowly becoming more open, or will social inequality remain at the same level? As I have argued, progressiveness is crucial in developing an openness to others and therefore to integration. Yet it is quite difficult to determine exactly how open-minded people currently are and then measure the effect of integration. Therefore this would be interesting to monitor and research.

Furthermore, another topic that could potentially be interesting, is whether quotas are necessary or if integration could also be achieved by incentives. What should these incentives look like? And if quotas are indeed strictly necessary, what should these quotas look like? How high should they be and where should they be implemented? These are questions that still don't have a conclusive answer.

Moreover, there seems to be a certain tension between the contact hypothesis and civic apathy, which could also be seen as leading to less interactions. Yet both the contact hypothesis and civic apathy are supposed to lead to adopting a more 'live and let live'-attitude that seems to be beneficial for integration. It could be relevant to see how these two concepts coexist and perhaps could even strengthen each other.

My last suggestion would be to investigate how to develop necessary skills to make integration go well. In other words: what kind of civic virtues are crucial in a diverse society? Such virtues can be tools to combat the racist structures that proponents of clustering often mention. Integration requires an investment of all parties involved and civic virtues are definitely something people should invest in to live together civilly. This requires an investment of all layers of government.

Recommendations for local governments

My recommendation for local governments to accomplish more social equality would first of all be to make sure the availability of affordable housing is available everywhere. But there should also be houses of diverse price classes available in every realm. This way, socio-economic clustering can be prevented. This is often related to ethno-cultural clustering,

because people with a non-native ethno-cultural background are more frequently in practical (low-paying) jobs. If certain neighborhoods only have houses in high price-classes, people with lower paying jobs will not be able to afford them. This also works the other way around: neighborhoods with only social rent will only attract people with low-paying jobs and therefore affect clustering. Having houses of diverse price classes in neighborhoods therefore stimulates mixing. If stimulation is not sufficient to accomplish the goals of integration and social equality, mixing should be enforced by quota.

However, even though integration is stimulated, this doesn't mean governments cannot offer groups places to practice their cultural habits (i.e. religious buildings). On the contrary, this is important in order to have support for integration. People will be more accepting of other cultural habits if they can have their own. It does mean that it is important to also offer places and events where interaction becomes possible. My second recommendation to local governments would be to facilitate this.

The last recommendation I would like to make, is that a zero-tolerance policy towards discrimination and racism should be implemented. Integration can only take place when marginalized people feel safe and secure – this is also reflected in the conditions of the contact hypothesis. They have to know that they're being seen as equal. Racist practices and comments don't contribute to this. Combatting this will increase the support for integration from people from marginalized groups.

Limitations

I would like to end by mentioning two limitations of this thesis. The first limitation is that my relatives and myself were all born and raised in the Netherlands. This is relevant in this case, because it means that I'm not bicultural, I don't have a migration background and I'm not a person of color either. This is also true for the authors I have used. So neither of us have any direct experience with clustering, integration or racism. The closest I could possibly come to such an experience is through listening to other people who have had these experiences and empathizing with them. Obviously, I have tried to do so, but empathy will never be equal to an actual experience. Therefore, perhaps a person of color might have come to different insights than me (or any of the other authors who plead in favor of integration).

Lastly, though I have given theoretical reasons why people can be expected to become more tolerant when integration is implemented in a specific way, there are always other societal factors that might affect behavior. The media has an important role in the narrative regarding immigration for example. This poses challenges regarding the refutation of the arguments in favor of voluntary clustering.

Nevertheless, I firmly believe that it should be possible to accomplish an equal society, where all citizens live in (relative) harmony with and amongst each other. A society where certain groups have to live separately from others, because they would otherwise be dehumanized and harmed, is not equal.

References

Advani, A., & Reich, B. (2015). *Melting pot or salad bowl: The formation of heterogeneous communities* (No. W15/30). IFS Working Papers.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

- Anderson, E., (2007). Fair equality of opportunity: a democratic equality perspective. *Ethics*, 117, 595–622.
- Anderson, E., (2010). *The imperative of integration*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193(5), 31-35.
- Bovens, M., & Trappenburg, M. (2006). Segregation through anti-discrimination: How the Netherlands got divided again. In *Clumsy solutions for a complex world* (pp. 86-104). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chaney, C., & Robertson, R. V. (2013). Racism and police brutality in America. *Journal of African American Studies*, 17(4), 480-505.
- Crenshaw, K. (1990). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stan. L. Rev.*, 43, 1241.
- Korkmazer, B., & Agirdag, O. (2015). Etnische ongelijkheid in het onderwijs. In *Armoede en sociale uitsluiting: jaarboek 2015*, 231-249.
- Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary political philosophy: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1986). The trace of the other. *Deconstruction in context*, 345-359.
- Lucas, C. G., Bridgers, S., Griffiths, T. L., & Gopnik, A. (2014). When children are better (or at least more open-minded) learners than adults: Developmental differences in learning the forms of causal relationships. *Cognition*, 131(2), 284-299.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). American Apartheid. *Inequality: Classic Readings in Race, Class, and Gender*, 103.
- Merry, M. (2012). Equality, self-respect and voluntary separation. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 15(1), 79-100.
- Merry, M. (2013). Equality, Citizenship, and Segregation: A Defense of Separation. New York: Palgrave
- Michalska, S., & Zwęglińska, D. (2018). Rural Populations and the Neo-Conservative Revolution in Eastern and Central Europe—Review and Commentary on the RECEO Special Issue No. 4/2016. *Eastern European Countryside*, 24(1), 245-254.

- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian political studies*, 30(2), 137-174.
- Schuppert, F. (2015). Non-domination, non-alienation and social equality: towards a republican understanding of equality. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 18(4), 440-455.
- Trappenburg, M. (2003). Against Segregation. Ethnic Mixing in Liberal States, *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 11(3), 295-319.
- Valentini, L. (2012). Ideal vs. non-ideal theory: A conceptual map. *Philosophy compass*, 7(9), 654-664.
- Van Leeuwen, B. (2010). Dealing with urban diversity: Promises and challenges of city life for intercultural citizenship. *Political Theory*, 38(5), 631-657.
- Villalpando, O. (2003). Self-segregation or self-preservation? A critical race theory and Latina/o critical theory analysis of a study of Chicana/o college students. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(5), 619-646.
- Young, I. M. (1990). Justice and the Politics of Difference. In *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1999). Residential Segregation and Differentiated Citizenship, *Citizenship Studies* 3(2), 237-252.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, I. M. (2008). Structural injustice and the politics of difference. *Social justice and public policy: Seeking fairness in diverse societies*, 77-104.